

Contents

Officers

5

PAPERS

The Devil and Daniel Shays

BY ROBERT A. FREER

7

Boston Woven Hose and Rubber Company:

Eighty-Four Years In Cambridge

BY ALDEN S. FOSS

23

The Middlesex Canal

BY BRENTON H. DICKSON

43

Lydia's Conversion: An issue in Hooker's Departures

BY NORMAN PETIT

59

Robert Frost of Brewster Village

BY ERASTUS H. HEWITT

84

The Discovery of the Charles River by the Vikings

According to the Book of Horsford

BY WENDELL D. GARRETT

94

Behind the Scenes at 47 Workshop

BY ELIZABETH W. BOLSTER

110

Jonathan Sewall: A Lawyer in Conflict

BY HILLER B. ZOBEL

123

Seventy-Five Years of Continuing Education:

The Prospect Union Association

BY ZELDA LIONS AND GORDON W. ALLPORT

137

A Historical Perspective

BY DAVID B. POTTS

159

Annual Reports

162

Members

167

The Cambridge Historical Society

LIST OF OFFICERS FOR 1964-1966

1964

<i>President</i>	<i>Mr. William L. Payson</i>
<i>Honorary Vice-President</i>	<i>Miss Lois Lilley Howe</i>
<i>Vice-Presidents</i>	<i>Mr. Richard C. Evarts</i>
	<i>Mr. Richard W. Hall</i>
	<i>Mrs. Robert W. Harwood</i>
<i>Secretary</i>	<i>Mrs. Charles S. Jeffrey</i>
<i>Treasurer</i>	<i>Mr. Alden S. Foss</i>

<i>Honorary Curator</i>	<i>Mrs. Henry H. Saunderson</i>
<i>Curator</i>	<i>Mrs. George W. Howe</i>
<i>Editor</i>	<i>Mr. Wendell D. Garrett</i>

1965

<i>President</i>	<i>Mr. Richard C. Evarts</i>
<i>Vice Presidents</i>	<i>Mr. Charles Conrad Wright</i>
	<i>Mr. Hollis G. Gerrish</i>
	<i>Mrs. Robert W. Harwood</i>
<i>Secretary</i>	<i>Mrs. Charles S. Jeffrey</i>
<i>Treasurer</i>	<i>Mr. Alden S. Foss</i>
<i>Honorary Curator</i>	<i>Mrs. Henry H. Saunderson</i>
<i>Curator</i>	<i>Mrs. George W. Howe</i>
<i>Editor</i>	<i>Mr. Wendell D. Garrett</i>

5

1966

<i>President</i>	<i>Mr. Richard C. Evarts</i>
<i>Vice-Presidents</i>	<i>Mr. Charles Conrad Wright</i>
	<i>Mr. Foster McC. Palmer</i>
	<i>Mrs. Robert W. Harwood</i>
<i>Secretary</i>	<i>Mrs. Charles S. Jeffrey</i>
<i>Treasurer</i>	<i>Mr. Alden S. Foss</i>
<i>Honorary Curator</i>	<i>Mrs. Henry H. Saunderson</i>
<i>Curator</i>	<i>Mrs. George W. Howe</i>
<i>Editor</i>	<i>Mr. Wendell D. Garrett</i>

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

1964

Mrs. Charles S. Bolster Mr. Robert G. Henderson

Mr. Hollis G. Gerrish Miss Penelope B. Noyes

Mrs. Charles Chauncey Gray Mr. Charles Conrad Wright

1965

Mrs. Charles S. Bolster Miss Penelope B. Noyes

Mrs. Richard W. Hall Mr. Foster McC. Palmer

Mrs. Charles Chauncey Gray Mr. Hartwell Pond

1966

Mr. Oakes I. Ames Mrs. Richard W. Hall

Miss Eleanor R. Appel Mrs. Ralph May

Mrs. Charles Chauncey Gray Mr. Hartwell Pond

6

The Devil and Daniel Shays

BY ROBERT A. PEER

AS children grow up, they change in many ways. But one important characteristic of childhood is never lost. Most people, of whatever age, sex, or description, retain one childish trait throughout their lives: the tendency to look for scapegoats, the effort to blame everything which goes wrong on someone else, the desire, the desperate desire, to find simple explanations for complex happenings — in short, to believe in the devil theory of history.

When a child is doing badly in his school work, the explanation may be a combination of several factors —he may be physically unwell; he may be distracted because his parents are constantly quarreling; he may be insecure and intensely jealous of his brothers and sisters. But the child will have one very simple explanation for his poor showing in school: "Mommy, the teacher doesn't like me." And so, the child explains history in terms of the devil, the devil in this case having taken the shape of the teacher.

And so it is with adults. In the late 1940's and early 1950's, it was fashionable in some circles to blame the Communist triumph in China on Harry Truman. Never mind the corruption of Chiang Kai-shek and the unwillingness of Chinese peasants to fight for a government which was doing nothing for them; never mind the military strength of the Communists or the hopes of a better future which the Communists held out to the Chinese. Never mind these and many other factors which account for the Communist victory; blame it all on Harry Truman.

Or, to take another example of the devil theory of history, the sit-in demonstrations, which have done so much to help win freedom for the American Negro, developed as a result of many factors ranging all the way from the adoption of the Declaration of Independence a century and three-quarters earlier to the sacrifices which Negro Americans made in World War n to defeat German and Japanese racism. And yet, in 1960, Harry Truman —the same Harry Truman who had himself been the victim of the devil theory of history a few years earlier — explained the sit-in demonstrations by recourse to the devil. The sit-ins, he proclaimed, were engineered by the Communists!

Blaming the devil is hardly new, however. Shays's Rebellion, which took place in western Massachusetts shortly after the American Revolution, has frequently been blamed upon the devil. What form did the devil take in Massachusetts during the winter of 1786– 1787 as farmers in western counties attacked the courts and the jails in order to keep from losing their farms to mortgage holders? It all depends upon which devil theory you care to accept, for two different devil theories have been developed to explain Shays's Rebellion. According to one version, Shays's Rebellion was the work of Tories; according to another, it was brought about by conservative Boston businessmen.

Soon after Shays's Rebellion broke out late in the summer of 1786, the Boston town meeting adopted a resolution which put the matter simply and directly: "We are convinced that the present disturbances, arise from British Emissaries residing Among us, whose every wish is for our Overthrow and ruin."¹ At about the same time, a newspaper editor commented concerning the armed attacks on courts, "I do seriously believe them to be excited, supported and encouraged by the emissaries of that nation to which we were formerly subject. They could not conquer us in the field, and they mean now to attempt our disturbance and ruin by exciting commotions, which tend to destroy the energy of our government and render it contemptible."² And so it went, with many

¹ *Boston Town Records, 1784 to 1796 (Boston, 1903), p. 131.*

² *Hampshire Gazette, Sept. 20, 1786.*

Americans, some of whom should have known better, blaming Shays's Rebellion on agents provocateurs sent into western Massachusetts by the British and by their American allies, the Tories.

It is sometimes difficult for the historian to prove that something was not being done. But, in this case, all of the available evidence makes it quite plain that neither Tories nor British agents were plotting or abetting a rebellion in Massachusetts.

Thomas Clarke, a local politician and representative to the General Court from Roxbury, wrote to Governor James Bowdoin early in September 1786, telling him about a neighbor in Roxbury who had a friend fifty miles away in Worcester County whose acquaintance had asked him to sign "a petition to the Parliament of Great Britain."³ This, according to Clarke,

proved that British agents were responsible for Shays's Rebellion. Bowdoin asked a confidant in Worcester County whose loyalty he trusted to look into the matter. No evidence of Tory troublemakers was uncovered, and the matter was dropped. This is typical of the flimsy evidence offered by those who argued that British and Tory agents provocateurs had started the Rebellion.⁴

The letters and diaries of Tories and British officials fail to uncover any plot against the government of Massachusetts. Just the opposite — their writings suggest that they had not heard of any such plot and would not have wanted to become involved even if the suggestion had been made to them. By the mid-1780's, most Tories had already faced up to the fact of American independence and were anxious to resume normal relations with their neighbors. And British diplomatic agents in America were convinced by the winter of 1786-1787 that the United States was here to stay and that it would be more realistic to try to get along with the new government than to hope for its collapse.

Phineas Bond, who was appointed British consul for the middle

³ Thomas Clarke to James Bowdoin, Roxbury, Sept. 8, 1786 (Massachusetts Archives, Vol. cxc, fol. 238).

⁴ For other reports of suspected Tory activity, see the following: Artemus Ward to James Bowdoin, Shrewsbury, Sept. 12, 1786 (Mass. Archives, Vol. CXC, fol. 252); Elbridge Gerry to Rufus King, Cambridge, Oct. 29, 1786 (Rufus King Papers, New-York Historical Society); Hampshire Gazette, Oct. 18, Nov. 8, 1786.

states in April of 1786 and arrived in Philadelphia the following autumn, had no fondness for the United States. He suggested opening a free port in the Bahamas from which the Spanish West Indies could be supplied, thus cutting off American trade and her most important source of specie. He helped smuggle back to England some textile machines which enterprising Americans had sneaked out of that country. And he suggested "very discreet and careful management" to encourage Americans to migrate to Canada. But he never proposed stirring up internal disorders or using secret agents to overturn American governments. Indeed, soon after his arrival in this country, Bond was convinced that Britain should prefer stable governments in America to weak ones.⁵

Throughout these years, Governor Bowdoin maintained an active correspondence with several British citizens who were sympathetic to the new American governments and who would likely have heard of any schemes of the British government to regain the lost colonies. John Temple, who came to the United States as British consul general, happened to be Bowdoin's son-in-law and was on good terms with the Massachusetts governor. Temple would have opposed plans to start a domestic insurrection within the Bay State which would have embarrassed his father-in-law and perhaps even have endangered his life, and would almost certainly have passed word of it along if he had heard of any such thing. Bowdoin's correspondents also included Thomas Pownall, a former royal governor who was thinking seriously of returning to America to live out his life, and William Vassall, who was seeking compensation for his estates which Massachusetts had confiscated. If either of these men had had any information which would have helped Bowdoin remain in power, they would likely have mentioned it to him in order to increase their own bargaining power.⁶

It is extremely unlikely that Shaysites would have admitted Tories to their ranks. Many of the petitions to the General Court

⁵ "Letters of Phineas Bond, British Consul at Philadelphia, to the Foreign Office of Great Britain, 1787, 1788, 1789," *American Historical Association, Report, 1896 (Washington, 1897)*, 1:513-659, *passim*.

⁶ "Bowdoin and Temple Papers" (*Massachusetts Historical Society, Collections, 7th ser., vol. VI [Boston, 1907]*), Vol. 2, *passim*.

demanding remedial legislation were vociferous in their denunciation of Tories and opposed their readmission to the state. Shaysites were proud of the part which they and their friends and relatives had played in the Revolution and would have resented anyone who told them that they had been foolish and that they should return to British rule.⁷ And, since these petitions to the General Court and the military action which followed them were organized on the local level, the citizenry would have known who the Tories in their neighborhood were and would have been able to pick out unfamiliar faces.

Efforts to blame Shaysism upon the Tories can be understood only in context of the suspicion of Tories and of anything British which permeated American life after the Revolution. Toryism took on all the aspects of an international intrigue as Americans became convinced that Britain's efforts to strengthen her hold upon Canada and the Indians in the Northwest were part of a plot to regain the former colonies.⁸ In such an atmosphere, charges of Toryism became part of the standard political baggage of American life, and were used by everyone from George Washington to the poorest town voter in western Massachusetts. As one Englishman living in America and familiar with American ways put it, "if the plague was to break out among ... [the Americans] they would be ready to impute it to the king's being in league with the prince of the power of the air,"⁹ Everyone blamed everything on the British. Shaysites wanted changes in the judicial system and justified their proposals on the grounds that the evils of the present court system had been copied from the British. It was just as natural for the "conservatives," for men who were reasonably satisfied with the political status quo in Massachusetts, to believe that the Tories were to blame

⁷ This generalization is based upon hundreds of petitions to the General Court asking for remedial legislation, preserved in the Massachusetts Archives and in town records scattered throughout the state. ⁸ See the following letters in Edmund C. Burnett, ed., *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress (Washington, 1936)*,

⁸:506—518: Henry Lee to George Washington, New York, Nov. 11, 1786; William Grayson to James Madison, New York, Nov. 22, 1786; Edward Carrington to Edmund Randolph, New York, Dec. 8, 1786.

⁹ William Gordon to John Temple, Jamaica Plain, March 15, 1786 ("Bowdoin and Temple Papers," 2:90).

for the unrest and violence. They did not need proof—they just knew it to be true.

Some men may also have hurled charges of Toryism against Shays's Rebellion in a conscious effort to smear their enemies. Toryism was a ready-made symbol of everything hateful, and some people likely decided that it would be much simpler to associate all of the emotions of this symbol with the Shaysites than to build up a new symbol. But most people probably believed quite sincerely — even if incorrectly—that Tories were to blame for whatever went wrong, including an insurrection in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

But Tories are not the only form in which the devil has been blamed for Shays's Rebellion. When the Rebellion was at its height, a Boston lady who frequently entertained her husband's political friends and who followed politics far more closely than was generally considered good taste for an eighteenth-century American woman hinted that Tories were not the only agents provocateurs. This, of course, was Mercy Otis Warren, that delightfully vigorous woman of the Revolutionary generation, friend of Abigail and John Adams and of Thomas Jefferson and sister of James Otis, a woman who wrote political satires, plays, poetry, and even history, whose portrait by John Singleton Copley graces a wall near the main entrance of Boston's Museum of Fine Arts. It was this sometimes-gentle lady who first suggested that Shays's Rebellion had been caused by Boston merchants who were up to no good. Writing to John Adams, who was then in London, Mercy Warren commented, "Time will make curious disclosures, and you, Sir, may be astonished to find the incendiaries who have fomented the discontents among the miserable insurgents of the Massachusetts, in a class of men least suspected." Nearly two decades later, in writing of the Revolution and its aftermath, she made her accusations slightly more specific. "These discontents," she said, had been "artificially wrought up, by men who wished for a more strong and splendid government." George Richards Minot, clerk of the House of Representatives who took pen in hand within a few months after the last shots of the Rebellion had been fired, made a

similar comment with the same absence of documentation: "Among the great body of the disaffected, were also to be discerned, many who wished to carry popular measures to such extremes, as to shew their absurdity, and demonstrate the necessity of lessening the democratick principles of the constitution."¹⁰

During the next century, little was heard of these charges that political conservatives had encouraged a popular insurrection as an argument for a stronger government.¹¹ But, within our own century, in the years following the Great Depression, when it became as fashionable to see a businessman behind every dark cloud as it had been to blame everything on Tories a century and a half earlier, the talk about agents provocateurs in Shays's Rebellion reappeared. One historian dismissed the suspicions against Tories as nonsense, but then went on to say, "This is not to exclude the possibility that agents provocateurs were at work among the Shaysites. But if so, they were more likely financed by conservative businessmen than by British gold. A good rebellion was what was needed, some reactionaries felt, to force the people to recognize the need for a strong central government with power to act in emergencies." He supported his argument by quoting Minot and Mrs. Warren and letters of Stephen Higginson and other Bostonians who seemed

pleased that a rebellion had broken out and who were not anxious to see it end quickly.¹² Another historian repeated Mrs. Warren's and Minot's gossip without specifically endorsing it, saying that "there were those who claimed that some men even encouraged the tumults to hasten the day of more powerful government."

¹⁰ *Mercy Warren to John Adams, Dec., 1786 (Mercy Otis Warren Letterbook, Mass. Hist. Soc.). Mercy Warren, History of the Rise, Progress and Termination of the American Revolution (Boston, 1805), 3:346. George R. Minot, The History of the Insurrections in Massachusetts. In the Year Seventeen Hundred and Eighty Six and the Rebellion Consequent Thereon (2nd edn., Boston, 1810), p. 105.*

¹¹ *See Samuel B. Harding, The Contest Over the Ratification of the Federal Constitution in the State of Massachusetts (Harvard Historical Studies, Vol. 2) (New York, 1896), p.13.*

¹² *Richard B. Morris, "Insurrection in Massachusetts," in Daniel Aaron, ed., America in Crisis: Fourteen Crucial Episodes in American History (New York, 1952), p. 33–37.*

¹³ *Robert J. Taylor, Western Massachusetts in the Revolution (Providence, 1954), p. 168.*

13

The most detailed exposition of this viewpoint was developed by Robert East in the late 1930's.¹⁴ According to East, there was a large body of conservatives in Massachusetts in the 1780's who wanted a stronger central government that could negotiate favorable commercial treaties with foreign countries and pay off public securities at face value. As the year 1786 wore on, the "extreme Massachusetts conservatives" were becoming desperate; they feared that the state was growing lax in fiscal matters and they could not convince all of their fellow conservatives of the need to strengthen the federal government. "Of these extreme nationalists, General Henry Knox was perhaps the chief spokesman." Knox and a few others realized that "the success of the Federal movement in Massachusetts" depended upon blasting "complacent" conservatives out of their satisfaction with the status quo and fusing "all types of conservatives into an aggressive nationalistic front." To accomplish this, East implied, Knox and a few men close to him planned a rebellion, organized a federal army with which to suppress it, and then used the incident to convince their fellow conservatives that a stronger government was necessary.

East never made the precise role played by each alleged member of the cabal explicit, and he agreed that "there is still a mystery in much of this, even as regards the conduct of General Knox." Knox was writing ominous letters "even before the insurgents had gathered at Springfield, and again after their peaceful dispersal," exaggerating the disturbances in Massachusetts which, according to East, were really no worse than they "had been for fifteen years or so." Meanwhile, Knox's close friend Major William North was out on the frontier sending in reports of unrest among the Indians — seemingly so that his patron would have them on hand to justify raising a federal army ostensibly against the Indians but actually to be used against the Massachusetts insurrection which had not yet broken out but which Knox and his friends knew was going to start

¹⁴ *Robert A. East, "The Massachusetts Conservatives in the Critical Period," in Richard B. Morris, ed., The Era of the American Revolution: Studies Inscribed to Evarts Boutell Greene (New York, 1939), p. 349-391- The quotations which follow are on p. 366, 367, 380, 382.*

14

soon. Baron Von Steuben, former drillmaster of the Revolutionary armies, was brought into the plot by his "dearest friend" Major North and was given the two-fold task of encouraging the insurgents and of convincing Prince Henry of Prussia to accept the job of King of the United States. Stephen Higginson's assignment was to write letters about the need for a stronger central government once the rebellion broke out. Rufus King's role remains particularly obscure, but East seems to have suspected that he, too, had a hand in stirring up Shays's Rebellion in order to provide the "common danger" which he "had come to believe by 1786" was the only thing which "would ever weld the states together."

East relied heavily upon circumstantial evidence. Many people were involved in suspicious activities—Major North sending in reports of an Indian uprising and then accepting a commission in the troops which were publicly justified through his reports but which were actually meant to be used against the Shaysites; Henry Knox casting about for a pretext upon which to increase the federal army and finding it in reports submitted by a friend; Baron Von Steuben encouraging the Shaysites at the same time that he was bemoaning the excesses of democracy. East also introduced letters in which Stephen Higginson and others did use Shays's Rebellion — after it had started — as an argument for a stronger central government. And finally, East cited the vague comments by such contemporaries as Mrs. Warren and Minot.

These accusations against eastern businessmen, however, are as dubious as the charges against Tories. Both versions of the agents provocateurs story reveal more about the periods which accepted them than about the Rebellion.

There is no direct evidence that any of the men mentioned by East and other historians helped to start the Rebellion. Correspondence, in some cases voluminous, has survived for all of the allegedly central figures —Knox, Higginson, North, Von Steuben, and King. And yet, in the hundreds of letters written by these men to one another and to others during 1786 and 1787, there is not a single statement about sending out agents to stir up trouble. There is evidence that the government planted spies among the Shaysites

in order to find out what their next move would be.¹⁵ But spies are a routine part of any military operation and are a far different thing from agents provocateurs. The absence of references to employing people to stir up trouble is not positive proof, of course, that it was not being done: it is possible that some of the arrangements were made in person and through letters which have disappeared. But it would be surprising if at least some written record did not survive if any such thing had been going on.

Not only is there no reliable evidence, but the stories which have developed carry so many self-contained contradictions and so many inconsistencies with known facts that it is difficult to accept them. East, as we have seen, accused Knox of writing letters to frighten people about the danger of rebellion "even before the insurgents had gathered at Springfield, and again after their peaceful dispersal, without touching the arsenal." But East failed to mention that courts had already been attacked at Concord, Worcester, Northampton, and Great Barrington, and that Knox had ample reason to be alarmed at the

seriousness of the threats. Nor was the confrontation between rebel and government troops at the arsenal the sort of "peaceful" or routine affair that East claimed. Thousands of armed troops facing one another and four dead when the smoke of battle cleared were harsh realities; they were not figments of Knox's imagination dreamed up for the purpose of scaring fellow conservatives. As to Knox's alleged support for Von Steuben's efforts to import Prince Henry of Prussia, Knox specifically rejected plans for an American monarchy on at least one occasion when the subject was broached to him.¹⁶ Furthermore, Knox was

¹⁵ Henry Knox to Joseph Williams, New York, Nov. 25, 1786; Knox to Thomas Dwight, New York, Nov. 25, 1786 (Knox Papers, Mass. Hist. Soc.). "A Sincere Friend" to Isaiah Thomas, Boston, Dec. 8, 1786 (Shays's Rebellion, American Antiquarian Society). Samuel Lyman to Samuel Breck, Springfield, Dec. 27, 1786 ("Bowdoin and Temple Papers," 2:122–124). Timothy Newell to Benjamin Lincoln, Great Barrington, April 30, 1787 (Wetmore Family Collection, Yale University Library).

¹⁶ For Knox's rejection of a monarchy, see Benjamin Tupper to Knox, April 1787 (Knox Papers, Mass. Hist. Soc.). Jefferson suspected Knox of complicity in a plan to turn Washington into a king in 1782, but there is no evidence that Knox favored a monarchy then or at any other time (Louise B. Dunbar, *A Study of "Monarchical" Tendencies in the United States from 1776 to 1801* [University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, Vol. 10] [Urbana, 1922], p. 40).

worried about the British invading the United States from Canada, and he would certainly have hesitated to stir up a rebellion which would have weakened the country internally at the very time that he feared an attack from a foreign power.¹⁷

The role assigned to Major North in the alleged plot also sounds unlikely. Starting in mid-August of 1786, North wrote to the Secretary of War about the possibility of an Indian war on the frontier, and Knox later submitted these reports to Congress when he wanted to raise an army, ostensibly against the Indians but actually against the Rebellion. East hints that Knox and North had arranged to have these reports on hand so that they would have an excuse to raise troops with which to control the Rebellion which they knew would break out in another couple of weeks. But North's reports were only a few of the many warnings about the danger of an Indian war which poured into the War Office for several months.¹⁸ And, while the War Office was being flooded with ominous reports, newspapers carried frequent notices of hostile Indian moves, and surveying of the Seven Ranges along the Ohio River had to be temporarily abandoned. There is no evidence that Knox was in collusion with any of these people. Further, North's behavior after accepting a commission in the new federal army was hardly what one might expect of a man who knew that he was taking part in a vast plan to start and stop a rebellion in order to remake the United States government. He became dissatisfied with his rank and jealous of his fellow officers.¹⁹ If North had been privy to Knox's deepest secrets, the Secretary of War could hardly have afforded to leave him dissatisfied.

The role that East assigned to Von Steuben also seems dubious. East pointed out that within a few days of one another Von Steuben authored both a newspaper article in which he expressed sympathy

¹⁷ Henry Knox to Samuel H. Parsons, New York, Nov. 19, 1786 (Knox Papers, Mass. Hist. Soc.).

¹⁸ *The Papers of the Continental Congress (National Archives) and Knox Papers (Mass. Hist. Soc.) contain extensive correspondence dealing with the possibility of an Indian war.*

¹⁹ *William North to Henry Knox, Dec. 8, 1786, and March 31, 1787 (Knox Papers, Mass. Hist. Soc.).*

17

for the Shaysites and accused the federal government of intending to use its new troops against the insurgents, and a letter in which he urged Prince Henry of Prussia to accept an American crown.²⁰ Encouraging the Shaysites and laying plans for an American monarchy can be reconciled, East implied, only by assuming that Von Steuben was part of Knox's plan to encourage unrest and to strengthen the government. But it would be strange, indeed, if Knox, who was trying to hide the real purpose of the new federal army, had planted someone to reveal its purpose! Rather than Von Steuben's activities having been planned in co-operation with Knox and North during August or September, the Baron's own correspondence shows that he did not make up his mind to publish his "Bellisarius" article on behalf of the Shaysites until near the end of October. There are simpler ways of accounting for Von Steuben's inconsistent actions than to place him in the midst of a group of schemers. His self-characterization as a man whose "impulsive nature too often leads me to folly" was an admirable summary of his personality.²¹ His whole life was so wound up in lies that he probably found it impossible to distinguish in his own mind between truth and fiction, between reason and foolhardiness. To Americans, he exaggerated his military exploits and social position in Europe. To Europeans, he lied about his accomplishments in America. He wrote the "Bellisarius" article in haste, probably without having thought seriously about its implications and with an inflated sense of his own importance. Obviously relishing the attention which the article would attract, he reported to North when he had finished it:

It is done;—said Brutus when he came out the Room of the Senat with the bloody Dagger in his hand, with wich he stabbit Cesar— it is done said he Vivat Republica aut periat Mundi.

²⁰ *For the "Bellisarius" article dealing with the federal troops and Shays's Rebellion, see John McA. Palmer, General Von Steuben (New Haven, 1937), Ch. 44. For the correspondence with Prince Henry of Prussia, see Richard Krauel, "Prince Henry of Prussia and the Regency of the United States, 1786," American Historical Review, 17 (1911-1912): 44-51.*

²¹ *Von Steuben to William North, quoted in Palmer, Von Steuben, p. 335.*

18

It is done sai I—with the pen in my hand, with wich I signed the name of Bellisarius to a piece wich will set all selected men in uproar, a Piece wich must raise Kings, Ministres and Ambassadors against a poor Republican—but Vivat Republica aut Periat Mundi.

He realized that his friend North, who was serving with the very troops which the article was exposing, would disapprove. And so, with his usual boyish enthusiasm, he ended his letter, "Pardon me, it is impossible to resist the temptation. . . . Scold me as much as you

please—but it is done."²² Von Steuben would hardly have written this sort of letter if his "Bellisarius" article were part of a secret plot which North knew about.

Von Steuben's letter to Prince Henry of Prussia about a monarchy for America was written the day after the "Bellisarius" article. A man of Von Steuben's temperament was probably untroubled by inconsistencies that might disturb others. He had likely become involved in the monarchist scheme first, drifting into it without ever quite realizing where he was going. Nathaniel Gorham, President of Congress, seems to have been seriously interested in working for an American monarchy. Hearing Von Steuben's stories of his close ties with European royalty, Gorham probably decided that the Baron could be useful and asked him to serve as go-between with Prince Henry. Von Steuben would have found it flattering to his ego to be asked to put a high American politician and a German prince in touch with one another. Even if he had wanted to avoid becoming involved, he would not have dared to refuse to help Gorham for fear that his lies about his European background would be discovered or that Gorham would block his petition for compensation for his Revolutionary services which was then pending in Congress.

It is also difficult to accept the alleged roles of the two remaining members of the cabal — Rufus King and Stephen Higginson. King's correspondence hardly shows a man who was co-operating harmoniously with four other conspirators. Immediately following the anonymous publication of "Bellisarius," for instance, King wrote

²² Von Steuben to William North, Oct. 27 and 29, 1786, quoted in same, p. 338-339.

*to his friend Elbridge Gerry damning the article and commenting that he suspected Von Steuben to be the author.*²³

Of all the supposed conspirators, it is easiest to convict Stephen Higginson on circumstantial evidence. Before the outbreak of the Rebellion, Higginson was convinced that Americans would be shaken out of their lethargy and into an awareness of the need for a stronger central government only by some major calamity. As early as 1785, he bemoaned the peace and quiet. "Perhaps nothing less than an apprehension of common danger will induce the States, to attend less to their separate and more to the general Interest in such Cases; but, however plain it may appear to the real politician, it is not easy in the moment of peace to impress upon the public mind, an apprehension of danger." Immediately before the outbreak of rebellion he was writing, "We appear to be verging fast to a Crisis. A change of Ideas and measures must soon happen, either from conviction or from necessity; when it does take place, I hope it will be for the better; it will then behove every man of property and influence to aim at giving the Tide a right direction." Once the Rebellion was underway, Higginson wrote several letters referring to Shays's Rebellion as the very crisis which would convince people of the need for a stronger government. During the Rebellion, he sounded quite pleased about it all. "You will endeavour no doubt to draw strong Arguments from the insurrection in this State in favour of an efficient General Government for the Union....This consideration...should guard those in office and power from an undue and ill timed modesty, as to the means to be used for increasing the powers of Government, and the manner of exercising them when acquired."²⁴

But Higginson's thankfulness for the Rebellion once it broke out does not prove that he helped to start it in the first place. Indeed,

²³ Rufus King to Elbridge Gerry, New York, Nov. 5, 1786, Burnett, ed., *Letters of Members*, 8:496-497.

²⁴ Stephen Higginson to John Adams, Boston, Dec. 30, 1785; Boston, July 1786; to Henry Knox, Boston, Feb. 13, 1787, printed in "Letters of Stephen Higginson, 1783-1804," *American Historical Association, Report, 1896* (Washington, 1897), 1:729, 741, 751-752. See also Stephen Higginson to John Adams, Aug. 8, 1785; to Henry Knox, Boston, Nov. 12 and 525, 1786; Boston, Jan. 20, 1787, in same, p. 724-725, 742-744.

20

many circumstances make it unlikely. Most of Higginson's letters during the winter of 1786-1787 urging that Shays's Rebellion be used as an argument for a stronger central government were written to Henry Knox — which would hardly have been necessary if Higginson and Knox had started the Rebellion for that very purpose. Furthermore, even after the Rebellion was suppressed, Higginson was still telling people that a common danger would be necessary to awake people to the need for a stronger central government.²⁵ In other words, this sort of talk was nothing but a rhetorical device which Higginson lapsed into whenever he thought about the political indifference which had settled upon most of his friends and neighbors. Higginson, indeed, was not the only one to use such language. David Humphreys warned that as a result of the refusal of states to pay their federal requisitions, "we are rapidly advancing to a Crisis....nothing but a good Providence can extricate us from our present difficulties and prevent some terrible convulsion."²⁶ And Washington was only one of many who said that he had "little hope of amendment without another convulsion."²⁷ But Washington was certainly not plotting to start a rebellion in Massachusetts when he used such words, and it is unlikely that Higginson was, either.

What, then, were the causes of Shays's Rebellion? The Rebellion was, basically, an outgrowth of postwar economic and psychological conditions in Massachusetts. The economy of Massachusetts was slower to recover from the war than most other states, and the merchant-creditor class which controlled Massachusetts politics saddled her with heavier taxes than taxpayers in many other states had to endure in the same period. Moreover, economic hardship came to Massachusetts at the very moment that her citizens, who had fought for freedom against England, had expected to enter a

²⁵ Stephen Higginson to Nathan Dane, Boston, March 3 and June 16, 1787, in same, P- 752-754, 757-760.

²⁶ David Humphreys to George Washington, New Haven, Nov. 1, 1786, in Frank L. Humphreys, *Life and Times of David Humphreys Soldier—Statesman—Poet "Belov'd of Washington"* (New York and London, 1917), 1:374.

²⁷ George Washington to Henry Lee, Mount Vernon, April 5, 1786 (John C. Fitzpatrick, ed., *The Writings of George Washington* [Washington, 1938], 28:402).

21

postwar world of comfort and security. As men had told one another again and again during the war, everyone would live "under his own vine and fig tree" as soon as peace returned.

It was the clash between the high hopes for the postwar years and the harsh economic realities of the mid-1780's which produced rebellion. Shays's Rebellion was not caused by the devil, whether in the shape of Tories or Boston merchants and their conservative friends.

Read January 28, 1964

22

Boston Woven Hose and Rubber Company: Eighty-Four Years in Cambridge

BY ALDEN S. FOSS

T*HE Boston Woven Hose and Rubber Company was founded in 1880. Based on a survey made by the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce, it is the oldest of the dozen largest industrial concerns continuously in business in Cambridge. It is now in its eighty-fourth year.*

EARLY YEARS 1880-1898

This part might be entitled "From Sewing Machine Hose to the End of the Bicycle Craze." These early years are recorded in a four-page article in Cambridge in 1896 published when Cambridge celebrated its fiftieth birthday as a city. We, that is, Boston Woven Hose, were then sixteen years old. The account was written by no less a person than our founder and President, Theodore A. Dodge, a retired Civil War Colonel.

Let us briefly summarize his four pages. Prior to 1880 hydraulic hose, meaning both fire hose and garden hose, was fabricated either from strips of leather riveted together to form a tube or from strips of canvas sewn longitudinally on a sewing machine, a machine invented by Lyman R. Blake and exploited by Gordon McKay of Cambridge. Colonel Dodge had invested in the McKay hose venture, but it was unsuccessful. The public looked askance at the sewn seams. Then one James E. Gillespie approached the Colonel with drawings of a loom to weave multiple-tubular products. The Colonel was sold on the idea and backed it. The first machine had

23

80,000 parts and was too complicated to function. Dodge then hired a young machinist named Robert Cowen who, after much time and effort, was successful in redesigning and simplifying the loom. By 1880, and after having spent over \$150,000, they went to market with their new product. They rented two rooms in the Curtis Davis Soap Factory on Portland Street. That first year they employed seven persons and produced and sold 15,000 feet of woven cotton garden hose —no mention of a rubber tube.

This time public reception was good. But the Colonel's resources were inadequate to finance a growing business. Hence in 1884 he formed the Boston Woven Hose Co., a Maine

corporation, and took in an associate, Mr. J. Edwin Davis, Harvard 1883, who became Treasurer. The new company had a capital of \$150,000. They took over more space in the soap factory and by 1886 they were employing sixty hands, and production could not keep pace with sales. In 1887 they purchased the Kinsley Iron property and put up a three-story brick building at the corner of Portland and Hampshire Streets, which still stands and is used today as our office building. From then on the company prospered. More land was acquired, more capital raised, more buildings built. By 1893 the annual output of Hose exceeded one million feet. The scope of the business was expanded to include many types of hose, belting made of several plies of cotton duck impregnated with rubber, and other mechanical rubber products.

It was in 1893 that bicycle tires were first developed and sold. The demand for them was terrific. All effort was turned to tires. At first the tires were in two parts – a casing and an inner tube. In 1895 the Vim hose-pipe tire, or single tube tire, was promoted and it was a pronounced success. Our sales technique or merchandising plans for bicycle tires in the Gay Nineties might interest you. No trading stamps in those days. Rather we sought testimonials from racing men. In 1895 our contract with one Walter Sanger provided for \$45.00 per week for salary and expenses to be paid to him during the racing season, for which he agreed to ride our Vim tires on both wheels in all his races, to post us as to his wins and to use his influence toward advertising and pushing our tires.

24

Now let me read to you from a booklet circulated in 1895 advertising our Vim bicycle tires.

One of the greatest if not the greatest features of the Vim tire is the pebble tread, the first non skid tread. We can produce hundreds of testimonials from riders who will use nothing else.

The pebble tread makes the tire a wonderful hill climber. In fact it now holds the world's record in climbing the famous Corey Hill in Brookline Mass., the greatest number of times in an hour.

Last September at the Springfield tournament, Vim tires were decidedly in evidence. Walter Sanger, the great racing man, rode them on his wheels and succeeded in winning most brilliantly the three races in which he started.

By far the most brilliant race was the two mile professional handicap on the second day, September 12, which was described in the Boston Globe of the next day as follows:

"Sanger, the big fellow, got up on scratch in the two mile professional handicap which was a magnificent event. At half, Sanger's nearest man was Starbuck.

"The field bunched heavily at the turn into the third lap, and Starbuck, jumping ahead of the big one, pulled Sanger up to the bunch at the mile and a half.

"Porter was in a great position to go through in the pole. Sanger saw it and tied up to the Waltham boy. Showing his profound generalship and tremendous power, he simply tailed Porter who was bound to land at the head of the bunch.

"He went steadily up and up, till he was in a good position. Then his admirers thought he had flunked. He suddenly fell back on the turn, but he knew his business, and came grandly around until he had an open hole in front of him.

"Then he came through. For an awful second to the people to whom Sanger was a favorite, he seemed to be in danger of first place, but he was riding his favorite race and knew his own power. Sanger's time was a world record for the two mile.

"Sanger said repeatedly that night, that while he himself was in good condition, he owed the race to the Vim tires."

Another sales promotion was to team up with a manufacturer of bicycles who had his own stable of racing riders. We would agree to pay a lump sum and to give them "free of charge all the racing tires they may call for, in consideration of their using our Vim tires as original equipment on cycles sold and mentioning our tires in

25

their advertisement." A further proviso in one such agreement was that "all Class A men who are drawing a salary are to waive the gold brick scheme." I recall that the gold bricking was where the races were fixed so that the riders occasionally could bet on a sure thing.

On renewing a contract with one of our racing men, after stating the weekly stipend and other conditions, we added, "and notify us that you have taken the pledge." Apparently salesmen have changed little.

One of our salesmen, Pete Alexander, who was still with the company in my first year, 1928, was a bicycle fan and had been a professional racer. His enthusiasm made me wish I had been around a generation earlier.

Another sales promotion was a giant tricycle built for us in Concord, New Hampshire, around 1895. A group from our factory went to Concord to accept delivery of it, and fortunately had their picture taken. Our Vim trade-mark on all the tires is conspicuous, and if you look closely, you can also read Boston Woven Hose and Rubber Co. The two big wheels must be twelve feet in diameter. The chassis was sturdy enough to support seven men, at least for this picture. One man could propel it by its chain drive and could steer it. Undoubtedly he wore a cap and jersey with Vim prominently displayed on each.

In an account of the big parade in Cambridge in 1896 celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of its becoming a city, all the entries are listed. No concern had more than Woven Hose with a total of eleven floats, presumably horse-drawn drays. Products were displayed on some; employees rode on others. One float is described as having four wheels with Vim tires twenty feet in diameter, and another carried the large rubber-tired tricycle. Apparently the parade moved too fast or too far for the rider to pedal it. What ever became of this tricycle is now a mystery.

The BWH property was bisected by the Broad Canal. For many years the company's letterheads included a picture of the plant which changed as buildings were added and the canal filled in. An 1886 letterhead shows a two-masted schooner with sails filled about

26

to dock behind Building #1, the Portland Street end of the canal. One used about 1890 shows horsecars passing along Hampshire Street and a lone rider on a high-wheel bicycle —sometimes called a penny-and-farthing bicycle. It undoubtedly had hard rubber tires which our company made by the mile for many years for children's tricycles, velocipedes, go-carts, baby carriages, etc.

THE BROAD CANAL

This part might be entitled "From Canals for Transportation to Canals for Process Water." Cambridgeport in its early days depended largely on canals for transportation. Our member, John Wood, referred to this canal system in his paper on Cambridgeport in our 1954 Proceedings. We are also indebted to John J. Nolan of the Somerville Historical Society and Wendell Garrett of our own Society for further information on this subject.

To sum it up briefly, in 1793 a single road, now Main Street, was used to bring produce of the outlying country to the mouth of the Charles River for shipment by boat. Efficient transportation then was by water. Canals were dug at the river terminus of Main Street to provide more docks to accommodate more boats. In 1805 Congress passed an act making Cambridge a port of entry, and our Legislature authorized an extension of the Middlesex Turnpike along what is now Beacon Street in Somerville and Hampshire Street in Cambridge to provide a second thoroughfare to the dock area of Cambridgeport. Grandiose plans were made for a land development for industrial purposes tied to canals for cheap transportation. But the War of 1812 interfered. Then by mid-century the railroads were coming into their own, and the canal system lost its great appeal, and the promoters lost all their equity.

The Broad Canal has long been a valuable asset of the Boston Woven Hose. It is eighty feet wide, about one mile long, and runs in a westerly direction from the Charles River. The rights to it run back to an agreement recorded in the Registry of Deeds, July 8, 1806, which locates several canals, including ours, and grants to abutters "right of water communication" in perpetuity. The Broad Canal as there denned, included a twenty-five-foot wide extension

across Portland Street under a bridge to that part called West Dock. West Dock, later acquired by BWH, was then a turn-around basin for ships. A footnote on page 182 of Paige's History of Cambridge (1877), reads: "Lots were laid out around West Dock with 20' water frontage apparently designed for stores and warehouses and were sold at high prices; but it does not appear that any such buildings were erected."

At least two canals were actually dug as branches of the Broad Canal. South Canal connected with the Charles River, paralleling what is now Ames Street, and Cross Canal ran in a northerly direction from our property towards the Lechmere area. It may have serviced several iron foundries and steel rolling mills then located near our property.

When I started at the Hose in 1928, the coal for our power plant came up the Broad Canal in barges pushed by tugs. An old bucket crane unloaded the barges. Even then the Canal

was supplying processing water —cooling water for the turbines and for rubber mills and calenders and for other manufacturing purposes.

Numerous proposals have been brought up for filling the Broad Canal. There are four bridges over the Canal and all were drawbridges. A tug whistled and the drawtender raised the bridge. One was operated by the M.D.C., two by the city, and one by the B&A Railroad. No longer can any of these bridges open for barges and tugs, but the "rights to water communication" still are a valuable asset of the Woven Hose.

The West Dock area, west of Portland Street, was filled before 1870. A story told by old-timers was that in a remote corner a cockfighting pit operated successfully for many years and was frequented by all the prize fighters in and around Boston. When Woven Hose bought the property, a good title could be had only by putting it through the Land Court. For many years this area has served us as a much-needed parking area.

On the subject of land titles, I was surprised to find the name of our late highly esteemed Vice-President, Lois Lilley Howe, on one of our deeds. One of our early land purchases was from one Sheldon who in turn had bought from Estes Howe, father of Miss Howe.

28

Our attorney found a flaw in the deed from Howe to Sheldon, and, Howe having died, his heirs gave us a confirmatory deed signed by Lois Lilley Howe I and II, apparently mother and daughter, and by several more Howes.

Many are surprised to learn that goldfish once abounded in Broad Canal. In summer they were not conspicuous, but in winter you could find open water where the "cooling water" from our power plant was returned to the Canal carrying sufficient heat to keep the surface water free from ice. There the goldfish basked in the winter sunshine. Our power plant was abandoned in 1946 and the goldfish deserted us. Also, on hot summer days, boys used the canal for swimming, diving off the bridges, until the police would chase them away for lack of proper attire.

Water transportation brings to mind the Page Box Company. Its land abutted ours and also Broad Canal. In 1928 we purchased the Page Box property. Its history is given at length in Cambridge of 1896. It was founded in 1844. It owned timberlands in Maine. It brought its lumber in sailboats from Maine up the Charles River and up the Broad Canal to its own dock. No extra handling in transit. Our million-dollar reclaim plant was built in 1952 on the Page Box land.

To return to the 1896 Cambridge anniversary book, Colonel Dodge closes his long account of his company as follows: "The enterprise which forms the subject of this monograph is sound to the core, and the City of Cambridge may well reckon the Boston Woven Hose & Rubber Co. among the best samples of prosperity in this memorial year." Just two years later, in June 1898, a letter was mailed to "The Creditors and Stockholders of the Boston Woven Hose & Rubber Co.," announcing that the company had made an assignment for the benefit of its creditors, to Josiah Q. Bennett and Robert F. Herrick, both of Boston, and Hermann Reimers of New York City. A gloomy picture is painted. Book assets had shrunk by

\$1,000,000, and liabilities, recorded and contingent, exceeded the appraised values of the "expert accountants."

No reason is given for this sad situation. I believe that 1898 was a depression year, both in the United States and in Europe, but

29

many sound companies weathered the storm. The information that I got in 1928 from the few old-timers who were around in 1898 was that the company's fiscal policies were extremely lax. Business began to slow up, and instead of cutting back production, we kept the bicycle tires rolling out. When we could not sell them, we consigned them. Not only this country but also Europe and Australia had consignments of our tires. In the 1890's rubber products did not age well. Rubber would "bloom" from sulphur reaction, and harden and crack. The result was that many customers gave us notes that were never paid, and many tire consignments were charged off 100%. The appraisal value of Accounts and Notes Receivable was 45% of the book value, and the inventories were appraised at 70% of their book value.

The assignees did not liquidate the business. The old liabilities consisted largely of notes payable to small country banks — commercial and savings banks — scattered all over New England, New York State, and even farther afield — three or four pages of bank creditors, all for relatively small sums. If I was correctly informed, the assignees set out energetically to effect compromise settlements and met with considerable success, making settlements from as low as 60% on up.

In May 1899 a prospectus was put out by the investment firm of Poor and Greenough, bankers, of Boston and New York. The prospectus consisted of three pages and bears little resemblance to an S.E.C. approved prospectus. Seventy-five hundred shares of 6% preferred were sold for \$750,000, and 4,500 shares of common were given away — one share free for each two preferred purchased.

The control was acquired by a group of Salem and Lynn men, which included Joseph N. Smith, Howard B. Sprague, and Benjamin F. Spinney. Smith served as President from 1900 until his death in 1912. His son, J. Newton Smith, served as President from 1928 to 1951. The reorganized company was successful from the start—very successful. We hear no more of Colonel Theodore Dodge — and no more of his treasurer, J. Edwin Davis. But the plant manager, Robert Cowen, was retained by the new management.

30

TWO WARS AND TWO DEPRESSIONS, 1899-1951

There is an artist's drawing of our plant made about 1915. Actually, it reminds me of the first time I saw Al Jolson. He comes on stage as a chauffeur, long linen duster, linen cap, goggles, and of course black-faced. He starts to talk about the bad roads in Kentucky. He stops short, turns to the man beside him, "Boss, was you ever in Kentucky?" Answer, "No." Then with broad smile, Al says, "Good, then I can speak freely." Well, the artists who

pictured our property for letterheads have always sketched freely – apparently believing no one receiving our letters will ever come to Cambridge.

The long building on Hampshire Street east of Building 1 may have been talked about once, but it was not there when the picture was made and never was built. Four big buildings were built in 1907, two for manufacturing (one a foundry) and two on a rail siding, one for incoming freight and one for stock and shipping. In 1910 came the brass shop. In 1912 a power plant –a beauty built by Stone & Webster – a top-flight mill room in 1913; another building in 1914, another in 1915, etc. How were these financed? By paying very large dividends with one hand and taking the money back with the other. For example, with the stock selling at \$150, a stockholder had his choice of taking \$100 cash or a share of stock, and everyone took the stock. Hence the tremendous expansion before, during, and after World War I was out of retained earnings.

In 1906 Joseph N. Smith brought into the company George E. Hall to be his successor. Mr. Hall was a dynamic individual, a man of action, and an able leader, and dominated the company for the next twenty years. All was smooth sailing for George Hall and Company until the severe but short-lived panic of 1921. Many good companies did not weather the storm, but we had learned our lesson in 1898. Business halted and prices plummeted. George Hall in his Report to Stockholders stated that inventories with cost value of almost five million dollars lost 50% of their value in less than six months. Purchase contracts were non-cancelable. Our bank borrowings rose to a peak of 4 1/2 million dollars, and our debt

exceeded our net worth. But, to quote George Hall, "by fair dealings we held our customers." Business recovered rapidly and in the next two years we more than made up the 1921 loss.

Let's see how the company fared in World War I, 1916-1919, with the income tax in its infancy, compared with the World War II years, 1942-1945, when excess profits taxes and renegotiations were confiscatory. A four-year period is taken for each war for purposes of comparison. Sales in first four-year period were 33 1/2 million and profits after taxes almost 2 1/2 million or 7.1%. Sales in second 4 years were 42 1/2 million and profits after taxes and renegotiation were almost 1 million or 4.1%. Income taxes had taken 17% of profits in World War I and 59% of profits in World War II. My point is that war taxes, while not burdensome for George Hall in World War I, were backbreaking for J. Newton Smith, President in World War II.

What about the Great Depression 1929-1932? George had died in 1928 and J. Newton Smith was at the helm. He was sound and conservative; 1899 was still very real to him. Our pounds produced dropped off only 10 to 15%, but our dollar volume dropped off to less than half the average for the preceding years. We both reduced drastically the number of employees and cut wages and salaries of all, showing no discrimination. Is there anything unreasonable in expecting management itself to take a salary cut if management is unable to produce a profit? It seems fair to me, but it is rarely done in this day and age.

In his annual reports, Newton Smith always referred to the taxes paid and related taxes to per share earnings. In 1935–1936 we paid our first Social Security taxes totaling \$10,000. In his report, Newton Smith commented that "This tax will increase rapidly in future years."

How true this remark was. Last year our Old Age and Unemployment Taxes, here in Cambridge, came to between \$300,000 and \$400,000 — and the trend is still upward.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO OUR CITY

What has Boston Woven Hose contributed to Cambridge and to the economy of our country? For these many years we have been

32

one of the largest producers of products for moving material, hose for moving all kinds of liquids, hundreds of different kinds of hose, and flat belting for power transmission and for conveying solids, sand and gravel, coal and coke, grain in grain elevators and food stuffs in canneries, etc. Hose and Belting have accounted for roughly two-thirds of our total business.

Our company has employed from 1,200 to 1,600, of whom roughly one-third have lived in Cambridge, one-third in Somerville and the remaining widely scattered. Assuming an average wage of \$80 per week, total payrolls for the year have run to near 5 million dollars, with at least one-third spent in Cambridge. Our company has been one of our city's largest taxpayers. Tax information is available in City Hall. By 1940 our annual property tax had reached the \$50,000 mark and had doubled in amount by 1956. Our property has grown from 2 or 3 acres and only 2 multi-storied buildings in 1898 to its present 6 1/2 acres with 20 or more buildings containing 15 acres of floor space.

Poundage in and out of a plant is a better measure of volume than dollar sales as poundage does not fluctuate with inflation of our currency.

<i>In 1910 we shipped</i>	<i>16 million pounds</i>		
<i>By 1920 it was</i>	<i>44 "</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>"</i>
<i>In 1928 a then record</i>	<i>52 "</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>"</i>
<i>In recent years</i>	<i>60 to 70 "</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>" per year</i>

Sixty million pounds per year is approximately 120 tons each work day. For many years most of our freight moved by rail or water. We were good customers of the railroads. And in the twenties and thirties much of our freight moved by boat to East Coast ports to Gulf ports and through the Panama Canal to Pacific Coast ports. Before 1910 New York City shipments went by water.

One of our catalog pages soon after 1900 assured New York City customers that if their telegraph order reached us before noon, the goods would be on the dock in New York the next morning. This was accomplished by a horse-drawn dray moving the goods to the South Station in time to catch the Fall River boat train, and the boat would dock the next morning in lower New York. Our New

33

York customers say they are not getting as good service today. After World War II much of our freight shifted to trailer trucks, but I am glad to say that in the past year or two the railroad piggyback services have put many of the long-haul trucks off the roads.

To return to Cambridge, our refinancing in 1898 was done largely with Lynn and Salem capital which our company attracted to Cambridge, but we also had numerous Cambridge stockholders. The most notable was Josiah Q. Bennett, father of our J. Clark Bennett who served as an assignee of the Theodore A. Dodge interests in 1898 and then for many years as Secretary and Director of the successor company. Among our early stockholders was Charles F. Cushman who served on the company's Auditing Committee in 1908 and 1909. Now his son Robert A. Cushman audits our Historical Society books. A public-spirited family, as both have served generously without pay. Another tie with Cambridge was the aforementioned George E. Hall, General Manager and President of our company from 1907 to 1928. Mr. Hall was closely related to our Society's distinguished member and former Treasurer, Oakes Ames.

Our factory whistle deserves mention here. For a great many years it has, at the request of the City Fathers, blown all fire alarms, the no-school signals on stormy days, and a 9:30 P.M. curfew when all good teenagers are off the streets. Also our whistle has summoned each shift to work, our plant normally working at least some departments three shifts. In recent years complaints from the occupants of 100 Memorial Drive have resulted in curtailing much of our whistle-blowing. But on cold winter nights our whistle could be heard clearly as far away as Avon Hill. Clark Bennett recalls that when his father heard our whistle sounding a fire alarm, he always feared it was a fire at either our plant or the Cambridge Electric Light Co. He was financially interested in both companies and unfortunately both were plagued by fires in the early years. Almost all rubber solvents are flammable liquids.

In 1924 our company was the first, or one of the first, small group to make Savings Bank Life Insurance available to its employees through payroll deductions. Industrial life insurance, offered by

the big life insurance companies was being broadly sold to the working man and he was paying a very high price for term insurance. Always conscious of the working man's injustices, our U.S. Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, sponsored the legislation enabling the savings banks of this state to write low cost ordinary life insurance for the great rank and file. Over the intervening years \$1,800,000 of life insurance has been written by the savings bank for our employees. Premium payments have been near the \$50,000 per year level, paid wholly by the employees.

Similarly our company has co-operated with our Employee's Credit Union which makes low-cost loans available to our workers. It was Edward A. Filene who fathered the Credit Union movement in this state to aid the working man. The only cost to our company for both these services has been the modest cost of making payroll deductions.

CHANGING PRODUCTS

Let's look at some of our products. Over the years we have advertised that we manufacture everything made of rubber except automobile tires, footwear, molded products, and druggist sundries. An 1896 catalog is devoted largely to bicycle tires and all kinds of accessories for the bicycles, but also refers briefly to hose, belting, packing and matting. An 1892 catalog listed several pages of products including roll matting, mats, perforated mats for porch or vestibule, table mats, and cuspidor mats.

At our meeting last March, Mr. Stephen T. Riley of the Massachusetts Historical Society read from a very old manuscript a guide to good manners and conduct for youth. It mentioned when and where to spit, or not to spit. This immediately brought to mind our cuspidor mats. For thirty or forty years they were in our line, pictured in our catalog, and sold by the thousands each year. Tobacco-chewing was the habit of most male employees from the bottom to almost the top. Particularly in the days of buildings built in part or entirely of wood, there were strict rules against smoking as a fire hazard. Chewing was the alternative. Every passageway and stair-

35

way had a pail of sand, and every office had a brass spittoon centered on a cuspidor mat. Even if the President and Treasurer did not chew, all the foremen did, and foremen were in and out of the executives' offices all day, every day. When I came with Hose in 1928, a regular task of the night janitor was to clean the cuspidors. If in the morning the mat was spotted or the cuspidor did not shine to sparkle in the sunlight, there was a great to-do. By World War II the cuspidors had disappeared, but many laborers in our plant still chew tobacco.

Soon after 1900, our catalogs included rubberized fabrics for automobile and carriage tops and curtains. Automobile topping developed into a big volume item with us. We supplied both Ford and General Motors in a big way. The pay was always prompt, but both companies were extremely fussy about quality. The appearance always was too shiny or not shiny enough, or there was some other complaint. The introduction of hard tops in the early thirties spelled the end of our auto-topping business.

Another large volume item, before and after World War I, was heels and soles. Production in 1915 was 6,000 pairs per day. In 1926 the decision was made to expand the company's business in industrial products, chiefly hose, belting, and packing, and withdraw from the highly competitive consumer items, one of which was heels and soles. No one then dreamed that thirty years later it was to be one of our competitors on heels and soles who would take over our company — of which more later.

The shift in our belting business is interesting. In the 1890's when canvas belting was being introduced, we were still selling leather belting. As the overhead shafting in mills was replaced by direct drives from individual electric motors, the sale of flat belting for power transmission fell off sharply. However, the use of flat belting for conveying materials increased by leaps and bounds. The biggest single order our company ever obtained was from the Coal Board in England, 2 1/2 million dollars of conveyor belting to mechanize the government-controlled coal mines soon after the close of the Second World War. Let me

add that, foreseeing the decline in demand for flat belting for power transmission when World War II

36

was ended, we equipped to manufacture V-Belts for direct drives and today enjoy a substantial volume of V-Belt business.

Garden hose has always been a big volume item for us. Sales figures on products are strictly confidential – would aid our competitors. But in a booklet printed in 1916 we were not bashful in reporting garden-hose shipment of: "20 miles of hose per day or enough in a year to reach from Boston to San Francisco." Actually this would be 5,000 miles a year or enough to reach to San Francisco and back again. Today Woven Hose continues to be a leader in rubber and plastic garden-hose sales.

Last winter Professor Theodore Levitt of the Harvard Business School talked to a group of Cambridge men and his subject was "Think small for big profits." In other words, big companies often lack the imagination to see the potential in small things. A perfect illustration can be found in our company during World War I.

An official of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., called to interest us in developing a fruit-jar rubber which would withstand boiling water for the length of time required for sterilization, not of the rubber, but of the contents of the jar. The object was to improve the efficiency of home canning. He happened to remark that he had been to the big companies in Akron and the undertaking was too small for them to bother with. This was a challenge to our then Director of Research, John M. Bierer. He believed it could be done and soon produced satisfactory laboratory samples. By that time it was mid-summer and the Department of Agriculture field workers were going out to visit the farm communities, granges, county fairs, etc., and wanted samples in quantity overnight. How should we package them? Any old package will do. The only lot of surplus jar-ring cartons were imprinted with the Good Luck trade name and were hurriedly packed with the new rings. That summer and autumn they were so enthusiastically recommended by a small army of U.S. Government field workers that we enjoyed the lion's share of the fruit-jar rubber business in the nation for the next fifteen or twenty years. We got so far ahead of the big companies they could not catch us. And the profits were very substantial.

37

To quote from a 1915 newspaper clipping: "Fruit Jar Rings form nearly a fourth of the Company's total business. Ten tons of rings are turned out each working day and the yearly production, if linked together in the form of a chain would twice encircle the globe." Soon after 1928 our Advertising Manager boasted that the Good Luck name and good will would easily bring a million dollars, should we desire to sell it. The Good Luck emblem, the Greek cross or Swastika, was on our jar-ring cartons until Hitler came along. Then it was hastily replaced by a four-leaf clover. No consideration was given to using up the Swastika cartons on hand. They were promptly burned.

Another product made a substantial contribution to our country's war effort in the Second World War. Wherever our Armed Forces went, there also gasoline in large quantities must go. Storage tanks above ground were easy targets for enemy bombs. Underground tanks of concrete could be built quicker and cheaper than ones of steel. But the gasoline must be protected from the concrete. Our company came up first with the answer: a tank lining of oil-resistant synthetic rubber film. The lining must be attached to the tanks with oil-resistant rubber cement. During the War we lined hundreds of underground tanks in every corner of the world, successfully completing contracts that ran well over the million-dollar mark.

Time does not permit the discussion of many other products, including rubber and friction tape, and the products of our brass foundry operated from 1907 to 1957 where we produced garden-hose nozzles, fire-hose couplings and play pipes, and sundry other brass items.

CHANGING PROCESSES

Boston Woven Hose was always searching for ways and means of improving processes and products. Many, many patents were taken out by its engineers and chemists and assigned to the company. Time permits reference to only a few of these major pioneering accomplishments.

The circular loom for weaving hose jackets has already been dis-

cussed. The next concerned the art of reclaiming rubber—recovering usable rubber from old tires, be they auto or bicycle tires, and from any other rubber scrap. This was and still is of tremendous importance. The supply of crude rubber always has been limited, and price fluctuations have been wide. The company which could make a good quality reclaim at a reasonable cost had a great advantage.

Most scrap rubber contains cotton yarn or fabric. Prior to 1890 reworked rubber with the cotton fiber still in it was mixed in with crude rubber but resulted in an unsightly appearing finished product. Next a process, broadly used, involved heating the scrap rubber with a dilute sulphuric acid which destroyed the cotton content and slightly softened the old rubber so that it would blend with new.

It was in our plant in the 1890's that a process was developed utilizing hot caustic soda instead of sulphuric acid, commonly known as the alkali process. It was a breakthrough in the art of reclaiming. The resulting product was highly plastic and free from the deteriorating action of the acid. This development work was done in our laboratory by two young men, Arthur Marks and Raymond B. Price, working under the direction of Robert Cowen, Plant Manager. Unfortunately for us, this process was proven and had reached the patent stage in 1898, just when financial troubles beset our company. Mr. Marks left us and went to work for the Revere Rubber Co., a strong competitor, and Mr. Price went to the Calumet Rubber Co. in Chicago. Both took out patents on the alkali process but did not assign them to us. The Philadelphia Rubber Works acquired these patents and first collected

royalties on the process. Our reorganized company had to be satisfied with shop rights —right to use the process without paying royalties to anyone.

On the subject of losing ambitious young men who saw greener pastures elsewhere, the list is long. Two notable ones are the present President of the U.S. Rubber Co., George R. Vila, who worked for a few years in our laboratory directly after his graduation from M.I.T. Another is a former President of B. F. Goodrich

39

Co., Bill Richardson, who worked in our factory for a few years after the end of World War I. He died only a few years ago.

Another outstanding discovery was the oxygen bomb for testing the useful life of rubber products. Freshly made products always could be tested for strength, stretch, and resistance to abrasion. The \$64 question was, how would they age? What would be their useful life? Must we wait two, three, or four years to find out which of several compounds would wear best or last the longest? Messrs. Bierer and Davis of our technical staff recognized that the oxygen in air is the major cause of rubber aging and believed that a way could be found to expose rubber samples to pure oxygen with controlled pressure and heat, and the results could be translated into a practical yardstick for measuring the useful life of each compound. The result was the oxygen bomb, which accomplished all this to perfection. No attempt was made to patent it or profit by it outside our own operation. We publicized it, with the result that practically every rubber manufacturer throughout the world has adopted this method of testing rubber products. Several hours of testing accurately foretells the results of several years of usage —a great boon to the rubber industry.

Skipping over many other patents or improvements in the quality of our hose, belting, and other products, let us look at one more major achievement to our company's credit, the Rotocure machine for the continuous vulcanization of sheeted and plied rubber products. Prior to World War II, all manufacturers employed flat presses or platen presses for vulcanizing belting, flooring and other sheeted-rubber products. A thirty-foot flat press would press thirty feet at a time —open, pull through another thirty feet, and repeat. Press marks were left between each press, tensions were not always uniform, etc. A group in our company headed by John M. Bierer, who later became President, conceived a method of continuous vulcanization. Overcoming many obstacles, they developed a machine which turns out sheeted rubber or plastic products as a Rotogravure printing press turns out your Sunday newspapers. This machine was patented and has been purchased by rubber manufacturers all over the world. This process was not given away.

40

Handsome royalties have been collected by our company, starting in 1946 and not yet exhausted.

A bit of humor in this connection.

In December 1949, John M. Bierer was the principal speaker at a meeting of the Institution of the Rubber Industry at Manchester, England. His subject was Continuous Vulcanization and the Rotocure Process. In his introduction he paid tribute to Thomas Hancock, who discovered a practical method of vulcanizing rubber in England at about the same time Charles Goodyear made a similar discovery in this country. But in the year 1949 Russia was claiming that it invented the steam engine, sewing machine, and about everything else. So Bierer observed that probably it was of little consequence whether vulcanization was first discovered in England or the United States because undoubtedly Russia was first with the idea.

A very few years later a Russian buying commission became very much interested in our Rotocure machine and requested literature on the subject. Thereupon arose a serious dilemma for us. The only adequate presentation of the subject in print was the Manchester address with its unfortunate reference to Russia, now our prospective customer. But this story has a happy ending. The booklet was submitted with the first page, containing the introduction, removed. We got the order, delivered a machine on time, and received our usual substantial royalty.

REBIRTH OF THE COMPANY

Before I close, you may be interested in where the Boston Woven Hose and Rubber Company fits into the picture today. It must be admitted that our Cambridge plant is inefficient by modern standards. Most of our buildings are four-story, long and narrow, with elevators of too-limited capacity. The efficient plants today, such as our own newer ones outside Massachusetts, are all on one level, with raw materials coming in at one end and flowing through automatically from machine to machine with little or no handling until the finished product comes out the other end. This efficiency is not possible in our older buildings.

41

In 1954 our company's operations resulted in a loss of close to \$1,000,000 before tax credits. In 1956 the American Biltrite Rubber Co. of Chelsea, Massachusetts, a highly successful manufacturer of heels and soles and floor coverings, acquired the controlling interest in our company. In 1957 Boston Woven Hose was merged with, and into, Biltrite, and thereupon Woven Hose ceased to be a corporate entity. Since then BWH has been a name only, or style under which our industrial products are marketed.

But the future of the American Biltrite is bright. It operates a dozen plants, most of them new, in five different states. Its growth pattern is impressive. Its stock is listed on the American Exchange, symbol ABL. Fortune magazine includes it in its list of the five hundred biggest companies in the U.S.A. It is a company with a promising future.

Read October 27, 1964

BIBLIOGRAPHY

History of Cambridge 1630-1877, by Lucius R. Paige,

Riverside Press, 1877.

The Cambridge of 1896, edited by Arthur Gilman,

Riverside Press, 1896.

Cambridge Fifty Years a City,

Riverside Press, 1897.

Our Neighbors at Kendall Square,

Murry Printing Co., 1922.

Continuous Vulcanization with Reference to Flooring, Belting, etc.,

by John M. Bierer, F.I.R.I.,

W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd., Cambridge, England, 1950.

Chamber Members—Fifty Years or More,

Cambridge Chamber of Commerce, 1961.

Also use made of old files of Boston Woven Hose and Rubber Co., more especially old patents, trade marks, deeds, catalogs, and Annual Reports, by courtesy of American Biltrite Rubber Co.

The Middlesex Canal

BY BRENTON H. DICKSON

ONE DAY I was standing on the Route 129 bridge across the Shawsheen River in Billerica, looking off at the great aqueduct ruins that towered above me, admiring the huge slabs of hand-cut granite so skillfully fitted together and thinking of the activity that once went on at this location. Suddenly an automobile stopped beside me and the driver, pointing at the ruins, said, "Those are curious objects. I've often noticed them driving by. I wonder what they are."

I explained that they were the remains of the Great Shawsheen Aqueduct, and he replied, "You don't say. What's that?"

I told him it was one of the eight aqueducts of the old Middlesex Canal —that formerly these objects supported a wooden trough filled with water, just wide enough for one boat to pass through at a time. Meanwhile boats were tied up in basins at either end, awaiting their turn to cross over the river. The boats, I told him, were usually seventy-five feet long by nine and one-half feet wide and carried twenty tons of cargo.

His next question was why the trough didn't leak, being made of wood, and I explained that New England had always been famous for shipbuilding and that this was like a ship in reverse.

"I wouldn't have thought of it that way," he replied, "but I suppose you're right."

As we talked we became a source of annoyance to passing traffic, so my friend decided to park fifty yards down the road and return on foot for further enlightenment. Our only interruption now was

43

the wife who couldn't care less about the canal and remained in the automobile. Every now and then she poked her head out the window and glared at us but her husband waved her back. Finally she got very impatient and started blowing the horn. Though I disapproved of her indifference toward an interesting epoch in American history I deferred to her wishes, concluded my lecture, and released her husband.

So tonight I will try to be sensitive to your emotions and stop talking before you wish you had a horn to blow at me.

Until a few years ago the course of the old Middlesex Canal could be traced, with minor interruptions, from Woburn to its confluence with the Merrimack River in Middlesex Village, an out-skirt of Lowell. Now, unfortunately, many of the well-preserved sections of towpath have disappeared, victims of real-estate development. It is disheartening to see the old embankment flattened by the bulldozer—many weeks of hard work erased in a matter of minutes. And what a contrast with 1795 excavation methods! At that time the canal was under construction, and the company's tool inventory included 274 shovels, 230 wheelbarrows, fifty-one crowbars, forty-three pickaxes, eight stoneboats and one cart.

This small number of tools constituted but one of the many handicaps to construction. Consider also the sparsely populated countryside: Boston was a city of only 20,000, Medford, Woburn, and Chelmsford were small villages, and Lowell at this time was nonexistent. Consider also that there were no canals of any length in the country. The Santee Canal in South Carolina, the only one to antedate the Middlesex, was still under construction; Pennsylvania canals, for which surveys were being made, were still very much on paper; and the Erie Canal was only a dream.

What remains of the Middlesex Canal today is more interesting for its historical significance than for its scenic value; but when one looks back 135 years the picture changes. It was a busy thoroughfare then with boats coming and going during the daylight hours. Cargo boats, proceeding along at a leisurely pace had to pause in order to make way for the canal's luxury liner, the General Sullivan, which had right of way over all other craft. Drawn by two

44

horses at a trot, it maintained a rigid schedule and covered the twenty-eight miles between Charlestown and Middlesex Village in seven hours. With its carpeted cabin and upholstered seats it was a model of comfort and elegance. "Seated in summer under a capacious awning," L. L. Dame has written, the traveler on the General Sullivan was at leisure to enjoy the view where "soft bits of characteristic scenery, clear cut as cameos, lingered caressingly in his vision; green meadows, fields riotous with blossomed clover, fragrant orchards and quaint old farmhouses, with a background of low hills wooded to their summits." Moreover, a passenger was assured a safe voyage, because the General Sullivan was "protected by iron rules from the dangers of collision; undaunted by squalls of wind, realizing, should the craft be capsized, he had nothing to do but walk ashore."

Cargo boats took eighteen hours to travel the length of the canal. Unlike the General Sullivan they had to observe a two -and -a -half-mile -per-hour speed limit and await their turn at the locks. These boats were drawn "each by a single horse walking on the towpath close to the water," according to P. L. Converse, and were attached "by a long rope to the boat amidships. As there was usually no driver the helmsman generally had a pile of small stones or apples near to touch up the horse with."

Once on the Merrimack River, cargo boats no longer depended on horses for propulsion. With favorable wind the boatman would set his sails. "Boats," wrote Henry Thoreau, "with their broad sails set moved slowly up the stream in the sluggish and fitful breeze like one-winged ante-diluvian birds." Lacking a favorable wind the boatman used poles or scull oars. The rivermen, Thoreau added, taking their fourteen or fifteen foot poles set the iron tip in the river's bed and, pushing as they went, walked back about a third the length of the boat. With hardly a sound they were "creeping stealthily up the side of the stream like alligators." These boats "commonly carry down wood or bricks — fifteen to sixteen cords of wood and as many thousand bricks, at a time and bring back stores for the country. They sometimes pile the wood so as to leave a shelter where they may retire

from the rain. One can hardly imagine a more healthful employment, or one more favorable to contemplation and the observation of nature. Their busy commerce did not look like toil, but rather like some ancient Oriental game played on a large scale, as the game of chess for instance." The boatman was "a brawny New Hampshire man ... of nameless age with flaxen hair and weather-bleached countenance in whose wrinkles the sun still lodged. As little touched by the heats and frosts and withering cares of life as a maple of the mountain —an undressed, unkempt, uncivil man . . . his humanity was genuine and his rudeness only a manner."

Canal boats also plied the Concord and Sudbury rivers, primarily to transport iron ore mined in Sudbury to the foundry in Chelmsford. According to Thoreau, "The news spread like wildfire when one of these boats came up the meadows and past the village. It came and departed as silently as a cloud. Where precisely it came from, or who these men were who knew the rocks and soundings better than we who bathed there we could never tell. We admired how their vessel would float sustaining so many casks of lime, and thousands of bricks and such heaps of iron ore, with wheelbarrows aboard . . . and it gave us confidence in the law of buoyancy."

At its southern terminus in Charlestown, near the old state prison, the Middlesex Canal departed from the Charles River. Twenty-one miles beyond, by a series of locks, the canal reached its summit in North Billerica, 107 feet above sea level. "Your progress was slow but it was sure," according to Bailouts Pictorial Drawing-Room Companion. "It was a good day's work to go from Boston to Lowell. You embarked at Charlestown in a trim-built barge drawn by two horses harnessed tandem. At the very outset you entered a lock. The gates enclosed you in a damp wooden receptacle and you seemed to be hopelessly lost to society in the bottom of a mouldy chest. But...you gradually found yourself rising in the world finally coming up to a quite respectable elevation. Then the gate swung open; the horses were put to and you resumed your voyage...Ever and anon a 'Sail ahead' would appear in the shape of a vast flatboat laden with flour or lumber or the produce of some

46

nascent factories, or it may be, a huge raft of timber came floating down with two or three mariners in charge and an old spavined horse dragging the establishment."

The canal wound its way through Charlestown and Somerville, crossed over the Mystic River into Medford on an aqueduct and paralleled the river to the Mystic Lakes (a section of towpath and aqueduct abutment can still be seen here) then through what is now Winchester to Horn Pond, Woburn; and after skirting the shore to the far end it was elevated fifty feet by three sets of double locks. Horn Pond, being readily accessible to Boston via the Middlesex Canal, became a popular resort. Pleasure boats took passengers on scenic trips while "Kendall's Brass Band and the Brigade Band of Boston rendered sweet harmony and the crowds wandered from the groves to the lake and back to the canal where shots of lumber, rafts and canal boats laden with cargoes were continually passing through the locks."

And high above Horn Pond, beside the uppermost lock and commanding a fine view of the countryside, was Horn Pond Tavern, another gay spot. It deteriorated badly with the falling off of canal traffic and was the scene of the Horn Pond Raids of 1844 when the "Woburn Washington Total Abstinence Society was aroused at its meeting to form a posse of 30 leading citizens and break up the cockfighting at that previously delightful resort."

A letter describing a trip from Boston to Horn Pond and written by an eligible young lady, states in part, "Entered the boat at Charlestown and set off at one half past nine; the water gave coolness to the air and the boat being covered gave shelter from the sun." We went "to the most romantic spot (9 miles from Boston) that I ever beheld. . . . On this island a band of music was placed which began playing as soon as we landed. It seemed a scene of enchantment." Her companion, equally enthusiastic, wrote in her diary about how they disembarked near water lilies. Some of the ladies expressed a desire for them and two gallant men "dashed into the lake and wading about gathered a number of lilies, brought them to shore and distributed them at the great risk of their health as they were obliged to wear their wet clothes the rest of the after-

47

noon. Fortunately they were attired in black silk or stuff pantaloons which were not injured in appearance."

Behind the present Woburn Library there was a large basin with wharfs; from there the canal proceeded northward, under the present Route 128 and on to Wilmington, where Maple Meadow Brook was crossed by an aqueduct, the abutments of which are in excellent condition. Just short of the aqueduct, the canal turned such a sharp corner that the long towropes rubbed against a ledge and left scorings which are still clearly visible. The abutments of another aqueduct in Wilmington are still in place, but the most interesting ruin is at the Shawsheen River close to Route 129. The original Shawsheen Aqueduct supported a wooden trough 188 feet long, but it was shortened considerably when rebuilt in 1830, and these are the ruins one sees today. Although vandals have been at work on the old structure it is still an impressive sight.

The canal then went on to North Billerica where it entered the Concord River. This was its highest elevation, or fountainhead, and water flowed from here in both directions and constituting the main supply for the canal. A floating towpath, removable to allow river traffic to pass, crossed the Concord River at this juncture. A lock on the far side lowered boats into the final seven-mile section of canal.

At Middlesex Village the boats descended into the Merrimack River by three cement locks, historically interesting because they were the first examples of hydraulic cement in this country, antedating the cement industry here by twenty years. By trial and error and varying the proportions of ingredients, a substance was discovered that became as hard as stone under water. "Decades ahead of other attempts," Christopher Roberts wrote in his history of the canal, "The Middlesex Canal bore every burden of a pioneer work. These years of struggle were a gain to American engineering."

The charter for the Middlesex Canal was granted in 1793. Ground was broken in Billerica in 1794 with some show of ceremony; one wit was quoted more recently as saying, "The stockholders were broken without ceremony later on." It was finally

completed the last day of December 1803. Forty-eight years later it ceased operations battered by competition from the child it had nurtured —the Boston & Lowell Railroad. The birth of this child was not of the canal's choosing, but once born the proprietors took advantage of the situation and transported rails and ties for it on their canal boats. These were profitable years while they lasted, but with the completion of the railroad the canal became obsolete. Counting locking and other delays, it normally took a freight boat about eighteen hours to travel from Boston to Lowell; today the running time for a nonstop passenger train is thirty-two minutes! When the railroad was extended to Concord, New Hampshire, a five day journey by water, the end was close. The last boat passed through the canal in 1851 or 1852. A century later, in 1950, a new edition of the Chambers Encyclopedia was published in England, and its description of Concord, New Hampshire, closes with the following statement: "The Middlesex Canal links Concord with Boston." The canal contributed greatly to the rapid development of the Merrimack Valley and inland New Hampshire during its thirty prerailroad years. "From Bedford and Merrimack have been boated the bricks of which Lowell is made," said Henry Thoreau. Granite was brought down

from Tyngsboro and Concord; new sources of bark were opened up to the tanners of Woburn; firewood, agricultural products, and lumber were brought down from what Thoreau refers to as that "vast uplandish country." The navy yard in Charlestown and the shipyards on the Mystic relied for many years on the canal for the greater part of the timber used in shipbuilding. When textile mills were built in Lowell, coal and cotton were transported to them by the canal in great quantities and finished goods were shipped to Boston.

Upon completion of the Middlesex Canal, a mania for building canals swept the countryside and New England became a network of canals on paper, although only three besides the Middlesex, and the much later Cape Cod Canal, ever reached completion. The most ambitious project for New England was one that was never actually begun —a cross-state canal from Boston to Troy, New York. Surveys were completed, and it is interesting to note that a

49

railroad later took, more or less, the route recommended for the canal. The surveyors recognized the necessity of tunneling through the mountains and the location they chose was where the present Hoosac Tunnel was bored some years later. They estimated that a tunnel would cost between \$400,000 and \$900,000; it actually cost \$10,000,000 which would have been the financial ruin of any canal company. The tunnel builders repeatedly faced unforeseen obstacles; the state kept granting more and more money, and there was no end of legal red tape. At one point, a sage aptly remarked that he knew how to get the tunnel finished quickly: just put a group of lawyers at one end and a large fee at the other.

Three other New England canals, however, were completed. One in Maine went from Portland to Sebago Lake and brought timber and agricultural products down from the inland regions. This twenty and one half mile waterway was opened in 1830 and closed forty years later when the Portland and Ogdensburg Railroad was completed.

Another went from New Haven, Connecticut, to Northampton, Massachusetts, more or less paralleling the Connecticut River. It was 78 miles long with sixty locks and over 500 feet of climbing and descending to get over topographical obstacles. For some years there had been considerable traffic on the Connecticut River with the result that Hartford was growing too fast to suit the New Havenites. The promoters of the canal argued that they could divert a lot of business away from Hartford by digging a canal. After all, they said, who would use a river if a canal were available?

In theory this argument had a certain amount of merit. On a canal, boats were drawn by horses and elevated from one level to another by locks, with comparatively little effort on the part of the boatmen. On the other hand, poling one of those clumsy barges laden with cargo upstream on a river was no child's play in spite of Thoreau who said "their busy commerce did not look like toil but rather like some ancient oriental game." Harlow's description is probably more realistic when he wrote, "The butt end of the pole was set against the boatman's shoulder, the other against a rock in the bed of the stream, and with back to the prow, the man moved

50

slowly aft pushing with all his might. On some streams —such as the Connecticut, his shoulder would often be fearfully bruised or lacerated after a few hours toil up through the rapids."

This canal got its charter in 1822, and after a long downhill struggle it too passed into history. It seemed to have more than its fair share of floods, washouts, and musquashes; and once a farmer who lived beside it had a feud with his neighbor and avenged himself by digging a hole in the canal embankment and flooding his neighbor's fields. Navigation presented many difficulties. A newspaper account of an excursion mentioned that "after beating and luffing and puffing and sweating and waiting for the ebbing and flowing of the tides to get over locks and stones and shoals for about nine hours it was found that one boat had advanced the immense distance of 8 miles and the other 6." In spite of the canal both New Haven and Hartford flourished, while the canal investors were the losers to the extent of about \$2,000,000.

Finally, there was the Blackstone Canal that extended north from Providence to Worcester. It was forty-five miles long with forty-eight locks of cut granite. Bostonians tried to prevent its construction, as they feared loss of business from inland Massachusetts. It was finally opened in 1828, begrudged not only by Boston but also by all other communities not close to the river. But, a Worcester resident remarked proudly, "We struck while the iron was hot and welded Worcester and Providence together and it will take a stronger arm than that of Samson to break us apart."

It carried cotton, molasses, and flour inland and brought back coal from the Worcester coal mines. It suffered, however, a chronic water shortage. The mills along the line were forever accusing the canal of draining their reservoirs, and their owners dumped sticks and stones into the locks at night, which nearly precipitated civil war. The boatmen threatened to burn the mills, so armed guards were maintained as a precaution.

A scheme was proposed for connecting the canal with Lake Quinsigamond in order to make the Worcester coal fields more accessible. Barges could be loaded on the shores of the lake, and coal shipped to all four corners of the earth by way of the Black-

stone Canal; one of the sponsors argued that Worcester coal was as good if not better than Lehigh coal. It could make a world-wide name for itself and put Worcester on the map. Another Worcester citizen with a more practical outlook, having used the coal in his mill, remarked that the residual ash weighed more than the coal itself! In any event, the connecting link to the lake was never dug. The canal was replaced by a railroad in the 1840's, and a few holes in the ground along Coal Mine Brook are all that's left of the great coal fields of Worcester! In the end, the Blackstone Canal was considered the greatest financial fiasco in the history of Providence. Long afterwards, in 1914, the Cape Cod Canal, a waterway of quite a different scale and character, was opened, more than two centuries after it was first proposed.

The practical work of planning and building the Middlesex Canal was accomplished by James Sullivan, attorney general and later governor of Massachusetts, and by Loammi Baldwin of Woburn. Baldwin is perhaps best known for the apple that bears his name. During the original survey for the canal through Butter's Row in Wilmington, an unusual number of woodpeckers were observed all flying toward the same location. The surveyors' curiosity was aroused, and upon investigation they found a wild apple tree with unusually good fruit. Baldwin did much to promote and propagate this apple. At first it was called the Pecker Apple, after the woodpeckers, but the name was later changed to Baldwin.

Baldwin was a natural genius. He had no advanced education, with the exception of attending a series of lectures in experimental philosophy at Harvard College given by Professor John Winthrop. He interested his friend and neighbor Benjamin Thompson, later Count Rumford, in attending the lectures, and they both walked eight miles daily from Woburn to Cambridge. Once home in the evening they repeated the experiments of the day with homemade apparatus.

The original survey for the canal was made by Samuel Thompson, magistrate of Woburn. As leveling instruments were then unknown in this country, he used a surveying method of his own

52

which consisted of squinting along a carpenter's level and making laborious calculations. Naturally, he made some rather bad errors. He estimated the ascent from Charlestown to the Concord River in Billerica as sixty-eight and one half feet —it was actually about 107. He estimated that the Concord River in Billerica was sixteen and one half feet lower than the Merrimack at Middlesex Village —it was twenty-five feet higher, or an error of forty-one feet in six miles! The directors soon realized the necessity for a more accurate survey. They heard of an Englishman named Weston who was surveying for canals in Pennsylvania, and Baldwin took a trip there to find him.

Weston consented to come to Massachusetts. Mrs. Weston, Baldwin wrote, "has more than once expressed a passionate desire of visiting Boston and has frequently told me that she longed to be acquainted with ladies and gentlemen of that metropolis. She observed that all English gentlemen and ladies enjoyed themselves better in Boston than any place on the continent. I daresay that in my important business you will think this a very trifling circumstance to report to you —however, I declare that almost my only hope of securing Mr. Weston's assistance . . . rests on this circumstance." Never underestimate the power of a woman!

In September 1794, Mr. Weston presented his report and a bill for his services of somewhat over \$2,100. This was for a little less than three weeks of work. In sharp contrast, the company was able to secure day labor at \$8 a month. The directors paid Weston without a quibble, thanked him profusely, and expressed the hope that they might call on him again. "There is neither plan nor estimate of the line," commented a British expert to whom Weston's report was shown a few years later, "and Mr. Weston's report is too general to afford much information." In justice to Weston, however, it should be mentioned that his levels were accurate and that he made two definite contributions: he instructed Americans in the art of leveling and surveying and he inspired confidence in the feasibility of the canal.

On September 10, 1794, Loammi Baldwin turned the first shovel of sod to formally begin construction of the canal. Other digni-

53

taries followed suit, each offering a little prayer or sentiment as he did so. Different sections were let out to independent contractors, but few jobs were ever completed on schedule. Labor was scarce, and men who were dismissed for disorderly conduct were often re-employed soon afterward. The wages paid were presumably as much as could be earned at manual labor elsewhere. They reached a minimum of \$7 a month and board in 1794-1795, and over the next six years they rose to \$10 a month. The working hours were from sunrise to sunset with time off for breakfast and the noon meal but no more than was necessary for eating.

As time wore on and completion still seemed a long way off, the stockholders became more and more impatient. They were constantly being assessed, and there was no immediate prospect of any return on their money. In an effort to console them, the directors in 1797 ordered the opening of the section between North Billerica and Middlesex Village. Baldwin pleaded for postponement, but the directors were adamant.

In November a group of prominent citizens went to North Billerica and embarked on two horse-drawn barges. As they proceeded along the canal, workmen marched beside them on either bank carrying their tools over their shoulders. They had received instructions from a long notice that ended: "It is requested that the dress of the workmen be decent and clean, their movements active but regular, their behavior civil and respectful; in short, their general conduct such as shall do honor to themselves and those concerned will consider themselves honored thereby." Once through the locks at Middlesex Village, the passengers disembarked and walked over to Howard's Tavern, a short distance away, passing between two rows of workmen still holding their tools in position. There, a sumptuous feast was provided.

As Baldwin anticipated, this trip caused a lot of damage. Banks collapsed, the lining sprung leaks, and some of the masonry was ruined. It was not until five years later that this section was opened to daily business, although after 1800 there were frequent junketing trips with large feasts for prominent citizens and discouraged stockholders. A pleasure barge had been especially decorated for

54

these excursions, the hull a brilliant red, the awning a bright blue, the seats and parts of the interior a vivid orange —a cheerful combination of colors, to be sure, but hardly enough to make them forget the mounting financial losses.

In 1802 daily passenger service was established between the Concord and Merrimack Rivers, and on December 31, 1803, water for the first time passed through the southern section of the Middlesex Canal. "The town of Boston is now connected by water to an

extensive and fine country on the Merrimack and up to Winnisaucopi Lake 130 miles and more," said a public notice.

John L. Sullivan, son of the general, took an active interest in the canal and carried on many experiments, one of which was with steam propulsion. He developed, on the Middlesex Canal, the first tugboat in the United States. Robert Fulton heard about it and wrote requesting information from Sullivan, who considerately answered the letter in detail. Fulton thereupon applied to the U. S. Senate for a patent embracing all of Sullivan's ideas, but his claims clashed with an application made by Sullivan some months later. When the question of priority of discovery was submitted to referees, Sullivan won. Towing by steam on the canal was abandoned in 1820 and never resumed. The time saved by slightly greater speed was more than offset by the extra time consumed in putting the boat through the locks.

Under the direction of Caleb Eddy, who managed the canal company for many years, the perishable wooden locks were replaced with locks of stone, a new dam was built in Billerica, and the service brought to a high state of efficiency. The new dam was the reason for a lawsuit brought by the proprietors of the Sudbury meadows. They argued that the canal had got along perfectly well with the lower dam for the past twenty years and should not be allowed to increase the height. The defendants secured the services of Samuel Hoar assisted by Daniel Webster. Webster accepted a retaining fee of \$100 to manage and argue the case in conjunction with Mr. Hoar. "Mr. Webster was called on by me," wrote Eddy, "and promised to examine the evidence and hold himself in readiness for the trial, but for some time before he was not to be found in

Boston, at one time at New York, at another at Philadelphia, and so from place to place so I am satisfied that no dependance can be placed with certainty upon his assistance, and our \$100.00 has gone to profit and loss account."

Between 1815 and 1831 the canal toll rates were constantly decreasing. Land transportation rates were lowered to compete, and it was this cheap transportation that encouraged the beginnings and growth of factories along the Merrimack River. Experiments in 1829 to show the great savings in water over land transportation resulted in all the Lowell factories shipping everything by canal — except in the winter when it was frozen over. So the competitive battle with the teamster was won, and a prosperous future seemed assured.

The triumph was short-lived. In 1830 the Boston and Lowell Railroad was chartered — "A doubtful speculation," the Boston Transcript reported. A committee, formed to stop the railroad, argued that the canal was both cheaper and safer and that there could never be any inducement to extend a railroad westward or northwestward from Lowell. They also asked that the canal be indemnified, but all to no avail. In 1831 Patrick T. Jackson wrote the canal company, "I am now laying out the route of the railroad from Boston to Lowell. We must cross your land and in some cases pass so near as to take some of your land."

The Boston and Lowell Railroad was built for eternity. The ties were of granite and joints between rails chiseled to a smooth finish. Located beside it was the Middlesex Canal, always building and rebuilding — a grim example of the consequences of cheap

construction. The ties and rails were delivered on canal boats; and finally the British-built locomotive traveled by canal to be assembled at the machine shops in Lowell.

In 1834 the Middlesex Canal paid a dividend of \$30 a share (dividends had been regular since 1819 but at a lower rate), and with it was issued a warning: "In a short time a large part of the tolls will be paid to another corporation." By 1836 the canal had lost most of its local tonnage. The railroad was extended to Nashua in 1839 and a few years later to Concord. From then until its death

56

in 1853, the canal's only business was carrying lumber products down from New Hampshire.

Meanwhile the Boston and Lowell Railroad prospered; it was, in fact, the most prosperous line of its length in the country, and its immediate success was almost entirely due to the pioneer work of the canal company. The agricultural and manufacturing interests along the Merrimack River could not have developed without some means of cheap and reliable transportation, and the canal furnished this. And when things were going smoothly, the railroad stepped in and took away all the business and flourished, while the canal slumped into a state of hopeless depression from which it was never to rise. It had been, as one of its promoters put it, "A magnanimous enterprise." Financially it was a failure. Assessments totaled \$740 a share, dividends \$559.50.

In 1843 when abandonment seemed inevitable, Caleb Eddy wrote his "Historical Sketch," the main purpose of which was to show the advantages of using the canal as a water supply for the City of Boston. "If the canal cannot put out the fire of the locomotive," he wrote, "it may be made to stop the ravages of that element in the city of Boston." He proposed using the upper section as an aqueduct, similar to those in foreign countries, and to pipe the water from Woburn to Boston.

For years the supply of water in Boston wells had been diminishing, and what was left was contaminated. "One specimen," said Dr. Jackson, an able chemist, "which gave 3% animal and vegetable putrescent matter, was publicly sold as a mineral water; it was believed that water having such a remarkable fetid odor and nauseous taste could be no other than that of a sulphur spring; but its medicinal powers vanished with the discovery the spring arose from a neighboring drain."

Eddy said he had had the Concord River water analyzed by "four of the most distinguished and able chemists in the country, all of whom agree that it is in every respect of the requisite purity for drinking and for culinary and for all other purposes." It is interesting to note that one of these distinguished chemists was Professor Webster, who later became notorious for murdering and in-

57

cinerating the body of Dr. Parkman in his Cambridge laboratory. Dr. Jackson went on to say, "The health of a whole community may be so affected by impurities in water drunk by

them as to give a peculiar morbid expression to their countenances which causes the observant eye of the traveler to remark it."

"And who knows better than the ladies the value of pure soft water?" Eddy wrote. "Mrs. Hale, in her excellent manual, 'The good Housekeeper,' remarks, that hard water always leaves a mineral matter on the skin, when we use it in washing, which renders the hands and face rough and liable to chap. Does not the water, if we drink it, likewise corrode and injure the fine membranes of the stomach? The Boston people, who constantly use hard water for all purposes of cookery and drink, certainly have bad complexions, sallow, dry, and hard looking; and complaints of the stomach, or dyspepsy, are very common among them."

Not only would Boston benefit by this project, but also vast tracts of meadowland in Wayland and Sudbury could be restored, should the flatboards on the dam be removed. He stressed the fact that there is a fall of only 3 1/2 feet from Sudbury to Billerica. According to Thoreau, the only bridge ever washed away on the river was carried upstream by the wind. The Billerica dam had been enlarged during the 1830 modernization program and had caused water to back up over the Sudbury meadows, ruining according to one authority 10,000 acres of the most valuable meadowland in the state. But by restoring the dam to its original height "a large tract of land might in all probability be reclaimed. By reference to the plan it will be seen how admirably calculated the river and the canal are for the supply of water, free from impurity of mineral and vegetable matters."

This water supply proposition was the last faint hope for survival, and when it failed the canal faced abandonment. The wheels of progress turn, and the outmoded, having served its purpose, must yield to the modern. The canal had served its purpose in expediting the development of industry along the Merrimack River. Then, having done its duty, it expired, and its benefits and even its very existence began to sink into oblivion.

Read January 26, 1965

Lydia's Conversion: An Issue in Hooker's Departure

BY NORMAN PETTIT

LONG BEFORE the settlement of Massachusetts, two generations of Puritan divines had devoted themselves to describing the intricacies of the conversion process. Yet in the early days of settlement the founding divines still could not agree on the nature of religious conversion. Indeed, when they discussed the matter they were frequently torn between the dictates of Reformed dogmatics and their own reading of the Bible. On the one hand, they looked to Zurich, Geneva, and Strasbourg, or to the views set down by the leading continental Reformers. On the other hand, they felt obliged to discover their own "true sense" of Scripture, with the result that conflicting notions of conversion gradually emerged.

In the sixteenth century, orthodox Reformed theologians had generally assumed that man could neither calculate nor expect God's dealings. As these first Reformers read the Bible, they stressed the utter depravity of man and his inability in any way to influence God or to

prepare for saving grace. Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531), to whom this great body of Reformed thought owed much, had conceived of God's movement toward man as absolutely arbitrary. In conversion, he maintained, there could be no co-operation, otherwise God would cease to be supreme. Moreover, by the time Calvin published his Institutes in 1536, the Zwinglian tradition had been well established. Yet in Puritan thought, from the early days of Elizabeth to the founding of New England, the notion of preparation for grace came to have momentous import; and our

59

purpose here is to show how the biblical example of Lydia's conversion (Book of Acts, chapter 16) played a leading role in the growth, development, and eventual decline of this concept. Above all, our purpose is to suggest that prior to the Antinomian Controversy, when in the spring of 1634 Thomas Hooker petitioned the General Court for permission to leave Cambridge, Lydia's conversion had already become an issue of some concern.

In Holy Scriptures, conversion is described in two ways: as man's voluntary return to God, and as God's turning man to Him. In the Old Testament, God in some passages exhorts man to return, while in others He turns him to himself by changing his heart. In Hosea 14:1 man is exhorted, "return unto the Lord thy God." In Jeremiah 31:18 it is written, "turn thou me, and I shall be turned." In the New Testament, Peter tells the Jews, "Repent ye therefore, and be converted" (Acts 3:19), while Paul tells the Romans, "It is not of him that willeth . . . but of God that showeth mercy" (Romans 9:16). Yet Paul presents the Philippians with the paradox, "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure" (Philippians 2:12, 13).

Throughout the history of Western Christendom, theologians of various schools have tended to prefer those proof-texts which fit their total doctrinal stance and to suppress those which do not. The first Reformers, in reaction to Pelagian tendencies at Rome, were inclined to emphasize the Pauline message, "It is not of him that willeth . . . but of God that showeth mercy." They were also inclined to assume — from the direct experience of Paul — that if grace came it would come as it had to a confirmed sinner. "The Word of God is so sure and strong," wrote Zwingli, "that if God wills all things are done the moment that He speaks His Word." Paul, Zwingli observed, had been "thrown to the ground and rebuked," therefore grace comes "when you find that the Word of God . . . crushes and destroys you, but magnifies God himself within you."¹ In keeping with the biblical account of Paul's con-

¹ Zwingli, "Of the Clarity and Certainty of the Word of God," printed in *The Library of Christian Classics*, Vol. xxiv, Zwingli and Bullinger, ed. G. W. Bromiley (Philadelphia, 1953), P- 68, 82, 94-95.

60

version, Zwingli maintained that the call to salvation had always to be fully and immediately effectual, as the new life could have no relation to man's repentant strivings or desires. Paul had neither sought nor asked for God's redemptive love: he had been against Jesus from the start. Moreover, when he finally experienced regeneration it was as an actual event, a moment in time on the road to Damascus: "And so it was, as I journeyed and was come near unto Damascus about noon, that suddenly there shone from heaven a

great light round about me. So I fell unto the earth and heard a voice saying unto me, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? ... So when I could not see for the glory of that light, I was led by the hand of them that were with me..." (Acts 22:6, 7, 11, 19).²

British churchmen, at the start of the English Reformation, were deeply concerned with the fact that Paul had been overcome by grace in one effectual call. Standing as they did in the shadow of continental Reformed theology, they had for the most part based their conception of conversion on the Pauline experience. They had emphasized divine sovereignty, human depravity, and irresistible grace. All is done on God's part, nothing on man's. But they were also aware that Paul, as the Apostle of Christ, had preached "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus" (Acts 20:21). The question which came to mind, therefore, was whether Paul had implied that repentance precedes faith, is synonymous with it, or follows after. While it was generally agreed that the divine act must precede man's, there was much confusion over God's method in altering the will, or the nature of the calling itself. According to William Tyndale, who as a leading Reformer under Henry VIII had been the first to translate the Bible into English from the original tongues, the call to salvation could be effectual

² *Here, and throughout the rest of the article, all biblical quotations are taken from the 1595 edition of the Geneva Bible. Though never sanctioned for use in the church, it was the most influential of the English versions at this time. Of the eighty-five editions of Scripture issued under Elizabeth, sixty were made up from the Geneva edition of 1595. In quoting from this Bible, as well as from all other original sources, spelling and punctuation have been modernized for clarity.*

only. Sinners could not be said to respond to an external call, or repent for their sins before grace, when "the devil possesses their hearts" and "they themselves can do no good." Until God has "poured the Spirit of his grace into our souls, to love his laws, and hath graven them into our hearts," Tyndale had declared, "we know not God."³ For Tyndale, who had officially adopted Zwingli's theology sometime between 1528 and 1530, the archetypal conversion experience was that of Paul on the road to Damascus. Without anticipation, or preparation of any kind, man is suddenly seized, after which he repents for his sins. Until the Lord has shed his grace, without warning, on the predestinate few, none can know in which direction to turn. "And why God giveth it not every man, I can give no reckoning of his judgements," said Tyndale; "But well I wot, I never deserved it, nor prepared myself unto it, but ran another way clean contrary in my blindness and sought not that way, but he sought me and found me out."⁴

By the late 1540's this view had gained additional support from the teachings of Peter Martyr, the Strasbourg Reformer who lectured at Oxford in the reign of Edward VI. "Vocation, conversion, or regeneration is wrought in an instant," Martyr had said; "God in saying live, makes us alive." "The thing," he wrote, "is not to be understood that men may first repent...First it is apprehended by faith: afterward followeth a sound repentance." From faith, which is the unsolicited gift of God, "proceedeth the efficient cause of repentance...otherwise if there is no faith, repentance is not available."⁵

When in 1553 Martyr was forced to return to the Continent, at the start of the Marian Counter Reformation, many English churchmen followed him into exile; and one of these, John Jewel, the final reviser of the Thirty-Nine Articles under Elizabeth, wrote

³ William Tyndale, *Prologue upon the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans* (1533), p. 316; *An Answer unto Sir Thomas Morels Dialogue* (1531), ed. Parker Society (Cambridge, England, 1850), Bk. IV, ch. 2, p. 174.

⁴ Tyndale, *An Answer*, Bk. IV, ch. 10, p. 192. For a complete statement on Tyndale's relationship to Zwingli, see Edward I. Carlyle, *Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 1950), 19:1353.

⁵ Peter Martyr, *The Common Places* (London, 1583), p. 203-204.

back to him from England in 1562: "As to matters of doctrine, we have pared everything to the quick, and do not differ from you by a nail's breath."⁶

In orthodox Reformed theology, then, the sinner was taken by storm. He could neither anticipate salvation nor look to the inner self for signs of regeneration. Yet Paul himself had warned the Corinthians to be "ready" lest he find them "unprepared" (1 Corinthians 9:3, 4). "This yet remember," said Paul, "that he which soweth sparingly shall reap sparingly; and he that soweth liberally shall reap liberally. As every man wisheth in his heart, so let him give: not grudgingly, or of necessity; for God loveth a cheerful giver" (1 Corinthians 9:6, 7). While the strictest divines continued to insist that faith comes only as an effectual call, or that repentance is synonymous with faith achieved, others began to express the idea that man, although totally depraved, might nevertheless be prepared for saving grace. And as they looked with greater frequency to God's mercy, rather than to His Majesty, they soon discovered ample scriptural support.

In the first Book of Samuel the Israelites are exhorted, "Prepare your hearts unto the Lord" (1 Samuel 7:3). In the Book of Job, Zophar advises, "If thou prepare thine heart, and stretch out thine hands toward him . . . then truly shalt thou lift up thy face without spot" (Job 11:13, 15). And in Luke's Gospel, Jesus warns, "Be ye also prepared therefore...for the Son of man will come at an hour when ye think not" (Luke 12:40). In other passages from Scripture, it is God, not man, who prepares the heart for reconciliation: "Lord, thou hast heard the desire of the poor: thou preparest their heart" (Psalm 10:17). In still others the meaning is left ambiguous: "The preparations of the heart are in man, but the answer of the tongue is of the Lord;" and "The heart of man proposeth his way, but the Lord doth direct his steps" (Proverbs 16:1, 9).⁷ Yet the

⁶ Quoted in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (3 vols., New York, 1878), 1:603.

⁷ In the Geneva Bible these passages from Proverbs are accompanied by marginalia which read: "He derideth the presumption of man, who dare attribute to himself any thing, as to prepare his heart or such like . . ." Yet the textual ambiguity remained un-corrected until 1611 when the authorized version was made to read: "The preparations of the heart in man, and the answer of the tongue, is from the Lord." For a more extensive examination of the preparation issue in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English divinity, see Pettit, *The Heart Prepared: Grace and Conversion in Puritan Spiritual Life* (New Haven, 1966).

scriptural idea of the heart prepared, whether from God or man, gradually came into its own.

In one important episode during Paul's preaching, the Lord had opened the heart of Lydia, "a seller of purple," before she was converted; and in this case the internal, or effectual, call was preceded by an external call, or a call to repentance: "And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, in the city of the Thyatirians, which worshipped God . . . whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which Paul spake. And when she was baptized . . . she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into mine house and abide there" (Acts 16:14, 15)- Unlike Paul, Lydia had not been wrenched from depravity to grace, but had moved toward faith through a sequence of preliminary stages. Having "worshipped God" in the external call, she was further drawn to Christ when the Lord "opened" her heart. Most important of all, it was clear from the text that Paul, in his encounter with Lydia, had not upheld his own conversion as normative. For Lydia, the external call had been a genuine part of the conversion experience.

*If it is assumed, however, that the *ordo salutis* — from the call or vocation through justification, sanctification, and glorification — deals with the effective call only, the external call can hardly be considered one of its stages. As long as the external calling does not become an internal or effectual call, through the direct operation of the Spirit, it has only a preparatory significance. Thus some English divines spoke of the external call as part of a general revelation of the Law and not the Gospel, meaning that men must first acknowledge, fear, and honor God as their creator.⁸ Although righteousness by the Law no longer applies in the days of the Gospel, the moral efficacy of the Law can draw the soul to Christ. ("For I through the Law am dead to the Law, that I might live unto God," Galatians 2:19.) Such an interpretation, of course, clearly*

⁸ Louis Berkhof, *Reformed Dogmatics* (3 vols., Grand Rapids, 1932), 2:43–44.

equated the external call with a call to repentance —in that men must first respond to the convicting work of the Law before grace is achieved. This view, in their estimation, complied with Paul's teaching that the Law is "our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, that we might be made righteous by faith" (Galatians 3:24). It was also in accord with Paul's rejoicing that the Corinthians had "sorrowed to repentance . . . For godly sorrow causeth repentance unto salvation" (II Corinthians 7 :9, 10). But the point it still left obscure was the extent to which preparatory repentance is the work of God or man. God might open the heart, as with Lydia; but what of the duties demanded from man in anticipation of the promises? "Repent," the Apostle Peter had said, "for the promise was made unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call" (Acts 2:38, 39). Furthermore, if the external calling, accompanied by repentance, is general in that it comes to all men who hear the Gospel preached, as a general offer it is inconsistent with strict predestination, particular atonement, and with Pauline restrictions on the power of the will; for Paul had said that election lies "not in him that willeth...but in

God that showeth mercy," and that God "hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth" (Romans 9:16, 18).

By the time of Richard Rogers, who wrote in the 1570's, certain Puritan divines had already begun to shift their emphasis from the effectual to the external call. In keeping with Lydia's conversion, they had also begun to bring about a shift in emphasis from God's initiative in the external call to the human response which the call itself implied. As spiritual preachers, "physicians of the soul," and builders of faith, how else, they asked, could one urge on all men the biblical question, "What must I do to be saved?" In short, how else could they encourage the doubtful, who had never been taken by storm?

Above all, they generally tried to effect in others the pattern of regeneration they themselves had experienced. Since rarely had this happened in the manner of Paul, but more frequently through the faintest beginnings, they had necessarily to be concerned with other possibilities. As members of an evangelical, proselytizing,

65

and reforming movement, most Puritans were concerned not merely to inform of salvation, but to exhort to it;⁹ and to uphold the Pauline conversion as normative would surely discourage potential believers. However much they preached rigid predestinarian concepts, their own ministerial enthusiasm led them to insist that a weak faith, or the "endeavour to apprehend," the "will to believe with an honest heart," was as much as most Christians could hope for. ("Him that is weak in faith receive unto you," Romans 14:1.) Moreover, as they never consciously separated experiential from biblical religion, but always assumed they were one and the same, the tendency was to move toward those proof-texts which could best be correlated with individual experience.

*This movement in Puritanism toward experiential immediacy was exemplified most strikingly by a renewed interest in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Where the earliest English Reformers had simply found "careless rapture" in the experience of Scripture, the Puritans believed that as they read the Bible the Holy Spirit was at work, illuminating the Word and enlightening their hearts.¹⁰ Richard Rogers, from his own reading of Scripture, was among the first to be convinced that grace came not from God as a removed creator, but through a personal experience of the direct operation of His Spirit. This meant, among other things, that grace was no longer an external something which descended from above, as in orthodox Reformed thought, but an "indwelling" of the Spirit which demanded "entertainment" in the heart. These views he expressed in his famous *Seven Treatises*, considered to be the first complete expression of the spiritual life in Puritan thought. First published in 1592, it was reissued seven times before 1630 and had considerable effect on the rising generations of Puritan divines.¹¹*

*In the preface to the *Treatises* Rogers stated his desire to present divinity in such a way that men would be neither "cast down with needless fear," nor "destitute of encouragement to walk forward*

⁹ Charles H. George, *The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation* (Princeton, 1961), p. 58.

¹⁰ Geoffrey Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* (Oxford, 1946), p. 3-4, 21, 23.

¹¹ William A. Shaw, *D.W.B.*, 17:138.

in a heavenly course." All men, he declared, cannot be sensibly constrained, as for some the greatest difficulty in conversion is knowing whether or not it has taken place at all. While the heart must be "cleansed and changed," the alteration itself may be imperceptible. "That which most troubleth the weak about this matter," said Rogers, "is that this change of the heart, and renewing thereof, is so hardly seen and so meanly felt within them, that they cannot satisfy themselves." Therefore, he concluded, the sinner is neither wrenched from sin to grace, nor violently constrained by divine coercion, but may be "secretly drawn, he cannot tell how, by the unspeakable work of the Spirit."¹²

Under the "first work" of the Spirit, or the convicting work of the Law, the sinner must repent and sorrow for his sins. Once conscious of these sins, he is then prepared to respond to additional motions of the Spirit—all of which opens the way to Christ. In orthodox Reformed theology an acute sense of legal conviction is also emphasized, but the work of the Law is reduced in time to the moment of conversion itself. God proceeds immediately from one extreme to another, so 'that man is virtually wrenched by the Law into Gospel grace. But for Rogers, the slightest "prick" of the Law was the full extent of its immediate efficacy in the external call. ("Now when they heard it, they were pricked in their hearts, and said . . . men and brethren, what shall we do?" Acts 2:37.) Since "we cannot discern or set down the very moment when faith is wrought," said Rogers, we must respond at first to the initial "prick of the Law," which in turn makes way for the "succeeding works of the Spirit."¹³

Through the workings of the Holy Spirit, Rogers saw a connecting link between God's part and man's, between divine initiative and human endeavour. Although man is not assigned "abilities" in the natural state, he is given a part to play of his own as he responds to the Spirit in the external call. In all of this, moreover, the facts of regeneration along experiential lines take precedence over

¹² Richard Rogers, *Seven Treatises* (London, 1610), "Preface to the Reader," p. 95, 103, 10, 20.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

prescribed theological dogma. The experience itself is allowed to determine the nature of the process. And significantly enough, Rogers looked to Lydia's conversion as the foremost scriptural example of all he meant to convey. "Thus God maketh [man] to see clearly that he is His," said Rogers, "when He hath opened his heart as He did the heart of Lydia."¹⁴ With Lydia, who at first "worshipped God," whose heart the Lord then "opened," and who finally came to believe, the change itself was barely perceptible. She was neither suddenly transformed nor violently constrained, but inwardly moved. At each step her response to the workings of the Spirit put her that much closer to salvation. At each step her desires, or affective nature, could be efficacious without diminishing God's initiative.

In addition to this, the fact that Lydia had experienced regeneration as a process, rather than as a moment in time, also meant for Rogers that "conversion" as such could not always be accompanied by absolute assurance of final election. Man, in the course of such a process, had obviously to search for evidence of grace. Perhaps, with the passing of time, he might gain some inkling of salvation; but rarely could he claim election without the agony of doubt. "If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord," Lydia had said, "come into my house and abide there." But at no time did she claim to be assured of saving grace. At no time did she actually count herself amongst the elect. "Since it be hard to determine when faith is wrought," Rogers observed, none can be "assured of it." The sinner, though he "longeth and almost fainteth for God's mercy," cannot always "call God Father," though he cannot "suffer the contrary thought to have any place in himself."¹⁵ In keeping with the pattern of Lydia's conversion, what remained in doubt was the line where reprobation left off and regeneration began. And this, in turn, left equally in doubt the extent to which man could be said to co-operate in the process.

If it is assumed, let us say, that the Spirit is given to men in some degree as reprobates, must they not obey the "motions" of the

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 24, 26.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 20-21, 25-26.

Spirit?; for how else can it be said that they resist or "grieve" the Spirit but that the Spirit is more eager to draw them than they are to respond? ("Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God," Ephesians 4:30.) If, then, they are to be stirred up by the Spirit, must they not, to some extent, stir up themselves?; for how else may they entertain the Spirit in their hearts? If the Spirit, in short, is the principle of the holiness of their actions, are they not, in a sense, the principle of their actions as well?

*These concerns were later taken up by Richard Sibbes, perhaps the most original spiritual thinker of his time. From 1617 he was preacher at Gray's Inn, one of the prize pulpits in London. There his sermons were taken down, frequently printed, and widely sold as classic examples of spiritual divinity. As a Puritan, he was never eager to provoke conflict with the authorities, although by 1615 he had been sufficiently nonconforming to lose the lectureship of Holy Trinity, Cambridge, to which he had been appointed in 1610. In 1633, however, he was allowed to return to Holy Trinity with a crown appointment to its perpetual curacy; and there he preached until his death two years later. Of his countless sermons, only those in *The Bruised Reed and Smoking Flax* were published during his lifetime; but within the next few years Thomas Goodwin and Philip Nye issued several editions, many of which found their way to New England.¹⁶*

Sibbes, more than any other preacher of his day, spoke for spiritual warmth. If divinity were cold, scholastic, or dogmatic, he maintained, few would feel the need for a change of heart. But if divinity could "warm" the heart, it mattered little what in theory man should not be allowed to do to effect his own salvation. While some may need "violent conversions," he declared, and some must be "pulled out of the fire with violence . . . because their will is nought, and thereupon usually their conversion is violent," others though reprobates may be made responsive to the "sweet motions" of the Spirit: and these

"we must bring on gently and drive softly," for they are "like glasses which are hurt with the least

¹⁶ Alexander Gordon, *D.N.B.*, 18:182-183.

69

violent usage," and if "gently handled" will "continue a long time."¹⁷

As reprobates, said Sibbes, we have "many motions by the Holy Ghost," so that if we are to have the Spirit of Christ we must "labour to subject ourselves unto it." "Turn not back those blessed messengers," he implored; "let us entertain them" so the Spirit may "dwell and rule in us."¹⁸ Grace, he explained, "sometimes is so little as is indiscernible to us." The Spirit "sometimes hath secret operations in us, which we know not for the present." Therefore we, still "mingled with corruption," are unable to tell when God's work begins. But we cannot, for this reason, "stay our turning unto God till we feel him saying to our hearts, 'I am thy God.' " We must "beg the Spirit" that God would "alter our hearts" and "discover his love to us"; we must "labour ... to have our hearts kindled with the love of God." And in all of this we are essentially reprobates. While the outcome remains in doubt "there goes somewhat of ours together with somewhat of God's."¹⁹

With Sibbes, as with few before or after him, man's natural abilities are barely distinguishable from the works of the Spirit; yet God remains the sole initiator of saving grace. Sibbes wanted not so much to exalt natural man as to emphasize the indiscernible nature of divine activity. Only through the closest analysis of experience itself, he held, could we tell when God's work begins. Although we ourselves can do nothing "to bring the soul to have grace," still we must "study experience" to know when God "by His Spirit. . . doth open our hearts."²⁰ And here Sibbes turned, as did Rogers, to the biblical example of Lydia's conversion. Certainly "she had some religion in her," Sibbes remarked, "though yet she was not ripened in the true religion." From "such kind of places as this," he observed, we have occasion to speak of "works

¹⁷ Richard Sibbes, *"The Bruised Reed and Smoking Flax," Works*, ed. Alexander Grosart (7 vols., Edinburgh, 1862-1864), 1153; *"A Description of Christ," Works*, 1:25.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, *"A Description of Christ,"* 1:25; *"The Bruised Reed,"* 1:43-44.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, *"The Bruised Reed,"* 1:59, 47; *"The Soul's Conflict,"* 1:265; *"A Glance of Heaven,"* 4:198, 181.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, *"Divine Meditations,"* 7:195; *"Commentary on II Corinthians, Chapter I,"* 3:252, 241, 18, 21.

70

of preparation." We do not "sow among thorns"; we "purge before cordials"; yet "we grant no force of a meritorious cause in preparation to produce such an effect as conversion is." Preparatory repentance, he explained, is only "to remove the hindrances and to fit the soul for conversion." Since the Spirit will not be effectual in a "rude, wild, and barbarous soul," to those who use the "talents of their understanding and will," God "discovers himself more and more." "Lydia," said Sibbes, "was religious in her kind," yet her heart had to be

"further opened" before she could be saved. Then, as soon as she believed, "the Spirit of God blowing upon the garden of her heart, where the spice of grace was sowed, stirred up a sweet scent of faith."²¹

In this highly experiential process, where man's part and God's seem always to blend, Sibbes maintained that it is "over-curious to exact the first beginnings of grace," for grace "falls by degrees, like the dew indiscernibly." God "offers no violence to the soul," but works "sweetly yet strongly, and strongly yet sweetly." The "stream is but changed," the "man is the same." For Sibbes, therefore, the efficacy of the Law had slight significance. Man's "bruising" he preferred to call the "inferior work of the Spirit." Such terms as "legal terror" and "fear of punishment" had virtually no place in his vocabulary. "Some divines, too many indeed," he wrote, "hold that the Holy Ghost only works ... as it were, without . . . not upon the soul as an inward worker." But this, he believed, was "too shallow a conceit for so deep a business," as the Spirit works "more deeply than so." The "Spirit of love," as preached in the Gospel, had always to be prized above the "Spirit of bondage." "It is not enough," he said, "to have the heart broken"; for as "a pot may be broken in pieces, and yet be good for nothing, so may a heart be, through terror and a sense of judgment, and yet be not like wax, pliable." True "tenderness of heart," he held, is first wrought by an expectation of God's love. Moreover, if God "looks upon us in our resolutions and preparations," He also "works our hearts ... to repent," so that "we are the principle of our actions,

²¹ *Ibid.*, "The Christian Work," 5:7; "Lydia's Conversion," 6:522-523, 534.

as they are actions, but the Holy Ghost is the principle of the holiness of our actions."²²

Of the numerous Puritan divines who fled to Massachusetts between 1628 and 1640, Thomas Hooker, Thomas Shepard, and John Cotton were among the leaders. Each was a duly ordained minister of the Church of England; each had been exposed to the writings of Rogers and Sibbes; and each came to America with the importance of Lydia's conversion in mind. Of the three, Hooker was most sympathetic to the earlier readings of the text, although his own conversion had at first resembled Paul's. But with Shepard, and especially Cotton, we find a gradual return to the stricter views of the first Reformers, or the revival of an "orthodox" view in which prescribed theological notions again begin to limit experience. Throughout the first period of settlement, it would appear, the founding divines had still to decide the course theology would run.

For Hooker, as for Sibbes, Lydia's conversion stood in the text as a clear alternative to Paul's. Furthermore, it lent strong biblical support to his own experiential knowledge. According to Cotton Mather, who wrote the fullest early account of Hooker's life, Hooker was converted sometime between 1611 and 1618, while serving as catechist and lecturer at Emmanuel College, Cambridge. At first, wrote Mather, "It pleased the Spirit of God very powerfully to break into the soul of this person with such a sense of his being exposed unto the just wrath of Heaven, as filled him with most unusual degrees of horror and anguish, which broke not only his rest, but his heart also, and caused him to cry out, 'While I suffer thy terrors, O Lord, I am distracted!' " In the "time of his agonies," said Mather, "he could reason himself to the rule, and conclude that there was no way but submission to God"; yet

"when he came to apply this rule unto himself in his own condition, his reasoning would fail him, he was able to do nothing." Tormented by the "Spirit of bondage" to no avail, it became his manner, "at

²² *Ibid.*, "The Excellency of the Gospel above the Law," 4:225; "Josiah's Reformation," 6:33; "Divine Meditations," 7:221, 119; "Commentary," 3:107, 314; "Precious Promises," 4:122, "The Christian's End," 5:308.

72

his lying down for sleep," to "single out some certain promise of God, which he would repeat and ponder, and keep his heart close unto it." And afterwards he counseled others "to take the same course," telling them that "the promise was the boat which was to carry a perishing sinner over unto the Lord Jesus Christ."²³

Hooker, to be sure, was initially constrained by the Law; but if Mather's account is correct, he soon discovered an alternative to seizure. The promises of "largest extent" in Scripture, he later wrote, belong to those who "take up their own hearts." If a man be a "scandalous liver," said Hooker, God "lays a heavy blow upon the heart... as He broke Paul's heart." But the Word "saith not" that it must be done in an "extraordinary and fearful manner." Paul, according to Hooker, "was not willing to take up his own heart, for that was mad against the Lord"; and "if a man have been an outrageous, rebellious wretch, alas it is not a little matter will do the deed, it is not now and then a gracious promise that will break his heart; but the Lord must come down from heaven, and break open the door by strong hands, by awakening his conscience, that all the country rings of him." If, on the other hand, a man anticipates the drawing of the Spirit, and looks to the promises, the "agonies" of divine constraint are clearly moderated.²⁴

With Lydia, said Hooker, there was never any need for constraint, as she turned to God with a willing soul. In addition, "God had no sooner opened the heart of Lydia to attend the Word but her affections were exceedingly enlarged towards the dispensers thereof... so that the cords of her loving invitation led Paul and held him captive; he professed she compelled them by her loving and affectionate expressions, prevailed with them for a stay." Although a "sinful woman," according to Hooker, yet she "worshipped God" in full anticipation of the promise. Therefore the

²³ Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana* (Hartford, 1855), Vol. 1, Bk. III, p. 333-334. While much that Mather says in the *Magnalia* may be attributed to his own imagination, we may assume this account is fairly accurate. Although written fifty years after Hooker's death, Mather cites for sources "The Life of Mr. Angier, lately published," and "some observations of that Reverend and excellent man, Mr. Whitfield," who had known Hooker.

²⁴ Thomas Hooker, *The Souls Preparation for Christ* (London, 1632), p. 172-181; *The Unbelievers Preparing for Christ* (London, 1638), 2:70.

73

Lord "opened her eyes and melted her heart kindly," and so brought her to a "taste of His goodness here and glory hereafter." When God stirs, Hooker warned, "do you stir your

hearts too . . . get up thy hearts higher in the very apprehension of sin . . . Begin you where the Holy Spirit begins that you may find his presence with you, and his effectual power and blessing to accompany your endeavours in that way"; for where there is "little saving sorrow" there is "little saving grace," where there is "no preparation for Christ," there can be "no true evidence of grace."²⁵

For Thomas Shepard, on the other hand, there was more to be seen in the text than immediately met the eye. Unlike Hooker, he refused to concede that the passage offered a clear alternative to seizure. "Do not judge of general and common workings of the Spirit ... to be the beginnings of effectual conversion," he wrote, as "torments and anguish" must invariably "affect Reprobates" before salvation is achieved.²⁶

Shortly after taking his degree from Emmanuel in 1623, Shepard had begun "daily meditations, sometimes every morning, but constantly every evening before supper," on the "evil of sin," the "terror of God's wrath," and the "deceitfulness of the heart." But conversion seemed unattainable, and so in time he began to question whether "old Mr. Rogers' Treatises . . . the book which did first work upon my heart," might not be "Legal." Rogers, in his *Seven Treatises*, had clearly emphasized the use of the Law as the "First Work" of the Spirit. From initial constraint, however meager, man moved toward perfection in Christ. But Shepard, unable to progress from "terror of conscience" to the slightest evidence of faith, now rejected the work of the Law as "Legal." In desperation, he looked for what he called "that glorious estate of perfection," or direct and immediate salvation by the Spirit alone, as an easier path to assurance. On recalling "how all the good I had, all the redemption I had, it was from Jesus Christ," said Shepard, "I found therefore, the Lord revealing free mercy," and so began to ques-

²⁵ Hooker, *The Souls Preparation*, p. 180, 190-198, 202-203; *The Application of Redemption* (London, 1659), p. 114, 454.

²⁶ Thomas Shepard, *The Sound Believer* (London, 1645), p. 56, 91.

tion: "Why did the Lord Jesus keep the Law? He had no guile in his heart. . . but holiness there. Was it not for them that did want it?" But these doubts about the Law did not last long; for shortly thereafter "the terrors of the Lord began to break in like floods of fire." In a fit of torment, he was tempted to run his head "against walls," to "brain and kill" himself. He saw God "like a consuming fire, an everlasting burning," and thoughts of "eternal reprobation" flashed across his mind. After this his heart became "humbled and cast down," the terrors of the Law began to "assuage sweetly," and he felt that God had given him "a heart to receive Christ with a naked hand."²⁷

Shepard's conversion, it might be said, was the direct opposite of Hooker's. Where Hooker had looked to voluntary response as an alternative to excessive constraint, Shepard put the efficacy of the Law at the center of the process — ending with far greater emphasis on legal constraint than "old Mr. Rogers" would ever have allowed. "Lie down under Him," said Shepard, that God may "tread upon thee" and "exalt Himself" as well as "lift thee up and exalt thee." Hooker, of course, was equally concerned with the use of the Law, and with the rule which said that the Law must awaken the conscience; but he tended, like Sibbes, to be more concerned with the drawing activities of the Spirit. When he had found he was unable

"to apply this rule unto himself in his own condition," he discovered that the soul could unite to Christ in other ways; while Shepard came eventually to believe that the "rules" of conversion should take precedence over all experience. "Crook not God's rules to the experience of men," he warned, "but bring men unto rules and try men's estates by that. . . We are not in this or in any other point to be guided by the experience of men only." We must "attend the rule," let the rule stand, and let men "stand or fall according to the rule." Many are "miserably deceived," he maintained, by "crooking and wresting God's rule to Christian experience." What is more, they are all the more likely to be deceived by following specious scriptural examples. "Do not make the examples of converted persons in Scripture patterns in

²⁷ Shepard, *Autobiography*, ed. Nehemiah Adams (Boston, 1832), p. 17–28.

75

all things of persons unconverted," he cautioned. "Do not make God's work upon the one run parallel with God's work upon another . . . To say that God opened Lydia's heart to believe in Christ, and yet opened not her heart to lament her sin and misery in her estate ... is more than can be proved from the text."²⁸

Yet Shepard, no matter what he had to say about the virtues of "rules" and the evils of "experience," was also aware that every man is not a "Heman" who suffers "distracting fears and terrors." ("While I suffer thy terrors I am distracted," Psalm 88:15.) Like Hooker, he allowed that some men are educated "more civilly" than others, and so have contracted less "guilt" and "stoutness of heart." At the same time, however, he was never able fully to reconcile personal acknowledgment of divine love with the notion of divine constraint. Having emphasized terrors and the efficacy of the Law to an extreme, he was hard put to arrive at a workable solution; and all he could do, under the circumstances, was occasionally to strike an awkward compromise. "Though Christ doth threaten, or terrify His people sometimes," wrote Shepard, "let a man accept the offer of Christ, not violently only by terror, but by stronger cords, even the cords of love."²⁹

Finally, with John Cotton, the stricter tradition found its purest expression in New England; for Cotton began his ministry in the Bay Colony with an outright rejection of the external call. In reasserting the doctrine of human helplessness, he refused to allow for preparatory repentance in the sense of a personal turning toward God. Man is brought to salvation, he insisted, only by divine constraint. "If the Lord mean to save you," said Cotton, "He will rend, as it were, the caul from the heart ... as a man would rend the entrails of a beast from him . . . That is true brokenness of heart . . . when the heart and will is broken."³⁰ Although Sibbes had said that "It is not enough to have the heart broken" as "a pot may be broken in pieces, and yet be good for nothing," for Cotton "true brokenness of heart" mattered more.

²⁸ Shepard, *The Sound Believer*, p. 4-48, 129, 147, 52-54.

²⁹ Shepard, *Certain Select Cases Resolved* (London, 1648), p. 53; *The Parable of the Ten Virgins* (London, 1660), p. 184.

³⁰ John Cotton, *A Treatise of the Covenant of Grace* (London, 1671), p. 128-129.

76

As an undergraduate, Cotton had been greatly concerned with the efficacy of the Law. Like Shepard, who had launched his daily meditations on the "terror of God's wrath," Cotton had assumed that the soul needs threats and terrors to bring it to Christ. But so little could he respond to any sense of terror in his own heart, that he turned to other possibilities. From 1609 he had gone frequently to hear Sibbes preach. Having despaired of righteousness through legal constraint, and having heard that the lecturer at Holy Trinity preached the Gospel above the Law, he eagerly sought out this great physician of the soul. Two years later, while a fellow of Emmanuel College, he at last felt the Holy Spirit illuminating his heart. Soon he began to imitate Sibbes in his own sermons, and quickly gained a wide reputation as a preacher of the Spirit. At St. Mary's, where he lectured, he acquired a large following. In 1612, the year of his conversion, he was chosen pastor at St. Botolphs, in the Lincolnshire seaport of Boston; and there he continued to preach in the tradition of Sibbes.³¹

While at Lincolnshire, he argued that sinners, although totally depraved, could still be held accountable for their failure to respond to the gifts of the Spirit. By "voluntarily falling . . . from the knowledge of God in nature," he said, or by "abusing other talents and helps," they shall find that God "rejecteth or reprobate them."³² Reprobation, then, according to Cotton's doctrine at the time, was clearly conditional. But the influence of Sibbes never went so far as to rid his mind of the need for fearful constraint; and herein lies the essential difficulty in Cotton's theology.

Although converted by Sibbes, he read the early Reformers with great interest. His grandson, Cotton Mather, tells us that at times he "preferred one Calvin" above all others. "Even such a Calvinist was our Cotton!"³³ And Calvin, in the Zwinglian tradition, had denied that man before the moment of effectual conversion could

³¹ For a detailed account of the influence of Sibbes on Cotton, see Larzer Ziff, *The Career of John Cotton, Puritanism and the American Experience* (Princeton, 1962), p.30-33, 41.

³² William Twisse, *A Treatise of Mr. Cotton's Clearing Certain Doubts Concerning Predestination, Together with an Examination Thereof* (London, 1646), p. 54, 43.

³³ Mather, *Magnalia*, Vol. I, Bk. in, p. 274.

do anything of his own. Being "previously prepared," said Calvin, does not mean that man has his "own share" in the work. Indeed, if the issue is ever to be resolved, he had declared, "Let us hold this as an undoubted truth, which no opposition can ever shake—that the heart is so thoroughly infected by the poison of sin that it cannot produce anything but what is corrupt, and always remains enslaved by its inward perverseness." There can be no "flexibility of the human heart," Calvin maintained, other than that "supplied by the grace of God." Moreover, the "perverse bias of the heart" can be corrected only by that which "constrains it to obedience."³⁴

Now if Cotton had fully accepted Sibbes' views, he would have been left with little choice but to reject this notion of constraint. He would have claimed instead that man's natural

response to the drawing activities of the Spirit is in itself efficacious. But this he did not do. While preaching at Lincolnshire, he gradually departed from his earlier concern with the gifts of the Spirit, or the notion that man could be drawn to Christ, and turned his attention to conviction of conscience and fear of divine punishment — an extraordinary fact in the light of his own conversion. Most important of all, it was this rigorous side of his theology that he eventually carried to New England.

During his first year in the wilderness, Cotton left the memory of Sibbes entirely behind. In contradiction to his earlier position, he now held that man cannot trust the first gifts of the Spirit, and so remains totally passive in conversion. "Rest in none of these," he said, "for these you may have and yet want Christ and life in him." Furthermore, he now discarded conditional reprobation on the grounds that "it is not all the promises in Scripture that have at any time wrought any gracious changes in any soul, or are able to beget the faith of God's Elect." The sinner, he wrote, cannot be said to turn to God in effectual anticipation of the promises, as "a man is but of a dead faith if he lays hold of the promises before he lays hold on Christ."³⁵ What is more, Christ himself must open the door of the heart before the soul can effectually respond.

³⁴ John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. John Allen (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1936), Vol. I, Bk. II, p. 321, 366, 325, 327.

³⁵ John Cotton, *Christ the Fountain of Life* (London, 1651), p. 27; *A Treatise*, p. 199– 200; *The Way of Life*(London, 1641), p. 401.

"When the Holy Ghost will give us an example of this very thing of the opening of the door," said Cotton, "speaking of Lydia he expresseth it thus, 'whose heart the Lord opened.' Acts 16:14. The door to be opened was the heart of Lydia, that was it at which Christ stood and knocked." But "what are the strokes of God by which he doth express his knocking?" Cotton then asked. "First he strikes with the hammer of his word, as many doors have hammers hanging at them, that make a shrill and loud noise that will waken men though they were asleep...He knocks also by his judgement, and knocks a loud... When a judgement comes and makes the foundations of a man's heart to shake, it sets his spirit a trembling, and puts him into a fear...that he knows not what to do." Although the Lord "giveth himself freely to the soul, without respect unto any work of the Law," Cotton later explained, "yet the Law is of special and notable use, working fear in the heart...The Law of God is of marvelous use in the days of the Gospel...to break the heart and drive it to Jesus Christ." God brings the soul to salvation, he declared, not by stirring up the embers of faith (as Sibbes had suggested in the case of Lydia) but through the Spirit of bondage alone; and "by the Spirit of bondage He setteth home the Law effectually into the soul."³⁶

For Cotton, then, Lydia's conversion had always to be judged in the light of Paul's. "Thus it was with Saul," he wrote, "who afterwards was Paul, when Christ called unto him out of heaven and challenged and convinced him of sin." In reaction to the teachings of Sibbes, he professed that "We must teach ministers not to be afraid of driving nails to the head...to the hearts of sinners. There are a generation of preachers that would now have no Law preached, but only draw men unto Christ. But unless the proud, wanton, and stubborn heart be pierced and wounded to death, there is no hope of salvation."³⁷ In keeping with the strictest Reformed theology, Cotton reduced the experience itself to a preordained moment

in time; so that man's response to an external call is clearly excluded from the ordo salutis. Man cannot turn to God,

³⁶ Cotton, *Gods Mercie Mixed with His Justice* (London, 1641), p. 3, 10, 11; *A Treatise*, p. 68-69; *The Covenant of Grace* (London, 1655), p. 175.

³⁷ Cotton, *The Covenant of Grace*, p. 175; *A Treatise*, p. 21-123; *The Way of Life*, p. 133-134.

79

*but must be seized. Man cannot willingly acknowledge God until he is wrenched, turned about, forced to believe in a new relationship which until that moment has played no part in his life. "Reserving due honor to such gracious and precious Saints as may be otherwise minded," Cotton once remarked, "I confess I do not discern that the Lord worketh and giveth any saving preparations in the heart till He give union with Christ. For if the Lord do give any saving qualifications before Christ, then the soul may be in the state of salvation before Christ; and that seemeth to be prejudicial unto the grace and truth of Jesus Christ...It seemeth to me that whatsoever saving work there be in the soul, it is not there before Christ be there."*³⁸

To Cotton's mind, the doctrine Hooker preached could be criticized from two sides: it both lowered and raised the standards of grace at the same time. It lowered the standards in that preparatory "evidences" of grace put sanctification too far down the scale in the ordo salutis. It raised the standards in that preparatory anxiety put off "assurance," so that man could never really know whether or not he was saved. For Cotton, however, the greater danger was that of bringing the standards down; and there is evidence to suggest that from the day he delivered his first sermon in New England, the differences between his own doctrine and that generally preached by Hooker became increasingly apparent.

Until 1632 Cotton had enjoyed a peaceful ministry at the English Boston. But in the spring of 1633, when process was begun against him in the Court of High Commission, he refused to answer the summons and fled to the nearest port, where he joined Thomas Hooker for the voyage to New England. After eight weeks at sea, with no apparent signs of disagreement, they reached port September 4. Throughout the winter of 1633–1634, while Cotton preached as "teacher" at the Boston church in the Bay, Hooker served as pastor at nearby Newtown (later Cambridge). But by May all was not well, as Hooker's congregation had petitioned the General Court for permission to have more land, or move to another part of the country. Conferences on the question of removal took place

³⁸ Cotton, *A Treatise*, p. 35.

80

from October 1635 to March 1636 when it was finally decided that Hooker and his company should be allowed to go to Hartford in Connecticut —for "want of accommodation for their cattle." Meanwhile, in the autumn of 1635, Thomas Shepard had arrived to organize a new church alongside Hooker's. During the winter of 1635-1636 both congregations lived in

*Newtown; and in the spring Hooker left with thirty-six families on the Indian paths to the West.*³⁹

Scarcity of land, however, was certainly not his sole motive for leaving. Indeed, the historian Charles M. Andrews has already suggested that Hooker and Cotton, during their first winter in New England, had soon discovered a discrepancy in doctrine; and that Hooker, as a result, had been prompted to petition for removal.⁴⁰ Andrews cites as evidence a letter received at the Colonial Office, London, dated January 3, 1637, from a Mr. Law, minister in the Barbados Islands. Law submits certain "grievances of the clergy" for consideration by church authorities, and asks "whether there be any saving preparation in a Christian soul before his union with Christ." This, says Law, is "Hooker's opinion," whereas Cotton is "against him and his party in all."⁴¹ In April of 1637, the Reverend Robert Stansby, a Puritan minister at Suffolk, England, wrote to John Wilson, pastor at the Boston Church, that he had heard there was "great division amongst good ministers and people which moved Mr. Hooker to remove." And William Hubbard, writing fifty years after the event, came to the conclusion that "Two such eminent stars, such as were Mr. Cotton and Mr. Hooker . . . could not well continue in one and the same orb." Finally, the eighteenth-century historian Thomas Hutchinson tells us that "The great influence which Mr. Cotton had in the colony inclined Mr. Hooker to remove to some place more remote from Boston than Newtown . . . some of the principal persons were strongly attached to one of them, and some to the other."⁴² Although the question of prepara-

³⁹ Williston Walker, *Ten New England, Leaders* (New York, 1901), p. 54-70; John Winthrop, *Journal*, ed. James Hosmer (New York, 1908), 1:132; Charles M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period, of American History* (New Haven, 1936), 2:77-81.

⁴⁰ Andrews, *The Colonial Period*, 2:84-86.

⁴¹ Great Britain, Public Record Office, *Colonial Records, Class I, Vol. 9, No. 72, Library of Congress Microfilm Ac. 10, 741, Reel 4.*

⁴² Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections, Series iv* (Cambridge, 1865), 5:10-11; William Hubbard, *A General History of New England* (Boston, 1848), p. 173; Thomas Hutchinson, *The History of the Colony of Massachusetts* (London, 1763), 1:43.

tion also became an issue in the Antinomian debates, these statements would suggest that Hooker and Cotton were already at odds before the Antinomians arrived, which was not until September of 1634, or five months after Hooker had first asked permission to leave.

For Thomas Shepard, who sympathized to some extent with both antagonists, Hooker's departure must have been extremely painful. In England, as a young divine, Shepard had known Hooker, and had enjoyed the "blessings of. . . Mr. Hooker's ministry." Moreover, by the spring of 1636 he was engaged to be married to Hooker's daughter, Joanna. But he had come to America for Cotton's sake as well. "I saw the Lord departed from England," he wrote, "when Mr. Hooker and Mr. Cotton were gone . . . and I did think I should feel many miseries if I stayed behind."⁴³

For the first few years after Hooker had settled Hartford, Shepard was apparently content to remain within Cotton's orb; but by 1640 he had thought of moving to Matabeseck (later

Middletown) on the Connecticut River. He was depressed, he said, by "the sad state of the Church." Not only had conversions fallen off, but he now saw "all men's souls and estates out of order," and "many evils in men's hearts." His own heart, he confessed, had begun to "withdraw itself" from his "brethren and others." Yet when Hooker advised him by letter, "if you can sell, you should remove," he nevertheless stayed on; for his Cambridge congregation "did desire to sit still" and "not to remove farther."⁴⁴

As late as 1652, Cotton still believed that "the most judicious and Orthodox of our best writers, Calvin, Martyr . . . and the rest," had been "slighted" in New England, and hoped that John Norton, his successor at the Boston Church, would carry on the strength of their tradition.⁴⁵ But most New England divines had by

⁴³ Shepard, *Autobiography*, p. 17–43, 46–58.

⁴⁴ John A. Albro, *The Life of Thomas Shepard* (Boston, 1870), p. 224-295.

⁴⁵ John Cotton, "To the Judicious Christian Reader," in John Norton, *The Orthodox Evangelist* (London, 1657). Cotton's preface is dated "Boston, 20. Sept. 1652," three months before his death.

82

now grown weary of acute theological speculation. As their sermons reveal, they were less concerned with the nature of true piety, and more concerned with the moral structure of society. For Norton, although he sympathized with Cotton's views, it was easier to avoid taking a firm stand one way or the other, and better not to mention Lydia at all. Repentance, he therefore decided, could be two-fold: "preparatory or legal, going before faith ... or saving, which followeth faith." And while "preparatory repentance worketh not any change of the heart," yet "there are in it, and accompanying of it, certain inward workings that do dispose to a change."⁴⁶

By the middle of the seventeenth century, then, Lydia's conversion had lost the place it once held within the complex of Puritan thought. But as a scriptural passage, it had served an important function. Apart from Cotton's interpretation, and to some extent Shepard's, it had appealed to those who wished to contest the doctrine of divine constraint. Man, said its exponents, must be allowed to desire. He must look to God with expectation; he must want to be reconciled with his creator before the moment arrives. If God, in the work of conversion, proceeds immediately from legal terrors to saving grace, then man is simply wrenched by the Law into a state of salvation. He cannot experience the transformation; he cannot anticipate; his own consciousness is not involved. But if God proceeds by degrees, then man, under the Law, may look to his heart before uniting to Christ.

Read March 23, 1965

⁴⁶ Norton, *The Orthodox Evangelist*, p. 153-154.

83

Robert Frost of Brewster Village

BY ERASTUS H. HEWITT

M*UCH has been written about Robert Frost and much more will be written, for he was a very remarkable man and a very complex man. His personality was prismatic in that it had many sides, most of them unusual and brilliant. Of his genius as a poet others have spoken, and I am frank to say that I was not a part of his literary life. It was my privilege, however, to know him as a neighbor and close friend and as a client. It is a pleasure to tell you something of the man I knew and loved for more than twenty years.*

I believe that it was in 1941 that Mr. Frost bought the house at 35 Brewster Street here in Cambridge. My own house is 23 Brewster Street, only a few doors away.

Strange as it may seem, I do not remember exactly when or where I first met Robert Frost, but I used to see him out walking with his Border collie, and it is my impression that we once came face to face in a narrow snow path after a heavy storm and exchanged a few words in passing. He was a friendly person.

When he moved into 35 Brewster Street his next-door neighbor was a charming lady, who was known to many of you, Mrs. Rosalind Parker Potter. Mrs. Potter was a friend of the Hewitts, and she invited us to dinner with Mr. Frost. It was a very pleasant occasion and, for my wife and me, a very happy one, for it marked the beginning of a delightful friendship, which endured until the end of Mr. Frost's long and distinguished life. I think we had met Mr. Frost before the dinner party at Mrs. Potter's, but that was the beginning of our intimacy with him.

84

Not long after that meeting our front doorbell rang one evening, about eight o'clock. I opened the door, and there was Mr. Frost with his dog, Gillie. "Have you got company?" he asked. I said that we had no company and that I was glad to see him. "Are you busy?" he went on. I assured him that we were not busy and urged him to come in. "If you really aren't busy," he said, "I'd like to come in for a few minutes. I can't stay long, for I have some work I've got to do."

That was characteristic of him. It apparently did not occur to him that he was giving us pleasure or bringing us distinction by dropping in on us that way.

He came in and took a chair near the open fire. I had heard, from Mrs. Potter, I think, that he liked ginger ale and I provided a large bottle of Canada Dry. He sipped ginger ale and talked for what seemed about half an hour and then said that he must go as it was getting late. I said to him, "Don't go yet. You just got here." He smiled and said, "It's eleven o'clock." And it was eleven o'clock. That was one of the remarkable things about him. He was one of the greatest of conversationalists and when he was with you, you became unaware of the passage of time.

I have often been asked, "What did he talk about?" Many times after an evening with him I have been unable to remember most of what he had said, but it was always fascinating, whatever the subject. He had an amazing knowledge of personages and people and of things in general. He had a great interest in botany, for one thing, and he was a lover of and well versed in the classics. One of his poems is entitled "The Need of Being Versed in Country Things," and he certainly was "well versed" in country things and country people and loved to talk about them.

Much of his charm as a conversationalist lay in his ability to draw out his listeners, who found themselves talking better than they had ever talked before. Probably that is one reason why he was known as one of the greatest of teachers.

One could not be long in his company without realizing that he was a really great man and a very wise one. I want to give you an illustration of this.

85

As about everyone knows, Mr. Frost had a farm in Vermont, and he had some livestock there, including several horses. One winter day he mentioned to me that he wanted to purchase a saddle and some other horse goods, and he asked if I knew of a place where he could find them. At that time I had a client who ran a harness store in Brighton, not far from the stockyards, and I told Mr. Frost about it. He said he would like to go there, and I took him over. He browsed around the store and bought a saddle and some other things. It was "cow day" at the stockyards, and some of the cattle-dealers from different parts of New England drifted into the place. After completing his purchases, Mr. Frost sat down on a bale of blankets and began to talk with the proprietor. The other visitors seemed to be attracted, and the group grew in size, the men standing in a semicircle around the speaker, listening quietly and gradually drawing closer. After perhaps half an hour we took our leave. Not long after that I happened to see my client, the proprietor of the store. "Who was that man you brought in the other day?" he asked me. "That was Robert Frost, the poet," I told him. "I knew he must be somebody important," he said, "but when you introduced him the name didn't register. After you had gone, one of the cattlemen asked me who he was and I told him I didn't know. He said, 'Well, whoever he is, he's the greatest man I ever listened to,' and all the others agreed with him."

Robert Frost was a man who could walk with kings, but he never lost the common touch. He liked people, and he appealed to all sorts of people.

This seems a good place to tell you that one day R. F. and I were walking together on Newspaper Row in Boston. He spoke of his grandfather, who seems to have had small use for his grandson's literary inclinations, and told me that when as a young man he took a job on one of the Boston papers, Grandfather did not approve. "Once a bum, always a bum," was his comment. Not long after our walk on Newspaper Row, I happened to read in one of Sir Winston Churchill's books that his father had told him that he was no better than a social wastrel. When I saw a photograph of Sir Winston Churchill and Robert Frost sitting together on a plat-

86

form and receiving honorary degrees at a college, it occurred to me that for a social wastrel and a bum they had done passably well in life.

I think it was shortly before he received this degree that Mr. Frost, or his secretary, telephoned me from Florida and asked me to go into 35 Brewster Street, find a certain academic hood, and send it South at once. I was told where to look for the hood, and it was described in detail. On the third floor of number 35 was a huge closet, almost as large as the average bathroom, and it was literally filled with academic hoods. The right one was located and forwarded, but I realized for the first time the great number of honorary degrees that had been conferred upon Robert Frost. I do not think that he, himself, knew how many he had received.

Mr. Frost was a widower, Mrs. Frost having died before he came to Brewster Street. Of his six children only two were living. He lived alone and preferred to do his own cooking. His long-time secretary, Mrs. Theodore Morrison, saw to it that a cleaning woman kept the house spick-and-span, though Mr. Frost was by nature neat and orderly. He was an excellent cook and enjoyed getting his own meals. It was his custom to take Gillie for a walk in the late afternoon, and he usually shopped at a market near the corner of Concord and Huron avenues. He could often be seen wending his way homeward with his arms full of bundles, but he was sometimes given a ride home in the market's delivery truck.

In spite of his fame, he was simple in his tastes and exceedingly kind. I remember well one instance of this. His next-door neighbor telephoned me one evening about dinner-time and said that a young man had been to Mr. Frost's house with a number of books which were to be autographed. Mr. Frost was not at home, and the young man had come next door to inquire about him as he had an appointment and it was important that the books be autographed. They were to be awarded as prizes at some exercises soon to take place. The next-door neighbors were expecting dinner guests. I had a key to the Frost house, and I took the young man inside and waited for Mr. Frost to return. The young man was a student and it was apparent that he was quite awed by his assignment. We did

not have long to wait, for Mr. Frost soon appeared, carrying two large bags of groceries. I explained how the young man and I happened to be in the house, and he said, "I forgot all about the appointment. I'm sorry. Come upstairs." He took the boy up to his study on the second floor, autographed the books and talked to him for probably an hour. I am sure that the youth will never forget that experience nor the kindness and courtesy shown him by a great gentleman.

One evening, when I was about to leave after a call, Mr. Frost said to me, "Did I ever give you a book?" I said that he had not. "Well," he said, "I've got one I want you to have." He went into a small room next to his study and returned with a book in his hand. "Have you a reading copy of North of Boston?" he asked. I replied in the affirmative. "Good," said Mr. Frost with a deprecating little smile, "then you won't have to cut the pages of this one." That was his modest way of telling me that the book he was giving me was a collector's item. That book is a first English printing of North of Boston and, of course, is one of my

most prized possessions, along with a manuscript poem, which he once wrote out for me and inscribed.

In the nature of things, Mr. Frost was called upon to attend all sorts of parties and dinners in Cambridge and elsewhere. Although he liked "to be made of," as he put it, these occasions were quite fatiguing to him, and he really much preferred a quiet family dinner with no other guests present. It gives me both pleasure and pride to remember that he would sometimes telephone us and ask if he could come to supper or dinner if we were having no other company. Such a meal was always delightful and so was the evening of relaxed good talk which would follow.

With his love of country things, he used to refer to Brewster Street as "Brewster Village," and some of the books which he autographed for us are dated at "Brewster Village," which gives a homey and friendly touch and awakens tender memories (and sometimes brings a lump to the throat) when a book is opened.

Robert Frost was well loved in "Brewster Village" and was a most welcome caller or dinner guest at several houses on the street besides our own.

88

There are so many fine photographs of Robert Frost, and he was so well known about Cambridge, that it is unnecessary to describe his appearance. He was, as we all know, a singularly fine-looking man. I do want to correct one statement which I have read several times. At least one interviewer described Mr. Frost's hands as "the gnarled hands of a farmer." That just isn't so. He had, to be sure, farmed for a living but he had remarkably beautiful hands. Strong and masculine, but beautiful.

It was a matter of regret to us in "the village" that Mr. Frost was in Cambridge for only short periods of time. His legal residence was in Vermont, and he used to go there as early in the Spring as his engagements and the weather permitted. He usually remained there until well into October, and he and the Morrises almost always went to the farm for Thanksgiving and Christmas. His lecture engagements kept him away from Cambridge much of the time during the winter months, and his tendency to heavy colds and, indeed, to pneumonia sent him to Florida, usually in January. The Cambridge house was really more or less of a jumping-off place and he was there only a matter of weeks in the course of a year.

He once told me that he did his best work between midnight and 4:00 A.M. The result was that he generally slept until noon, and he often took midnight walks. In one of his poems he says, "I have been one acquainted with the night," and he spoke truly. His companion on these walks was his dog, Gillie, a remarkably intelligent animal. Gillie was of the breed famous for sheep-herding and brains. Sometimes Mr. Frost, while in the midst of a conversation with someone, would say without raising his voice, "Gillie, shut the door, will you?" and Gillie would get up, go to the door, push it shut and then stand, watching his master's face and waiting for further orders. Mr. Frost used to say that Gillie would utter the word "out" when he wanted to leave the house. It is the fact that he would stand near the door, open his mouth and bark, or yawn, in a way that certainly sounded like "out."

On one occasion Mr. Frost was ill and unable to walk with Gillie. He telephoned me and asked if I would take Gillie for a walk around the block, and I repaired to number 35. When I asked

89

Gillie to come with me he stood still and looked at Mr. Frost who said, "It's all right, Gillie. Go with him." Gillie immediately began to frisk with joy, and we had a pleasant walk together. He was truly a "one man dog," and he was sadly missed when he reached the end of his days.

Mr. Frost sometimes did unexpected things. One day in late Spring I was at my office, and my better half telephoned to say that Mr. Frost was very anxious to see me and wanted to know how soon I could get out to Cambridge. I dropped everything and started home at once, to find that Mr. Frost needed no legal advice but was about to go to Vermont and wanted to take us to lunch before he left for the summer. Unfortunately for her, my wife had another engagement, but I drove Mr. Frost out to the 1776 House on the Concord Turnpike, where we had a sumptuous luncheon. Of course, he was recognized before very long, and one or two strangers, with more enterprise than delicacy, came to our table and asked for autographs, which he politely declined to give. Otherwise he would have been set upon by others, and the place was crowded. He was surprisingly well known and whenever he traveled he would be recognized by someone, often one or more of the train crew. I once traveled with him to Hanover, New Hampshire, and he was greeted cordially by the train conductor, the trainman, and the Pullman porter. Sometimes, however, he would not be recognized by a traveling companion, and he had some amusing conversations with people who had no idea who he was. One woman began a conversation with the question, "You're a farmer aren't you?" Mr. Frost accepted the classification, and the talk went on from there. It is just possible that the lady is immortalized in one of his poems. Most of the characters in his long narrative poems were people he had known or, at least, met.

I recall with delight one unexpected call which he made upon me, almost at midnight. We had spent the evening together at his house, talking and, I think, eating ice cream or candy. He was very fond of both and kept his house well stocked. In the course of our talk, he said something of his early writing days, and I asked when he first realized that he would be in the first rank of poets. I did not

90

put the question just that way but lapsed into the lingo of horsemen. As some of you doubtless know, a horse which can trot a mile in two minutes is one of the very select few and is commonly called "a two-minute trotter." Mr. Frost liked horses and I have always been exceedingly fond of them, so I assumed that he would understand my question when I asked him when he first realized that he was "a two-minute poet." I do not recall what his answer was, but it did not seem clear to me. After the candy, or the ice cream, was all gone, I took my leave, probably about ten-thirty. As I was getting ready for bed, at nearly twelve o'clock, the front-door bell rang long and loud. I put on a bathrobe, went downstairs, and opened the door. There stood Robert Frost. "I've been taking a walk," he said, "and it has just come to me what you meant by 'a two-minute poet.'" That's one of the nicest

compliments I ever had. Goodnight." And he turned and walked down the steps into the darkness. That from a man who had won the Pulitzer Prize four times!

The Vermont farm (in Ripton) was a remote place, on a side road which ended in Mr. Frost's front yard. Beyond that point it had been abandoned, although it was still passable for pedestrians or saddle horses. The Morrison family occupied the farmhouse, but Mr. Frost had a log cabin up on a sidehill a short distance away. I was fortunate enough to visit Ripton on several occasions, and R. F. would talk the night away up in the cabin. Unless one was in good physical shape, it was a strenuous experience to take a walk with him, for at eighty he could climb a mountainside like a cat and could walk mile upon mile without any sign of distress. He did much work in his garden, and his usual attire, while in Vermont, was a blue shirt, blue slacks, and blue, very thick-soled, sneakers.

One day in summer we had a telephone message from Ripton that Mr. Frost was coming to Boston for some emergency dentistry and would like to have us lunch with him at "Joseph's" in the Back Bay. We accepted, dressed up for the occasion, and repaired to "Joseph's." Mr. Frost arrived on time and emerged from a taxi — dressed in his Ripton attire. Spotlessly neat, as always, but still in his farm clothes. He must have broken his tooth so near to train

time that a change was impossible, but that would not bother him. We entered "Joseph's," and I confess that I was wondering somewhat how a "countryman" might be received. I did not wonder long. The headwaiter greeted him with enthusiasm, and all the waiters seemed to stand at attention. We were shown to a choice table and received red-carpet treatment throughout. I might mention in passing that Mr. Frost was a generous tipper, but that would hardly account for the affection and respect with which he was generally regarded in hotels and restaurants. He had a certain charm.

On one of our Ripton visits it happened that the Morrises had to be away for most of one day, and we were left alone with Mr. Frost. As usual, he did not put in an appearance at the farmhouse until around noon, and he was not feeling well, having been tired out by some trip away. In the early afternoon there appeared an automobile filled with visitors — a young couple and several children. The girl, before her marriage, had spent a summer or two at the farm as a companion to the Morrison children. She and her family were driving through the region and she had come to call on the Morrises. It was characteristic of Mr. Frost that he welcomed the group with great cordiality, saw to it that the children were given refreshments, and really gave up his afternoon to their entertainment. He was really fond of the girl and was interested in her family but, all the same, he was not well that day and would have preferred to be alone.

Simple though his tastes were, he was a celebrity and, especially after he became known as a friend of President Kennedy, he was an object of interest to the reporters. When it was made known that he was to go to Russia, reportedly to meet with Premier Khrushchev, every effort was made to interview him. On the evening of his departure it was arranged that he would have dinner with us and stay until it was time for him to go to the airport. The house at 35 Brewster was dark, but from our windows we could see car after car drive up and people mounting the Frost front steps and ringing the doorbell. None of them

guessed that their quarry was four doors away, enjoying a quiet dinner. I remember that he ate quite

92

heartily, although he was far from well and really in no condition for such a journey as had been planned for him. A less courageous man would not have left home, but he accomplished his mission, even though he was ill all the time he was in Russia. As a matter of fact, he was unable to go to see Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Khrushchev came to him, instead. After his return, Mr. Frost told us something of the interview, which took place in a small inn. Mr. Frost sat on the edge of his bed, and Mr. Khrushchev sat on a chair facing him. The two men got on well together, although their political beliefs differed widely. Mr. Frost said to me, "He's a great man. Make no mistake about that. And he has great ability. He's a friendly man with a sense of humor, and you can talk to him." I think the poet and the premier really liked one another, and further meetings between the two might have been very helpful to this world of ours, but such was not to be.

In the course of an evening with Mr. Frost I made the remark that the world was in such a condition that I felt glad that I would not be around fifty years hence. He replied, "Oh, I'd like to be around fifty years from now to see what the damn fools had been doing." That remark was typical of him. He would want to be around to see what had happened in fifty years. And his opinions and advice would be good, too.

Not long after the Russian journey, Mr. Frost became really ill. I last saw him in his hospital room shortly before he underwent a serious operation, and I am glad that neither of us realized that it was to be our last meeting. I do not remember much of our conversation, and the visit was short, but I do remember that he was wearing blue slacks.

Read May 25, 1965

93

The Discovery of the Charles River by the Vikings According to the Book of Horsford

BY WENDELL D. GARRETT

ONCE again the partisans of Christopher Columbus and Leif Ericson are locked in battle. The most recent occasion for reopening this long-standing and irrelevant feud was the publication in 1965 by Yale University Press of a manuscript and map called *The Vinland Map and The Tartar Relation*. More accurately it may be described as a world map which, if authentic and correctly dated, is evidence of the belief in mid-fifteenth-century Europe that "Vinlanda insula," a large island situated a fair distance to the west of Greenland, was the Vinland stated in the sagas to have been discovered and temporarily settled by the Norsemen. The map is not a cartographical representation of reality but a puzzling source for the study of what men thought the reality was. It widens, ever so slightly, our slender

knowledge of the intellectual preparations for the conquest of the Western Ocean by European seamen —and it deepens the mystery surrounding that exploration.

The publication of this map and the learned commentaries that accompany it is but one more chapter in the complicated and long-debated study of medieval geography and Atlantic exploration. The problem of Vinland and the subject of the discovery of America has attracted the attention of more than a fair share of cranks and charlatans. There is a romance, unquestionably, in the history of Norse voyages through strong winds, violent storms, and immense seas of the North Atlantic. Because the literary evidence from the sagas is often less than consistent and not rarely appears

94

contradictory, Vinland has been sought and found on the American continent by seasoned scholars and misinformed zealots between Hudson Bay to the north and the state of Florida to the south. The facts of geography, strung out as they are over thousands of miles of varied coastline, can all too easily be made to fit very different interpretations of this evidence. There are, of course, strong arguments based on these surviving literary sources for a Norse discovery of America. But every Norse archaeological discovery made on the American continent has failed to command a general confidence, with the possible exception of the recent findings of the Norwegian explorer Helge Ingstad at L'Anse-aux-Meadows in northern Newfoundland. The publication of Ingstad's findings is awaited with more than ordinary interest and curiosity.

*Many volumes have been written on the eleventh-century discoveries of the Northmen in America since the Icelander Thormodus Torfaeus published his *History of Vinland* in 1705. For two hundred and fifty years historians and students of the sagas have disagreed in their identifications of the various landfalls made by the voyagers to Vinland. Theory has challenged theory; yet none has won complete acceptance. It was not until the publication of Carl Rafn's *Antiquitates Americanae* in Copenhagen in 1837 that the Norse voyages became widely known to the educated American public. This remarkable work, containing the original texts of the sagas translated into Latin and Danish, was published in an American edition in 1841. He identified the area visited by the Norsemen with the region between Martha's Vineyard and Cape Cod.*

Rafn's work came dramatically upon the American scene at exactly the right time to arouse the widest and most eager interest. It was a time of great intellectual activity, and an age of romanticism: the literary period of Irving, Cooper, Bryant, and Poe; the historical age of Bancroft, Palfrey, Prescott, and Motley. Although some voices — notably that of Bancroft — spoke loudly against the supposed genuineness of the Norse discoveries, and some —like Irving's —expressed cautious acceptance, most American authors who read Rafn became enthusiastic adherents of his doctrine. This general acceptance undoubtedly is to be attributed in part to the

95

native pride of the New England writers who then dominated American literature and who were very ready to accept Rafn's arguments in favor of the Massachusetts coast as the scenes of Leif's exploits.

Against this background of New England literature and historical study of the mid-nineteenth century, it is a little easier to understand the truly astonishing success of one of the most convincing fabricators of historical myth and romance of late nineteenth-century New England —Eben Norton Horsford of 27 Craigie Street in Cambridge. That Professor Horsford was a Harvard chemist of brilliance and distinction there is no question. As late as 1955 a historical journal contained a learned article entitled "E. N. Horsford's Contribution to the Advancement of Science in America" which outlines in part this aspect of his long and varied career.¹ But it is on his last and most controversial career as gentleman-historian of the Norse discoveries, explorations, and settlement of the Charles River that I would like to make a few comments.

Two points should be made clear before I deal with the life and times of Horsford the Bold: first, I am neither qualified nor really interested in the validity of Norse Atlantic sagas and discoveries. A whole school of writers and scholars has grown up around this subject; the consensus, I need not tell you, is against Horsford's theories. (I am aware, of course, that the problem of Vinland is a little like the King Arthur legend: it is easy to deny the notions of others, and hard to establish a more durable case of one's own.) Secondly, I am not the first historian to attack Horsford's imperious use and abuse of evidence. The Massachusetts Historical Society was disturbed "by the recent unveiling of a public statue in Boston commemorative of Leif Ericson" in 1887 and, without specifically naming Horsford, appointed a committee "to consider the question of the alleged early discovery of America by Norsemen."² Horsford was stung and replied bitterly in a published answer in 1891: "The language in which they refer to me, directly and indirectly, as the aim of their communications, identifies me

¹ Rolf King, *New York History*, 36:307-319 (July 1955).

² *Massachusetts Historical Society, Proceedings*, 2d ser., 4 (1887–1889): 12, 42.

beyond question."³ The Historical Society committee concluded their report to the membership with sarcasm aimed at Horsford: "your Committee . . . think that there is the same sort of reason for believing in the existence of Leif Ericson that there is for believing in the existence of Agamemnon."⁴ Horsford answered his critics:

It will be interesting—amusing—one of these days to look over a record of the charges against me for having attempted, in my fortunate leisure and opportunities, to widen the base of the glory of the State of my adoption. There are charges against me of "cartological perversion"; assertions that my papers are significant mainly in the "study of psychology"; that those historians only find evidence of the presence of Northmen in Massachusetts "who are distinguished for exuberance of imagination and redundance of thought"; that the idea of evidence of any kind that Northmen ever came south of Davis' Strait is "abandoned except by a few enthusiastic advocates"; that I am trying by unworthy means to impose upon children (not to say grown men and women) my views on the subject of the discovery of America by Northmen; that I rely upon evidence which at the best is only "insufficient

and trivial"; that my authorities are untrustworthy, little known, or vague and uncertain in statement,—and so on. And these sweeping charges are made by gentlemen who conceive themselves entitled to claim that their naked, adverse opinion shall be accepted as competent authority in a matter of geography, while there are countless maps and charts, and the testimony of discoverers and explorers, which, carefully examined, may be found to hold as I do.⁵

Thanks to his pedantry and antiquarianism, his soaring egotism and instincts toward elaborate scholarly apparatus, Horsford listed in this counterattack the best criticism that can be made of his work. Now what of the man himself?

I

Eben Norton Horsford was born in Moscow, in western New York, on July 27, 1818. His father, Jedediah Horsford, earlier a Vermont soldier and later a missionary to the Seneca Indians, was a "learned man," we are told. From this early association with Indians, Eben Horsford's later interest in their dialects probably originated. His

³ Eben Norton Horsford, *The Defences of Norumbega* (Boston, 1891), p. 3.

⁴ *M.H.S., Procs., 2d ser., 4* (1887-1889): 43-44.

⁵ Horsford, *Defences of Norumbega*, p. 3–4.

mother was the former Charity Maria Norton of Goshen, Connecticut; she too reputedly "had much literary taste and fondness for books."

Of Horsford's youth little is known except that "It was his favorite amusement to collect the fossils which abounded on his father's farm." One wonders with some skepticism how his obituary writer knew, except with hindsight, that the lad "was known among his playmates as a marvel of general information."⁶ At the age of thirteen Horsford entered the Livingston County High School in upstate New York, and at nineteen graduated as a civil engineer from the Rensselaer Institute of Troy. For two years he was employed as the assistant to the professor in charge of a geological survey of the state of New York — work which undoubtedly influenced him in old age to take up archaeological investigations of Norse settlements. Between 1840 and 1844 he was professor of mathematics and the natural sciences in the Albany Female Academy.

During the early 1840's he also annually delivered a course of lectures on chemistry at Newark College in Delaware (later the University of Delaware). Chemistry became his chosen profession; he therefore departed for Germany in December 1844 to study analytical chemistry for two years at Giessen under Baron Liebig. And on returning to America he was elected to the Rumford Professorship of the Application of Science to the Useful Arts at Harvard College; shortly after his arrival he was transferred to the newly established Lawrence Scientific School. Here he taught chemistry and carried on investigations for sixteen years independently of the chemistry department, which was started about the same time by Josiah P. Cooke. "The laboratory of the Lawrence Scientific School," it has been said, "was one of the first in the United States to be organized and equipped for

*teaching analytical chemistry systematically to individual students and exerted a profound influence on the development of analytical chemistry in America."*⁷

⁶ Rev. George M. Adams, "Professor Eben Norton Horsford," *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, 49:86 (January 1895).

⁷ "Eben Norton Horsford," *Dictionary of American Biography* (New York, 1928-1936).

98

Many of Horsford's investigations while at Harvard were made in the area of food and drink compounds; in experiments he was repeatedly putting new chemical ideas into practical use. He secured for himself in the process around thirty patents and, after he left Harvard, became a very rich man when he engaged in chemical manufacturing largely based on his own inventions. Of greatest commercial value and widest fame was Horsford's Acid Phosphate, widely advertised in the newspapers as "An agreeable preparation of the phosphates, for Indigestion, Nervousness, Mental and Physical Exhaustion." It has been said that "His invention of the acid phosphate grew as much out of a desire to help the soldiers [in the Civil War] as anything else. Acid phosphate, he reasoned, would be a great exhilarant, and he offered the surgeon general of the army to supply the soldiers of the United States with quantities of the beverage for nothing at his own expense altogether."⁸ All of his life Horsford was a compulsive writer and rushed into print at the slightest impulse. By 1863 when he resigned from Harvard he had already published over thirty articles and books, dealing largely with the chemistry of foods. They related to the restoration of phosphates lost in milling and theories on breadmaking, his development of processes for manufacturing condensed milk and baking powder, emergency rations, control of fermentation in mildly alcoholic beverages, and elaborate explanations and advice for the proper material to be used for water pipes.

Professor Horsford engaged in a number of civic and extra-professional roles which should be mentioned in order to understand more fully the professional weight he was able to bring in old age to his bizarre historical and archaeological theories on Vinland. Discredited and rejected as these theories were even in his own time by professional scholars and more distinguished gentlemen-historians, the verisimilitude he was able to give these theories, which were widely and popularly accepted and even today are scattered around greater Boston in durable stone and bronze, stems in large part, it seems to me, from the broadly based and influential appointments and elections to organizations he enjoyed. ("On this

⁸ *Obituary in the Boston Evening Transcript, January 2, 1893.*

99

spot in the year 1000 Leif Erikson built his house in Vineland" reads one of his stone markers presently placed outside the fence of Mount Auburn Hospital, which was, with a touch of irony, moved to its present "spot" during recent road construction on Memorial Drive.) In 1847, for example, he was elected a resident fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; shortly following his return from Germany he prepared and published the plans on the proper materials for the service pipes of the Boston Water Works; in 1860 he was elected resident member of the New England Historic Genealogical Society; during

the Civil War he was appointed by Governor Andrew to the Commission for the Defence of Boston Harbor, and it was Horsford who drafted the plans which were adopted to protect the city in the event of an attack by Confederate cruisers; he devised marching rations for the Union Army that so impressed General Grant that he ordered a half million of the rations for his army;⁹ in 1873 he was United States Commissioner to the Vienna Exhibition; in 1876 he served as a juror at the Centennial Exhibition at Philadelphia; he was president of the board of visitors of Wellesley College and made generous contributions of money to that institution for books, scientific apparatus, and a pension fund; he was among the earliest members of the American Chemical Society; and he was twice appointed an examiner of the United States Mint. All of these appointments and elections were part of an image he desperately wanted to project of immense, even if suffocating, nineteenth-century respectability and learning.

Professor Horsford married Mary L'Hommedieu Gardiner in 1847, daughter of Samuel Smith Gardiner of Shelter Island, New York. Four daughters —Lilian, Mary Katherine, Gertrude Hubbard, and Mary Gardiner —were born of this marriage before his wife's untimely death in 1855. In 1857 Horsford married her sister, Phoebe Dayton Gardiner; the only child of this marriage was a

⁹ *Horsford, The Army Ration (New York, 1864). This pamphlet was reprinted by the Department of Army in 1961, during the Civil War Centennial, as one of the more important innovations to come out of that war in troop mobility and diet (Quartermaster Food and Container Institute for the Armed Forces, Quartermaster Research and Engineering Command, U. S. Army, Library Bulletin, Supplement no. 1, July 1961).*

daughter, Cornelia, who later shared many of her father's antiquarian interests and, after his death, edited and finished for publication some of his posthumous works. After the death of his father-in-law, Mr. Gardiner, the large estate on Shelter Island came into the possession of Horsford. He and his family usually summered there, where he interested himself in the antiquities of the island and erected a monument to the Quakers who found "shelter" there from Puritan persecution. Horsford's compulsion in his later years to erect monuments, statues, and cairns was almost as strong as his irresistible drive to break into print. Nonetheless, these Shelter Island investigations and memorializings seem to have been the crucial experiences for Horsford that launched him onto the wind-whipped, storm-belted, god-impelled, mirage-led sea of debates over the Norse voyages of discovery and settlement.

II

The storm, in which Horsford was to live his last dozen years, broke in May 1880. William Everett, sometime Latin tutor at Harvard College and later master of Adams Academy in Quincy, addressed himself to his fellow members of the Massachusetts Historical Society.

I desire, sir, to call the attention of the members to a scheme which is assuming somewhat serious proportions; in which, if it is really judicious, the Historical Society ought to help; against which, if it is otherwise, it is our duty to protest. I mean the scheme for erecting a monument to some person called the first discoverer of New England; not, however, John Cabot, or Sebastian

Cabot, or Verrazzano, but an indefinite Northman, to whom, if I may be allowed a very bad pun, it is proposed to put up a Leif statue.

This scheme is espoused by several of our citizens, who, it is hardly unfair to say, are more enthusiastic than critical; largely stimulated by the patriotic fervor of a Norwegian gentleman living among us [meaning Horsford, whose name could be taken to be Scandinavian, I suppose], most eminent for genius of a peculiar order, but hardly an authority on matters of history. ... It is absurd, while Cabot and Virginia Dare stand uncommemorated, to erect a statue with any thing resembling an historical motive to Leif or Eric or Thorwald.¹⁰

¹⁰ *M.H.S., Procs., 1st ser., 18 (1880-1881): 79-80.*

Everett had to admit, however, that his more famous father, Edward Everett, while governor of Massachusetts in the late 1830's was actually the first person to seriously suggest the erection of "this very monument" of Leif Ericson. But Governor Everett was politically motivated to make this rash suggestion, his son was eager to point out; he went on to explain that when the governor

was endeavoring to stir the sluggish martinets of Copenhagen into giving Miss Maria Mitchell the king's gold medal for her comet discovered at Nantucket, almost in despair at making them enter into the subject as he desired, he raked up Vinland as a possible equivalent for Nantucket; but I have heard him repeatedly declare his conviction in later years that the whole attempt to fix the "discoveries" of Biorn and his successors to New England, and in any way to destroy the irrefragable glories of Columbus and Cabot, was of the most moonshiny character.¹¹

"Moonshiny" or not, a bronze statue of Leif Ericson designed by Anne Whitney was unveiled on Commonwealth Avenue in Boston on October 29, 1887. (The statue of Leif stands today on Commonwealth Avenue at the Charlesgate East, in front of the Somerset Hotel, with a cupped left hand shielding his eyes, as if he were trying to look under the new Charlesgate overpass.) Horsford was, naturally enough, as chief instigator of the statue, the principal speaker at the unveiling ceremonies that were held in Faneuil Hall. In a speech running to sixty-one printed pages, he assured his listeners that, "In thus fulfilling the duty we owe to the memory of the first European navigator who trod our shores, we do no injustice to the mighty achievement of the Genoese Discoverer," but he went on to add confidently and without qualification, "the American continent was discovered by Northmen, and Leif was the first European to set foot on its shores, — the first to tread the soil of Massachusetts." He concluded his oration, "We unveil to-day the statue in which Anne Whitney has expressed so vividly her conception of the leader who almost nine centuries ago, first trod our shores. Do not be surprised if you fail to distinguish between your ideal hero and the artist's creation. Such a creation Appleton and Longfellow would have set up in Boston. Could we but hear their

¹¹ *Same, p. 80.*

acclaim at such fulfilment of their desire, how rich would it be with the benedictions of Art and Song."¹² Under the caption "Who Discovered America?" the Boston Evening Transcript covered the dedication and discreetly identified Professor Horsford as one "who has had the misfortune to differ with accepted Boston and Cambridge historical authority on other but cognate matters before this."¹³

"The subject of the alleged discovery of America by the Northmen was then introduced" at the November 1887 meeting of the Massachusetts Historical Society, "being suggested by the recent unveiling of a public statue in Boston commemorative of Leif Ericson." The Proceedings of that society reveal that "After an interesting discussion, in which several members of the Society took part, it was voted that the subject be referred to a committee."¹⁴ The following month the committee reported back:

As regards the truth of the proposition that "Leif Ericson discovered America in the year 1000 A.D.," your Committee have reached the following conclusion: They think that there is the same sort of reason for believing in the existence of Leif Ericson that there is for believing in the existence of Agamemnon,—they are both traditions accepted by later writers; but that there is no more reason for regarding as true the details related about his discoveries than there is for accepting as historic truth the narratives contained in the Homeric poems. Your Committee believe not only that it is antecedently probable that the Norsemen discovered America in the early part of the eleventh century, but that this discovery is confirmed by the same sort of historical tradition, not strong enough to be called evidence, upon which our belief in many of the accepted facts of history rests; and that the date 1000 A.D., assumed for such discovery, is sufficiently near for all practical purposes,—much nearer the truth than is the traditional date given for the foundation of Rome.¹⁵

Toward the middle of 1888 Horsford's "Address at the Unveiling of the Statue of Leif Eriksen" with a number of ponderous appendices was published under the title *Discovery of America by Northmen — his first major book on the Vinland question. Early in*

¹² Horsford, *Discovery of America by Northmen: Address at the Unveiling of the Statue of Leif Eriksen Delivered in Faneuil Hall, October 39, 1887* (Boston, 1888), p. 58, 60-61.

¹³ *Boston Evening Transcript*, October 29, 1887.

¹⁴ *M.H.S., Procs.*, 2d ser., 4 (1887-1889): 12.

¹⁵ *Same*, p. 43-44.

1889 the famed Justin Winsor, librarian of Harvard University and corresponding secretary of the Massachusetts Historical Society, published Volume One of his *Narrative and Critical History of America* (though it was one of the last of the eight volumes to be published). In a chapter on "Pre-Columbian Explorations" he launched an attack on Horsford and the statue:

The question was brought to a practical issue in Massachusetts by a proposition raised—at first in Wisconsin—by the well-known musician Ole Bull, to erect in Boston a statue to Leif Ericson. The project, though ultimately carried out, was long delayed, and was discouraged by members of the Massachusetts Historical Society on the ground that no satisfactory evidence existed to show

that any spot in New England had been reached by the Northmen. The sense of the society was finally expressed in the report of their committee ... in language which seems to be the result of the best historical criticism; for it is not a question of the fact of discovery, but to decide how far we can place reliance on the details of the sagas. . . . Nothing could be slenderer than the alleged correspondences of languages, and we can see in Horsford's Discovery of America by the Northmen to what a fanciful extent a confident enthusiasm can carry it.¹⁶

*In a footnote he went on to say that the "most incautious linguistic inferences and the most uncritical cartological perversions are presented by Eben Norton Horsford" in this book. The good Rumford Professor was understandably angry and bitter at the college librarian and lashed back within the year with a short book, *The Problem of the Northmen* printed "in an edition for private circulation," that had the following lengthy subtitle: "A Letter to Judge Daly, the President of the American Geographical Society, on the Opinion of Justin Winsor, that 'Though Scandinavians may have reached the Shores of Labrador, the soil of the United States has not one vestige of their presence.' "¹⁷ Horsford cited in full all of Winsor's criticisms and aspersions on his scholarship and answered him:*

It is quite true that members of the Massachusetts Historical Society discouraged the efforts of the immediate friends of Ole Bull here, and the two millions of Scandinavians of the West and the East who sympathized

¹⁶ P. 98.

¹⁷ Published in Cambridge, 1889.

with him, in his patriotic wish to recognize in a monument, to be set up in Boston, the services of Leif Ericson in the discovery of America. It is also true that they virtually caused the rejection by the city government of Boston of the offer by the late Mr. Thomas Appleton of \$40,000 for the erection of a memorial in Scollay Square to the Discovery of America by Northmen.

It is also true that in the paragraphs cited there is, in carefully chosen terms, and in a tone of conscious infallibility better suited to an earlier day and another meridian, an intimation of the proper limit of geographical research, and of who may pursue it, in New England; and there is also an undertone of recognized authority,—all of which will find adequate appreciation. One may ask, Is Massachusetts apreserve?¹⁸

For most of us today, I believe, it is difficult to appreciate fully the heat and controversy generated by Horsford's drumming the Norsemen cause during the period preceding the quadricentennial year of 1892, at the same moment when every schoolboy and scholar, preacher and politician, judge and journalist, was feverishly preparing to resurrect a very tired Columbus and 1492 for a four-hundredth-year celebration. Even Judge Daly, President of the American Geographical Society, to whom Horsford directed most of his books as if they were extended letters, replied in one to Horsford: "It is especially interesting at this period, when we are preparing to celebrate the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of this continent by Columbus, that the facts you have ascertained should be brought to light in connection with this earlier discovery of America."¹⁹ The timing of the publication of Horsford's books immediately preceding the 1892 Columbus celebrations broke like a thunderclap over the historical landscape; the Norse discovery issue quickly degenerated into an emotional debate, dividing individuals and groups along ethnic and nationalistic

lines. In a similar manner the announcement by the Yale University News Office of the publication of The Vinland Map last October immediately before Columbus Day resulted in the same outburst of partisan feeling. American-Italian leaders and politi-

¹⁸ Horsford, *Problem of the Northmen*, p. 7–8.

¹⁹ Horsford, *The Discovery of the Ancient City of Norumbega: A Communication to the President and Council of the American Geographical Society . . . November 21, 1889 (Boston, 1890)*, p. 7.

cians, in particular, objected strongly to Yale's "deliberate" timing of the news release and called the Vinland map a "fraud" and "fabrication" and its publication a part of some widespread "conspiracy."

Amazingly, Horsford wrote and published a number of major books between his Discovery of America by Northmen in 1888 (when he was seventy years old) and his death on the first day of January in 1893, at the age of seventy-four. Early in 1890 he brought out The Discovery of the Ancient City of Norumbega, in which he elaborated on the details of his discovery of the site and walls of the ancient city. His first research led him to the old fort of Norumbega at the junction of Stony Brook with the Charles River in Weston. There in the summer of 1889 he erected a tower of stone with an elaborate inscription to mark the site of the ancient fort and to commemorate the discoveries of Vinland and Norumbega.²⁰ Horsford, who obviously enjoyed the proper ceremonies of an unveiling, said of this book and that event:

It had been proposed to accompany the unveiling of the Tablet on the Tower just completed with a summary account of the way by which I had been conducted to my later discovery, together with other exercises appropriate to the occasion,—including a Poem rehearsing the story of the Vinland Sagas, and music contributed by our Scandinavian friends and by a party of ladies from Norumbega Hall of Wellesley College, so called in honor of the discovery which was communicated to the public at about the time the corner-stone of the Hall was laid.²¹

On these occasions the American Geographical Society sent important representatives and lent its support to Horsford's claims. But more and more the aging professor was coming under severe attack from historians, and therefore felt impelled to defend himself in print. His next book, *The Defences of Norumbega*, published in 1891, had the telling subtitle, "A Review of the Reconnaissances of Col. T. W. Higginson, Professor Henry W. Haynes, Dr. Justin Winsor, Dr. Francis Parkman, and Rev. Edmund F. Slafter."²²

²⁰ See also Sigmund Diamond, "Norumbega: New England Xanadu," *American Neptune*, 11:95-107 (April 1951).

²¹ Horsford, *Discovery of the Ancient City of Norumbega*, p. 5–6.

²² Published in Boston, 1891.

Each man had attacked Horsford and his historical methodology in speeches and in published writing; in this book he attempted a full refutation of their charges. "The fate that has attended my researches is not . . . without precedent," he reminded his audience; he compared himself and his situation to "the fate of Harvey, who discovered the circulation of the blood."²³ What is revealing and of most interest, I believe, in his last few books—particularly those in which he reacted to his critics—are autobiographical statements of just how he approached his subject: that is, his historical method. And it is with an observation or two on his methodology that I would like to conclude.

III

Eben Norton Horsford was unquestionably a man of genius and immense brilliance. He excelled in several careers over a long and fruitful life. Since he was a scientist by training, it is not surprising to find that he became an early advocate of the scientific approach to history. This school of historical thought was very much in vogue in the late nineteenth century, and the Boston Evening Transcript on October 29, 1887, voiced its approval of Horsford's methods in reporting on the unveiling of the Leif Ericson statue:

Without pinning our faith to everything that Professor Horsford's fascinating address suggests ... we may heartily admire and approve the new spirit in scholarship, the new methods and the new field which it represents. It has the spirit of modern science—dropping the hard-and-fast dividing lines, doubting the catastrophes and heroic treatment which had hitherto accounted for the world's history, and trusting rather to every-day and natural operations, through long periods, to accomplish things.

Horsford studied his maps and literature thoroughly, and I might add, crammed every scrap of evidence he could find into his books. But in the end he practiced a sort of divining rod approach to archaeology. Of his approach he once said:

Let me tell you of a little prediction that I made at a certain early stage of my research, which, if my reasoning from data discovered were correct, must be realized, and which may help to give you patience as well as

²³ Horsford, *Defences of Norumbega*, p. 4.

courage. It was the test of the trustworthiness of my method of research. I said to myself and to my household: "If I am correct, every tributary to the Charles will be found to have, or to have had, a dam and a pond, or their equivalent, at or near its mouth or along its course." That was my prophecy. ... It was long after this prediction that I found its verification at every point I examined.²⁴

The key words here are "prophecy" and "prediction." He went on to explain in his own personal style:

Why do I speak so confidently? Fortunate leisure has enabled me to go far enough in certain directions of study and exploration to see what must be as a matter of scientific deduction. When that point, the what must be, is reached, prediction is natural, unavoidable, and safe. As I prophesied from the literature of geography the finding of Fort Norumbega at the junction of Stony Brook with the Charles, and went to the spot and found it; and as I deduced the site of the

remains of Leif's houses in Vinland from the necessities which the strict construction of the Sagas required, and went to the spot where I had indicated that the remains had once been, and found them there more than a year after the prediction was announced,—so I have arrived by inevitable deduction at the seat and centre of the early colony of Northmen in America.²⁵

Horsford was speaking here for a generation flushed with confidence. The scientific developments of the nineteenth century, with their facile physical laws and theorems that explained so much, stirred his imagination as a student of history to seek similar universal generalizations for the distant era of discovery and exploration. At the same time he had a certain exuberance and spontaneity, with a charm of style that made a kind of literature of his history. That he was wrong — dead wrong — in his conclusions, historians today are all agreed. But one has to admire Horsford for his accumulation of a vast quantity of source and monographic materials meticulously calendared in his books on Norse exploration of the New World. It must be a courageous spirit who will dare, alone, to scan our history of a millennium ago and set himself the task of writing its record. Because of Eben Norton Horsford, the subsequent writing and reading of the history of

²⁴ *Horsford, Discovery of the Ancient City of Norumbega, p. 17.*

²⁵ *Same, p. 36.*

108

Cambridge was markedly influenced — and never has been quite the same. His books and speeches, statues and historical markers, generated a stormy debate in his own day that still attracts, after three-quarters of a century, lively proponents and antagonists. Of very few local historians of Cambridge of his own day — or indeed of any since — can that be said.

Read January 30, 1966

109

Behind the Scenes at 47 Workshop

BY ELIZABETH W. BOLSTER

LET ME preface this paper by saying that I am following one of the precepts taught to me in this area. "This area" was the playwriting course and the originator and teacher of it was Professor George Pierce Baker. The courses, English 47 and 47A, were offered at Harvard University and Radcliffe College (in those days, courses were taught separately and conservatively at each of these institutions) and a would-be member had to submit an original one-act play to be accepted or rejected, as the case might be. As is obvious, the famous 47 Workshop bore the magic name (or rather number) of the courses.

This particular precept to which I refer, one which the professor tried, not always too successfully, to pound into the heads and pens of his students, was: "Write about what you know; the area with which you are familiar, the kind of people you really know about. You may think that this may not be of interest to others, but it will be, if you present it

convincingly. Whether or not you have the ability to present your material well will make the difference between vividness and dullness." To this day, these words, or a reasonable facsimile thereof, still ring in my ears. Therefore, it seemed natural to me to choose a subject with which I was quite familiar and an atmosphere in which I worked very closely.

G.P., as he was known, always in the frame of reference and sometimes to his face, would expatiate on the fact that the newer and more eager the would-be playwright, the more certain he or she would be to plunge into the deepest, darkest kind of gloom and tragedy, with characters dying of despair like flies and not a rift

110

of light in the heavy clouds of tragedy. "Comedy," he would say, "is by far the most difficult and elusive type of drama to depict. There must be a light, deft, sure touch, or heavy-handed and unrealistic slapstick and improbability will result. To be able to write it well, is a gift given to few."

Do not fear; I am not about to give you a play, either tragedy or comedy. But I would like to tell you about the behind-the-scenes of the 47 Workshop of which I was a very active but unimportant part in the early 1920's.

For a long time in Professor Baker's English 47 and 47A he and his students had felt a real need for a testing ground. The Castle Square Theatre, made famous by John Craig and Mary Young (and the starting point for many famous actors such as Alfred Lunt) had offered a prize to the English 47 students (the course started in 1904 at Radcliffe College and 1906 at Harvard College) for the best play submitted. The first one chosen and produced was "The End of the Bridge," written by Florence Lincoln in 1911, followed the next year by Fred Ballard's "Believe me, Xantippe." Although this Castle Square offer continued for several years, it gave little opportunity for the many other potentially good plays to be produced, which were being written all the time in English 47 and 47A. This latter course was an extra year for those who had taken English 47 and were "invited back" to do more writing.

On July 8, 1912 Miss Elizabeth McFadden, who had taken these courses, and whose play "The Product of the Mill" had won a Castle Square prize and production, wrote to Professor Baker that "Dean Goes (of Radcliffe College) approves (or rather, does not disapprove) of the 47 plan of plays being tried out or given a production at the Agassiz House theatre." Miss McFadden felt much encouraged over the scarcity of dressing rooms at this (college) theatre. She hoped that if the necessity of wings (on the stage, that is), flies (ditto), trap doors, proper acoustical arrangements and even a revolving stage "could be driven home to the authorities by illustrative action rather than by talk, it might hasten the building of a real theatre, as nothing else would." After all, the Agassiz House stage seemed designed for lectures rather than for anything

111

else. It is interesting to note that the Agassiz Theatre remains today in 1965 practically the same as it was then, some fifty-three years ago. To be sure, now there is the Loeb Theatre, of quite recent vintage, but there has been a vast stretch of no adequate theatre in

between. Miss McFadden then went on to state that "Not too much will be accomplished during the first half of this (1912) academic year of either dramatic or artistic significance, but if we can win the co-operation of the college authorities, the loyal interest of the audience we want, and evolve an harmoniously working committee, this would be a big step."

Earlier, there had been a 47 Club established by the English 47 Radcliffe students, sparked by many who lived nearby (former members of the classes, and who, consequently could furnish continuity in furthering interest and future plans). One of its members, Lillian S. Shuman (remember A. Shuman's clothing store in Boston?) gave a substantial sum of money to start this first small venture of putting plays from the courses into production. The 47 Club, to raise more money, put on a series of programs held at the then (and always to me) Copley Plaza Hotel. Among these events were: Josephine Preston Peabody giving readings from her plays and writings; Mrs. Marian Craig Wentworth giving a reading of the play "Milestones" by Arnold Bennett; and readings also by Edward Knoblock (a former member of the playwriting course) and by Mr. Percy MacKaye.

At this time, plans were drawn up for a new theatre. Needless to say, they remained on the drawing boards where they doubtless are to this day. Copies of these plans and the idea of a workshop acting and producing group were sent to a large number of former students, both from Professor Baker's courses on the "History of the Drama," and to the many who had taken the playwriting courses, as well as to others who were noted for their special interest in drama. The names speak for themselves, and I list only a few: Miss Margaret Anglin, John Drew, John Craig, and Mary Young, Livingston Platt, Fred Ballard, Walter Prichard Eaton, Josephine Preston Peabody Marks (author of many plays, such as "The Wolf of Gubbio," "The Pied Piper," etc.), Mrs. Beulah Dix Flebbe ("The

Road to Yesterday"), Percy MacKaye ("A Thousand Years Ago"), Edward Knoblock ("Kismet," shall we say of Otis Skinner fame?), Edward Sheldon ("Salvation Nell," "Romance" at that time, the year 1912-1913, and many others since).

The first play to be produced was "Linda Amuses Herself" by Mrs. Merrill, and the second one, "Educated" by Marian Winnek. A statement written by "G.P." was sent out to a potential group of givers and prospective audience members and read as follows:

The Workshop is not in the usual sense a theatre. It is simply what its name implies—a working place for young dramatists. What is needed to round out the play into final form is just what the author is unable to get— an opportunity to see the play adequately acted before an audience, sympathetic, yet genuinely critical.

It does not aim to uplift or to compete. It is not at all a group of amateurs who ask their friends to come and admire. It is a serious, co-operative effort for a common end deeply interesting to all, by men and women who are students of any of the arts connected with the stage, acting, producing, stage-setting, the newer methods of lighting, etc.

The audience is an important part, and must take their duties seriously and responsibly. Above all, theirs should be fair and objective criticism.

Professor Baker was indeed a pioneer in this field of drama. Play-writing, particularly in puritanical regions, New England certainly, and Harvard University definitely, has always been regarded, I feel, as faintly immoral and to be counted for academic credit only over several dead bodies, loosely speaking. The fact that Professor Baker won fame and reputation, not only for his teaching, but for helping to establish and encourage playwrights and experimental theatres all over this country, in no way won over the sceptics. That Harvard University, because of him, also shared in the glory of this tremendous movement, has not as yet resulted in the establishment of a graduate department in this field. This honor went to Yale, helped by a forward pass from Harvard. Consequently, when play-writing and the producing of plays written in the courses moved to New Haven, no other similar courses were offered at Harvard. A play might be accepted in a creative writing course, or an original play written by a student might be produced by one of the Houses, or more recently once in a while at the Loeb Drama Centre, but that was all.

113

However, back in Harvard's "Golden Age," in the early 1900's, drama flourished. With the establishment of the 47 Workshop, starting from very small beginnings, the whole movement grew and expanded. Money provided by small gifts (and not by the colleges) provided the means in the first small ventures. Value lay in the fact that a play produced takes on life and color, much more so than when read aloud in class. Defects showed up, as well as potentialities, and the would-be male or female playwrights were better able to see what needed to be rewritten, added to, or deleted—mostly the latter because nobody, but nobody, runs on into scene after scene as does a budding playwright. And for many, there might be the salutary effect of turning to other fields of endeavor.

At first, the 47 Workshop (as it was officially called) was very small. Two, or at most three plays a year were produced with an audience composed mostly of the course's students, their friends, and the friends of those acting and helping backstage. Gradually it grew until, when I came into the picture, we had a large audience composed of Cantabrigians, students, faculty, and fringed benefits. (In those days, in the early twenties, no group wore more beads, shawls, scarves, bangles, fringes, etc., than Cambridge ladies in the evening. I would match them any day with the audiences of the Friday afternoon symphony audiences—and I am sure they formed a large part of them!) The price for belonging to the 47 Workshop audience (and you had to be proposed and seconded) was a written critique of each play attended, due within a week. This was strictly followed up — one of my jobs. And you must attend the plays unless you had an excellent reason, such as illness or absence from town. At times, we had a waiting list, since, because of the smallness of the theatre (the seats from which you could see anything, that is), we had to limit the size of the membership. Those who could, and there were many, made a voluntary contribution, and on these gifts and a few "memorial" performances, the plays were produced, five a season. "Operation Shoestring" was the watchword, and a very valuable one, too. Many grandiose ideas for settings on the part of authors were cut down to size, resulting in a more workable and marketable play.

114

Thus the 47 Workshop began and ended its life with "home base" in Massachusetts Hall in the famous Harvard Yard and in one of the three original buildings of the college.

A description given in an article in The Century Magazine, February 1921, gives a most accurate and vivid picture:

Johnston Gate is the official entrance to Harvard University. Massachusetts Hall, with the memories of its successive uses as dormitory, barracks for Revolutionary soldiers, dormitory again, lecture rooms for courses in history and economics, drill hall for members of the R.O.T.C., had its lower story given over to the 47 Workshop. (Actual productions took place on Agassiz Theatre stage at Radcliffe College.) Rehearsals begin at 7:30 p.m. "What a queer old rattery you've got here!" might be the first comment of a visitor. Thirty feet by one hundred and fifty feet stretched before him in bewildering confusion. A large piece of canvas against which some wit has set two imitation marble pillars, one surmounted by a Russian brass pot, the other, by a New England teakettle. High above hung a placard reading "Furniture and Undertaking." Scenery on every side, large properties, tables, fireplaces, bits of staircases, treetrunks (imitation!), chairs, and stools. There are two corners, one enclosing a tiny office, and the other where small props and lighting apparatus are kept. Backdrops and gauzes are everywhere. An ungainly wooden structure, looking like a medieval battering-ram is a staging of different levels for scene painters. Not even the middle of the room offers wholly free space. Ceiling rafters, put in place long before the days of iron girders, require the support of two iron pillars. Broad white lines run slantwise to piles of scenery at the back of the room. On these lines, wooden chairs have been so placed as to suggest a room with doors and windows. The space thus enclosed, twenty feet long by twelve feet deep, represents the stage in Agassiz House, Radcliffe College. Just in front of the suggestion of a stage are a gilded high-back bench and a small, dark table. If you have happy memories of Sir Johnston Forbes-Robertson's "Hamlet," these will look familiar. Bidding farewell to the American stage in a performance of "Hamlet" at Harvard University, he passed on these and other props to the 47 Workshop as evidence of his generous interest in it. Today its director conducts rehearsals from this bench, across the little table.

As the time for rehearsing drew near there would be an influx of all ages coming in. The "prop" people set around makeshift properties. On the director's left is a young man or woman who is the prompter. On the director's right is a young man or woman who is the author.

Allow me to take you back to that happy scene as I remember it.

There are three kinds of plays: (1) one is never finished, (2) another has promise but is not quite ready for production, and (3) the last deserves the opportunity to be presented to a Workshop audience. Plays in the second group are, as far as possible, acted after a few brief rehearsals in this room for the director's criticism and that of his classes.

During all rehearsals there is evident absorption of everyone in his particular task. There are no social amenities, no noise. Sociability takes place before rehearsal starts or in pauses to refresh the actors. The basic idea in all branches of the Workshop is to discover what special ability, if any, each person has and to help him to develop it. Actors are

allowed to move as they liked and felt except when they got into bad groupings or in each other's way. When main positions have been obtained, the director offers suggestions of the movements which may help to reveal the characterization or to add beauty to the groupings. Always the question: "Now do you feel comfortable? If not, what do you want to do?" Suggestions are tried and not discarded until the actor himself (or herself) is convinced of its undesirability. There is discipline, but not the immediate, unquestioning obedience of militarism. Usually plays are rehearsed and produced in three weeks because of the intelligent and hearty co-operation by many skilled people.

Copies of the play are handed early to the costumer, set designer, property person, lighting, and stage managers. The purpose is to try to make the play, as nearly as the equipment of the Workshop will permit, close to what the author thinks he wrote. All who work on a production are volunteers. Sometimes there will be assistance in the painting of a larger scenery from members of courses in designing and painting at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts School.

My connection with the Workshop was supposedly secretarial, but actually resulted in my being receptionist, general factotum, crying towel, listener to tales of woe, and dogsbody. It was hard work and long hours, but fun, as well as a most valuable experience. I had just graduated from Radcliffe College, old enough not to be interested in, or interesting to, the undergraduates as a person, but young enough to see their point of view. My cubbyhole of an

*office on the lower floor of Massachusetts Hall had a window looking out on the Harvard Yard. Often Tom Wolfe would drape his six feet and six-or-seven inches from outside to inside over the window opened from the top. From him in this position I have no doubt that I heard most of his book *Of Time and the River*, as his ideas poured forth just like a river indeed! All he needed was a captive audience, any captive, of which I was certainly top man (or woman), from nine to five daily. I got so that I could listen with one ear, talk on the telephone, type letters, while he flowed on relentlessly. Be it ever to G.P.'s credit that he recognized the genius of this man, but persuaded Tom that he should write books, not plays. We put on one of his plays, "Welcome to Our City," and it's a wonder the audience isn't still there listening to the first performance ! (It is interesting to note that this play was published in full in *Esquire*, October 1957.)*

I sat at my desk attending to the usual secretarial duties plus every kind of interruption you can imagine: people coming in not liking the parts in which they were cast; could someone bring twenty people to the next production? Mr. Forbes-Robertson or Mr. Philip Barry or Mr. Morris Gest's secretary would like to speak to Mr. Baker, etc., etc. Meanwhile, the sets for the next play were being constructed, hammered, sawed, painted, just outside my paper-thin office door in the large work area. No wonder I was able to understand how my children could do their homework with (in those days) their radios going full blast! They inherited this talent from me.

Or perhaps John Mason Brown, Donald Oenslager (of scene-designing fame), James J. Rorimer (the director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art), John Lodge, Conrad Salinger, Doris Halman, or Dorothy Sands (all but the last two undergraduates at that time) would

drop in during the day for a turn at the paintbrush, or with a problem to be discussed. Could he or she have a moment with G.P.?

Or President A. Lawrence Lowell might stick his head in the window as he was passing by, and was Professor Baker in? If he was, there would ensue a discussion as to why Professor Baker

117

wanted land for a new theatre when he, A. Lawrence Lowell, wouldn't ask Harvard University for even a new wastebasket. And President Lowell would be wearing a slightly scandalized expression as if to say "Imagine putting playwriting and acting even in a wastebasket category!"

Or Benny Lettieri, later to blossom into a fleet of large moving vans manned by one or two of his never-ending sons, would clop-clop and draw up outside in his rickety old wagon and somewhat moth-eaten and rebellious horse, to convey completed sets and backdrops up to Agassiz House for an impending dress rehearsal. I can still hear the creaking of his conveyance and the hoof beats of his nag on their way up to Garden Street.

Another incident I recall is the time when Morris Gest was putting on "The Miracle" in Boston, and his emissary needed help and advice from G.P. This he apparently received (and successfully), for a telegram arrived to Professor Baker, "Everything fine. You are the Wonder Boy!" Needless to say, it was signed by the emissary, since it would be a term one would never think of applying to G.P.

Those were the days of hard work on everyone's part. A play, once chosen, was immediately put into rehearsal and scene-building. This latter, as I mentioned before, went on during the day and often far into the night, while rehearsing also went on (until the week of dress rehearsals and production) in the evening. Quite often, they went on simultaneously, though they tried to keep the scenery-building to a dull roar, or maybe just painting, during the actual rehearsal. Hordes of undergraduates of both sexes worked on the sets. They came and went, looking like the Beatniks you see in Harvard Square today, with paint-splashed jeans, unkempt locks, and very dirty. However, they had a real excuse to look this way.

In the week of production everything was then transferred up to the Agassiz stage. People sitting up nights and planning the most inconvenient stage and equipment possible couldn't have done a better job. Small, narrow, curved, with seats for the audience at impossible angles except for the very center, dressing rooms up

118

and down twisting stairs, depth of stage extremely shallow — you name the handicap and Agassiz stage had it. I am sure that Don Oenslager's ingenuity and talent which have given him such fame stemmed from dreaming up settings for bullfights, mountains, or elegant drawing rooms in the face of this rugged challenge.

Well, here plays of all sorts had their little moments —some, big ones, of course. A charming one-act by Rachel Field; a delightfully English-flavored one-act by Eleanor Holmes Hinckley (later her "Dear Jane," based on Jane Austen, and "The Clam Digger" won professional recognition); a richly dramatic five-act play laid in Spain by Gertrude Thurber; Tom Wolfe's "Welcome to Our City" (which I have mentioned before, in five acts and doubtless more that he was made to cut out, written in his own bitter, caustic style about corrupt Southern politics); a Pennsylvania Dutch long play by Roscoe Brink which had a Broadway production; Philip Barry's "A Punch for Judy"—and many, many others over the years, most of which sank into oblivion. But this was indeed a workshop, the testing place, the "sharpen-your-teeth" test. But in the end producing playwrights like Philip Barry and Robert Sherwood, and many others, as well as several volumes of one-act plays given to this day by schools, colleges, amateur groups.

During World War I many plays were taken on the road for the soldiers at Camp Devens in Ayer, Massachusetts, and also given in the Boston area at the request of the authorities. Professor Baker was appointed by the government as Head Supervisor of Amusements for the soldiers in the Boston district. Of him a Boston newspaper wrote: "He (Professor Baker) is a busy man, dividing his time between his work with the soldiers, his college classes, editing another volume of Harvard Plays, and directing the 47 Workshop productions."

Plays were also given to raise money for the Red Cross. Also the Workshop (but not during the war years) made trips away from Cambridge to neighboring communities.

Never shall I forget the organized confusion that attended these alarms and excursions. Picture the Spanish play "Pastora," with its five elaborate settings being transported to Worcester, there to

be adapted to a totally different (and usually much larger) stage. To paraphrase the title of a recent movie, "Situation Hopeless, but not Serious." Somehow, everything always came out all right and the show-on-the-road went on.

The plays were superbly directed. No one, I feel sure, could direct a play better than G.P. His vision, patience, understanding, and belief in what he was doing, were, to coin a Hollywood phrase, colossal. Settings, lighting, costumes were meticulous and imaginative and, in the face of every obstacle, incredible. The acting was surprisingly good, considering its amateur standing. Mary Morris, Dorothy Sands (who is still treading the boards professionally in New York and abroad), Professor Frederick C. Packard of Harvard University who "went professional" for a while in New York before assuming his teaching career, all acted many times in many plays. Even John Mason Brown, though he was no actor, Heaven love him, had a few small parts.

G.P. himself was tireless, giving everything he had, which was almost limitless, to whatever he did. He literally inspired everyone who worked with him to attain goals they never realized they had. Perhaps that was his greatest talent — to give those with whom he worked so hard, a belief in themselves and in what they could do. He worked so tirelessly himself that no one could let him down by doing less, whether it was in writing, acting,

behind scenes, or even in the office. I have never known anyone before or since who could command such devotion and such hard work from so many people.

At the end of each season, all those involved in the putting on of the Workshop plays during the year, wrote a take-off of them, known as the "47 Varieties." I well remember, the parody on a play of Tom Wolfe's was titled "Sheep's Clothing," and "Heaven Helps Him," by Robert Leven became "Leven Helps Himself." The parodies were most clever and delighted the audience and the workers even more, but I suspect the authors were not quite as amused. "Pastora" had a delightful song in its parody entitled "And Then the Bull Past O'er Her" sung by John Mason Brown and Rosy, the Bull (myself), neither of whom could carry a tune if it was wrapped up for us!

120

In 1924, at the end of the season, Professor Baker announced that he was taking a much-needed Sabbatical year and that Harvard University had decided to turn Massachusetts Hall back into a dormitory again. In 1925, he was offered a sum of money sufficient to build a new theatre. The only land Harvard offered was completely inadequate as to size, nor would Harvard hear of establishing a graduate department of Drama and the Dramatic Arts. Yale University offered him both of these (though the money offered for the Harvard building was from an entirely different donor than the one who was to give the theatre to Yale).

In my opinion, it is greatly to Harvard's discredit that this situation was ever allowed to happen. I feel that G. P. was really heartbroken that Harvard never recognized his great work. However, he won his goal of founding a native drama and was recognized all over England and Europe, as well as in this country, before he died. As one of his former students wrote: "But without '47' and the Workshop this might never have happened. It was not the theatre at Yale that established his reputation. It was his students at Harvard who made him famous and meant more to him than even a beautiful theatre like the Loeb could have done. For over and above his power to stimulate his authors and faithfully produce their plays, was his even greater ability to project himself into their fortunes, so that their success made him rejoice and their triumphs were his."

I remember G.P.'s once saying to me, after he had gone to Yale and enjoyed a then completely up-to-date small theatre with all its excellent backstage and working facilities, that in spite of every kind of stage equipment with which to work, the loss of challenge to produce against odds, was a great one. To stage and produce a play with almost nothing to work with, is not only a character builder, but results in a creative ingenuity helpful in all the aspects of a good dramatic production.

A farewell party entitled "The Last Act" was tendered to him by his loyal and devoted group. It was a notable, if somewhat tearful success. Speakers included John Mason Brown, Agnes Morgan, Dorothy Sands, and many others.

121

There has never been anything like the 47 Workshop and I doubt that there ever will be. However, the phoenixes of Little Theatres, college workshops, and the off-Broadway type of productions rose all over this country, and in many places abroad. It is encouraging in the face of radio and TV that Harvard has never had so many groups, House and otherwise, putting on plays. Boston now has two Repertory theatres, small, to be sure, but doing an excellent job, and well supported by the public. This, after a long desert of none, after the demise of the Copley Theatre, is encouraging. It is hoped that courses in playwriting will return again to Harvard and Radcliffe. One of the American theatre's greatest needs today is for good, native playwrights. Albee, Pinter, and the Theatre of the Absurd may be one answer, but we need many others with, maybe, less absurd tendencies.

I would like to end with a little poem, written by Doris F. Halman when G.P. left Radcliffe:

*There was a Hindu dervish
A mighty, magic man.
From naught he made more wonders
Than other people can.
Upon the desert drift he blew,
And lo! a rose tree sprang and grew.
The desert's now a garden,
With water, seeds and shears;
And here there will be rose trees
Implanted down the years.
But, O, the magic's at the first,
When once he made a tree from thirst.*

Read March 29, 1966

122

Jonathan Sewall: A Lawyer in Conflict

BY HILLER B. ZOBEL

IT IS early March 1770. A lawyer sits writing at his desk. He is drawing up an indictment, a dull task he has performed numberless times before, one he will repeat again and again in the future. The stereotyped phrases pass from his memory to the paper almost without the aid of thought:

At his Majesty's Superiour Court of Judicature Court of Assize and General Goal delivery, begun and held at Boston, within and for the County of Suffolk. . . . The Jurors for the said

*Lord the King upon oath present that . . . not having the Fear of God before their eyes, but being moved and seduced by the Instigation of the devil and their own wicked Hearts . . . feloniously wilfully and of their malice aforethought did kill and murder . . . against the peace of the said Lord the King, his Crown and Dignity.*¹

Archaic language cloaking a timeworn formality. The indictment when completed will be set before the twenty-three Grand Jurors, whose oath binds them to "present no man for envy, hatred or malice," nor to "leave any man unrepresented for love, fear, favor or affection, or hope of reward."² And if twelve of the Grand Jurors believe there is a prima facie case against the accused justifying trial, the foreman will inscribe "This is a true Bill" on the indictment, the accused will be arraigned and the trial will proceed. All very usual, all very routine. And in those days of practical simplicity, when court papers were all handwritten, and the hand-

¹ L. Kinvin Wroth and Hiller B. Zobel, eds., *Legal Papers of John Adams*, Cambridge, 1965, 3:46-47.

² Wroth and Zobel, *op. cit. supra n. I* 2:283 n.

writing was the lawyer's own, not even the highest law officer in the province could avoid the drudgery. Jonathan Sewall, the Attorney General himself, is writing up this indictment, in the same neat script which calls to book burglars, pickpockets, counterfeiters, and rogues of every stripe.

But the subject of this indictment is no petty robbery, the putative criminals are no band of minor thieves. The crime is the alleged murder of "one Crispus Attucks, then and there being in the peace of God and of the said Lord the King," and the accused bear such names as Thomas Preston, William Wemms, and Mathew Killroy. We know the episode which has brought them to the law's notice as the Boston Massacre.

I have opened with a somewhat florid account of Sewall's initial participation in the Massacre litigation in order to emphasize that the scene depicted represents the sum and total of Jonathan Sewall's contribution to the most politically important criminal trials of his time. Why the Province's highest law officer should so limit his contribution is one of the two issues I hope to explore here. The other, which in a sense underlies the first, is an assessment of Sewall as a man and, especially, as a lawyer, with particular reference to that segment of his practice dealing with slavery.

By March 1770, Jonathan Sewall had been Attorney General for over two years; he had been Advocate General in the Court of Vice Admiralty slightly longer. During that time he had, as Attorney General, personally conducted the prosecution of virtually every criminal case before the Superiour Court, and many before the Suffolk Court of General Sessions of the Peace. He had also handled the Crown's Admiralty business, whether criminal or civil.³

*Two things deserve note in connection with Sewall's Admiralty duties. First, many of the cases carried political (as opposed to legal) significance. Thus, *Rex v. Corbet et al*, a prosecution for murder before the Special Court of Admiralty in 1769, concerned the right of American seamen to avoid impressment. And *Sewall v.**

³ For details of Sewall's life, see John Langdon Sibley and Clifford K. Shipton, *Biographical Sketches of Graduates of Harvard University, in Cambridge, Massachusetts, Cambridge and Boston, 1873—*, 12:306—324; see also Wroth and Zobel, *op. cit. supra/ note 1, i:cix-cx; Mass. Hist. Soc., Proceedings, 47(1914): 212.*

*Hancock, the year before, had arisen from what a modern practitioner might call the tax angles of John Hancock's importing business.*⁴

*Second, to some extent, Sewall was able to treat such cases with professional detachment. He conducted the Corbet case, John Adams later admitted, "like a judicious lawyer and a polite gentleman."⁵ And during 1768, he several times resisted the clear wishes of the Commissioners of Customs when he felt those wishes to be incapable of lawful implementation. He opined against the legality of requiring customs bonds from vessels sailing coastwise; and he flatly refused to proceed against Hancock either in Admiralty or at common law in the Lydia affair, distinguishing between rudeness toward a customs underling and violation of the revenue laws.*⁶

In short, Sewall knew how to assert that independence of judgment essential to a proper, and one might even say effective, attorney-client relationship. So independent was Sewall that his nominal clients chafed under his restraining hand; and Sewall frankly spoke of resigning his office, giving "for reason that he could not please the Commissioners of the Customs."⁷

I have emphasized this aspect of Sewall's professional character because it seems to me essential to the problem which faced him immediately after the Massacre, Here were eight soldiers and an officer who fired on a crowd and killed five men. The facts need not concern us at the moment, for they are in a way immaterial to the question of Sewall's duty as Attorney General. That duty required him to do one of two things. If he decided that the evidence would not fairly support an indictment or conviction, he could refuse to bring the case before the grand jury (which would have been futile, since a grand jury may present of its own volition) or he could "nol pros" any indictment which the grand jury might return. On the other hand, if he felt that the evidence required the prosecution to

⁴ *Rex v. Corbet et al., Wroth and Zobel, op. cit. supra note 1, 2:285-335; Sewall v. Hancock, ibid., 2:173-210.*

⁵ *Charles Francis Adams, ed., The Works of John Adams, Boston, 1850-56, 10:209.*

⁶ *See Sibley and Shipton, op. cit. supra n. 3, 12:311—312.*

⁷ *Francis Bernard to Commissioners of Customs, Jan. 6, 1769, Bowdoin-Temple Manuscripts, Mass. Hist. Soc., 7:239.*

proceed, and if he had sufficiently strong personal objections to the matter's going forward, he should have resigned his office. In short, an attorney general who for whatever reason does not believe an accused person should be tried or convicted should either obtain the dismissal of the charge or should step down.

Sewall, unhappily, did neither. Having drawn the indictments, he left Boston. Since he lived in Cambridge (apparently in the Lechmere House on the corner of Brattle and Sparks streets, which he was to purchase on June 10, 1771), leaving Boston meant merely absenting himself from the sittings of the various Suffolk County courts.⁸ Sewall certainly did not hide or quit the Province —although a valid excuse for the latter course was readily available, Sewall having been appointed in January 1769 as judge of the new Vice Admiralty Court at Halifax. He visited his jurisdiction only briefly in the summer of 1769. A deputy was filling his place; Sewall could easily have gone to Halifax during the post-Massacre days.⁹

But, avoiding Boston, he stayed in Massachusetts. After telling Governor Thomas Hutchinson he would "never . . . appear at any other court in that town, after the present, as Attorney General," he went to Ipswich for the sitting of the Essex Inferior Court of Common Pleas and the Essex Court of General Sessions.¹⁰ Between Court terms, he apparently remained at his Cambridge home. An entry in the Town records shows that on May 7, 1770, he was elected to a committee to "chuse a Grammar Schoolmaster."¹¹ And, as we shall see, he maintained an active practice in the Middlesex County court sittings.

In his sketch of Sewall, Clifford K. Shipton has argued that "There were obvious and sound reasons for his action." John Adams' critical comment suggests at least one such reason: "Mr. Sewall. . . ought at the hazard of his existence, to have conducted those prosecutions."¹² But I venture to suggest that even fear for

⁸ Sibley and Shipton, *op. cit. supra n. 3*, 12:310; Lucius R. Paige, *History of Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1630-1877*, Boston, 1877, p. 168.

⁹ Wroth and Zobel, *op. cit. supra n. 1*, 2:219.

¹⁰ Almon, *Remembrancer for 1775*, London, 1775, p. 181; *The Diaries of Benjamin Lynde and of Benjamin Lynde, Jr.*, Boston and Cambridge, 1880, p. 194.

¹¹ Paige, *op. cit. supra n. 8*, 1:375.

¹² Sibley and Shipton, *op. cit. supra n. 3*, 12:313; C. F. Adams, *op. cit. supra n. 5*) 10:201.

his life did not professionally justify Sewall's abandoning his duty without resigning his office. It should also be noted that the radicals as early as March 9 realized that the prosecution might lack desired vigor and accordingly arranged to offer the Crown "Assistance," in the form of the politically reliable Robert Treat Paine. Thus, even if Sewall had remained to lead the prosecution, he would have found himself unable to control the conduct of the trial. He would, in effect, have been locked in: unwilling to press for the death sentence he believed unmerited; unable (because of Fame's presence) to resolve doubts in favor of the accused. But even as we sympathize with Sewall, we continue to question the Tightness of his solution. In further mitigation, I can add only the possibility that the radicals were just as glad to have Sewall out of the way. His legal talents, which we shall be examining shortly, were considerable. Among the then-active practitioners, only John Adams exceeded him in knowledge of the law —and as a courtroom performer, he may well have stood alone. Here is Adams' own appraisal:

Mr. Sewall had a soft, smooth, insinuating eloquence which, gliding imperceptibly into the minds of a jury, gave him as much power over that tribunal as any lawyer ought ever to possess. He

*was also capable of discussing before the court any intricate question of law, which gave him at least as much influence there as was consistent with an impartial administration of justice.*¹³

*In the face of this, the popular party would have had every reason to eliminate the chance of a prosecution-managed acquittal by encouraging Sewall's absence, however much the radical press may afterwards have chided him for it.*¹⁴

Whatever the real reason, Jonathan Sewall remained away from the legal aftermath of the Boston Massacre. Not until the trials were over and the accused (Captain Preston, eight soldiers, and four civilians) discharged did Sewall finally play any active part in the controversy. His role was literate, legalistic, and pseudonymous. More significantly, his contribution appeared only in response to the most extreme provocation. After the acquittals, Samuel Adams

¹³ C. F. Adams, *op. cit. supra* n. 5, 4:7.

¹⁴ *Boston Gazette*, April 2, 1770, p. 2, col. 2.

(writing as "Vindex") published a series of pieces in the patriot-controlled Boston Gazette frankly designed to review the evidence, retry the military men, and convince the reader, especially the out-of-Province reader, that justice had miscarried.

Written in Adams' vivid and plausible style, the "Vindex" articles made special use of the ex partedepositions which had been taken by the radicals within days of the Massacre.

While ostensibly refusing to treat these as the equivalent of courtroom testimony, Adams very cleverly utilized such of the depositions as he needed to make his points. Clearly, "Vindex" required an answer.

In a four-part series (a promised fifth article never appeared), Sewall attempted a riposte, using the pen name "Philanthrop," which had brought him fame or obloquy (depending on the reader's political principles) in a newspaper battle four years earlier.¹⁵ This time the performance, competent though it was, left the argument still unsettled. If Sewall hoped, consciously or not, to atone for his earlier abandonment of duty, he failed. For one thing, his attitude was too impartial. "I shall not attempt to charge the blame of the melancholy catastrophe of the 5th of March, to the Town of Boston — I never thought them chargeable with it — nor, on the other hand, shall I set up the soldiers as saints or good citizens — I never conceived of them in that light."¹⁶

My criticism of "Philanthrop's" argument is not entirely based on my personal feeling that enough of the Boston citizenry were in fact looking for trouble that night to make the town chargeable for the tragedy. "Philanthrop's" real failure stems from what Jonathan Sewall, the jurors' delight, should before anyone else have realized : an advocate cannot affect impartiality. Fairness? Yes. Candor? Yes. Honesty? Yes. But neutrality? Never. The "Philanthrop" pieces afford valuable instruction on theories of evidence and the uses of

depositions in perpetuam rei memoriam. Legalistic essays, however, rarely convince laymen; so, I fear, it was with "Philanthrop."

¹⁵ For the latter view, see L. H. Butterfield, ed., *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, Cambridge, 1961, 1:365.

¹⁶ *Boston Evening Post*, Jan. 8, 1771, p. 2, col. 1.

The weakness of the papers from a forensic standpoint paradoxically illustrates the depth of Sewalls legal understanding, his courtroom skills, and, more important, his ability to render legal theory intelligible.

In order to the full discovery of the whole truth, much depends upon the cross-examination of a witness even tho' he be never so honest, yet if he be unused to testifying, he may, by artful interrogatories, be easily drawn, inadvertently to give a very partial and imperfect account of facts—but if his passions, prejudices and inclinations happen to be on the side of the party who takes his testimony, tho' he is conscious that he has not declared the whole truth, yet he will readily apply this Salve to his conscience, that he has answered truly to all such questions as were put to him.¹⁷

Sewall, it is obvious, loved the law as a profession and as a field for intellectual exercise. In John Adams, of course, he found a spirit in all respects save the political kindred to his.¹⁸ Six years older than Adams, Sewall opened up a correspondence with him in the late 1750's which continued until the time of troubles. Although only fragments have survived, even these deal with a wide range of topics, from the technical problems so cherished in that age of special pleading to the entire theory of human government.¹⁹ In an early letter, Sewall explicitly set out his own feelings about the profession which Adams had just entered:

It gives me the most sensible pleasure to find in my friend so becoming a resolution to persevere in the sublime study of the law, maugre all the difficulties and perplexing intricacies with which it seemsembarrassed. I call it a sublime study; and what more sublime? What more worthy the indefatigable labors and pursuit of a reasonable man, than that science by which mankind raise themselves from the forlorn, helpless state, in which nature leaves them, to the full enjoyment of all the inestimable blessings of social union, and by which they (if you will allow the expression) triumph over the frailties and imperfections of humanity?

Your account of Mr. Blackstone's Lectures is entirely new to me, but I am greatly pleased with it. The embellishments of historical and critical learning, as well as the alluring ornaments of language (too much neglected

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ See L. H. Butterfield, *op. cit. supra n. 15*, 3:278, 287.

¹⁹ See C. F. Adams, *op. cit. supra n. 5*, 1:4g, 51, 55.

by law writers) would undoubtedly render much more agreeable the study of the laws of England, in their present system too abstracted and dry.²⁰

In the simplistic society of Provincial Massachusetts, lawyers were generally men who tried cases in courts, rather than legal advisors. Often a lawyer riding circuit would be ignorant of his clients' names (let alone problems) until he reached the "fishing ground" as John Adams once called it, the shire town where the trials were held.²¹ But occasionally a lawyer was asked for advice; we are fortunate that one of Sewall's "opinion letters" has survived, for it shows us how he turned his legal acumen and his "fund of wit, humor, and satire, which he used with great discretion at the bar,"²² to enlighten and mollify the client. The client in question was the most difficult type of all, a relative. Moreover, he had been so unfortunate as to have been sued for the price of some bricks purchased on an oral agreement, the agreement having been concluded and the suit commenced well before he sought Sewall's help. The best advice Sewall could give him was to pay the sum sued for as quickly as possible to minimize court costs. Sewall therefore bore the unhappy professional duty of telling a client that the client was wrong, foolish, dilatory, and (worst of all) inescapably bound to pay the other side. The full correspondence is too long for repetition here, but the closing paragraph sufficiently represents the whole.

For upon the word and honor of an honest lawyer (if you won't deny the hypothesis), a gentleman, and a Christian, I solemnly declare it to be my firm opinion, that if two men have a dispute, where the difference is not more than 6 or 8 pounds lawful money, and both obstinately resolve to contest it at law and accordingly rush into the law, whether they are both honest men, or both knaves, or one an honest man and the other a knave, it is morally, physically, legally and absolutely impossible for them to get out again without being both losers. This is a truth which I wish all my friends, and you among the rest, to attend to with seriousness and reverence. Experimentia docet, but bought Wit may be too dearly purchased, sat verbum sapienti. Finis. Only, upon supposition you want any more bricks,

²⁰ C. F. Adams, *op. cit. supra n. 5*, 2:80 n.

²¹ L. H. Butterfield, ed., *Adams Family Correspondence*, Cambridge, 1963, 1:122.

²² C. F. Adams, *op. cit. supra n. 5*, 4:7.

let me advise you to reduce your contract to writing and let it be signed by the other party. It is but little trouble. Three lines does it. And all ground for litigation is taken away. And if you have any dispute and want my advice, don't wait till you are sued, which is like going to a physician after the disease is obstinately rooted, or like going to the parson when the D—1 is come.²³

When considering Sewall's relations with his clients, it is important to appreciate our present ignorance of the rules which governed the commencement of such relationships. We simply do not yet know the extent to which a lawyer could accept or refuse retainers. In England today it is a general rule that (without special justification) no barrister may refuse any brief in any court in which he holds himself out to practice. In the United States, by contrast, any lawyer may decline to represent any given client, with or without reason.

Whether the rule in Massachusetts before the Revolution was one or the other of these standards is a question bearing particularly on Sewall's status in that odd genus of litigation known as Slavery Cases. The study of this type of action —where the putative slave sued for his freedom on the ground of his alleged free status — relates closely to the degree of freedom afforded a lawyer in selecting his clients. Sewall, for example, appeared for the slave in three of these actions, never, so far as we know, for the owner; Adams appeared for the owner in four, never for the slave; Benjamin Kent appeared twice for the slave, once for the owner.²⁴ If these figures represent merely the workings of chance and the first-come, first-served system like the modern British rule, then the statistics are meaningless. If, however, Massachusetts barristers could, in effect, pick and choose among prospective clients, the patterns of representation may (and I emphasize the speculative nature of the thought) reflect moral or political choices on the part of the lawyers concerned. If so, how odd that Adams the Founding Father supported the institution of slavery while the Loyalist Sewall, whom

²³ Sewall to Thomas Robie, Nov. 1773, printed in *Mass. Hist. Soc., Proceedings*, 2d ser., 30(1896) 1411.

²⁴ These figures have been derived from the data in Wroth and Zobel, *op. cit. supra* n. 1, 2:48-67.

Adams had castigated for "propagating as many lies and slanders against his Country as ever fell from the Pen of a sycophant," appeared for the slaves.²⁵

The entire subject of the pre-Revolutionary legal attack on slavery in Massachusetts has received only superficial attention.²⁶ Some of the documents were published in the Legal Papers of John Adams, but many more, particularly of cases without Adams' connections, are still in the court files. This is an area which merits detailed legal-historical exploration, for it contains matters which if explained could add substantially to what we know about what might be called the climate of personal liberty in the decade before independence. Why, for example did slaves choose to secure freedom by the inherently risky and obviously expensive method of a lawsuit? How did the plaintiff-slaves obtain such excellent representation? Why did some slaves sue while others remained in bondage? What was the role of the white community?

As a sample of what a diligent search might reveal, let me put before you some of the litigational facts in two of Sewall's slave cases.

The better known of these is James v. Lechmere (1769). Historians have sometimes treated this case as though Sewall there established a principle of freedom by arguing, "That under the terms of the Massachusetts Charter all persons born or residing in the Province were free," a point not established in England until Somersetts case in 1772.²⁷ The truth is considerably less dramatic. To begin with, as early as 1766 a slave had won her freedom by proving it. Second, James v. Lechmere involved no argument of any kind, nor even any trial. An inspection of the file papers in the Suffolk Court House shows that the action was commenced at the Cambridge Inferiour Court in May 1769 and continued to the Con-

²⁵ See n. 15 *supra*.

²⁶ See generally the sources collected in Wroth and Zobel, *op. cit. supra* n. 1,2:48-49, 52. See also Washburn, "The Extinction of Slavery in Massachusetts," *Mass. Hist. Soc. Collections*, 4th ser., 4(1858):333; Staples, "The Existence and the Extinction of Slavery in Massachusetts," *Lexington Hist. Soc., Proceedings* 4(1912) 148.

²⁷ Sibley and Shipton, *op. cit. supra* n. 3, 12:310; *Somerset's Case*, Lofft 1, 98 Eng. Rep. 499; 20 State Trials (N.S.) 1 (K. B. 1772).

cord Inferiour Court in September 1770. There, Francis Dana for the defendant interposed a conventional plea and then entered with Sewall into a money- and time-saving agreement called a sham demurrer whereby judgment would be entered for the slave owner with the understanding that the slave would appeal to the Superiour Court, where the pleadings would be reopened, and the matter tried on the merits.

At the October 1769 Superiour Court sitting in Cambridge, Sewall summonsed in his witnesses. But between October 26, the date of the summons, and November 1, when the case was called, either the parties reached agreement or else the owner decided to quit. At any event, the Minute Book shows that the appellee-owner "makes default." Judgment was entered for James in the amount of £2, and costs of £4/16/8.²⁸

James v. Lechmere, therefore, no matter how important its result may have been to the parties, cannot rate as a leading case. Much more significant was the prolonged battle of a middle-aged Lexington woman named Margaret, who struggled to freedom through two jury trials, one in 1768, the second in 1770. Margaret, like most slave-case plaintiffs, depended for proof on testimony from people who had known her, who had known her parents (particularly the mother, since it was a principle of law that the child took the status of the mother), or who had known the circumstances under which she had come into the defendant's possession. Because in Margaret's case many witnesses were either old or far-removed from the location of the court (or both), it had been necessary for Sewall to have this evidence collected in deposition form. A mass of the material has been preserved in the court files, giving us an excellent view of the way a case of this type was put together.

²⁸ Office of Clerk, Supreme Judicial Court (Suffolk County), Boston, File No. 147752; Min. Bk. 88, Cambridge, Oct. Term 1769, N-a; Rec. 1769, fol. 196. Dana was later to become Sewall's partner, Sewall to Charles Monroe, St. John's, New Brunswick, Dec. 8, 1789. Public Record Office, London: A.O. 13/137.

²⁹ Office of Clerk, Supreme Judicial Court (Suffolk County), Boston, File Nos. 147651, 147830; Min. Bk. 88, Cambridge, Oct. Term 1768, N-is, Oct. Term 1770, C-10; Rec. 1767-1768, fol. 311, Rec. 1770 fol. 216.

One paper even contains a notation in Sewall's handwriting showing that he was actively supervising the collection of evidence from such then-distant points as Stratford, Connecticut. "I should," he wrote, "be glad Mr. Green would, if he can, add to his Deposition what he understands became of the said Molatto child, after he sold her to his Brother, and to whom she has been since sold, and what he knows of her name being changed from Kate to Margaret or Peggy."

To whom was Sewall writing? Who would, on behalf of a slave, expend the time and money to locate faraway witnesses and travel to their homes to secure their statements and depositions? The documents indicate that Margaret's principal benefactors were two Lexington men, John Bridge and Joseph Bridge Jr., descendants of that John Bridge whose statue stands today on Cambridge Common.³⁰ The Bridges rounded up the evidence from the out-of-town witnesses, and then apparently testified in open court during both of Margaret's trials. In between, strangely enough, they were also assisting James' battle for freedom: their names appear on a document in the file of that case as witnesses prepared (unnecessarily, it turned out) to testify on his behalf. Finally, one of the depositions shows that during October 1770, at least, Margaret was living at John Bridge's Lexington home.

Were the Bridges, then, a kind of eighteenth-century NAACP? Lacking additional evidence, I believe the answer is more simple, illustrating the personal motives which might impel members of the white community to aid people like James and Margaret.

The Lexington town records show that John Bridge had a manservant with the vernal name of Robin Tulip. Robin Tulip at an unknown date married one Margaret, whose birth date (1719) coincides with that of our Margaret. The town records also show that the Tulips had four children, of whom the eldest, born March 5, 1735, was named James.³¹

³⁰ *William D. Bridge, Genealogy of the John Bridge Family in America, 1632—1934, Cambridge, 1924. This book, and Charles Hudson, History of the Town of Lexington, Boston, 1913, detail the prominent place the Bridges occupied in Lexington's power structure.*

³¹ *Hudson, op. cit. supra n. 30, 2:490.*

Coincidence? Perhaps. But consider that one of the file documents in Margaret's case states that she "had a Son now called James who was afterwards sold to Lieutenant Gov'r Phips." Spencer Phips had a daughter named Mary who around 1754 married Richard Lechmere.³² Did James accompany Mary Phips as part of her marriage portion? We do not yet know, but the conclusion seems inescapable that Jonathan Sewall's clients were mother and son.

As indicated earlier, freedom came less easily to Margaret than to James. The jury in 1768 found in her favor, true enough. But Muzzy pressed for an action of review, an entire new trial. Sewall and the Bridges collected more evidence during the spring, summer, and fall of 1770. Their efforts met full success on November 2 at the Superiour Court's Cambridge sitting (held in the interim between Captain Preston's trial and the trial of the soldiers). There, hearing the facts Sewall had gathered and the "soft, smooth, insinuating eloquence" with which he argued as he appealed to "Humanity, common Justice, and eternal Morality"³³ a second jury followed the example of the first and found Margaret to be a free woman.

Charles Francis Adams once said of Sewall: "Reputation, which in this world generally follows the maintenance of right principles and sometimes even that of wrong principles when attended with success, failed in this case from the want of both requisites."³⁴ In a way this judgment is too narrow; or perhaps, to shift dimensions, not sufficiently deep. The documents which have come to light in the century and more since Adams wrote show that Sewall's reputation—as a professional—is secure, and that his political failures cannot in

the least diminish the stature he achieved as a master of fact, of law, and of human relations; his stature, in a word, as a lawyer. But in another sense, Adams was right. When Sewall allowed the political implications of the Massacre trials to affect his pro-

³² Paige, *op. cit. supra* n. 8, 1:627.

³³ The quotation is taken from Sewall's unsuccessful argument on behalf of the slave Newport at Springfield in 1768. Wroth and Zobel, *op. cit. supra* n. 1, 2:57.

³⁴ C. F. Adams, *op. cit. supra*, n. 5, 2:80 n.

135

fessional duty, he was patiently abandoning those "right principles" which he, perhaps above all others, should have preserved. The conflict of which he was a part and which was a part of him forced him away from his private principles and thus from possible public greatness.

Read May 24, 1966

136

Seventy-five Years of Continuing Education: the Prospect Union Association

BY ZELDA LIONS AND GORDON W. ALLPORT

I. The Beginnings of the Union

BY ZELDA LIONS

PROFESSOR Francis Greenwood Peabody, Plummer Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University, wrote in 1899 of the beginnings of the Prospect Union:¹

An institution may begin with a plan, or it may begin with a man. Sometimes there comes, first a scheme, then an endowment, and finally a person; sometimes there come, first a person, then a few other persons with him, then a gradually unfolding plan, and finally a working institution. The first way of growth is artificial and forced. It is like tying branches to a trunk and making a tree; the branches putting themselves forth because of the life within. The Prospect Union grew as nature grows. A young minister, Robert Erskine Ely, had his parish work among the poor of Cambridge while...attending lectures at the University. What was more natural than for him to think of bringing the forces of this University to bear on the life of the less fortunate? He happened to have his rooms in a building which had once been a hotel, called the Prospect House. The No-License policy of Cambridge had made such a hotel unprofitable, and various clubs of workingmen had moved into these convenient quarters. Mr. Ely talked with a few

Harvard students about starting in his rooms a few classes for workingmen; and early in 1891 an organization was formed, with forty-four members. It was a genuine democracy. On the one hand were a large number of men in Cambridge who worked with their hands all day, and were hungry for intellectual opportunity; on the other hand were a great many young men who worked with their heads all day, and knew little of the ideals and problems of handworkers. Would it not be good for both sets of people to be brought into real fellowship? Could there not be a Liberty and Equality and Fraternity which should be more than a motto; a real freedom for honest speech; a real equality of mutual confidence and respect; and the real fra-

¹ *The Prospect Union, 1891-99, p. 16-18.*

ternity of a working brotherhood? Such were the ideals with which a dozen college men and twenty handworkers began the organization. The name they assumed The Prospect Union came of the building in which they happened to meet. It is now, practically, without meaning, but perhaps no less valuable on that account, and it has already a sentimental and historical interest which would make a more descriptive name hard to accept.

The beginnings of the Union were of the very simplest description. The rooms were bare and small; the coffee and crackers and cheese on Wednesday evenings were served in Spartan fashion; the membership was very varied, and some men joined the Union in order to ventilate their special social programmes. But very soon the atmosphere of real liberty and fraternity brought such men—Catholics and Protestants, Socialists and Anarchists, black and white, Russians, Swedes, Irish, Americans—into a working unity, and there has never been any serious friction, or any sense of being suppressed. College boys were eager to give their time and love; and the interest and loyalty of a constantly enlarging body of members gave confidence in the principles first laid down.

Such were the days of small things in the history of the Union. It was a very small work, illuminated by a very large hope. Of its expansion in membership, or its removal to a more luxurious and adequate home, and of its alliance with other interests of public welfare, others will write; but to any one who had the privilege of sharing those first days of plain living and generous thinking, and those first meetings of open-minded college boys with hard working hand-laborers, no later and greater achievement of the Union can ever be happier to recall than are those modest beginnings of its work.

A STUDENT-TEACHER SPEAKS

George Lyman Paine, '96, wrote of his experiences (at the 75th Anniversary Meeting in 1965, Mr. Paine gracefully gave an oral supplement to this report). We quote from the original report:²

Harvard University sends a volunteer faculty of seventy-five student teachers to The Prospect Union, thus making possible the existence of this workingmen's college. In this paper I limit myself to a brief exposition of some ways in which the students benefit from their work at the Union. First and most important, the University man, who is primarily a student, is brought into contact with the practical world. Union is effected between the practical world. Union is effected between the lecture room and real life, the

² *Ibid. p. 19-23.*

book and the man. . . . This sort of work is essential if the University is to turn out men best prepared to further peace and happiness. The first step toward amelioration of social conditions must be more perfect sympathy between all classes, which can come only through that mingling of the classes which will inevitably result in better mutual understanding. In the Union class room, student meets workingman on an equal footing of common manhood, and in a friendliness conceivable only to those who have experience in what a wonderful way the Union lives out its motto of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.

Secondly; President Eliot has said that the way to learn English is to write it. Another way is to teach it; and this applies equally to subjects other than English. . . . Let a man take a class in French or Algebra or History, and the chances are ten to one that he will never forget what he has succeeded in drilling into his patient, plodding scholars. But, better still, with this cementing in the mind of facts and theories comes practical knowledge and training in apt application. I have gone many times to my class in Economics, primed with all that Mill has said on a certain subject, only to find that the first question by the ardent Trade-Unionist or convinced Socialist was framed in language so different, from points of view so varying, that to answer it my smoothly turned principles had to be completely restated....

The work at the Prospect Union is of such a nature as to develop a man's sense of responsibility. It gives him deeper insight into life, and trains him in habits important to society. . . . The teacher cannot but gain in habits of thoroughness and faithfulness, for he must, if his class is to attain its best success ... be scrupulously careful in preparation, unfailingly regular, always prompt. . . . And there enters the element of self-sacrifice, for in the course of the year there will be many pleasures and many pressing demands which he must unhesitatingly put aside. . . . Perhaps for the first time in his life he is placed in a position where others are dependent upon him. . . . Eight years ago the students of Harvard and the workingmen were to a great extent living apart, and by ignorance kept indifferent to each other, perhaps even opposed. Whereas in isolation each was imperfect, now, coming together in the Union building, they are being brought to a more perfect understanding of one another. Among other things, the student has brought the workingman knowledge, culture, ambition, sympathy and friendship; and the workingman has given the student knowledge, patience, earnestness and inspiration.

A WORKINGMAN SPEAKS

"What has been the effect on workingmen of membership in the Prospect Union?" asks a workmgman-student:³

Simply this, men have been taught to respect themselves, and to find true worth in others. It has taught men how to talk and when to talk, and how to conduct themselves when in discussion with others. Workingmen who take up courses of study are very apt to be ridiculed by their fellow-workers, but when the student proves that he is in earnest, a certain sense of respect for him grows up among his associates. Membership in The Prospect Union takes men out of the dreary monotony of their daily existence and gives them something to do and something to look forward to; and at the end of a course of study, instead of looking back over a season of frivolity,

a season of wasted time and money, they look back with satisfaction over a season well spent, and feel a new strength growing out of an increased intelligence.

Refinement of the mind, which comes with education, sometimes makes men dissatisfied with their lot and long for those things in life that are too often beyond their reach; but it also teaches them how to adapt themselves to their situation and to make the most of what they have. The education that men receive in the Prospect Union teaches that there are two sides to a question and to listen patiently to the other side; thus prejudice and intolerance find no encouragement to remain there.

HISTORICAL SETTING AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT

David B. Potts, in an article printed in The New England Quarterly, called "The Prospect Union: A Conservative quest for Social Justice," wrote:

During the late 1880's and early 1890's American reformers imported from England the techniques of university extension and university settlement. The Prospect Union in Cambridge, Massachusetts, combined both of these new reform methods and was one of the first organizations which applied them to America's social problems...⁴

Potts continues:

In the vanguard of these general reform movements, the Prospect Union was also the specific response of one American Community to the problems

³ *Ibid.*, p. 24-25.

⁴ *The New England Quarterly*, 35:347-48 (September 1962).

created by rapidly expanding industry and the flood of immigration. Cambridge had been plagued by growing pains even prior to the post-Civil War industrial boom. In 1805 the section of town known as Cambridgeport, near the mouth of the Charles River, was designated by Congress as a port of entry. The rapid settlement and commercialization which followed disturbed many residents of the Northwest section of town known as Old Cambridge. By 1842 the hostility between these two sectors became overt. Old Cambridge presented a petition to the Massachusetts Legislature asking that Cambridgeport and its industrialized neighbor, East Cambridge, be set off as separate towns, with Old Cambridge retaining the original name. When this simple solution was denied, new answers were sought for the social problems of a population which was not only rapidly expanding but becoming increasingly heterogeneous.⁵

Mr. Potts continues:

Robert Erskine Ely, a young Congregational minister in Cambridgeport, formulated the original plans for the Prospect Union. A graduate of Amherst and Union Theological Seminary, Ely soon moved from the ministry into social work. By 1896 he preferred to be "regarded as a man rather than a minister" and was devoting all of his time to directing the activities of the Union. After ten years as President of the Union he moved from Cambridge to New York in 1901 to become Executive Director of the League for Political Education. This group subsequently became known as Town Hall, Inc., and began broadcasting the popular "America's Town Meeting of the Air" in

1935. Ely retired as Director Emeritus in 1937. A "bubbling enthusiasm" highlighted Ely's intense personality and endeared him to many segments of the Cambridge population.

The Cambridge Chronicle commended him for showing rare executive ability, a genial manner, an earnestness and enthusiasm which are contagious, adding that he was "practical and sensible withal." . . . Even when giving weekly lectures on "Practical Morals" at the Massachusetts Reformatory, Ely increased attendance from a mere handful to over 150 and threw the class into a state of profound excitement.⁶

Potts goes on:

Collaborating with Ely to found the Prospect Union was Francis Greenwood Peabody, Harvard's theologian of the Social Gospel. Peabody's course in social ethics (known among the undergraduates as "Peabo's drainage,

⁵ **Loc. cit., p. 348.**

⁶ **Loc. cit., pp. 350, 351.**

drunkenness and divorce") emphasized a basically conservative approach to the social problems of the 1880's and 1890's.⁷

The Prospect Union school for workingmen was a success from its beginning. The workingmen of Cambridge flocked to its doors. Enthusiastic support of the Union from leading citizens of Cambridge and Boston soon assured its continuance. In 1894 a gift from Mrs. Belinda Randall made it possible to buy the old City Hall Building at 744 Massachusetts Avenue, where the ever-expanding school activities provided a common ground for Cambridge citizens from all walks of life. In 1896 The Prospect Union became a Corporation. Listed among the corporate members were Governor William E. Russell, Oliver Wendell Holmes, President Charles W. Eliot, Professor Charles Eliot Norton, James Russell Lowell, Edward Everett Hale, John Graham Brooks, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Joseph G. Thorp, James J. Myers, and many other notable citizens. On Wednesday evenings public lectures were offered, and on that evening women were allowed into the building. Indeed, Lucy Stone, Julia Ward Howe, and Mary A. Livermore were among the lecturers. For a period of time there were weekly social dances.

THE PROGRAM

Classes in many subjects were offered. In order of their appearance in the report of 1899, courses were available in English, German, French, Italian, Spanish, Latin, Greek, History, Economics, Philosophy, Physics, Chemistry, Geology, Botany, Zoology, Physiology, Arithmetic, Geometry and Trigonometry, Calculus and Mechanics, Drawing and Painting, Penmanship, Bookkeeping, and Music. There were also courses in Civil Service preparation. Many years later the Superintendent of the Cambridge Post Office told us that he had received the preparation for his first Civil Service examination at The Prospect Union. He spoke sentimentally of the "old days" and said that many Cambridge men "got their start in life at The Prospect Union."

⁷ *Loc. cit.*, p. 350.

More than sixty professors and officers of Harvard University are mentioned as having lectured at the Union, including President Eliot, Professors Ashley, Baker, Bartlett, Blake, Channing, Cummings, Davis, Emerton, Everett, Farlow, Goodale, Goodwin, Hanus, Hart, Hollis, Jackson, von Jagemann, James Kittredge, Macvane, Marsh, Moore, Norton, Palmer, Parker, Peabody, Putnam, Royce, Santayana, de Sumichrast, Taussig, J. H. Thayer, Toy, Trowbridge, Wambaugh, Wright; Doctors Coolidge, Rand, Sargent.

Occasional speakers were: Edward Atkinson, Eugene V. Debs, Prince Kropotkin, William Lloyd Garrison, John Graham Brooks, John Fiske, Edward Waldo Emerson, Nathan Haskell Dole, Hamlin Garland, Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, Rt. Rev. Dr. John H. Vincent, Rev. Lyman Abbott, Dr. Washington Gladden, Dr. Samuel M. Crothers, Dr. David N. Beach, Dr. Charles C. Earle, Rabbi Solomon Schindler, Rabbi Charles Fleisher, Hon. Josiah Quincy (Mayor of Boston), Hon. E.R. Champlin (Mayor of Cambridge). A complete list would be long indeed.

The Union stood steadfastly by its announced policy, giving to both sides of every question an entirely fair hearing. A note appears in the 1899 report:

On account of the extreme difficulty of discussing religious subjects with fairness and courtesy, and because of the diversity of the religious creeds professed by the members, these are excluded altogether from public discussion.⁸

Many topics were covered but those pertaining to social reform predominated: the single tax, socialism, anarchism, trade-unionism, woman's suffrage. The Prospect Union prospered. It survived even when, around the turn of the century, Mr. Ely departed for New York.

In his Annual Report of 1913, Professor Julian Coolidge, President of the Union at that time, wrote:

The dominant note of the twenty-second year of the Prospect Union is cheer and confidence. . . . The devotion and enthusiasm of the teachers continue to be most praiseworthy, the work of the Association being of great value to us and to them.

⁸ *The Prospect Union, 1891-99, p. 43.*

On the front page of this 1913 report Professor Peabody wrote:

The Prospect Union is a Harvard Annex, with all the educational advantages which come from this close union. Teaching and learning, however, are not our whole aim. We stand for fraternity. Education for one's self, fraternity for one's neighbor, good citizenship for the common welfare —these are the aims and work of The Prospect Union.

And Dr. Charles W. Eliot wrote in the same pamphlet:

*We commonly think of education as an affair of boyhood or youth; but it is really a life long interest, and when education has been too brief or too limited it is of the utmost importance that it be pursued in a systematic way in adult years. That is the road to a better livelihood, a better command of one's faculties, and a larger enjoyment of life, and that is the road which The Prospect Union opens to Cambridge workingmen.*⁹

In 1914 war clouds darkened the sky over Europe and spread to our country a year or two later. Professor Coolidge and many other officers and members of the Prospect Union went to war. The Prospect Union came to a standstill. After the war, the Board of Trustees decided to appraise the situation. A few years before the Cambridge-Boston subway had been built, making the educational opportunities in Boston readily available. By this time there were a great many evening schools for men and women in Boston and its vicinity.

Dr. James Ford, a member of the Board of Trustees and Assistant Professor in the Department of Social Ethics at Harvard, suggested to the Board that they consider the need for a clearinghouse in adult education, the purpose being to help men and women find the courses they need, to investigate schools for adults, to steer adult students to reliable schools, and to publish a directory of approved educational institutions. It was decided to survey the field. Professor Ford had a graduate student named Herman Haskins; for his Master's thesis he chose the subject "Survey of Educational Facilities in Metropolitan Boston Available to Those in Gainful Occupations." The study was made in 1922; meanwhile, it was decided to sell the school building, for our Treasurer,

⁹ *The Prospect Union Association Annual Report, 1913. Pamphlet on file at The Educational Exchange of Greater Boston.*

Mr. Walter F. Earle, advised the timeliness of the sale, real-estate values being then very high. The building sold for \$90,000. After current expenses, \$88,000 was left in the Prospect Union Treasury. This was put into the capable hands of the Harvard Trust Company, where it has been ever since.

THE EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

Mr. Haskins' Survey impressed the Trustees greatly. Indeed, there seemed to be a need for a central service for helping men and women find the schools and courses they need to continue their education.

First it was decided to publish Mr. Haskins' information in pamphlet form. Since the Prospect Union had no home of its own to prepare the manuscript, space in the vestry of the First Parish of Cambridge, Unitarian, was offered for this purpose. There was, compiled the first Educational Opportunities of Greater Boston for Working Men and Women; it is called by many the Bible in adult education.

The Board of Trustees further decided to conduct an experiment, another pioneer service — the establishment of a central clearinghouse in adult education, the purpose being to provide:

1. An annual publication listing approved schools and courses for adults, the schools to be investigated before listing.

2. A personal service—imparting educational information to the public, by letter, visit or telephone.

3. Educational counselling, assisting men and women in finding courses which will best meet their needs.

4. Impartial reports on educational opportunities for adults, assuring protection against fraudulent or incompetent schools.

A modest budget was provided. Two store rooms at 760 Massachusetts Avenue were rented, some old furniture from the old school building was arranged, and an office was opened in September 1923. A Director, Charles A. Gates, was engaged in 1923. (He took another job in February 1925.) In November 1923, when Professor Peabody and Professor Ford were interviewing Miss Lions for the job of office secretary, Professor Peabody cautioned, "This

147

may be a temporary job, for we consider this an experiment. If we find that this is a useful service to the community, we will use our endowment for this purpose, as long as it lasts."

The service proved useful from the very start. The publicity attendant upon the publishing of the unique catalogue, Educational Opportunities of Greater Boston, brought a thousand people to its doors within a few months.

After considerable discussion, the Trustees decided to call the new service, The Prospect Union Educational Exchange. The catalogue was given away to social agencies, industries, business firms, libraries, schools and colleges, probation officers, churches, public information bureaus, and to individuals who asked for them. Individuals served personally were called "clients" as in most social agencies.

The endowment, small as it is, is still appreciable, due to the Harvard Trust Company's husbandry and the persistently modest budgeting. Although small gifts from charitable foundations were received every year, and the catalogue, after 1947, was sold at a moderate price, the income was sufficient to meet current expenses only one year in the forty-three years of the existence of the Educational Exchange. Deficits were met by withdrawal from capital funds.

THE INVESTIGATION OF SCHOOLS

The service is unique in many aspects, and one of the most important is the investigation of schools for adults. Years ago, in the 1920's and 1930's, anyone could hang out a shingle and found a school. There were many fraudulent schools. It became necessary to secure a great deal of information about each school before listing, so that clients could be steered to reliable institutions. The procedure of investigation includes a visit to the school unannounced, but in a friendly spirit. Notes are made of condition of the building, evidence of seriousness of purpose, condition of equipment, class discipline. Questions are asked

about backgrounds of instructors, enrollment contracts, size of classes, numbers of graduates, etc. A few days after the visit to the school a letter ask-

148

ing for references is sent, requesting names of firms employing graduates, names of a few recent graduates, references from city and state school departments, and other appropriate sources, depending on the nature of the school. These references are followed through, evidence gathered, and if it is satisfactory, and no complaints have been received about the school, it becomes eligible for listing in the annual catalogue. Co-operation from the Boston Better Business Bureau and the Massachusetts Department of Education has been invaluable through the years.

The steering of clients away from fraudulent schools has saved the public uncountable sums of money, and lots of precious time.

THE CATALOGUE

In 1966 the Exchange published the 44th Annual Edition of Educational Opportunities of Greater Boston, a two-hundred-page book listing nearly 5,000 courses for men and women. It includes public and private schools, large and small, free, and those charging tuition, day or evening, informal and formal programs, degree-granting and those offering no credit, university extension programs, trade schools, engineering schools, commercial schools, homemaking schools, art schools, music schools, academic programs—schools of every description, open to adults who want to continue their education through part-time study. It does not include regular day-college programs or college-grade schools which do not accept adults for part-time study.

The ten-page double-column Index of the catalogue is a remarkable list of the many diverse subjects offered by the schools in Greater Boston.

Among the many subjects listed under A, for example, are accounting, aeronautics, Afrikaans, algebra, Americanization, anthropology, art appreciation, astrophysics, automobile driving.

Schools are listed alphabetically, and with uniformity, so that no one school or course of instruction is advertised more than another.

A Summer School Supplement is printed in the Spring, and is included in the purchase price of the catalogue. This catalogue is

149

still the only directory of its kind. Other cities have used it as a model, and many cities have published similar catalogues for a year or two, but Educational Opportunities of Greater Boston remains unique in format and continuity.

The catalogue is now sold to social agencies, industries, business firms, libraries, schools and colleges, probation officers, churches, public information bureaus, and many other agencies, and to individuals. A large part of the annual editions are sold by standing order.

The catalogues are published in August, well in advance of the school season. The splendid co-operation of the schools makes this possible.

CHANGING TIMES

The Educational Exchange, like the Prospect Union, was a success from the very start, if success means being needed and used by the public. The demands for service have varied with the world situations. In the early 1920's most of the clients were men who asked for vocational training, and high school courses. In the late 1920's when our economy was at a high peak, people requested more cultural courses. Just about this time a number of clients recently arrived from England and Scotland came to ask for vocational courses. They were trying to find employment here after years of idleness in their own country, where so many were "on the dole." Unemployment grew here soon afterwards, and when the Great Depression struck this country, each day brought clients whose stories tore one's heartstrings. Men and women with superior educational and vocational backgrounds desperately sought any training that would bring them bread for their children.

Some clients' problems were complex —they needed more than educational advice. Other social agencies were visited to learn about their services, so that efficient referrals could be made.

And then Hitler and Mussolini began their scourge of Central Europe and there resulted an influx of refugees who needed to learn the language and to learn new vocational skills, and to learn to live in a strange country.

150

In the late 1930's we began to prepare for war. We called it Defense. We published a special list of schools and courses for training for Defense. Then came the war itself, and our client load dropped down to a low ebb. Men and women were busy in war activities and had little time for educational pursuits.

The Postwar period brought a tremendous revival of interest in continuing education, partly because veterans took advantage of the "G.I. Bill," and because our "affluent society" brought not only the financial means, but increased leisure time for study. The trend for demand for part-time day courses for women, was first noticed about fifteen years ago. In more recent years the demand for college programs on a part-time basis has been increasing noticeably. Automation —automatic clothes washers and dryers, and dishwashers and cooking appliances —has freed women from many household chores, and they have time for other interests.

In the forty-three years since the Exchange opened its doors 149,000 clients have been served directly from our office. We have no way of knowing how many people have been steered to reliable schools through the use of the forty-four editions of our catalogue, which are in constant use in public libraries, social agencies, and educational institutions all over

Massachusetts and in other states, too. In 1965 we served 7,729 people directly from the office by phone, visit, and letter.

The original name of the Corporation, the Prospect Union Association, endured until 1964. The Prospect Union Educational Exchange was an activity (the sole activity) of the Corporation from 1923. Although Professor Peabody kept his interest in, and association with, the Corporation until his death in 1937, Professor James Ford was the effective head of the agency from 1923 until his death in 1944. At that time Professor Gordon W. Allport assumed the Presidency. Gradually the membership of the Association and the Board of Directors were enlarged, and women for the first time were admitted to both groups.

151

THE CHANGE OF NAME

Throughout the years, newspapers, radio, and TV stations have been generous in giving free time, free news releases, editorials, feature stories, special articles, spot announcements, and special TV programs. For some years the radio and TV program directors have asked us to prepare our copy with the name Educational Exchange rather than the whole name Prospect Union Educational Exchange. The long name was too much for the announcers. The public soon began to call us The Educational Exchange. This made sense. It was much easier to remember. Except to a few people, the name Prospect Union had little meaning. So, after several meetings, the Membership voted to change our name formally to The Educational Exchange of Greater Boston, Inc., which was accomplished through the proper legal channels in 1964.

OUR CLIENTS

Many clients come because a friend or relative told them about us. It is not uncommon to have as clients the children and grandchildren of former clients. A great many are referred by social agencies, firms, schools, libraries, and other services.

Throughout the busy years we have never lost sight of our purpose — to help men and women improve their lives through further education. People like to come and talk over their problems. Our office is modest and homelike, our service unhurried, and they are assured of our interest in their problem.

People from all walks of life come to us for assistance. It may be the man from Watertown, a successful business man, who had never learned to write English. He had depended upon his American-born wife to keep his books and write his letters. But she is gone now, and his children are far away, and he must learn to write. Or it may be the need for encouragement in the case of the nineteen-year-old young man, who has an interest in art, but no training, whose family took a dim view of art as a vocation. This client is now a teacher of Sculpture in our State College of Art; or it may be a foreigner who must learn our language quickly in order to apply

152

for a job; or it may be the state police officer who took some college-grade courses on our advice and passed them, but found that he was a slow reader. This worries him, not only because he wants to continue his education, but he has just been transferred to the Traffic Department and he must learn to read car numbers rapidly; or it may be the woman of forty-five who was sent by her doctor to ask for a course in piano playing and handicrafts to exercise her fingers, to combat arthritis; or it may be the young mother whose children are at school during the morning hours, and who wants to continue her education where she left off, when she married at age nineteen; or it may be the man of forty who had "married into the hardware business" but who really wants to study biology seriously now that he can afford to do so.

The constant improvement of our annual catalogue, of our office methods, and the long years of experience and familiarity with schools and courses make it possible to provide answers to our clients' questions promptly, and apparently without effort. To others our work may seem deceptively easy. There was, for example, the lady about sixty years old, who came in looking glum. She had been in one firm for thirty years, and the firm had changed hands, and she had been "retired." She said she had been sitting in her one-room apartment for two months, looking at those same four walls, twiddling her thumbs, until she was ready to go mad. Like many people, her life had been the dull walk from her home to her office, from the office to her home, back and forth, day after day, until a deep rut had been formed. Now she is desperate. She looked a little more hopeful when she was informed that there were lots of things to do—what are her interests? Well, her doctor thought a little exercise would be good for her. She lived near Central Square, Cambridge. "Fine," I said. "The Y.W. has a class for mature women on Tuesday mornings and costs only three dollars for the year." What else interests her? Well, she had always knitted and crocheted. "Great," was the response. "If you have that kind of talent you could take a course in handicrafts at the Cambridge Center and make your own Christmas gifts. They have a course in the morning or evening." Our client looked brighter by the minute. "Do you

153

think I'm too old to study psychology?" she asked. She was told about a popular course meeting at Sever Hall. "How would you like to do some volunteer work?" we asked. "The Hospital is in great need of help. Miss S. is the person to see." "My goodness," said our client. "I guess I'd better take notes of all this." Then she asked, "Do you mind if I ask you a personal question?"

"No, of course not, what is it?"

"What do you do here?"

Read October 25, 1966

154

II. The Prospect Union in Perspective

BY GORDON W. ALLPORT

IT WOULD BE a mistake to think of the Prospect Union—before its transformation into the present vigorous and unique Educational Exchange — as merely a sentimental episode in Harvard and Cambridge history — something to be treasured as an antiquarian memory. The fact is that historians have already noted deep significance in the three-decade span of the Union's activity. They ascribe to it landmark significance in the fields of settlement work, Americanization work, university, and adult education.

An article published in *The New England Quarterly* in 1962 devotes itself to the place of the Prospect Union in the social history of our country. The paper, written by David B. Potts, a graduate student in history at Harvard, is titled, "The Prospect Union: a Conservative Quest for Social Justice." One may be grateful to Dr. Potts for his careful chronicle and yet at the same time challenge his judgment that the quest was "conservative." He himself shows that in several respects the work of the Union was truly pioneer (p. 348).¹ Pioneers, unless I am mistaken, bring about social change and open new territories. They do not stand pat or maintain the status quo. It would be more accurate, I think, to say that in its own day the Prospect Union was a semi-radical venture, and that even today if taken in the broad perspective of social philosophy, it cannot properly be called conservative.

To be sure the Union did not officially endorse syndicalism, communism, or anarchism. It did, however, open its Wednesday evening forum to all types of social reformers (p. 353). One week

¹ All references are to pages in David B. Potts, "The Prospect Union: a Conservative Quest for Social Justice," *The New England Quarterly*, 35:347–366 (September 1962).

Eugene Debs argued for unionism and socialism; the next Edward Atkinson presented the case for industrialists and sound money. One asks: are academic balance, freedom of speech, two sides to an issue, characteristics typical of conservatism? Mr. Potts cites, and does not refute, the statement of Robert A. Woods that "a policy of broad patient education —without passionate propaganda —may perhaps be the most revolutionary course that could be pursued" (p. 357). Officially, of course, the Union committed itself to "no ism, creed, or theory of reform, whatever" (p. 356). But then no honorable educational enterprise ever does so. Are all reputable educational undertakings therefore innately conservative?

Over and above its primarily educational function the Union had certain features of a social settlement. Its motto was drawn from the French revolution, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" —scarcely a conservative chant. And when one thinks of the yeasty, Wednesday-evening forums and socials at which an average attendance of one hundred wage earners, Harvard students, and faculty engaged in lively debate — one has an image of progressivism rather than conservatism. Political deviance was freely aired.

But Mr. Potts might say that he rests his case on a deeper logic. For one thing, financial support and direction came in large part from Boston Brahmins. Did some of them feel that their benefaction might stave off a social revolution? Did they fear that the Haymarket riots might be repeated in Cambridge? Potts suggests that such motivation did exist, although he does not prove his case. To be sure, at one point Robert Ely, the director, states that the net

effect of their educational enterprise for workingmen has not made them "dissatisfied with their lot in life" (p. 356). But this statement—which might indeed be considered truly conservative — is not characteristic of Ely's reformative approach as a whole. As for the many participating staff and student members at Harvard, one cannot believe that they suddenly became guardians of the status quo when they shifted their intellectual efforts a mile east of Harvard Square. Did William James, Charles Eliot Norton, Sidney Fay, become suddenly less pioneer in their thinking? Did Harvard students drop their rebellious ideas when they left the Yard?

156

But Mr. Potts believes that all of these groups —donors, teachers, and the wage-earner students themselves —held a "mutually conservative belief in laissez-faire individualism" (p. 363). Here Potts refers to an underlying faith in self-help, in education, in getting ahead through personally relevant experiences. In a sense Harvard students, wage earners, Board members, and even Harvard faculty felt that they were individually benefiting from the enterprise. Perhaps "individualism" is a proper label to use here, but laissez-faire is not. Laissez-faire means to do nothing, to leave things alone, and this intricate town-gown enterprise was leaving nothing alone. A beehive could scarcely have been more active.

To uncover true laissez-faire conservatism in the 1890's Potts should have turned not to Harvard but to Yale where William Graham Sumner was teaching a truly conservative, hands-off laissez-faire, doctrine of society. Sumner himself raised the question, "What do social classes owe to each other?" and answered in effect, "Nothing at all." He thought it sheer arrogant interference with social evolution for A & B to work up a plan of social reform for C to administer to D. Better leave social classes alone, except for occasional acts of personal charity. In sharp contrast the Prospect Union, as Professor Peabody said, deliberately set out to fashion a "more perfect sympathy between all classes" (p. 355) in Cambridge —specifically to bridge the gulf between academic and manufacturing communities. There was nothing laissez-faire about it.

Then there is the question of the social gospel. As Potts notes, the social gospel was undoubtedly the inspiration for the whole movement in the mind and heart of the founder and director of the Union, Robert Erskine Ely. Coupled with a strong bent toward co-operatives (which were a side, though not official, activity of the Union, p. 366), and with echoes of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, the social gospel here issuing into action could scarcely be called conservative. Is not the social gospel, whenever it crosses over the threshold from words to deed, invariably a thorn in the flesh of true conservatives?

First and last the Prospect Union (including its successor, the Educational Exchange) has been oriented toward a single goal —

157

continuing education. Always there has been deliberate emphasis on freedom from bias and exploitation in the quality of instruction offered or recommended. In such a program there is nothing inherently conservative nor inherently radical, although to my taste, if any political meanings are to be read into the process, I detect more of liberalism than of

conservatism. But at bottom the judgment we give should be in terms of educational values, not political.

A major multivolume work remains to be written. It will deal with the History of Education in Cambridge, Massachusetts. While the story of public instruction and of the two world-famous universities, and of other schools and colleges will take up most of the space, there will also be a special section on the unique educational services to adults offered by the Educational Exchange of Greater Boston and its predecessor, the Prospect Union Association.

FINAL WORD

As far back as 1899 Francis Greenwood Peabody reported that the vigor and success of the Prospect Union was due to its natural growth around a person. Robert Ely was a person with project. While he needed and received the loyal assistance of teachers, students, sponsors, it was his creative fire that ignited their zeal and resulted in an historic period of educational pioneering which, though relatively brief, had a certain brilliance. Left to themselves institutions harden, contract, atrophy. A living, creative person is the one and only guarantee of success.

When, following the vision of James Ford, the function of the Prospect Union was sharply altered in 1923, a second person with a project came onto the scene to guide the new idea over a period of more than forty additional years of successful expression. Miss Zelda Lions along with Robert Erskine Ely form a remarkable historic team. Between them their service covers a span of seventy-five years of single-minded devotion to the cause of continuing education. There is nowhere a duplicate of their achievement. Their contributions are marked by a progressive outlook, by a devotion to quality in education, by practical judgment, and sensitive management.

Read October 25, 1966

158

A Historical Perspective

BY DAVID B. POTTS

P*ROFESSOR Allport's comments seem to be more successful in emphasizing a dimension of the Prospect Union's history only briefly considered in my article than in directly challenging my main thesis. But in advocating his own interpretation of the Union, Mr. Allport misreads some of the arguments and information in my article. The result is a perspective with limited historical foundations.*

My interpretation does not seek to "place . . . the Prospect Union in the social history of our country." At least the title of my article and the concluding paragraph should make it clear that I am working within a considerably less comprehensive context, that of a particular movement in American history during the years between roughly 1880 and World War I. This late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century quest for social justice included the political socialism of social gospeler George Herron, the single-tax campaign of Henry George in New York City, William Jennings Bryan's crusade against the Eastern

establishment, trade unionism, and drives for state and municipal regulation of utilities. It is difficult to see where else the Prospect Union's program of individual education can be placed except on the extreme right of this reform spectrum. And William Graham Sumner can hardly be considered a part of this movement.

Evidence is presented in my article to show that the Union's motto, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," despite its revolutionary origins, was chosen merely to attract workingmen and then defined in such a way as to prevent any direct efforts at social reform by the

159

organization itself. This motto did not, as Mr. Airport implies, accurately characterize the Prospect Union.

Most of my article is devoted to an exploration of the ways in which the Prospect Union was a conservative quest for social justice. The word "conservative" is used throughout in a social and economic sense. The Union is described as conservative primarily because of its nature as an institution and its very mild response to the pressing social and economic problems of the times. Open debate and the promotion of better understanding between social classes might be important first steps in correcting social and economic injustices, but, unlike most contemporary reform efforts, the Prospect Union never went much farther.

Rather than directly confronting this argument and the evidence to support it, Mr. Allport bases his critique on a definition of the word "conservative" which is completely foreign to the main point of my article. He finds the Union "cannot properly be called conservative" because it was a "pioneer" and "semi-radical" in terms of educational innovation; it was liberal in terms of the "academic balance" and "freedom of speech" at its meetings; it was progressive in terms of its motto and the participation in its activities of pioneer thinkers on the Harvard faculty and Harvard students with "rebellious ideas." Where I use the term laissez-faire individualism in a social and economic sense, Mr. Allport denies the validity of this description by noting that the Union was very active on an intellectual level. The Union for Mr. Allport crossed over "the threshold from words to deed," but he quickly adds that the deed was an educational one and therefore neither "inherently conservative nor inherently radical." The conclusion to this reasoning is really the premise on which the entire critique is based: "the judgment we give should be in terms of educational values, not political."

Yet the Prospect Union, as Mr. Allport admits, thought of itself during the period covered by my article as part of the social gospel movement. Since the predominant concerns of this movement were political and economic, it is difficult for me to see the impropriety of a historian analyzing the Union in these terms. Although the

160

ultimate significance of the entire history of the Union may for some people quite legitimately lie in the academic realm, I find this context much too restrictive for viewing the Union's nature and functions prior to 1923.

The word "conservative" has acquired a large increment of derogatory overtones in most academic circles since my article was written. I wish to emphasize in closing that I used this term to define and describe the Union, not to determine its merit. If the question of merit were put to me, I would say that just to be a part of the social justice movement at the turn of the century would give any organization an admirable heritage.

161

Annual Reports

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL AND THE SECRETARY FOR THE YEAR

1964

THE Cambridge Historical Society held four meetings in 1964 —the fifty-ninth annual meeting on January 28, 1964, the 226th meeting on March 31, 1964, the 227th meeting on May 26, 1964, and the 228th meeting on October 27, 1964.

The speakers at the meetings were: Mr. Robert A. Peer, Associate Professor of History at Northeastern University, who read a paper on "Shays' Rebellion"; Mr. Stephen T. Riley, Director and Librarian of Massachusetts Historical Society, whose paper dealt with "Collecting Manuscripts for the Massachusetts Historical Society"; Mr. Robert D. Romsheim, Historian of the Minuteman National Historical Park, whose talk explained "Some research problems connected with establishing Minuteman National Historical Park," and lastly our Treasurer, Mr. Alden S. Foss, whose paper and illustrations concerned "The Boston Woven Hose and Rubber Company, Eighty-four Years in Cambridge."

The Council met on February 20, 1964, June 8, 1964, and October 20, 1964.

Thirteen members of the Society have died and seven have resigned.

The present membership is four Associate Members, nine Life Members, and 227 Regular Members.

For the last five years the Society has been very fortunate to have such a clever and humorous leader as Mr. Payson. Affairs appear to move effortlessly under his regime. We shall all miss his leadership.

Respectfully submitted,

Anna H. Jeffrey, Secretary

162

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL AND THE SECRETARY FOR THE YEAR

1965

THE Cambridge Historical Society held four meetings in 1965 — the sixtieth annual meeting on January 26, 1965, the 230th meeting on March 23, 1965, the 231st meeting on May 25, 1965, and the 232nd meeting on November 17, 1965.

The speakers at the meetings were: Mr. Brenton H. Dickson who gave a paper on the "Middlesex Canal"; Mr. Norman Pettit, Assistant Professor in the Department of Humanities at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who read a paper on "Lydia's Conversion: An Issue in Hooker's Departure"; Mr. Erastus Henry Hewitt who read a paper entitled "Robert Frost of Brewster Village"; and Mrs. Elizabeth MacDougall, Associate Survey Director for the Cambridge Historical Commission, who gave an illustrated talk on "Cambridge Vernacular Architecture in the Nineteenth Century."

The Council met on February 9, 1965, April 14, 1965, October 8, 1965, and January 5, 1966.

Seven members of the Society have died and four have resigned.

The present membership is 6 Associate Members, 8 Life Members, and 229 Active Members.

The Society has enjoyed a good year under the affable and capable leadership of Mr. Evarts.

Respectfully submitted,

Anna H. Jeffrey, Secretary

REPORT OF THE TREASURER
FOR THE YEAR 1966

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF INCOME & EXPENSES
FOR YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1966 AND 1965

	Year Ended December 31, 1966	Year Ended December 31, 1965
<i>Income</i>		
Investment Income		
Savings Bank Interest	\$1,416.98	\$1,034.91
Bond Interest	1,170.50	1,170.00
Dividends on Stocks	<u>2,656.22</u>	<u>2,359.04</u>
	\$5,243.70	\$4,563.95
Operating Income		
Membership Dues	1,647.00	1,592.00
Guest and Admission Fees	58.48	53.75
Sale of Publications	30.50	2.50
Donations for House Maint.	702.95	569.00
Special Donations	<u>2,385.00</u>	<u>2,262.25</u>
	4,823.93	4,479.50
Total Income	<u>10,067.63</u>	<u>9,043.45</u>
<i>Expenses</i>		
Operating Expenses		
Meetings	477.00	403.44
Clerical and Postage	355.40	264.35
Printing and Stationery	127.50	117.50
Miscellaneous	<u>40.00</u>	<u>49.60</u>
	999.90	834.89
Real Estate, 159 Brattle Street		
Insurance	408.25	301.18
Hostesses	200.00	—
Repairs and Maintenance	<u>2,625.13</u>	<u>456.83</u>
	3,233.38	758.01
Total Expenses	4,233.28	1,592.90
Excess of Income over Expenses	5,834.35	7,450.55
Deduct Additions to Reserves		
Reserve for Structural Repairs	2,000.00	3,000.00
Reserve for Publication of proceedings	<u>500.00</u>	<u>1,000.00</u>
	2,500.00	4,000.00
Addition to Unappropriated Surplus	<u>\$3,334.35</u>	<u>\$3,450.55</u>

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND FUNDS
DECEMBER 31, 1966 AND 1965

	December 31 1966	December 31 1965
<i>Assets</i>		
Cash in Checking Account	\$ 3,623.28	\$ 5,029.50
Cash in Savings Accounts	35,157.41	35,706.66
Bonds, at cost or face value	26,974.05	26,974.05
Market Val. 1966 \$25,278		
Market Val. 1965 26,123		
Common Stocks, at cost	49,745.34	41,955.52
Market Val. 1966 \$69,332		
Market Val. 1965 72,373		
Other Assets, at nominal value		
Land	1.00	1.00
Buildings	1.00	1.00
Furniture & Fixtures	1.00	1.00
Collections, etc.	1.00	1.00
Total Assets	<u>\$115,504.08</u>	<u>\$109,669.73</u>
	December 31 1966	December 31 1965
<i>Funds</i>		
Restricted Principal Funds		
Cook Bequest	\$ 1,006.67	\$ 1,006.67
Emerson Bequest	20,000.00	20,000.00
Life Memberships	1,325.00	1,325.00
	<u>22,331.67</u>	<u>22,331.67</u>
Unrestricted Principal Funds		
Bequests & Donations	26,319.89	26,319.89
Unexpended Income	10,722.04	10,722.04
Unallocated Principal Gains	10,647.23	10,647.23
	<u>47,689.16</u>	<u>47,689.16</u>
Reserve for Structural Repairs		
Bal. Jan. 1, 1966 & 1965	16,000.00	13,000.00
Appropriated from net income	2,000.00	3,000.00
Bal. Dec. 31, 1966 & 1965	<u>18,000.00</u>	<u>16,000.00</u>

Reserve for publishing of proceedings		
Bal. Jan. 1966 & 1965	2,000.00	1,000.00
Appropriated from net income	500.00	1,000.00
Bal. Dec. 31, 1966 & 1965	<u>2,500.00</u>	<u>2,000.00</u>
Plant & Contents Funds	<u>4.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>
Unappropriated Surplus		
Bal. Jan. 1, 1966 & 1965	21,644.90	18,194.35
Excess of Income over Expenses for Year	<u>3,334.35</u>	<u>3,450.55</u>
Bal. Dec. 31, 1966 & 1965	<u>24,979.25</u>	<u>21,644.90</u>
Total Funds & Surplus	<u>\$115,504.08</u>	<u>\$109,669.73</u>

Alden S. Foss
Treasurer

To the Officers of the
Cambridge Historical Society
Cambridge, Massachusetts:

I have examined the statement of assets and funds of the Cambridge Historical Society as of December 31, 1966, and the related statement of income and expense for the year then ended. My examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as I considered necessary in the circumstances.

In my opinion, the accompanying statements of assets and funds and the related statement of income and expense present fairly the financial condition of the Cambridge Historical Society at December 31, 1966, and the results of its operations for the year then ended, in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding years.

Robert A. Cushman
Certified Public Accountant

Cambridge, Massachusetts
January 17, 1967

List of Members

1964,1965,1966

**Died **Resigned A Associate Member L Life Member*

Douglas Payne Adams

Marion Harmon Stanwood (Mrs. D.P.) Adams

** Raymond Wolf Albright*

*** Caroline Elizabeth Ayer (Mrs. R.W.) Albright*

Paul Frost Alles

Margaret Wilder (Mrs. P.F.) Alles

Elizabeth Gardner (Mrs. C.) Almy

Mary Almy

James Barr Ames

Mary Ogden (Mrs. J.B.) Ames

Oakes Ingalls Ames

Harriet Hastings (Mrs. O.I.) Ames

Dwight Hayward Andrews

Matilda Wallace (Mrs. D.H.) Andrews

Eleanor Appel

** John Bradshaw Atkinson*

*** Louise Marie (Mrs. J.B.) Atkinson*

*** David Washburn Bailey*

Gage Bailey

Ellen Nealley (Mrs. G.) Bailey

Helen Harwood (Mrs. I.W.) Bailey

Frances Josephine Baker

** Edmund Johnson Barnard*

*** Althea Pew (Mrs. E.J.) Barnard*

Dorothy Bartol

Ruth Richards (Mrs. A.) Beane

Ralph Beatley

Pierre Belliveau

167

**** Katherine Eliza Kneeland Henry (Mrs. K.H.) Benedict**

Howard Lane Blackwell

Helen Thomas (Mrs. H.L.) Blackwell

Frank Aloysius Kenney Boland

***Velma Louise Gibson (Mrs. F.A.K.) Boland**

Charles Stephen Bolster

Elizabeth Winthrop (Mrs. C.S.) Bolster

*** Sylvia Church (Mrs. I.) Bowditch**

**** Robert Fiske Bradford**

**** Rebecca Crowninshield Browne (Mrs. R.F.) Bradford**

Laura Post (Mrs. S.A.) Breed

Arthur H. Brooks, Jr.

Jean (Mrs. A.H.) Brooks, Jr.

Eleanor Sheridan (Mrs. D.E.) Burr

**** Douglas Bush**

**** Hazel Cleaver (Mrs. D.) Bush**

Harriet Ropes (Mrs. R.C.) Cabot

Levin Hicks Campbell

Eleanor Lewis (Mrs. L.H.) Campbell

*** Paul DeWitt Caskey**

Ruth Blackman (Mrs. P.D.) Caskey

Melville C. Chapin

Elizabeth Parker (Mrs. M.C.) Chapin

Louise Fletcher (Mrs. C.L.) Chase

James Ford Clapp, Jr.

Grace (Mrs. J.F.) Clapp

A Roger Saunders Clapp

A Winifred Irwin (Mrs. R.S.) Clapp

Arthur Harrison Cole

Anna E. Steckel (Mrs. A.H.) Cole

L Mabel Hall Colgate

Mary Conlan

Theresa Reynolds (Mrs. J.L.) Coolidge

Phyllis Byrne (Mrs. G.) Cox

Katharine Foster Crothers

Robert Adams Cushman

Esther Lanman (Mrs. R.A.) Cushman

Richard Ammi Cutter

Ruth Dexter Grew (Mrs. R.A.) Cutter

168

John Francis Davis

Margaret Finck (Mrs. J.F.) Davis

Gardiner Mumford Day

Cecil Thayer Derry

Thomas Henri deValcourt

Arthur Stone Dewing

** Frances H. Rousmaniere (Mrs. A.S.) Dewing*

Frank Currier Doble

Helen I. Dadmun (Mrs. F.C.) Doble

James Donovan

Frances Cooper-Marshall (Mrs. J.) Donovan

David Crooker Dow

Eunice Greta Eleonora (Mrs. D.C.) Dow

Sterling Dow

Elizabeth Flagg (Mrs. S.) Dow

Arthur Drinkwater

Dows Dunham

Marion Jessie (Mrs. D.) Dunham

James Morse Dunning

Mae Bradford (Mrs. J.M.) Dunning

L Ethel Harding (Mrs. F.C.) Durant

Osborne Earle

Eleanor Clark (Mrs. O.) Earle

Charles William Eliot, 2nd

Regina Dodge (Mrs. C.W.) Eliot

**Mary Fife (Mrs. L.E.) Emerson*

Richard Conover Evarts

** Mary Lillian (Mrs. R.C.) Evarts*

Richard Manning Faulkner

Marion Carter Thomson (Mrs. R.M.) Faulkner

** Henry Wilder Foote*

*** Eleanor Tyson Cope (Mrs. H.W.) Foote*

Edward Waldo Forbes

Lois Whitney (Mrs. A.B.) Forbes

Alden Simonds Foss

Dorothy Tenney (Mrs. A.S.) Foss

A Francis Apthorp Foster

John Freeman

Elizabeth Burditt (Mrs. J.) Freeman

169

Ingeborg Gade Frick (Mrs.)

Robert Norton Ganz

Claire MacIntyre (Mrs. R.N.) Ganz

Wendell Douglas Garrett

Martha Jane Nuckols (Mrs. W.D.) Garrett

Hollis Gup till Gerrish

Catherine Ruggles (Mrs. H.G.) Gerrish

Henry Lathrop Gilbert

Priscilla Brown (Mrs. H.L.) Gilber

* *Roger Gilman*

Robert Lincoln Goodale

Susan Sturgis (Mrs. R.L.) Goodale

Charles Chauncey Gray

Pauline De Friez (Mrs. C.C.) Gray

Harding Updike Greene

Dusser de Barenne (Mrs. J.D.) Greene

L Helen McQuesten (Mrs. P.) Gring

Erwin Nathaniel Griswold

Harriet Allena (Mrs. E.N.) Griswold

Addison Gulick

*** Margaret Buckingham (Mrs. A.) Gulick**

Lilian Helen (Mrs. T.) Hadley

Edward Everett Hale

Helen Holmes (Mrs. E.E.) Hale

Constance Huntington Hall

*** Richard Walworth Hall**

Amy deGozzaldi (Mrs. R.W.) Hall

Mary Louise Perry (Mrs. R.W.) Harwood

Robert Hammond Haynes

Christina Doyle (Mrs. R.H.) Haynes

Robert Graham Henderson

Lucy Gregory (Mrs. R.G.) Henderson

Erastus Henry Hewitt

Jane Meldrim (Mrs. E.H.) Hewitt

A Albert Frederick Hill

Georgiana Ames (Mrs. T.L.) Hinckley

Elizabeth Mary Hincks

Sinclair Hamilton Hitchings

Catherine Farlow (Mrs. S.H.) Hitchings

170

****Anna Coolidge Davenport (Mrs. C. M.) Holland**

James Cleveland Hopkins

Barbara Cassard Rowe (Mrs. J. C.) Hopkins

George Wright Howe

Rosamond Coolidge (Mrs. G. W.) Howe

*** Lois Lilley Howe**

Marjorie Hurd

* *William Alexander Jackson*

** *Dorothy Judd (Mrs. W.A.) Jackson*

Charles Street Jeffrey

Anna Hollis (Mrs. C.W.) Jeffrey

* *Henry Angier Jenks*

L *Constance Bouve (Mrs. H.A.) Jenks*

George Wilbur Jones

Susan Wilbur (Mrs. Llewellyn) Jones

Wilbur Kitchener Jordan

Frances Ruml (Mrs. W.K.) Jordan

L *Theodora Keith*

Persis McClennan (Mrs. Chester T.) Lane

* *Louise Higgins Langenberg (Mrs.)*

William Leonard Langer

Rowena Morse (Mrs. W.L.) Langer

* *Marion Florence Lansing*

* *Delmar Leighton*

Isabella Carr Thompson (Mrs. D.) Leighton

Margaret Child (Mrs. G.A.) Lewis

George Arthur Macomber

Ella Sewell Slingluff (Mrs. G.A.) Macomber

Thomas H. D. Mahoney

Dorothy St. John Manks

Ralph May

Gladys Smyth (Mrs. R.) May

Keyes De Witt Metcalf

Elinor Gregory (Mrs. K.D.) Metcalf

**** Alva Morrison**

****Amy Gallagher (Mrs. A.) Morrison**

Ona Amelia Morse

James Buell Munn

Ruth Crosby Hanford (Mrs. J. B.) Munn

171

Elizabeth Flint (Mrs. F.H.) Nesmith

Henry Webster Newbegin

Harriet Jackson (Mrs. H.W.) Newbegin

Edwin Broomell Newman

Mary Beaumont (Mrs. E.B.) Newman

Grace Wyeth (Mrs. A.P.) Norris

John Torry Norton

Rose Eleanor Demon (Mrs. J.T.) Norton

Penelope Barker Noyes

****Joseph A. O'Gorman**

Walter George O'Neil

Isabel Marchant (Mrs. W.G.) O'Neil

Foster McCrum Palmer

Doris Madelyn (Mrs. F.M.) Palmer

***Stanley Brampton Parker**

Bryan Patterson

Bernice Caine (Mrs. B.) Patterson

****Gilbert Russell Payson**

William Lincoln Payson

Frederica Watson (Mrs. W.L.) Payson

Eleanor H. Pearson

Norman Pettit

Beatrice Binger (Mrs. N.) Pettit

Helen Russell (Mrs. G.W.) Pierce

Marion Hilton Pike

Elizabeth Bridge Piper

Mary Friedlander (Mrs. J.S.) Plaut

Hartwell Pond

Mildred Clark Stone (Mrs. D.T.) Pottinger

Edward Sears Read

* *Fred Norris Robinson*

George Irwin Rohrbough

Martha Fraser (Mrs. G.I.) Rohrbough

Alfred Sherwood Romer

Ruth Hibbard (Mrs. A.S.) Romer

* *Anne Elizabeth Hubble (Mrs. G.B.) Roorbach*

* *Paul Joseph Sachs*

Charles Rodney Sage

Marjorie Llewellyn (Mrs. C.R.) Sage

Edward Joseph Samp, Jr.

Cyrus Ashton Rollins Sanborn

Agnes Goldman (Mrs. A.) Sanborn

Laura Dudley (Mrs. H.H.) Saunderson

A Mason Scudder

A Celia Vandermark (Mrs. M.) Scudder

L Edgar Viguers Seeler, Jr.

L Katherine PerLee (Mrs. E.V.) Seeler

**Philip Price Sharples*

**Eugenia Jackson (Mrs. P.P.) Sharples*

John Langdon Simonds

Mary Frances Trafton (Mrs. J.L.) Simonds

Elizabeth Copley Singleton

Carol Mary Smith

Clement Andrew Smith

**Edna Stevenson (Mrs. W.) Smith*

William Stevenson Smith

Chauncey Depew Steele, Jr.

Marian Elizabeth (Mrs. C.D.) Steele

Theodore Lyman Storer

Katherine Ladd Storey (Mrs. T.L.) Storer

Carolyn Stubbs

Arthur Eugene Sutherland

Mary Elizabeth Genung (Mrs. A.E.) Sutherland

Ellamae McKee (Mrs. W.D.) Swan

Helen Ingersoll Tetlow

Gordon Bruce Thayer

Lydia Coffin Prescott (Mrs. G.B.) Thayer

Persis Louisa Webster (Mrs. C.F.) Toppan

Robert Treat

Priscilla Gough (Mrs. R.) Treat

**Eleanor Gray (Mrs. H.D.) Tudor*

Genevieve C. (Mrs. W.L.) Tutin

Adam Bruno Ulam

Mary Hamilton Burgwin (Mrs. A.B.) Ulam

L Mary Wellington (Mrs. K.S.) Usher

George Eman Vaillant

Anne Greenough (Mrs. G.E.) Vaillant

**Mabel Henderson (Mrs. W.E.) Vandermark*

173

Marjory Rowland (Mrs. M.H.) Walter

Roger Sherrill Webb

Anne Van Vleck (Mrs. R.S.) Webb

William Burton Webster

Marguerite Bigelow (Mrs. W.B.) Webster

Daniel Bradford Wetherell

Esther Elizabeth Hughes (Mrs. D.B.) Wetherell

Thomas North Whitehead

Harriet Eaton (Mrs. T.N.) Whitehead

Walter Muir Whitehill

Jane Revere Coolidge (Mrs. W.M.) Whitehill

Charles Frederick Whiting

Amos Niven Wilder

Catherine Kerlin (Mrs. A.N.) Wilder

Constance Bigelow Williston

A Mary Magnadier Mathews (Mrs. J.H.) Wing

Grace Davenport (Mrs. H.J.) Winslow

Henry Davenport Winslow

Katherine Nichols (Mrs. H.D.) Winslow

Henry Wise Pearl (Mrs. H.) Wise

Albert Blakeslee Wolfe

Beatrice Ewan (Mrs. A.B.) Wolfe

John William Wood

Charles Conrad Wright

Elizabeth Hilgendorff (Mrs. C.C.) Wright

Grace Williams Treadwell, Honorary Member