

The Proceedings of the Cambridge Historical Society, Volume 6, 1910

Twentieth Meeting

- The State Arsenal and the Identification of the Cannon
- on the Cambridge Common
- Address: Archibald Murray Howe
- The Aims of the Society for the Preservation of New
- England Antiquities
- Address: Charles Knowles Bolton
- A few Old Cambridge Houses
- Address: Mary Isabella Gozzaldi

Twenty-First Meeting

- The Cambridge Humane Society
- Address: Edward Henry Hall
- Why I Started the Index to Paige's History of Cambridge
- Address: Charles John McIntire
- History and the Local Historical Society
- Address: Frederick Jackson Turner

Twenty-Second Meeting. Seventh Annual Meeting

- Report of the Council
- Report of the Secretary
- Report of the Curator
- Report of the Treasurer
- Election of Officers
- Mary Huntington Cooke
- Address: George Hodges
- The History and Meaning of the Proposed New Charter
- for Cambridge
- Address: Lewis Jerome Johnson

Gifts to the Society

Necrology

Officers

Committees

Members

- Regular
- Associate
- Honorary

By-Laws

PROCEEDINGS of THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

THE TWENTIETH MEETING

THE Twentieth Meeting of the Cambridge Historical Society was held the twenty-fourth day of January, nineteen hundred and eleven, at a quarter before eight o'clock in the evening, in Emerson Hall, Room J, Harvard University.

The President, Richard Henry Dana, presided.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved.

For the first topic of the meeting Archibald Murray Howe , Esq. read the following paper:

5

THE STATE ARSENAL AND THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE CANNON ON THE CAMBRIDGE COMMON

At first I felt like apologizing for my effort to disturb a harmless tradition which for more than thirty years has given an impression to our citizens that in our midst were cannon dead enough as artillery, because spiked and filled with mortar, but giving life to the memory of the valiant Knox and his co-patriots. But, impelled by statements made by the honored dead and by the circumstances of those who dwelt at the Common's edge from the earliest times, who were my progenitors and whose nobility of spirit perpetuates in me an undiminished glow of local patriotism, I shall now read to you words which, however dry in detail, seem to afford information worthy of perpetuation by our Society.

5

The proper recognition of the value of these cannon and of their condition represents the quality of the conduct of our local government, and any serious and long-continuing neglect to preserve these

ancient relics should cause all our citizens to question whether our municipality is as sound as it should be. I do not wish to emphasize or encourage memorialization of a thoughtless character, but these guns were planted in our Common one hundred years (1875) after its occupation by our patriotic army, to be kept there in safe condition forever; and as long as we permit warlike memorials they should hold a most dignified position.

Whoever realizes what a great piece of land our Common is, when considered historically, will certainly exert his utmost strength to keep it free from any further memorials to individuals. Our age and time is overwhelmed with the thoughtless habit of memorializing distinguished men and women without discrimination as to the soundness and continuing value of their lives. Let this Society beware lest it unwittingly cheapen our Common by permitting any further incumbrances upon its "Training Field." To secure its dignity and its natural beauty may at some time require the outspoken protest of our most patriotic men and women; should such time unhappily be upon us, let this Society do its full duty.

I do not find that Massachusetts, whether colony or province, had any other place than "The Castle" for deposit of munitions of war in large quantity. On the accession of William it was called Castle William, and after cession to the United States by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts President John Adams called it Fort Independence — the name it now bears. The history of "The Castle," built in 1633, destroyed by fire, rebuilt and again and again provided with ordnance by the royal government, is well known. In 1692, after the second charter, the Crown provided ordnance for four bastions known as "Crown," "Rose," "Royal," "Elizabeth." Twenty-four cannon were nine-pounders, twelve twenty-fours, eighteen were thirty-twos, and four were forty-twos. At this time invasion by the French from Canada was expected.

After the accession of William, Colonel William Wolfgang Romer, an able German engineer, rebuilt the fortifications, and it is said one hundred pieces of cannon, including some forty-twos, were

then mounted. In 1740 the Shirley Bastion was constructed with twenty forty-twos mounted, and in 1744 a present of guns came from George II, said to be thirty-twos. In 1749, according to one writer, there were one hundred and four cannon besides bombs and mortars at "The Castle." After the evacuation of "The Castle" by the British in March, 1776, the Americans found a number of cannon at that fort, although the arms of most of them had been broken off; still some spiked guns were redrilled and some mutilated thirty-twos were repaired by affixing new trunnions or arms by strong iron hoops. The "Somerset," a British man-of-war, which in 1758, during the reign of George II, took part at Louisburg and Quebec, was wrecked in 1778 off Cape Cod, and supplied to this fort twenty-one handsome thirty-twos, probably bearing the "2 G. R." mark. About that time the Commonwealth rebuilt the works, so that in the new fortification, besides the ancient and mutilated iron cannon, there were twenty-one thirty-twos, three nines, twelve fours, iron cannon and thirteen saluting pieces, eleven of which were nines and probably all were brass or copper. Of this armament, the iron ordnance was all British-made. I find a Massachusetts resolve of November 2, 1776, passed for the purpose of establishing a furnace in Massachusetts to cast and bore large cannon ; but, while brass or copper cannon were undoubtedly cast hereabouts, it seems probable that in 1776, and for some years after, only iron cannon were cast in or near Philadelphia, at Hope Furnace in Rhode Island, or at Hughes's Foundry in Cecil County, Maryland, and at Salisbury, Connecticut. At the latter place John Jay and Gouverneur Morris, as agents, superintended the casting of cannon, and there guns for the

"Constellation" and the "Constitution" were cast. Cyrus Alger did not begin his work at South Boston until 1809, and he manufactured iron cannon during the War of 1812. Much earlier, June 9, 1798, when the frigate "Constitution" was being armed, Major William Perkins at Fort Independence was ordered to deliver to Captain Nicholson, commander of the frigate, not exceeding sixteen eighteens. Admiral Preble, in his history of the Boston Navy Yard, writes that the "Constitution" carried through the War of 1812 and long after, for her first battery, guns which bore the monogram " G. R.," showing their English origin.

By the Act of June 25, 1798, the fort now called Independence and the island where it stands were ceded by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to the United States of America, reserving the ordnance and all warlike stores then on the island which were the property of the Commonwealth. In estimating the sums received for this property by agreement of the parties, it appears that by a new agreement of the 3d of September, 1803, the amounts received by the Commonwealth from leaving out the mutilated cannon were reduced to \$21,336.37; "the guns saved from the 'Somerset' were retained." Whether this means that the Commonwealth or the United States of America retained these guns is a matter of inference, but at all events it thus appears that these thirty-twos were still existing and not in use. On October 2, 1798, among the iron cannon at "The Castle" were twelve thirty-twos on carriages and eleven thirty-twos dismantled.

In 1835, among other iron cannon at Cambridge were detailed four thirty-twos and two twelves, and among the gun carriages five thirty-twos, fort carriages. May 8, 1848, George Devereau, adjutant and acting quartermaster-general, wrote to the governor and council that the number of cannon at the Arsenal to be sold was thirty-seven, weighing 175,157 pounds. "Some of the guns," he wrote, "bear the British royal cipher and came from Fort Independence." "Perhaps," he adds, "it may be well to reserve two or more, as a matter of interesting association. This may be easily provided for in a resolve." George W. Rayne, born in 1837, son of George Rayne, superintendent of the Arsenal, says that thirty-four dismantled guns were stored for many years in sheds on land now occupied by the house of the late George S. Saunders Esq., then part of the Arsenal grounds; that in 1848 there was a sale of this ordnance to the South Boston Iron Works; that his father, the superintendent of the Arsenal, selected the three guns now on Cambridge Common from the whole stock of cannon in the sheds and put them on the Arsenal grounds, where they stood on carriages for many years; and that his father put a tin sign on them, marked "Left on Fort Independence at the Evacuation of Boston." There was also at the Arsenal a large, high-wheeled carriage which was intended for the transportation of heavy ordnance by slinging the cannon between the wheels with heavy chains.

In addition to a discrepancy between Knox's inventory¹ and the weights and calibre of the three cannon² it is well known that the carriages bearing these cannon are ship or fort carriages (sea-coast). And it is generally believed by all experts in our Revolutionary ordnance history that Knox's guns went with Washington's army to New York. General Knox, in 1778, when seeking ordnance, does not ask for thirty-twos. The largest cannon he thought of was twenty-four, the standard size gun of that time. In 1781 no thirty-twos were sent to Yorktown and thirty-twos were thought of for a proposed siege.

The only iron siege cannon at Yorktown were twenty-fours and eighteens with the American army and six- teens and twenty-fours with the French.

Drake, in his book published in 1874, entitled "Historic Fields and Mansions of Middlesex," page 265, writes :

¹ S. A. Drake, Memorials of the Massachusetts Society of the Cincinnati, pp. 544-545: Schedule of cannon brought from Ticonderoga by General Knox December 10, 1775.

² The three cannon on Cambridge Common were identified by Mr. William Read, the marks, weights, bores, and lengths being as follows:

The one on left of Monument :			
<i>Marks.</i>	<i>Weight.</i>	<i>Bore.</i>	<i>Length.</i>
Crown, G. R. 19, Arrow (being Government prop- erty mark, H. B. M. Ord- nance). Inside of right arm this mark. $\overline{\text{A}}$	(By weight cut into gun.) Cwt. q. lbs. 54 0 24	6 1/2 in.	9 ft. 7 in.
(About 6072 lbs.)			(Probably 32-pounder.)
The one on right of Monument :			
<i>Marks.</i>	<i>Weight.</i>	<i>Bore.</i>	<i>Length.</i>
Crown (being obliterated), No. 1293, no Arrow. Inside of left arm. ∇	Cwt. q. lbs. 50 1 9	6 1/2 in.	9 ft. 8 in.
(About 5637 lbs.)			(Probably 32-pounder.)
The one back of Monument :			
<i>Marks.</i>	<i>Weight.</i>	<i>Bore.</i>	<i>Length.</i>
Crown (obliterated), shape of rose, No. 22, Arrow. Inside of left arm, "R."	Cwt. q. lbs. 28 2 0	4 1/2 in.	9 ft. 1 in. or with bevelled edge.
(About 3192 lbs.)			(Probably 12-pounder.)

"The visitor will find some relics of the siege at the State Arsenal on Garden Street in several pieces of artillery mounted on sea-coast carriages and arranged within the enclosure. These guns were left in Boston by Sir William Howe * * * it is to be hoped that the State of Massachusetts can afford to keep these old war-dogs which bear the crest and cipher of Queen Anne and the Second George. All have the broad arrow, but rust and weather have nearly obliterated the inscriptions impressed at the royal foundry. The oldest legible date is 1687."

Within the houses at the Arsenal before 1874 were two beautiful brass field pieces with date 1760-1761, and two Spanish pieces of December, 1767, and other valuable relics. All had in 1874 disappeared, excepting one cannon. This British trio, that never will again make a sound excepting it be by falling to the ground from rotten carriages, was well known to the late Estes Howe, of Cambridge, a man of accurate memory and interested in local history, who repeatedly referred to them as from the fort in the harbor, but a pleasing tradition has been perpetuated in print several times in Cambridge historical memorials which would be most gratifying to me. It is that the cannon were taken at Ticonderoga and Crown Point by Ethan Allen and his men and brought here by General Knox. (My maternal ancestor was with Allen in May, 1775, and was commended in public proclamation to the Continental Congress.) That this cannot be the correct statement of their origin I think I have herein proved. The cannon were granted to the City of Cambridge by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by resolve of March 81, 1875, as the three old iron British cannon and their carriages now in the State Arsenal yard to be kept in good condition forever. Their present condition (January, 1911) is deplorable.

The grant to the City was promoted by the late Isaac Bradford, who in 1863, as a young captain, with his command guarded the Arsenal and lived near by. His interest in the military affairs of Cambridge led to the planting of the cannon on the place where our patriot army encamped. It is to be hoped that soon our authorities will protect the guns from falling to the earth and thus save our city from dishonor and our children from danger. The only justification for the words marked upon the stone near the cannon —

"These guns were used by the Continental Army in the Siege of Boston during the American Revolution " — is that, although they may have been used by the British against the Americans before the evacuation, possibly the Massachusetts militia who afterwards occupied the fort, artillery men under Colonel John Trumbull, detachments from Colonels Marshall's and Whitney's regiments of militia, particularly Crafts's train of artillery, may have mounted these guns, with others, when Shirley Bastion was prepared to defend Boston Harbor after March, 1776. There were a few shots fired at the British transports which, June 16-17, 1776, were captured with Lieutenant-Colonel Archibald Campbell and several hundred of the Seventy-first Regiment, Frazer's Highlanders, but I doubt if any shots were fired from Castle Island.

Thus ends the story of the guns, and it is the only story I can tell now; perchance some London ordnance authority may refer me to Woolwich or Carron, but, whatever the future may afford as to the making of the guns, it seems worth while to recall the place they guarded before they came to their present position; it was the State Arsenal grounds near the post flag-staff. During the earlier years of the class of 1855 at Harvard, probably the freshman year, Francis C. Barlow, of that class, discharged one or more of these cannon, probably the last of their warlike use. Later in his life that student became a brave general, and to-day the land is occupied by his classmate. The disappearance of the Arsenal from Cambridge makes it worth while to recall its existence, otherwise to many of the coming generations Arsenal Square ("square" being a common misnomer hereabouts) will always be a triangle without meaning. About one hundred and fifteen years ago the impending difficulties with the French led our Commonwealth to consider the necessity for the better storage of its munitions of war, and as Cambridge a little more than twenty years earlier had been the centre of military activities, with barracks and a laboratory at the upper or westerly part of the Common, Cambridge was selected as the place for the State Arsenal. For public and probably warlike purposes buildings had been

maintained there as public storehouses since 1776 continuously until April, 1785, when a question arose as to the right of the proprietors of Common lands to lease parts of the Common so occupied, and it may be inferred that this question

led the authorities to acquire title to land favorably situated for the use of the Commonwealth and thus avoid paying rent to either the proprietors or the town of Cambridge. However that may be, June 10, 1796, Massachusetts bought of Joseph Bates, housewright, a piece of land bounding westwardly on the road commonly called "Milk-Porridge Lane" (now a part of Garden Street) and, no doubt, moved the old buildings or built new and inexpensive buildings thereon to store any materials of war that should come to the Commonwealth whenever acquired by purchase from the United States or private parties.

In 1813 more land adjoining was purchased from the heirs of Bates, and in March, 1817, Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse sold to Massachusetts land adjoining. His letter of January 10, 1817, to Amasa Davis, quartermaster-general, is worth preservation. The following is a copy of it:

Amasa Davis, Esq., Quartermaster-General.

Sir, — I have considered your proposition and consulted gentlemen of judgment relative to parting with the piece of ground for the Arsenal, and presume that you and I can hit what is just and right that the Commonwealth should give and I receive for it.

I must beg you, however, to consider that I have no wish to part with any of my land. I have only between nine and ten acres, just enough to keep my creatures and amuse me in its cultivation. I had rather increase than diminish the boundary of my land. Thus circumstanced, no one can suppose that I could estimate my land otherwise than by the foot like all the house lots.

It is easy to see that this valuable military depot will extend itself. It cannot be otherwise. In time of war it would doubtless have an armorer's and carpenter's shop with barracks for a subaltern's guard, with other needful accompaniments; and this would create a neighborhood not very desirable to cornfields, orchards and fruit gardens. The very spot you wish for is part of that portion of my land which I have often contemplated as the most proper for two house lots and two gardens.

Respecting the price, I will observe that the late Governor Gerry sold his land for more than 25 cents the square foot. Land has been lately sold at Cambridgeport for 12 1/2

cents the foot. Now I am willing to sell mine to the Commonwealth for half that sum, viz. 6 1/4 cents, or 4 1/2 the square foot, and this I presume neither you nor the Government would ever think out of the way.

12

Judge Winthrop told me yesterday that the United States gave him two thousand, five hundred dollars per acre for the land on Governors Island, on which is built Fort Warren.

Should you take the land, I would endeavor to accommodate you as it regards bringing on your materials provided it would not interfere with my spring work or open my grounds to the ingress of cattle and depredators. I presume you will need 140 feet by, I guess, 85. But of this you are the best judge.

I am, sir, with respect,

Your obedient servant,

Benjamin Waterhouse.

In 1848 an exchange of land by Mrs. Louisa Waterhouse and the Commonwealth made Follen Street possible, and, I think, there was no further acquisition of land for Arsenal purposes until 1864, when a lot having 418 feet front on Chauncy Street was purchased from the Waterhouse heirs. Twenty years later, June 6, 1884, the whole estate, buildings and land, was sold to a private citizen for private use. While I cannot give a full statement of the Arsenal buildings, I can give some detail. December 12, 1816, the General Court found that there was an absolute necessity for additional buildings for the safe keeping of munitions of war. January 12, 1818, Governor Brooks reported to the Senate and House that a fire-proof distributing arsenal and laboratory in Boston (this was on Carver Street), which was sold in 1847, and a fire-proof brick building in Cambridge were complete and all within the appropriation of \$14,000. The building in Cambridge is described in the Resolve of 1816 to be 100 feet long by 40 feet wide and three stories high, this to be used as a place for the more permanent deposit of tents, camp equipage, fixed ammunition, and other munitions of war.

In the year 1848-1849 (see Resolve 28, April, 1849), some old wooden sheds at the Arsenal were sold, as well as some war material (probably the same sale referred to by Mr. Rayne), and a "neat and elegant building erected 1 1/2 stories high, 100 feet long and 25 feet wide, with slated roof and finished attic, all for \$2,728.78." I suppose this was the building which stood at right angles with the building of 1816-1818 and perhaps almost parallel with Garden Street. It was the office of the superintendent, and somewhere in

it, I am told, cartridges were made during some part of the War of 1861-1865.

Besides sheds, on the land near Follen Street, there was built, under authority of an act of 1852, a brick dwelling house with a slate roof for the use and occupation of the keeper; the cost was not to exceed \$2500. Finally, in 1864 or 1865, a machine shop was built in the rear of the building of 1816-1818, which, after it had for some time been lying idle, was occupied by the youth of Cambridge, who there, in 1876, organized the Cambridge Social Dramatic Club. Its beginnings were characteristic of its members, who with their own hands erected the stage and made their scenery and enacted plays of Sheridan and other classic dramatists.

April 29, 1861, Harvard students signed an obligation to obey such drill officers as the corporation might appoint. They were uniformed and organized into a battalion of four companies under command of Joseph Hayes, of the Harvard class of 1855, afterwards a brave general officer with the brevet of major-general. This battalion guarded the Arsenal during May, 1861, and perhaps at other times. Two hundred and fifty-seven names of students of this battalion appear upon the rolls at the State House.

Again, in 1863, during the draft riots of that summer, the Washington Home Guard, a Cambridge company commanded by Captain Isaac Bradford, afterwards chief of the police and later mayor, did guard duty there. During a night of their occupancy Governor Andrew sent wagons to convey muskets, rifles, and ammunition from the Arsenal to the State House. Although the principal arsenal for the Commonwealth, there were many years between 1796 and 1884 when the estate was a place for equipments that were decaying. Massachusetts took small part in the land forces of the War of 1812. Perhaps General Sumner's words may be worth quoting, to show the possible celerities of 1812-1814. He writes that men twenty miles distant from headquarters laboring in the fields and workshops appeared at the places to which they were summoned in their military attire, furnished with three days' rations as the law required, in twenty hours from the time the videttes notified them of danger. Officered by men of their choice, this militia garrisoned the forts of the metropolis and of other principal towns during 1814, while the regulars marched from the maritime to the inland fron-

tier. In the Mexican War one regiment raised by Caleb Cushing from Massachusetts served as United States volunteers. In 1843 some repairs were made and then, about 1849, came some activity — "a year's supply from the United States," referred to in the quartermaster-general's letter of June 5, 1849, to the governor, compels the quartermaster-general to ask for more storage room.

Furthermore, he recommends the sale of several hundred damaged muskets and a number of old gun carriages, the cannon belonging to which have been melted up, and which are in themselves wholly unserviceable, together with a lot of condemned cartridge boxes, belts, and other small equipment. The old gun carriages were out-of-doors and becoming less valuable. There were about twenty old gun carriages, tumbrils, and at times white oak for gun carriages was there stored. Some pieces of mahogany were found, showing the variety of arms which may have been there. During the War of 1861-1865 a great variety of tents and equipments were stored and sold at the Arsenal. Perhaps some articles were from captured blockade runners. There were a few heavy cannon deposited on the

grounds — Dalgrens painted red — though one witness thinks some Blakelys, painted brown, were there; and it is known that two thousand equipments for infantry, made of brown leather probably from captured blockade runners, were sold from the Arsenal to private parties.

Cambridge gave little attention to the Arsenal. Poets and patriots, trees and old mansion houses have taken the fancy of almost all writers, but Cambridge has not yet conquered the brutal spirit in man or boy. However much the acts of peace are cultivated, the love of immediate power and success compels some preparation for defence against some enemy on earth, and at the entrance to Cambridge called Massachusetts Avenue stands a modern State armory, of considerable luxury in its arrangements, where a citizen militia is drilled and entertained. I trust, however, that the exercise derived from military manoeuvres may increase the standard of moral and physical health, without laying too much emphasis upon war as a probable necessity at times when, as General Sherman said, because weak men were in high office he was obliged to draw the sword.

15

For the second topic of the meeting CHARLES KNOWLES BOLTON gave, with photographic illustrations, an address, of which the following is an abstract by the Secretary:

THE AIMS OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE PRESERVATION OF NEW ENGLAND ANTIQUITIES

THE work already accomplished by this new Society has awakened public opinion on matters of local historic interest and value. In these days of improvement and progress old houses of distinction in design and architecture should not be allowed to be torn down. They stand as present examples for guidance to our knowledge of the past. Old landmarks should be carefully and faithfully preserved, their quaint and odd features being of special significance and worth.

Movements of a similar kind have long been active abroad, as shown in the preservation and restoration of a large number of houses in which great men have lived. Among them may be mentioned - and here illustrated by photographs - the Harvard house at Stratford, the Dr. Johnson house in London where his "Dictionary" was written, the John Knox house in Edinburgh, the Burns home at Alloway, the Carlyle house at Chelsea, and in Italy the house of Raphael at Urbino.

In our own country it is to be noted that old houses in the Southern States were generally built of stone, in contrast with those of the Northern States, which are mostly of wood. The latter are for that reason much less durable, and need all the more care and attention for their adequate preservation. Among New England houses may be singled out the Devotion house in Brookline, an interesting example of early architecture and now used as a museum, the Pierce house in Newbury, and the White-Ellery house in Gloucester. Incidentally it is to be observed that the automobile has been doing much to preserve old houses, by making accessible remote parts of all communities.

A careful study of old houses in the Connecticut Valley has just been made by the founder of this Society, Mr. William S. Appleton. In the next issue of its Bulletin will be described the old garrison houses of New England, of which there are only a few left, and

16

some of these have been covered over with clapboards. Among other objects for preservation are windmills, of which some twentyfive are still active. Interesting instances of repairs of old houses are those of the Craddock house in Medford, and more recently of the House of Seven Gables in Salem, which has been restored as nearly as possible to its original condition, including even the old hidden stairway.

Plans are now being made to save a number of old houses about New England, one of them being in Newburyport, and another the Austin house in Cambridge. In both instances it is the purpose and the hope of the Society that the houses may be bought outright, and that afterward they may be kept in repair and rented to responsible people, who, in consideration of the rent, will become their caretakers and open the houses to public visitors at occasional or stated times.

In this movement for the preservation of old houses and other relics of the past the interest is becoming wide-spread, and as a most encouraging result the membership of our new Society is already large. The co-operation of the Cambridge Historical Society and of all its members is most cordially solicited. As an aid to that co-operation our Society will publish, from time to time, bulletins which will give full information about old houses and about other objects of similar antiquarian interest.

17

For the third topic of the meeting Mrs. MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI read the following paper:

A FEW OLD CAMBRIDGE HOUSES

OUR Cambridge poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, has written

"All houses wherein men have lived and died

Are haunted houses."

"We have no title-deeds to house or lands;

Owners and occupants of earlier dates

From graves forgotten stretch their dusty hands,

And hold in mortmain still their old estates."

Do we not feel this when we cross the threshold of a seventeenth-century house? Are we not carried back to the days of

high thinking and plain living, when large families were brought up in what seem to us incredibly close quarters? Or when we stand in the hall-way of a lordly eighteenth-century house do we not catch glimpses of powdered heads and queues, of small clothes and diamond knee-buckles, of patches and high-heeled shoes, as the ghostly occupants flit through the wainscoted rooms?

"We meet them at the doorway, on the stair,

Along the passages they come and go."

How does a man who is not a great thinker, writer, or teacher more impress the men of the generations that succeed him than by his house? Men build their characters into their houses, or did before we had architects. If the builder were liberal, his rooms were as large, his windows as wide, as his purse would allow. If he had taste and culture, the ornamentation of his house was from Greek models, restrained, classic; if he were fond of show, his drawing-rooms were grand and courtly; if convivial, his diningroom received the most attention; if warm-hearted and hospitable, his mind turned to lordly guest-chambers; if social, to a ballroom. All these characteristics we see in eighteenth-century houses, when building in New England became a fine art.

It is this personal element in old houses that leads us to visit the birthplaces of famous men. We wish to see the rooms where they first opened their eyes on the world. Here it was that they saw "the vision splendid" of their boyhood. It was in these surroundings, humble or grand, that they worked out the problems of their lives.

In the houses inhabited by those unknown to history it is the atmosphere of family life that we feel. Here were enacted the events of importance to them.

From that chamber clothed in white,

The bride came forth on her wedding night:

There, in that silent room below,

The dead lay in his shroud of snow."

All the cycle of human experiences has been witnessed again and again by these old walls; could they speak, what tales we should hear! When an old house with which we have grown familiar is pulled down we feel that we have lost a friend. Has Boston ever

ceased to regret the loss of the John Hancock house? Have we ever ceased to mourn the historic Holmes house? Oh, let us, while there is still time, try to save those houses that will show to our descendants what manner of men their ancestors were!

Cambridge has but few *very* old houses; only three claim to be of the seventeenth century, and the changeableness of the population of our city is emphasized by the fact that there is not a single house, to my knowledge, where the family of the builder has dwelt for eight generations. Such houses are common in Essex County. I remember, in an afternoon spent near Newburyport, seeing at least half a dozen still inhabited, I was told, by the descendants of the builders.

There are three seventeenth-century houses in this neighborhood. One is the Vassall house (94 Brattle Street), which has been so altered and pulled about by its numerous owners that probably the only part remaining of the original house, built by William Adams, is the western chimney, laid with pounded oyster-shells, and the two rooms on each side of it. The Lee-Nichols house may have been built in the latter part of the seventeenth century, when it was the home of a well-to-do farmer in what was then a part of Watertown. It was not until 1758 that Judge Lee enlarged it and made it what it now is. The details of the origin of the third house we know, a house that has not been materially altered or enlarged. Never made elegant or stately, it still remains the cosy home of the old New England type that the builder intended it to be. This is the Cooper-Austin house on Linnaean Street. It was built by Deacon John Cooper in 1657, out of the trees which his townsmen gave him permission to fell on the common lands. The beams are of oak, as solid as when cut two hundred and fifty-odd years ago; the original clapboards are still on it, placed quite near together at the bottom, widening as they go up, and nailed on with old hand-wrought nails. At the east side the third story overhangs the second, and at the back the roof slopes from the ridgepole to within six feet of the ground. In the middle of the house stands the huge five-flued chimney. On either side of the door are large square rooms, both, as well as the two rooms over them, having exposed beams and large fireplaces. At the back is a long room for the

kitchen, with a tiny bedroom at one end; and over this are the two-step bedrooms, so called because they were reached by steps from the front rooms. In the third story are two good-sized rooms with windows in the gables.

John Cooper was a prominent man of his time. He was selectman for forty-four years from his election in 1646, town clerk for twelve years, and deacon of the church for twenty-three years, until his death in 1691, at the age of seventy-three. He came here in 1636 or 1637 with his mother and step-father, Deacon Gregory Stone, who is supposed to have been the brother of Rev. Thomas Hooker's reader in the First Church, Rev. Samuel Stone.

Deacon John Cooper married Anne Sparhawk, daughter of Deacon Nathaniel Sparhawk, who was here in 1636. She was the greataunt of that Nathaniel Sparhawk who built the old house at Kittery Point and married the daughter of Sir William Pepperell. Their son, Samuel Cooper, who was the next owner of the house, married Hannah, daughter of Deacon Walter Hastings, who came from England with his father John in 1682. Their son, the grandson of the builder, Walter Cooper, inherited the house, and married Martha, daughter of Benjamin Goddard. He seems to have been the first person connected with the house who was not a deacon. When he died in 1751, Walter Cooper left to his widow Martha

"the west half of his dwelling house, with liberty of the oven in t'other room, the east half of the barn, and liberty to pass and repass about the house and barn," privileges which she enjoyed for many years, for she outlived her son, the next heir, a second Walter, who married Lydia Kidder, daughter of Thomas and Lydia (Prentice) Kidder. The first husband of Lydia (Prentice) Kidder had been John Cooper, brother of the first Walter Cooper. This marriage took place in 1755, and Walter Cooper Jr. died the following year, at the age of twenty-seven (before the birth of his son Walter, who died when two years old); so his widow, Lydia, inherited the east half of the house. She married for her second husband Jonathan Hill in 1763. He bought out the rights of the Widow Martha Cooper to the west half, oven, and barn, and the house passed from the family of the builder after more than a hundred years of occupancy.

Of this second marriage two children were born, Jonathan Cooper

Hill and Lydia, and now we come to the only romance of the old house that has become public property. When Lydia was baptized in the old meeting-house in the College Yard, in 1766, a student of the College was present, and tradition says that she made such an impression on him that he then and there declared that he would marry her. Nearly ten years later this student, then Major Fogg, of Kensington, New Hampshire, staff officer of Colonel Poor's regiment, was stationed in Cambridge and made the acquaintance of little Lydia; after the war of the Revolution was over he returned and married her. In 1788 she and her brother sold the house to Deacon Gideon Frost, a great-grandson of Deacon John Cooper who built the house. His descendants still own it. Martha, daughter of Gideon Frost, married Thomas Austin of Boston and died in 1838; her daughter married, in 1837, Rev. Reuben Seiders, who before his marriage changed his name to Richard Thomas Austin. So to the last two generations this has been known as the Austin house. Thus this house has been in the family of the builder more than two hundred and fifty years, except for the twenty-three years when it went by inheritance and purchase into the Hill family - a record I think no other Cambridge house possesses.

Until 1839-1840 Cambridge was rich in seventeenth-century houses. The first house built here by Lieutenant-Governor Thomas Dudley was burned in 1666, as I learned from the deed given in 1691 by Edward Pelham, son of Herbert Pelham, member of Cromwell's parliament. No picture is known to exist of this house, so we cannot judge whether or not Governor Dudley was guilty of the fault of which he was accused by his contemporaries, of wanton luxury in the wainscoting of his house.

In 1839 the first tavern, that stood on Dunster Street next door to the first meeting-house and was kept by the first deacon, was also destroyed by fire. Nothing remains to us of this but the old door step, the property of the Misses Harris, which I hope may some day belong to this Society, for the feet of every early settler in Cambridge must have pressed that stone.

In 1840 many of the old. houses were still standing. Having sheltered six generations in the two hundred years, they were good for many another year, but the village of Cambridge was awakening and was transforming itself into the modern city that it became in

1846. These houses stood in the way of improvements and they fell by the hand of man.

Fortunately for us, Miss Eliza Susan Quincy sketched one of the oldest of these houses, which stood in the College Yard. It was built in 1633 for the Rev. Thomas Hooker, the first minister, who lived in it until he went with the Braintree Company to Connecticut. His eldest daughter became the second wife of his successor, Rev. Thomas Shepard, and was mistress for eight years of the house built for her father. The year after her death the minister married a third wife, Margaret Boradel, and dying two years later left church and house and wife to his successor, Rev. Jonathan Mitchell, who bought the house in 1651, and lived in it eighteen years, until his death in 1668.

The next occupant of whom we have any knowledge was President John Leverett, 1696-1724; next it became the property of Professor Wigglesworth, first Hollis professor of Divinity. His son succeeded him in the professorship and in the ownership of the house, living in it until his death in 1794. After that Richard H. Dana, the first of the name, lived in it, and it had other occupants whose names we do not know. During its last years a school for little girls was held here by Miss Austin and later by Miss Mary Hedge, which was attended by some of the older members of this Society.

Another house built in this same year was standing within the memory of many, the Haynes house, on the west side of Winthrop Square. This was built by John Haynes, Governor of Massachusetts and Connecticut, who went to the latter State with the Hooker Company in 1636. Mr. Littlefield thinks that this mansion was built around a court like the house that Governor Haynes later built in Connecticut, but the memory of those who knew the house in its latter days does not confirm this theory. It was to this house that the widow of Rev. Jose Glover came when she landed here with her fatherless children, the Daye family, and the first printing-press. Here it was that she married Henry Dunster, first President of Harvard College. Alas, the house rich in so many associations went in the fifties!

Another house about which old people still talk, and which fell before the middle of the nineteenth century, is the Hancock house.

It stood on the east side of Dunster Street, about a hundred yards south of Harvard Square, and was built by Nathaniel Hancock in 1634. He died young, about 1648; his widow and children lived here, and his famous grandson, John Hancock, of Lexington, Harvard College 1689, called "the Bishop" (grandfather of Governor John Hancock, signer of the Declaration of Independence), was born in this house. The Hancocks owned and lived in it for nearly a century, and it then became the home of Judge Samuel Danforth, who was here almost fifty years, until Revolutionary times. The house is described when it was destroyed, "as old and weather beaten, with second storey projecting quite three feet beyond the lower floor."

Another house that fell in 1843 was the Old Parsonage, built in 1670, in the College Yard, east of the Hooker House. Its first occupant was Rev. Urian Oakes. Next came Rev. Nathaniel Gookin, and he was followed by the revered pastor, Rev. William Brattle. His successor, Rev. Nathaniel Appleton, was living here at the time of the Revolution, and was followed by Rev. Timothy Hilliard. The last minister to live here was Rev. Abiel Holmes. After that probably various professors occupied it until it was pulled down.

Another house, to the existence of which eyewitnesses remain, was that built for Captain Patrick, the blustering Irishman who trained the earliest settlers in their military duties. He came here in 1632.

After his welcome departure Christopher Cane lived here; his daughter Ruth Cane married that picturesque character Marmaduke Johnson, who, sent out here in 1660 by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England, for the purpose of printing the Indian Bible, used his spare time in making love to the Puritan maidens while he had a wife in England, to the great dismay and annoyance of the magistrates. He lived only four years after his marriage, but Ruth must have loved him, for she left the house to her family on condition that Marmaduke's son "did not come out of England to get it."

Judah Monis, who abjured Judaism and embraced Christianity in 1723, and the following year was made professor of Hebrew, bought this house, that same year, of the Canes. After the Battle of Bunker Hill it was used as a hospital, and the Baron von Riede-

23

sel and his family were quartered in it for a short time. Later it was bought by the learned Thaddeus Mason, who died here in 1802, aged ninety-five. It stood at the southeast corner of Winthrop and Boylston Streets, with its fine old door on the former street and beautiful garden behind.

Directly opposite stood a quaint little house which disappeared so silently that no one marked the date of its going. It was supposed to have been built for that Mrs. Elizabeth Sherborne who concealed and cared for Rev. Thomas Shepard before he left London. She died in 1652. It was long the home of Peter Towne, sexton of the First Church, who was one of the earliest abolitionists, as in his will, dated 1705, he freed his slaves and left them legacies. John Bradish succeeded him.

Another seventeenth-century house that gave place to a college club-house only six years ago stood on the corner of Holyoke Street and Holyoke Place. Joseph Cooke, the friend of Shepard, and his descendants lived there for more than a century, the original house having been rebuilt and much enlarged in, 1668. In 1737 it was bought by President Holyoke as a dower house for his wife, who lived here during her widowhood, her son-in-law, Professor Eliphalet Pearson, continuing to reside there after her death. Later it was owned by the Winthrops.

All these houses were in the village, that is, between the College Yard and the river. There was also a group of four houses of like early date and architecture on Holmes Place. They were the Meane-Hastings house, the Percival-Greene house, the ParksGannett house, and the house of Moses Richardson, later the home of Royal Morse. All these are gone, the last being taken down in 1888.

I have dwelt so long on the early houses that I have left no time for the stately mansions of the next century. These are better known to us and have been often described. Fortunately Tory Row still continues to be the aristocratic end of the town, and the houses have not fallen in the social scale, and lapsed into that sad state that pains us in so many old towns. Only three of the preRevolutionary houses, as far as I now remember, have fallen from their high estate: the Ralph Inman house, that once stood where the City Hall now stands, which has been taken to Brookline Street

24

and curtailed of its fair proportions; the Lechmere-Sewell house, better known to us as the Riedesel house, moved from under its fine lindens and partly rebuilt and now standing at the corner of Riedesel Avenue and Brattle Street; and the house of Professor John Winthrop, to whose hospitable door the scientists of his day all came, and where the meetings of the Committee of Safety were held in the dark days before the Revolution. This house, on the northwest corner of Mount Auburn and Boylston Streets, has been turned around to face the latter street and transformed into a small shop, so that it no longer bears any likeness to the learned professor's home.

The eighteenth-century houses in Cambridge fall into three groups. In the first group were the gambrel-roofed houses, like the Holmes house. We still have with us the Wadsworth house, 1726, the Brattle house, 1727, the John Hicks house, Dunster Street, corner of Winthrop Street, and the Captain Edward Marrett house, originally built on the northeast corner of Dunster and Mount Auburn Streets, but lately turned around to the south and now numbered 77 Mount Auburn Street. This house is noticeable for its fine paneled door, a replica of the east door of the Vassall house. These two houses were built in 1760.

Of the grander houses, in the style we call Colonial, we have several that form the second group: Craigie house, 1759, Apthorp house, Fayerweather house, and Elmwood, all built about 1760. To which should be added as worthy of note, though built after the Revolution, the Philips-Norton house, on Irving Street, 1790, and the Thomas Lee house, 153 Brattle street, 1799.

In the third group I would place those humbler houses that followed more closely the seventeenth-century houses, such as the Read house, 1726, the Waterhouse house, 1740, and the WatsonDavenport house, at the corner of Massachusetts and Rindge Avenues.

A fine example of the house of a rich merchant at the beginning of the nineteenth century is that of Mr. John Chipman Gray, corner of Fresh Pond Lane and Brattle Street. Its spacious front and high-studded rooms conceal the older Wyeth house, whose small windows, paneled doors and quaint chimney cupboards are still to be seen at the back of the house.

25

We have much yet to learn of our old houses, but the past gives up its secrets grudgingly and only to the persevering seeker. May there be many such in our Society!

At the conclusion of Mrs. Gozzaldi's paper the meeting was dissolved.

26

THE TWENTY-FIRST MEETING

THE TWENTY-FIRST MEETING OF THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORICAL SOCIETY was held the twenty-fifth day of April, nineteen hundred and eleven, at a quarter before eight o'clock in the evening, in Emerson Hall, Room J, Harvard University.

The President, RICHARD HENRY DANA, presided.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved.

For the first topic of the meeting Rev. EDWARD H. HALL, D.D., read the following paper:

THE CAMBRIDGE HUMANE SOCIETY

ON January 2, 1911, this Society received notice of the disbandment of the Cambridge Humane Society, which had just completed the ninety-seventh year of its beneficent activity. It passed away as quietly as it had lived. Though challenging little attention from the city at large, its career had been a most interesting one, and the annals of the Cambridge Historical Society, no less than the chronicles of our city for nearly a century, would be incomplete without some record of this otherwise unheralded event. Two small volumes with faded leaves are the sole memorial it has left to us; my duty to-night is to give this brief story a permanent place upon our pages. Once before this story has been told, and I cannot do better than to begin this sketch by citing the main passages of Mr. Arthur Gilman's pamphlet called "An Old-Time Society." It was written for a publication called "The Cambridge of 1896," and is so complete a record of the earlier years of the Society's existence, and gives so much more intimate a sketch of that period than I could write that (with the permission of the publishers) I reproduce it here as part of my paper. [Mr. Gilman's sketch being readily accessible in its original form as printed in

27

"The Cambridge of Eighteen Hundred Ninety-Six," pp. 267-274, as well as in the separate pamphlet used by Dr. Hall, the portions quoted by him are herewith omitted.]

We are fortunate in having this interesting statement [above omitted] of the beginnings of our Society, written *con amore* by one who was himself for twenty-nine years its secretary, and was always one of its most devoted and distinguished laborers.

Among societies of its kind, it is doubtless the most venerable in our city. According to the Boston Directory of Charities, 1901, the only charitable organizations around Boston older than the Humane Society are these: The Boston Dispensary, 1801; The Boston Female Asylum, 1803; The Massachusetts Congregational Charitable Society, 1786; The Boston Episcopal Charitable Society, 1784; The Roxbury Charitable Society, 1799.

The dates given are those of incorporation. It must be remembered that the Humane Society was not incorporated, so that there may have been others, unincorporated, which are older still.

The most noteworthy feature of the history of the Society has been the roll of its membership, and the mere names of the officers and more active members whom it has enlisted in its service. Its presidents have been Rev. Abiel Holmes, D.D., who served it for twenty-three years, from 1814 to 1837; Judge Joseph Story, 1837-1845; Simon Greenleaf, 1845, 1846; John G. Palfrey, 1846-1856; William L. Whitney, 1856-1860; Stephen T. Farwell, 1860-1872; William M. Vaughan, 1872-1875; Francis G. Peabody, 1875-1879; Joseph H. Allen, 1879-1884; Samuel Batchelder, 1884-1888; Francis J. Child, 1888-1895; Richard H. Dana, 1896-1911.

Among its vice-presidents have been Prof. Henry Ware; Henry Ware Jr.; James D. Greene.

Among its secretaries we find Sidney Willard, William J. Whipple, Charles Willard, E. W. Metcalf, C. R. Metcalf, William Watriss, A. H. Ramsay, Charles E. Norton, J. C. Farnham, Samuel Longfellow, Arthur Gilman.

In view of these eminent names, as well as of the commodious quarters in which nowadays so many of our business or charitable organizations are housed, it is instructive to note that the Humane Society contented itself to the end with no special home it could call its own. It met in Porter's Tavern, the Charles River Bank,

28

Lyceum Hall, the Gas Office, the rooms of the Social Union, the hospitable vestry of one or another of our churches, or the private parlor of the treasurer or secretary.

It will not surprise us to discover, under this order of things, that in the treasurer's modest reports salaries play an exceedingly small part. The most valuable labors in our communities are often the gratuitous ones, contributing to the welfare of the community what money cannot repay. One trembles to think how the treasurer's statements of the Society would have mounted up, had the business men, the statesmen, the chief justices, the lawyers, even the professors, or ministers who figure upon these lists charged upon the Society the market value of services actually rendered. For a time, as many will remember, it availed itself of the assistance of college students, glad of a puny recompense for going from house to house, chiefly I think at mealtimes, to collect the small subscriptions by which the machinery of the Humane Society was so efficiently run. The sum of \$5, \$3, or \$2 from each cheerful giver was sufficient for the most part to meet the demands of administration where the best hearts and brains of the city were freely drawn upon for advice, sympathy, and aid; and \$10 was always a generous subscription. The total annual receipts upon the books averaged about \$500, rising under special incentive to \$684, \$780, and \$1033. The regular annual call upon the generosity of the Society was for a \$500 appropriation.

The records in the two books remaining I am sorry to say are of the briefest kind. The meetings were small, consisting oftener than otherwise of the officers alone, the subjects under discussion very few. Once in a while votes were passed to hold courses of addresses to draw in recruits and to inform the community of the needs of the Society, but no such meeting seems to have been held, the Society evidently preferring to do quietly and from its natural resources the duties it had originally undertaken. If this seems to you almost too monotonous a recital, I may perhaps refer to a certain mystery which overhangs the scanty records, which has caused the present historian much pains to disentangle. Two volumes were put into my hands, giving, as I was told, all the information extant concerning the Cambridge Humane Society. The first contains the official records of the Society, its birth, its lists of members

29

and officials, its meetings, and its final dissolution. Side by side with this, however, is another small blank-book, containing first a brief financial statement of the Old Cambridge Baptist Church, evidently

the original purpose which the blank-book was intended to serve, then, as if so much valuable stationary should not be lost, passing instantly into the inner life of the Cambridge Humane Society, from 1853 to 1866. Its title is simply "Records of the Trustees of the Humane Society." No explanation of this mystic narrative is anywhere given, no statement of origin or ultimate purpose, no attempt to reconcile its facts with the original records whose existence it somewhat contemptuously ignores. Like the other record it issues from the Charles River Bank; its lists of officers and accounts of meetings correspond generally with those of the older volume, though interposing several of which that volume is quite unaware, while quietly omitting others which the older gives in full. A historian with a vivid imagination or desiring to make a good story might suspect here some grave crisis in the proceedings of the Society, some angry dissensions among those high dignitaries, which it was important not to bring to light. Let me say at once, however, though no one whom I have consulted could help me to solve this puzzle satisfactorily, I have come to the conclusion that the hidden cause of the extra volume was the question of appointing a special agent to disburse the Society's funds. Up to that time, as has been seen, all receipts and expenditures were in the hands of the members themselves, without looking abroad for advice or financial aid. About 1853, however, as is not unusual on such occasions, the question began to arise whether affairs could not be managed better by engaging a paid agent and entrusting all investigations and disbursements to his hands. For some time, according to this second chronicle, each meeting closed with some reference to this mooted question.

No strife seems to have risen over the subject, but in due time, November 29, 1853, Mr. Charles Eliot Norton was appointed a committee to consult with Dr. Samuel Sawyer, and offer him the position of agent of the Society, to visit the poor, and act also as superintendent of the evening school, to be paid for his services \$50 a month. Arrangements also were made "to procure and furnish a suitable office for the agent at the expense of the Society" (see

smaller book, November 29, 1853). According to this smaller volume, which seems to know much more about the agent than the larger and older one, this order of things continued, with various vicissitudes, for several years, first under Mr. Sawyer as agent, then under Mr. Atkinson, and finally, at the advice of the Ladies' Humane Society (founded the same year with the male Society), which had come to the financial aid of the latter in this emergency, under Mr. Charles R. Metcalf. The experiment does not seem to have been altogether successful. The agent's salary gradually decreased, a debt was incurred, which the Ladies' Society had to assist in meeting, the question of expenses became more pressing, until finally (1865-1866) the agent appears no more, and the Society reverts quietly to its original basis.

About all these matters relating to the agent, the older volume is noticeably taciturn; but in the other we come upon a single line which throws light at last upon the whole situation. It reads: "Dec. 20, 1866, Voted: that Mrs. H. W. Paine act as agent for the year of 1866." All who lived in Old Cambridge at that time and were acquainted with its humanitarian movements know very well what that statement means. For many years Mrs. Paine's interest in the poor, and wide acquaintance with their needs, her devotion to every good cause and intelligent understanding of the methods of charity, made her almost indispensable in all benevolent activities; and while she was at the head of affairs no question of salaried officials needed to be considered. It is a disappointment to be told so little of the circumstances under which her connection with the Society began, or her exact relation with it. She stood plainly in no official relation to it, but from this time till her death its charitable funds passed through her hands, and her judgment was its controlling factor. It needed nothing but her name to

insure for it the confidence of the community, and nothing but her cordial support to carry out all its benevolent ambitions.

It is an interesting proof of the rich resources which the Society had at command in the conduct of its affairs that at the death of Mrs. Paine another stood ready at once to carry it on in the same spirit, and with the same command of the situation. Her death was announced to the Society, May 17, 1887, and at the same meeting the following vote was passed: "That Miss Alice R. Wells

be requested to distribute such funds as the Society raises in the way that Mrs. Paine has distributed it" (p. 62). It was added that, as in the case of Mrs. Paine, Miss Wells is thus made almoner of the Society as a private person, and not as holding any official position. Thus the future of the Society was secured, and it has come down to us of the present day with the fine stamp upon it of these two devoted almoners.

Its closing annals, as shown in our original volume, reveal therefore no changes of policy, and no fresh departures, but the same quiet processes of benevolent activity to the end. Meantime, however, as we all know, the methods of benevolence have changed inevitably with the country's advancing wealth and larger responsibilities, and new and more elaborate theories have come up to solve the problems of charity. I need not dwell upon this familiar tale, and I could not give a clearer statement of the influences at work upon all our benevolent activities than the announcement to which I have already referred, by which the Humane Society declares that its work is done. I close my narrative by giving the words of this Circular:

Whereas, the undersigned are the surviving and remaining trustees of the Cambridge Humane Society, and

Whereas, that Society was founded to provide care chiefly for the sick poor, and incidently for the relief of the indigent, and

Whereas, since the founding of the Society, the Massachusetts General Hospital, which was opened in 1821, the Cambridge Hospital, the Holy Ghost Hospital for Incurables, which take care of such cases, have been put in operation, and

Whereas, in Cambridge, the Associated Charities, the Female Humane Society, the Paine Fund, to say nothing of other organizations, take care of the Indigent,

IT IS HEREBY unanimously decided, with the full approval of the almoner of the Society, Miss Alice R. Wells, and the Treasurer, Mr. Franklin Perrin, that the Cambridge Humane Society, which has never been incorporated, be disbanded, and that the Treasurer be requested to send a list of our recent donors to the Associated Charities of Cambridge, the Female Humane Society, and the Trustees of the Paine Fund, with a notice of our disbanding.

CAMBRIDGE, January 2, 1811.

For the second topic of the meeting Hon. CHARLES J. MCINTIRE read the following paper:

WHY I STARTED THE INDEX TO PAIGE'S HISTORY OF CAMBRIDGE

I HAVE been requested by your Committee to prepare a paper for this meeting explaining how I came to start upon the work of preparing an Index to Paige's "History of Cambridge," which work happily is practically completed and has been surrendered to our Society to print and publish. In view of what now is realized as to the amount of time and careful labor which Mrs. Gozzaldi and her willing associates have been obliged to expend before giving it over to us, I confess that I feel guilty for my presumption, and recognize that my explanation must be largely in the form of apology. When Mr. Ayer overtook me on his wheel a few days ago, and somewhat abruptly announced what the Society desired me to publicly explain, I at first declined, pleading lack of time, but, upon a little urging, I promised that I would give it further consideration. Now, after having considered what mitigating circumstances I might offer, I have come prepared to make full disclosure, and to plead in "confession and avoidance," after the ancient privilege.

A complete and truthful, though very short, reply to your question would be, that I began the task of writing an index to the book because I felt its need for my personal convenience. As this answer, however, would be undoubtedly followed by the query, "Why did you, a busy man, need it so much as to be willing to undertake the task?" I will not wait for the latter inquiry, but will endeavor to state as many of the reasons as occur to me.

Primarily, every native of Cambridge naturally is, or should be, interested in all the facts of her history. Especially so should be one born upon a spot made doubly historic: first, from being a portion of the hundred-acre estate of Thomas Graves, that remarkable man whom the Massachusetts Bay Colony sent over in 1628 to aid by his genius in establishing the settlements at Charlestown and Boston, and who had occupied it with his family for nearly two years before the settlement about Harvard Square; and second, from being the landing place of the British forces, nearly one hundred and fifty

years later, on their way to Lexington and Concord, as well as being the site of Fort Putnam, constructed by Generals Putnam and Heath under the eye and personal direction of General Washington.

Added to this it is my good fortune to be lineally descended, on both paternal and maternal sides, from founders and early settlers of the "Newe Towne." My father's mother, Betsey Holman, had, for progenitors, Sparhawks, Hastingses, Meanes, Moores, Coopers, and Kidders, whom you will recognize as belonging to families closely connected with the church, civil, and military activities of the town, and who lie, some in the old Garden Street churchyard, and others in that older burial place, outside the "Common Pales," not now definitely located, but thought by Paige to be near to and westerly beyond the corner of Brattle and Ash Streets; and my mother's maternal ancestors reached back to

John Talcot and his son John, who came over in 1632, with the congregation of the Rev. Thomas Hooker, and who, after a few active and important years, the older Talcot being selectman and deputy here, followed Hooker to Hartford and became prominent in the affairs of the Connecticut Colony.

These reasons alone may explain why one might have considerable interest in such a magazine of facts concerning Cambridge history as has been gathered and compiled by Dr. Paige; but it is your wish to know why my interest was so great as to induce me to undertake, unaided, a work of such proportions when official duties were occupying nearly my entire time.

Several things contributed to this. A short time before the History was printed, and about the time Dr. Paige was preparing it for publication, I had some interesting correspondence with the author concerning certain historical facts which I was then engaged in putting into a sketch, and thus I became acquainted with and interested in him as a man as well as a historian. Also, I had been a member of the board of aldermen of Cambridge in 1877, the year when the volume was published, and was appointed by the mayor, together with Mr. George F. Piper, on the special committee to distribute the five hundred copies which, under an order of the previous year, the city had purchased of Dr. Paige.

It may interest you to know, at this point, what led up to the purchase by the city. You may have noticed that the order was

34

passed in the year 1876, the centennial year in United States history, when patriotic emotion was universally awakened. The records of the aldermen for June 21 will show that a communication had been received from the Secretary of the Commonwealth, transmitting a copy of a joint resolution of the United States Congress, requesting the preparation and filing at Washington of an historical sketch of Cambridge from its foundation; and accordingly it was voted that the mayor be authorized and instructed to cause such a sketch to be obtained and a copy transmitted.

It is known that at this time Dr. Paige had nearly completed his history in manuscript; that unaided he did not feel like taking the financial risk of its publication; and also that he preferred to give whatever benefit might arise from its publication to his city before offering it to a publisher. Whether the interest of the Congress was fostered by friends of Dr. Paige, in order to secure the early printing of his work, I have no knowledge. It is, at the least, a coincidence.

On July 26, 1876, there was a communication from the mayor, stating that he had applied to the Rev. Dr. Lucius R. Paige for an historical sketch of Cambridge, as its contribution to the records of "the Centennial," and that he had received a reply, which he transmitted; and stating also that he should delay taking further steps before receiving additional expression of the opinion of the city council.

The correspondence over this is instructive and interesting, and the communication from Dr. Paige reads as follows:

CAMBRIDGE, July 18, 1876.

Hon. ISAAC BRADFORD, Mayor of Cambridge.

DEAR Sir, - In reply to your official note of the 15th instant, permit me to say, that I am using my utmost exertions to complete a history of Cambridge, on which I have long been engaged, and which I hope may be published before the end of this year, as my Centennial offering. But this I suppose will be a much more voluminous work than is contemplated by the vote of the City Council, and would be considered too unwieldy for acceptance even if the manuscript were offered gratuitously. At my age and with imperfect health I have neither time nor strength to abridge this work into the form of an historical sketch, and therefore must decline the task which you invite me to assume.

35

Thereupon the matter was laid upon the table until August 28, when the mayor presented another letter from Dr. Paige, as follows:

DEAR Sir, - Your recent request that I should prepare an historical sketch of Cambridge emboldens me to make this communication. My history of Cambridge is nearly completed. It will make an octavo volume of about 750 pages, and will be put to press as the subscription list will warrant the undertaking. There is now an opportunity for the city to secure a sufficient supply of the history for a sum not greatly exceeding the cost of the proposed sketch, especially if a reasonable compensation to the writer of the sketch be included in the cost. If the city council will subscribe for five hundred copies, I may safely say that the price will not exceed four dollars per copy, neatly and substantially bound in cloth; or, if it subscribes for three hundred copies, the price will not exceed five dollars per copy. You will readily understand why the larger number can be afforded at the lower rates. With five hundred copies at an outlay not exceeding \$2000, the city can probably supply the home demand, and also, by a judicious system of exchange, place in its own library the histories of many other cities and towns not otherwise easy to be obtained.

The matter then was referred to a joint special committee, which reported on October 18, favoring the expenditure of not more than \$2000 for the purchase of five hundred copies, to be placed in the Public Library for distribution under future order. The edition was to be one of a thousand copies, one half of which number Dr. Paige would receive for his years of research and labor.

The correspondence with Dr. Paige and the action of the mayor and city council were familiar to me and had awakened my interest. Returning to my explanation, I would say, further, that, not long after the history had been published, the late Mr. Tillinghast, then our State Librarian, and engaged on his valuable work relating to colonial and provincial officials of our Commonwealth, wrote me for particulars regarding one of my forbears, Ezra McIntire, my father's grandsire, whom he had discovered as a member of the convention which ratified the Constitution of the United States. Unable at the time to give the full particulars which he desired, I began to make search, and became then mildly inspired with an interest in genealogy, and from this was led to make considerable subsequent

research, in which I was greatly aided by facts contained in the compilation of Dr. Paige.

In 1886 I was made city solicitor, holding the position for nearly eight years, and in the performance of my duties as such the assistance rendered by Paige was of inestimable value. It was during those years that I became impressed by the wealth of information which the volume contains; but I was frequently hampered and delayed when, in times of haste, I desired to ascertain some fact of importance. It seemed to me that some one, seeing, as I did, the great value and necessity, would surely undertake the preparation of an index, and gradually the idea crept into my mind that I might make one myself!

While city solicitor, however, I never found favorable opportunity to begin, my days being devoted to active duties, and my evenings to the more quiet consideration and study due to the office; and it was not until after I came into my present position that I thought I might make a beginning by devoting to it evenings and holidays.

Although I realized, before taking up the task, that necessarily many long hours must be devoted to complete it, yet it must be confessed that its actual magnitude appeared only as the work progressed. None of you who has had occasion to use freely the history need be told that it is wonderful how much Dr. Paige has put into that single volume of facts, so clearly stated in precise language and without embellishment. He was seventy-six years old when it was published, and had been many years gathering and arranging every item of importance he could find by careful and diligent search at reliable and original sources. He had no faculty of imagination, no power of constructing a long story out of a few facts; and that he fully realized this is shown when, in introducing his completed work, he naively writes concerning it, that "the almost entire absence of legendary lore may be regretted; but it should be considered that while it may have been my misfortune, it was not my fault that I was not born in Cambridge and that I had no opportunity in the first thirty years of my life to gather the local traditions which so deeply impress the youthful mind, and which tinge the facts of history with such a brilliant, though often a deceptive light."

I commenced the index for my own personal use and comfort,

coupled with a feeling of satisfaction that it might be of assistance also to my family and friends. It was with no intention of publishing that I began, but while engaged upon it, it did occur to me that

possibly, if the effort was a success, at some future time the city might become sufficiently interested to put it in print, for I understood fully the value of such aid to all municipal officers.

In the beginning I took the old-fashioned method of indexing, that is, by means of a blank book with the letters of the alphabet cut in its margin, - and hopefully I supposed that when the labor was completed this book would be my index for use. I labored in this way for some time. After a while, however, finding that the work never could be accomplished successfully on those lines, I relinquished what I had done and commenced anew, using the card system.

The work became more interesting as it progressed, and as its proportions grew and were more definitely indicated, more time was devoted to it, depriving me of necessary rest and exercise. During the entire period I was performing each day my full judicial duty, and, as should have been expected, after continuing for a considerable time, and when about one third of the chapters were indexed, nature rebelled, and, attacked by nervous indigestion, I was ordered away, to cease all work not obligatory, and devote myself to restoring my health. Reluctantly I put away my material, hoping that at some future time I might take it up again and pursue it to completion.

Such, then, is my explanation, and my apology for venturing upon the undertaking; but the story of the index itself needs a few words to bring it down to the present favorable result.

Some time after I had desisted, as I have described, Col. Thomas Wentworth Higginson, who, with the rest of us, had suffered for the want of the index, suggested to Mrs. Mary I. Gozzaldi that the Hannah Winthrop Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, of which she was then Regent, might do a good and patriotic thing by putting its members at work preparing an index to Paige. Neither she nor he at the time had any information of the beginning which had been made by me, and she brought the subject to the attention of the members at a meeting which soon followed. One of my daughters, then a member, informed the

meeting of what had already been accomplished in that direction, saying that I would gladly contribute it. Thereupon the work was taken up with enthusiasm, was divided among a committee of sixteen members, and an advisory committee was appointed outside of their body. Mrs. Gozzaldi took the direction of the task, and with zeal devoted herself unceasingly to its completion, taking for herself the hardest and largest part, the genealogical; and now after nearly seven years from the time of the suggestion made by Colonel Higginson, and after many interruptions, obstacles, and lapses, the almost completed work is in our hands, a monument to the energy of woman. If, as I hope, my effort has relieved the good ladies, who have gone on, undismayed, with so much determination and persistency to the end, of but a small amount of the labor which proved necessary to complete the undertaking, then I am fully requited for the little which I succeeded in accomplishing.

May I add a few closing words about Dr. Paige, who has left us all his debtors for one of the best, if not the best, municipal history ever written? Some of you knew him personally, and others have often seen him upon our streets, about the city hall, and in the banks, where once he had been officially connected. His picture, the frontispiece of the history, is an excellent likeness as he appeared at the time of its publication, and he retained the same appearance, allowing but little for increasing years, to the time of his death, in 1896, in the ninety-fifth year of his age.

Dr. Paige was a man of methodical habits, gentle and genial in manner, easily approached, and ever willing to assist others from his store of knowledge and wealth of manuscript. Behind a serious countenance there lurked a quiet humor, in which he liked to indulge when with friends. He was unpretentious, occupying for his home during most of his life the modest dwelling where he died, at the corner of Washington and Pine Streets. He was ever precise in statement, and in all matters showed the same regard for detail as is manifested in his histories. At the age of ninety his writing remained the same legible, bold, and steady hand which characterized it forty years before.

Last week I examined Dr. Paige's will, which is on the files at my court. Leaving an estate of but moderate amount, as measured in these days, the will disposing of it consists of ten closely written

pages, of foolscap size, copied by his own hand in 1888, and supplemented by four codicils, making in all an instrument of nineteen pages. You may imagine what an interesting document it proves to be, illustrating his character of precision, his fulness of detail, his clear and unmistakable direction, and provision for every possible contingency, as likewise his thoughtfulness, charity, and benevolence.

A very limited synopsis of the will is this: First, a very liberal provision is made for his wife, who survived him ten years and is said to have been his first sweetheart; but at the same time he shows that he does not forget those other wives whom she succeeded. In the very fulness of his usual elaborate detail, when mentioning those whom he wishes to lie with him in his lot at Mt. Auburn, for which he provides perpetual care, he calls by their full names all of his four wives in the exact order of their instalment, the clause reading in part, "for the purpose of securing it as a burial place for myself and my present wife, Ann M. Paige, for my deceased wives, Clarinda R. Paige, Abigail R. W. Paige, and Lucy R. Paige," and so on, naming other persons.

After this provision he gives to many relatives and friends specific small bequests, and is most generous to the town of Hardwick, the place of his birth, which town he makes his residuary legatee, leaving to it, after the death of his widow, all his books, manuscripts, and his many articles of historic and other interest, therein specially named, and providing for the erection of a library building to be called after his family name of Paige.

Tufts College, which gave him his degree of D.D. in 1861, receives, in addition to \$5000, which he had before given, \$2000 for a "Paige" scholarship for Divinity students, and, if Hardwick should decline to accept his gift upon the conditions he prescribes, Tufts should have the books, manuscripts, etc. for its college library.

I regret that this Society cannot have what he describes as the "round maple table, which was a part of my mother's outfit when she was married in 1780, and on which was written a large portion of my Commentary on the New Testament and the Histories of Cambridge and Hardwick"; but I was pleased to find that the will discloses the existence of a bust of him, made by Dexter, which is also given to Hardwick. And I venture to suggest that for a com-

paratively small sum, if not a replica, at least a plaster cast, might be made from this, and placed in our own Library, or elsewhere, in some convenient place, where it may be seen and enjoyed by our Cambridge citizens.

For the third topic of the meeting Professor FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER read a paper on:

HISTORY AND THE LOCAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

This paper, unfortunately, it has not been possible to obtain for publication.

At the conclusion of Professor Turner's paper the meeting was dissolved.

41

THE TWENTY-SECOND MEETING BEING THE SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING

THE TWENTY-SECOND MEETING; being the Seventh Annual Meeting, of THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORICAL SOCIETY was held the twenty-fourth day of October, nineteen hundred and eleven, at a quarter before eight o'clock in the evening, in Emerson Hall, Room J, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

The President, RICHARD HENRY DANA, presided.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved.

The following persons were chosen a committee to consider and report a list of nominations for the officers of the Society for the ensuing year: HOLLIS RUSSELL BAILEY, FRANKLIN PERRIN, and STEPHEN PASCHALL SHARPLES.

On behalf of the Council ARCHIBALD MURRAY HOWE submitted its Annual Report, as follows:

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

FIVE meetings of the Council have been held, the first four at the President's house, 113 Brattle Street, and the fifth at Emerson Hall, Room J, Harvard University.

At the first meeting, January 6, 1911, \$75 were appropriated to secure title and possession of the card Index to Paige's History of Cambridge, prepared by members of the Hannah Winthrop Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and to get a proper copy of the Index, besides the other details to be settled.

At the second meeting, April 6, 1911, the President, Colonel T. W. Higginson as Vice-President, and the Secretary were appointed delegates to attend the banquet of The First Volunteers Citizens'

Association, which was held April 17, 1911, at Memorial Hall. Various committees were chosen to arrange for proper shelving of the Society's collection at the Public Library, to consider additions to the membership, and to consider the expediency of an historical exhibit during the ensuing year, while some changes were made in the membership of the standing committees.

At the third meeting, June 1, 1911, the Council voted to have a memorial meeting in honor of the late Thomas Wentworth Higginson (who died at Cambridge, May 9, 1911), to be held December 21, 1911, the evening before the anniversary of his birth, and a committee of five with full power was appointed. Another committee of three was appointed to assist Mrs. Gozzaldi in the preparation for publication of the Index to Paige's History.

At the fourth meeting, October 6, 1911, arrangements were perfected for the Fall Meeting. The President appointed, as a special committee for the memorial to Colonel Higginson, Messrs. Cook, Bailey, Bell, Thayer, and, by request, himself. The Secretary's resignation was received and accepted.

At the fifth meeting, October 24, 1911, was transacted necessary business preliminary to the Annual Meeting of the Society on the same evening.

Three stated meetings of the Society were held: the first in the Cambridge Latin School, the other two in Emerson Hall, Room J, Harvard University.

At the first meeting, held October 25, 1910, Mrs. Mary Isabella Gozzaldi made the first report of the special committee on the descendants from the early settlers of Cambridge. The chief paper of the evening was entitled "The Adventures of John Nutting, Cambridge Loyalist," by Samuel F. Batchelder, Esq., a most interesting and exhaustive paper, disclosing an almost forgotten incident in pre-Revolutionary history.

At the second meeting, held January 24, 1911, the purchase of the Index to Paige's History was reported as accepted by the Hannah Winthrop Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution. An invitation from Stoughton Bell, Esq., chairman of the Association to celebrate the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Departure of the First Volunteers from Cambridge to the Front, was received and referred to the Council.

Archibald M. Howe, Esq., read a paper on "The Arsenal at Arsenal Square and the Identification of the Cannon on Cambridge Common," exhibiting photographs.

Mr. Charles K. Bolton, as President of the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities, gave a clear account of the aims of the Society, producing pictures of important ancient buildings in Europe and other countries.

Mrs. Mary Isabella Gozzaldi read a paper giving "Some Account of a Few Old Cambridge Houses."

At the third meeting, held April 25, 1911, a communication from the Park Commissioners stated that they had included in their estimates a sum sufficient to make the necessary repairs on the gun carriages on Cambridge Common, which Mr. Howe had referred to as unfit and dangerous.

The President appointed a committee of three, Mrs. Gozzaldi, Miss Elizabeth Harris, and Mrs. R. H. Dana, on the advisability of having an historical loan exhibit during the coming year.

Rev. Dr. Edward H. Hall read a paper on "The Cambridge Humane Society."

Hon. Charles J. McIntire, Judge of Probate for Middlesex County, referred pleasantly to Mr. Hall as chaplain of his regiment in the Civil War, and read a very interesting address entitled "Why I Started the Index to Paige's History of Cambridge."

Prof. Frederick J. Turner followed, giving the Society suggestions as to the value to our fellow citizens not of Anglo-Saxon origin of local historical research made in all places where men have had their beginnings, in our country and among all races of men, that their history may touch more points than are emphasized when we repeatedly return to Plymouth Rock.

During the year past the Society has lost by death four regular members: Eliza Jane Nesmith Bouton, May 20; William Bullard Durant, October 4; Thomas Wentworth Higginson, May 9; John Taylor Gilman Nichols, August 26.

The Longfellow medal for the best essay upon "Home Life in Longfellow's Poetry" was awarded for the year to Miss Elizabeth Chadwick Beale, a pupil and graduate of Miss Constance B. Williston's School.

As each year passes, our members should become more and more

ready to take active part in the doings of the Society, for they should consider how important any genuine historical work may be that presents the true value of the past to all our citizens, many of whom were born in European countries where the beginnings of America are little known, and thousands of whom have no knowledge of our local history and its relation to the best ideals that are maintained to-day.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

IN the Report of the Council has been included, in conformity with precedent, much material that might consistently form part of the Report of the Secretary. His task has accordingly been lessened and limited in its scope to incidental details of the work of the preceding year.

His chief labor has been the preparation for the printer of the annual volume of Proceedings V. The delay in its preparation has been as unusual as unexpected, one early cause being due to the wish of Mr. Samuel F. Batchelder to obtain for his address on "The Adventures of John Nutting, Cambridge Loyalist" verification and amplification of certain data for which he had been obliged to send again to England. This painstaking attention to details is only one of several distinctions which Mr. Batchelder

may justly claim for his address, combining, as it does, exceptional scholarship and research, as shown conspicuously in his elaborate notes and citations, and marked interest and vigor of style.

In the make-up of the new volume of Proceedings it is to be noted that the exhaustion at the Dalton mills of the former issue of paper for the outside cover and the impossibility of exact reproduction have compelled a change of color, that chosen being a delicate bluish gray in place of the older dark olive green. On the score of uniformity for the issue of the whole set of Proceedings this change is a matter of regret, but it has not diminished the attractiveness of the new volume.

Special attention has been given to the development of the part of the Proceedings under the heading Necrology. In this work Mr. William R. Thayer and Mr. Hollis R. Bailey, serving as the

Committee on Memoirs of Deceased Members, were aided chiefly by Mrs. Mary Isabella Gozzaldi and the Secretary. The files of the Society's collection contain the original accounts, of which the printed Necrology consists, in most instances, of abstracts. In this field of the activities of the Society there will always be important work to do, for the Society includes in its membership men and women of note in the community, the record of whose lives ought to be written as soon as possible after their deaths, and placed on file for convenient reference at all times.

The award of the Longfellow Prize Medal for the best essay of this year, the topic being "Home Life in Longfellow's Poems," was attended by circumstances of peculiar interest, especially in consideration of the fact that the meeting in Miss Willard's School on Berkeley Street, where the award was made, was the last in which the late Colonel Higginson appeared in public. In his own inimitable manner, which at the same time showed conscious effort, he spoke to the pupils of the school and to a few others present, including several members of the Council of the Society, about his own association with the Longfellow home, in amplification of the topic of the award; and at the end he presented to the winner of the Prize Medal, Miss Elizabeth Chadwick Beale, a mounted group of photographs of the poet taken at different ages, which he had kept by him for many years. Mr. Thayer, as chairman of the Committee on the award of the Prize Medal, presided, and Mr. Dana, as President of the Society, spoke feelingly of the perfect harmony and beauty of the home life of Longfellow, of which the speaker's own intimate relationship with the family gave full knowledge.

As time goes on, the duties devolving upon the Secretary of the Society promise a steady increase; and it behooves the members of the Society as a whole, and the Council in particular, to see to it that the Secretary, whether or not he is to serve voluntarily and without compensation, shall be given all possible aid, through active co-operation of the regular standing committees, and of new committees for special occasions as they may arise.

CLARENCE WALTER AYER

Secretary

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., October 24, 1911

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CURATOR

THE additions to the collection of the Society have been few. The number of bound volumes is 163, and the increase for the past year 28; the number of pamphlets and unbound issues is 820, and the increase 61. The card catalogue has easily been kept up to date, and the work upon it and upon the last volume of the Proceedings has been done, as before, by Miss Ella S. Wood.

Among the gifts to the Society have been the following: from Archibald M. Howe, Esq., a series of photographs of the Cambridge Arsenal and the cannon on the Common, which he had prepared in connection with his Address for the Society thereupon, and also a number of books and magazines, including a partial set of the Harvard Graduates' Magazine, which was made complete, from October, 1892, to June, 1911, vols. 1-19, by a supply of missing numbers from duplicates given by the Cambridge Public Library; from Miss Susanna Willard, 37 manuscript sermons of the Rev. Joseph Willard; and from Mr. George Howland Cox, a framed page of a Vicksburg, Mississippi, newspaper, printed on the back of a piece of wall paper, July 2, 1863.

In the last annual report of the Curator was given an outline of the arrangement of the Society's collection, to which attention is here called. Its location, as now made in part of a spare room on the second floor of the Public Library, is obviously unsatisfactory, but its material can be readily consulted. The lapse of one more year only makes the need of adequate quarters for the collection by so much the more pressing, and opens still wider the opportunity for some generous benefactor to present the Society with a new building, conveniently located and suitably equipped.

CLARENCE WALTER AYER

Curator

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., October 24, 1911

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE TREASURER

IN obedience to the requirements of the By-Laws the Treasurer herewith presents his Annual Report of the Receipts and Disbursements for the year 1910-1911.

47

CASH ACCOUNT
RECEIPTS

Balance, 25 October, 1910 -----			\$228.46
Admission Fees -----		\$4.00	
Annual Assessments	Regular Members ---	\$519.00	
	Associate Members --	18.00	537.00
Commutation of the Annual Dues:			
Two Regular Members -----		100.00	
Interest -----		11.18	
Society's Publications sold -----		4.80	\$656.98
			\$885.44

EXPENDITURES

The University Press, printing bills, etc.	\$9.00	
Bureau of Printing and Engraving, printing notices and postal cards	19.50	
The Colonial Society of Massachusetts, paper used in printing Publications IV	28.22	
Hannah Winthrop Chapter D. A. R., card Index of Paige's History of Cambridge	50.00	
Harriet L. Horne, clerical services rendered the Treasurer	25.00	
Edna M. Bullard, stenography and typewriting	10.73	
Sarah L. Patrick, typewriting	8.50	
Thomas F. Cahir, janitor service	3.00	
Postage	17.00	\$170.95
Cataloguing the Collections:		
Ella Sites Wood, services	\$33.25	

Library Bureau, index cards	1.50	34.75
General Fund, Commutation Fees received during the year		100.00
Balance on deposit 20 October 1911		579.74
		\$885.44

The unusually large balance of cash on hand is accounted for by the fact that the Committee of Publication has been unavoidably delayed in getting out the Transactions for the past year, hence the bill for this number has not yet been received.

HENRY H. EDES

Treasurer

CAMBRIDGE, October 20, 1911

48

REPORT OF THE AUDITOR

I FIND the foregoing account from 25 October, 1910, to 20 October, 1911, to have been correctly kept and to be properly vouched.

I have also verified the Cash Balance of \$579.74.

A. McF. DAVIS

Auditor

The report of the Committee on Nominations was read and accepted and the Committee was discharged.

The following persons, nominated by the Committee, were elected by ballot for the ensuing year:

The Council

CLARENCE WALTER AYER,

MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI,

HOLLIS RUSSELL BAILEY,

EDWARD HENRY HALL,

FRANK GAYLORD COOK,

ARCHIBALD MURRAY HOWE,

RICHARD HENRY DANA,

WILLIAM COOLIDGE LANE,

ANDREW McFARLAND DAVIS,

ALICE MARY LONGFELLOW,

ARTHUR DRINKWATER,

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER.

HENRY HERBERT EDES,

President

RICHARD HENRY DANA.

Vice-Presidents

ANDREW McFARLAND DAVIS,
EDWARD HENRY HALL, ARCHIBALD
MURRAY HOWE.

Secretary

ARTHUR DRINKWATER.

Curator

CLARENCE WALTER AYER.

Treasurer

HENRY HERBERT EDES.

The SECRETARY-ELECT was duly sworn.

49

For the first topic of the meeting Rev. GEORGE HODGES, D.D., read the following paper:

MARY HUNTINGTON COOKE

MARY HUNTINGTON COOKE was born in Lowell, Massachusetts, in 1833, on the third day of September. She was married to Professor Josiah Parsons Cooke, in 1860, from the same house in

49

which she was born. She died on the twenty-first of May, 1911, in her seventy-eighth year.

In a privately printed sketch of the early years of her distinguished brother, Dr. William Reed Huntington, Mrs. Cooke described the character and public service of their father:

"Dr. Elisha Huntington came to Lowell when it was a very small town, about the year 1826. He was a young physician, fresh from the Yale Medical School, and began practice at once. One of the first evidences of his unselfishness, which was one of his main characteristics, was in the very early days of his residence there. A stranger was attacked with virulent smallpox, and as there was no provision in Lowell for such a case, he placed him in a deserted house on the outskirts of the town. No man was willing to go to the sick man, in dread of the disease. Dr. Huntington at once offered his services, and quarantined himself, sharing the man's solitude, and caring for him throughout his sickness.

"His medical services were always very welcome, and he was always ready to give to the poor and afflicted, being singularly indifferent to any compensation for his services; and by his generosity and kindness he won St. Luke's name of the Beloved Physician. He was also President of the Massachusetts Medical Society.

"At the time of his death the whole city was in mourning.

"He rendered great service to Lowell, after it became a city, by serving several terms as mayor, in spite of the encroachment upon his medical work. He gave the city the best of his powers. Whenever it was rent and disturbed by political troubles, the people always turned to him as a last resort.... He served as Lieutenant-Governor of Massachusetts with Governor Clifford, and was very much interested in the State Prison work. Those were the days before the Associated Charities and the new views of political economy, and the only thing brought up against him by his enemies when he was candidate for mayor, was that he was too good to the poor. Owing to his life of charity and sacrifice, he died a poor man, leaving behind him a blessed memory."

Occasional references in this tribute of affection reveal the mother as a "gentle and loving spirit," not strong in body, but strong in character, and a constant inspiration to her children. She had the gift of cheerfulness, and never permitted the ills of life to "shadow the sunshine of her nature." In this she was helped by a devout faith. She brought her children with her into the privileges of religion.

Out of this home, where the service of God and of man was taught by continual example, Mary Huntington brought qualities which determined her life. She combined her father's concern for the common welfare with her mother's capacity for happiness. She knew how to take life seriously, but not too seriously. She did good instinctively, and was simply and naturally religious. She had the fine quality which appears in Holy Scripture, and disappears for a long time in the Middle Ages, and at last encounters the disapproval of the Puritans,- the quality of being a saint and of being "merry and joyful" notwithstanding.

Her marriage with Professor Cooke developed all these pleasant virtues. He was not only an eminent man of science, a pioneer of modern chemistry, and one of the glories of Harvard College, but he was "one of the first professors to take a vital interest in the students in a social way." He liked to have them about him. Groups of them came to tea on Sunday evenings, and read and talked with him, and before they went home family prayers were said.

Mrs. Cooke found in Cambridge an association with an old-fashioned name, and a long and honorable history, called the Female Humane Society. Its work of relieving the needs of the poor appealed to her, and she joined it. Its endeavors to supply the distressed with food and coal and clothing seemed to her in line with the philanthropy of her father. She particularly interested herself in that part of the service of the Society which provided sewing for poor women. At the beginning of this enterprise the women had to be taught to sew, and after that instruction had been effectively given the managers still cut out the clothing for them. The women took it home, and brought it back completed, and it was then sold - to the women, if they wished to buy it, at an annual sale opened to all purchasers. With the money from such sales, increased by private subscriptions, the material was provided and the women were paid for their work. They were thus given employment, and were enabled to buy garments at small cost. Every week Mrs. Cooke and her associates spent hours cutting out these garments, and sometimes as many as a hundred women came to take them home.

This work prepared Mrs. Cooke to take an understanding inter-

est in the establishment of the Associated Charities, in 1881, and she became one of the vice-presidents of that organization.

She was made almoner of several charitable funds, which she personally administered. She visited the beneficiaries in their homes, helped them out of their troubles, and gave them not only alms and good advice but sincere friendship, and had their devoted attachment in return. She cared much for the little gifts which some of them sent her at Christmas time, sometimes queer, sometimes pathetic, but always evidences of strong affection.

The Missionary Society of the ladies of the congregation of St. John's Memorial Chapel held its monthly meeting at her house, and she gave to its activities a generous measure of her time and energy.

When her nephew, Dr. Oliver Huntington, started Cloyne School for boys, at Newport, Rhode Island, Mrs. Cooke took a deep and helpful interest in that undertaking. One of her many gifts was an infirmary completely filled with all necessaries for the comfort and recovery of sick boys.

She interested herself greatly in the work of the Cambridge Hospital, and at the time of her death was president of its Women's Aid Association.

In 1878, when the first steps were definitely taken towards the establishment of Radcliffe College, Mrs. Cooke was one of the seven ladies who constituted a "committee" to bring the matter to the attention of the public. The others were Mrs. Gilman, Mrs. Greenough, Miss Longfellow, Miss Horsford (now Mrs. Farlow), Mrs. Agassiz, and Mrs. Gurney. Her wisdom and vision and counsel contributed to make that experiment an assured and increasing success. She never ceased to concern herself helpfully with its affairs. Into this also she brought that friendly care for the individual which was characteristic of her. She interested herself not only in the College but in the students.

She had a genius for friendship, and a singular memory for the details of people's lives. She remembered anniversaries, and knew the names of children, and kept the domestic affairs of her friends so accurately in mind that she seemed a member of their own family. She was sister and aunt and foster mother to a hundred people.

Thus she lived her useful life, quietly and busily, keeping her left

52

hand in ignorance of the good deeds of her right, sustained in pain and trouble by the strength of religion, and making the world more pleasant every day for those about her.

53

For the second topic of the meeting Professor LEWIS JEROME JOHNSON made the following address:

HISTORY AND MEANING OF THE PROPOSED NEW CHARTER FOR CAMBRIDGE

MR. PRESIDENT, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am afraid I may have to offer the history and meaning of the proposed new Cambridge charter in a somewhat intertwined form; there will be some "history" and I hope some "meaning." I think possibly, however, they will run along together without confusion.

The history of the Cambridge charter might include the history of the democratic movement in government which has been going on for centuries. But I am sure that I shall have your approval if I skip these centuries and come down at once to the last decade, and even perhaps to the last two years. In the last ten years most significant progress has been made in devising means for improving American city government. The last decade is, in fact, the most interesting one in our history in this

respect. It is gratifying to us who love our old Massachusetts traditions that this decade seems to be making effective the hopes and aspirations which we in Massachusetts have held for generations. It is gratifying to be able to reflect that our purposes and ideals have been correct all the time and that defective details in the machinery account in the main for not securing the ends desired. From the experience of the last two decades, and of the last decade particularly, we have learned how to correct some of the worst of these mistakes. This seems particularly clear to me because it falls within the line of my profession, that of an engineer. Our purpose was fine, but defects in details have become evident. What to do seems clear.

These four lines from the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of Massachusetts, adopted a century and a third ago, express in a few words, which cannot be bettered to-day, what our purpose was and I believe is still:

53

"ART. VII. Government is instituted for the common good; for the protection, safety, prosperity, and happiness of the people; and not for the profit, honor, or private interest of anyone man, family, or class of men."

But the private interests of various men have found numerous ways to creep in and gain precedence in government - in cities and States and in the nation. They have entrenched themselves in the institutions set up to keep them in check. What was worked out - the checks and balances, and all the rest - was a system which conceivably might work if economic conditions never put temptations in men's way and if various other things were so which are not. But, be that as it may, it is a system which has notoriously failed to produce the desired results, particularly in our cities. One of our chief national causes for disappointment has been the government of our cities, but to-day we think we see pretty good reasons why that failure has occurred. In my opinion, we started by misunderstanding the nature of the city problem. We have been firm in the faith that our form of city government must be in the main correct because it involves the federal form of checks and balances, the Montesquieu fetich, fascination with which was one of the worst of the fathers' errors. Open to grave question as this principle is in general, it is particularly unsuited to city organization. For city government is mainly executive, and efficiency, simplicity, and responsiveness to the public will would seem obviously to be prime requisites. But, unfortunately, as our cities developed, we thoughtlessly applied to them the federal form of government. Results were bad. For decades we contented ourselves by scolding our good citizens because they did not make this old arrangement work. We assumed that if anything of so respectable an origin did not work some person must be to blame. We see, however, that something else must be done. We are coming to see that it is but a waste of time and energy trying to beseech and scold our best citizens into jumping to the task of making the venerable system work. It might work, I admit, if everybody were a sort of Columbus for daring, and a St. Thomas for self-abnegation. But our citizens are not all of such a type. Meanwhile the same old system has gone right on doing its harm.

In order to start the American citizen straight on this thing, it

54

required a physical catastrophe of appalling magnitude. When the waters had subsided from a devastated city, the people of Galveston saw that something both intelligent and radical had to be done. The politicians stepped aside at once. They said, " While ordinary conditions suit our purposes finely, heaven knows there is nothing in this situation for us; we surrender." So there was appointed a commission of five men to succeed them, violating tradition after tradition, and discarding particularly those happy havens for inefficiency and corruption, the double chamber system and divided powers. These results were so good that the neighboring city of Houston said, "Well, if that thing works so well in the wrecked city of Galveston, why can it not work well in a city that is not yet destroyed? " and so they followed suit in Houston, and so it has gone on from those beginnings right through the country. The form of city government which has constantly and persistently been getting American cities into trouble is clearly doomed. We shall doubtless have a wide range of experiments in the search for improvement, but it looks as if it would be pretty hard to get far away from the so-called commission form.

The Galveston charter discarded the old form, root and branch, and put all the powers of the city into the hands of a single board of five responsible persons, elected at large, and thus established concentration of power and responsibility. That was an enormous stride forward. From the point of view of efficiency, it covered the ground. It also attained simplicity.

Now, the spread of this sort of thing throughout the country was greatly hastened by the work of Des Moines, There they retained the simplicity and efficiency of the Galveston form, but added a new, though, for permanently good results, probably indispensable feature, the power of direct popular control of the commission through the Initiative and Referendum and Recall. This gives what should be an effective means of controlling the city business, however the officers may be elected. In Galveston the way it has worked out, the publicity and conspicuousness attending all that these five men do, has been such as to produce admirable results. In Des Moines they not only have all that, but have secured more; they have the Initiative, by which the people can pass a measure over the head of the council; the Referendum, by which the people

can, by popular vote, veto an act of the city council; and the Recall, whereby the people can remove a commissioner from office before the expiration of his term.

Now, that Des Moines charter was adopted in 1907 and went into effect in 1908. The germination of the seed that was planted in Galveston in 1901 had been comparatively slow; the growth was bound to come, but other cities were getting the news and beginning to think. The word came to Cambridge and this vicinity largely through President Eliot. He, as some of you will recollect, returning from a trip that he had been making among the Texas cities, told of the marvelous results that had been obtained, principally in Houston. He reported asking one of the commissioners how they could build all those schoolhouses and build all those streets, and all that without a bond issue and with a reduction in the tax rate. The commissioner's reply, " We are getting a dollar's worth of government for each dollar's worth of taxes collected," arrested attention. This kind of news was being carried elsewhere and was taking effect. The spread of the commission form of government then began in earnest, and became so rapid, and is now so rapid, that we do not hope to keep the literature for our charter campaign up to date; it is changing so fast that I think our latest literature is already

somewhat behind the times. This movement progresses in spite of the combined opposition, generally, of the political machines of both parties and of all the other special interests that profit by a bad city government. There are those in a community who like to have the city administration run with a little favoritism here and there, and sometimes with a great deal of favoritism. They naturally make a point of standing ill with the political machines of both parties.

Fine as the results had already been, and high as was the perfection in form after the Des Moines contribution, it seemed clear that it would do no harm for us in Cambridge to bide our time for a while. Better things still were likely to develop.

Two years ago, the little city of Grand Junction in Colorado had scarcely been heard of; but, like many another small place, it was destined to have a marked effect on the thought and practice of men. Two years ago, Grand Junction adopted a new charter of the commission sort, including all the good features of the Des

Moines plan, but introduced a new system of electing officers - an attractive system of preferential voting. This seemed to certain citizens of Cambridge to be the capsheaf, so to speak, of the developing form of city charter. It then looked to them as if energy, experience, and political genius had developed what we might safely assume to be the standard modern form of American city charter. It looked then as if we might assume that the type of construction best adapted for the purpose, so far as our experience would permit it, had been worked out; and the question at once arose, Would it not be a pretty good thing to give the citizens of Cambridge an opportunity to adopt an up-to-date charter of this kind? It was in the fall of 1909 that that form of election was developed and tested. The previous lack of so important an improvement was no doubt the reason why the Cambridge commission charter movement had not developed before. The appearance of preferential voting is, at all events, the main cause for this charter's coming up at this time, and since it is the greatest novelty of the charter, perhaps it will be appropriate for me to devote special attention to it.

There seems to be universal agreement that the proper method of nomination is by non-partisan petition of a moderate number of voters - the number of signatures put as low as possible consistent with decorum. The idea is to give unorganized bodies of voters the least possible difficulty in putting a favorite in nomination. This allows the nominations to be perfectly free and open to any candidate for whom there could be any hope of election. In Los Angeles one hundred signatures secure a nomination; in Spokane, twenty-five; in Des Moines, twenty-five; in Lynn and Haverhill, twenty-five; in fact, twenty-five is the usual figure. This results at once in the nomination of a large number of candidates; then the dilemma to settle is, which candidates should win? Obviously it would not do to let all of these candidates go on the ballot, and leave it in the usual way for a plurality, which might, after all, be only a small fraction of the voters, to decide the issue. Such a decision might or might not be acceptable or endurable to the majority. When a candidate is elected by a minority, nobody knows whether he is on the whole the preference of the majority or not. Mayor Barry, for example, at the last election had less than half the votes cast for mayor. His vote, though a plurality, was a minority,

his two opponents having together more votes than he. The same is true of Mayor Fitzgerald of Boston. He had 47,172 votes; his three opponents together, 48,184. A more striking illustration of the absurdity of the old system occurred in a recent election in Salem, when Mayor Howard was elected by 1800 votes out of a total of 7200. There were five candidates, the vote was close, and 1800 sufficed for a plurality and an election. Nobody knew whether Mayor Howard was the man the citizens of Salem wanted or not. To win by this system one need only to be the favorite of the largest single group or organization. Nothing could be more dangerous. We have hitherto striven against this danger, and by one arbitrary means or another kept the number of nominees low- a practice directly in violation of the cardinal democratic principle of readily secured nominations and a wide choice for the electorate. The excessive number of 5000 signatures required in Boston arose no doubt partly from the fancied necessity of keeping its number of nominees down. Setting the required number of signatures low forced a radical change in practice. The expected, desired, and resulting large number of nominees made it absolutely necessary.

So what they did in Des Moines was to resort to the system of double elections, long familiar in western Europe, -to have two elections instead of one, - a primary and a final election, each requiring an election day. At the primary election the names of all the candidates appear on the ballot, arranged alphabetically or by lot, and each voter puts a cross after the name of his first choice for an office. The two highest candidates then appear on the final ballot some days or weeks later, all the rest having been dropped, and the voters are forced to choose between these two. This is the plurality system, thinly disguised, with a great premium on organization and machine work.

In Grand Junction they said: "What is the use of two elections? Cannot we manage this with one election and do it a great deal more neatly and safely, besides? We will arrange it so that the voter can mark not only his first and second choice for anyone office, but as many" other choices" as he likes. This will enable the voter to support everyone of perhaps a large number of good candidates, as against the machine or undesirable candidates. It will also destroy largely or entirely the great advantage long en-

BALLOT ILLUSTRATING PREFERENTIAL VOTING
As Embodied in the Proposed New Charter for Cambridge, Mass.

INSTRUCTIONS.— To vote for a candidate make a cross (X) in the appropriate space.

Vote your FIRST choice in the FIRST column.

Vote your SECOND choice in the SECOND column.

Vote ONLY ONE FIRST choice and ONLY ONE SECOND choice for any one office.

Vote in the THIRD column for ALL THE OTHER CANDIDATES whom you wish to support.

DO NOT VOTE MORE THAN ONE CHOICE FOR ONE PERSON, as only one choice will count for any candidate.

If you wrongly mark, tear or deface this ballot, return it and obtain another.

ONE MAN TO BE ELECTED FOR EACH OFFICE

Supervisor of Administration (Mayor)	First Choice	Second Choice	Other Choices	Supervisor of Public Works	First Choice	Second Choice	Other Choices
Charles E. Hughes				Guy C. Emerson			
Champ Clark				John Mitchell			
John A. O'Gorman				Stephen O'Meara			
Nelson W. Aldrich							
Richard Croker				Supervisor of Health			
Robert L. Owen				H. W. Wiley			
William H. Taft							
Joseph W. Folk				Supervisor of Public Property			
Robert M. LaFollette				Gifford Pinchot			
Woodrow Wilson				Richard A. Ballinger			
William J. Bryan							
Chauncey M. Depew							
Theodore Roosevelt							
Supervisor of Finance							
Bourke Cockran							
Leslie B. Shaw							
John A. Sullivan							
Nathan Matthews							

joyed by the machine, and, moreover, eliminate the objection to a large number of candidates."

The sample ballot (page 59) which has been distributed shows how the ballot would actually look.

Now, this method of election not only does away with primaries, but it does a number of things besides. It means that a man may accept nomination for office without there being incumbent upon him the necessity for spending money, without even making a speech if he does not want to. Now we well know that some of the most desirable candidates, particularly for city office, are not speech-makers and cannot or do not wish to spend money, and above all things do not wish to put themselves in the position of having their motives misunderstood or misrepresented, or go out asking for votes. Under this ballot a large number of nominees appear, and it is of no consequence, presumably, that any particular one should win. It is important only that some one of the right type should win. Under the old system the candidate's failure is his party's failure, something supposed by his supporters to bring great disappointment and harm. The new system eliminates that excess of strain and responsibility upon the candidate. No one man is singled out as a target for abuse or mud-slinging, unless, at least, the case against him is pretty strong. In fact, the incentive is the other way. Unnecessary offense to voters whose second or other choice votes, if not first, are being angled for, is obviously to be avoided. In short, it goes a long way toward solving the problem of making standing for office attractive to the right kind of citizens, whom we have found it hitherto hard to attract.

Another thing that this ballot does will be a relief to the much berated element which has ideals, conscientious scruples, and differences of opinion which lead to splits and which handicap thorn so severely in any effort against unscrupulous solidarity. It enables any body of voters automatically, quietly, and painlessly to get together behind some candidate more or less perfectly representing the general views of that group. It practically eliminates the danger, usually fatal, of a split ticket, avoided readily enough by steam-roller methods of a machine, but not so easily avoided by people with scruples, self-respect, and pride.

Now those who feel hopeful of getting decent city government in this country base their hope on the faith that those who want the city

run right are in the majority, divided usually, however, into hostile camps by party lines based on nothing more important than which of two factions shall hold the city jobs and hand out the city favors. Now, if we can eliminate the false party issue and get the majority of the city together, as has been found possible in other cities, we shall have accomplished a great thing. With this ballot the number of candidates may be large and include plenty of the best of all parties or no party, and in this way somebody satisfactory to the majority is sure to win if there is anybody in the list who is sufficiently well and favorably known to secure the support of the majority; and if there is not, we get the next best thing, and the best possible with that list of nominees; that is, the candidate who among all the others commands the largest following after a free and full expression of choice by the voters. The voter, no longer limited to one choice, no longer has to treat all other acceptable candidates just as he does the most objectionable men in the list. Thus, numerous candidates will no longer split up the votes of a majority and contribute to the election of a plurality man who is earnestly opposed by the majority. With the proposed ballot each voter may vote for as many of the nominees as he likes and a plurality election cannot be obtained in defiance of the wishes of the majority, unless all the candidates are objectionable.

The ballot that has been handed around has on it the names of thirteen candidates for mayor. I will improvise a ballot here to show how the marking is done.

For Mayor	First Choice	Second Choice	Other Choices
Smith			X
Doe	X		
Mason			
Sikes			
Roe			X
Asquith			
Jones		X	
Robinson			X

I suppose there is a list of eight candidates as shown. The arrangement of names is, as prescribed by the proposed charter, by lot, and not alphabetically.

The voter's task is this: He notes the name of candidate Doe, whom he prefers on the whole to any of the others. So he votes a first choice for him by putting a cross in the first column after his name. Then, being one of the right kind of citizen, conscientious and devoted to the good of the city, he looks further and notes that there are other good men nominated : that if Doe should not win there would be no calamity. Jones is a good, satisfactory sort of man. He would put him next. So he votes a second choice for Jones by putting a cross in the second column after his name. Then there are Robinson, Smith, and Roc. They are also competent and acceptable men. He does not want to vote against them, and so he votes an "other choice" for each of them by marking for them in the third column. Note that he is not facing the usually impossible task of grading them in the order of his preference. This ballot makes it as easy as possible to vote for all his kind of candidates. There may be only one or two thoroughly objectionable candidates, and they should be thoroughly voted against by all the majority voters supporting all the majority type of candidate. The way it is likely to be is this: The boss knows very well that strength in the campaign does not lie in a multiplicity of nominees for the same office, and he therefore will very likely be successful in keeping candidates among his faithful down to one or two. A rival boss or two may put in candidates. The clientele of such candidates are likely to bullet- to vote for their own men and no others - and split the selfish vote. The grafter is likely to want one candidate and no other, for personal reasons, and so will vote no second or other choices for fear of beating his first choice. The other element are met by no such dilemma. They should mark freely for all good candidates, and their victory is doubly assured - by being probably in a majority anyway, and by facing a factionally and selfishly divided enemy. Here is the opportunity for self-respecting, conscientious persons to get together in such a way as to save the

votes of each and everyone of them. When the votes are counted, they may find to their surprise, as in Grand Junction, that for the first time

in the memory of men they have won, and deservedly. If you will look at the little slip which has been passed around, you will see how it worked out. The slip runs as follows:

PRACTICAL WORKING OF PREFERENTIAL VOTING						
GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO, NOVEMBER 2, 1909						
Total number of ballots cast	1,847
Necessary for a majority	924
RESULT OF THE VOTES FOR MAYOR						
		1st Choice	2d Choice	Other Choices	Combined 1st's and 2d's	Combined 1st's, 2d's, Others
D. W. Aupperle	.	465	143	145	608	753
* W. H. Bannister	.	603	93	43	696	739
N. A. Lough	.	99	231	328	330	658
* E. B. Lutes	.	41	114	88	155	243
E. M. Slocomb	.	229	357	326	586	912
Thomas M. Todd (Elected)	.	362	293	396	655	1,051
		<u>1,799</u>	<u>1,231</u>	<u>1,326</u>		

The two starred candidates for mayor, Bannister and Lutes, represented factions of the reactionary interests against whom the new charter was aimed, the former being the strong candidate of that sort. The progressive opposition was divided and put up four candidates for the place. The situation was much the same as in the first election under the new Boston charter - with the striking difference that out there, Bannister, the Fitzgerald of that situation, did not get elected, as the result of the divided opposition, or otherwise. There were 1847 votes cast, and in order to win this election a person must have a majority (924) in first choices; or, failing that, must have the highest number of firsts and seconds combined, provided it is a majority; and failing that, the one getting the highest total of all choices would win. The thoroughly objectionable candidate led in first choices, as was to be expected under the circumstances, and under our Massachusetts way of doing things, he would have been regarded the winner. But, as the figures show, he had only a few over a third of the voters behind him. The vote was nearly two to one against him.

Still I find it very difficult to make Cambridge politicians see why Bannister should not win. They not unnaturally profess to feel outraged that so strong a candidate was not seated. You will see that his

opposition of about 1150 voters were simply divided into three or four camps, but, thanks to the form of election, they suffered no penalty and secured a mayor acceptable to them, with two other candidates leading their arch enemy Bannister.

To be more precise at this important point, and at the risk of repeating to a slight extent for the sake of perfect clearness, I wish to add the following few comments on that election.

The starred men were the anti-charter and minority candidates; the others the pro-charter and majority candidates.

Omitting reference to the Grand Junction practice of "dropping the low man," - an unessential complication, not likely to be widely adopted, and without influence on this result, - the decision was drawn from the foregoing figures as follows:

There being no majority in First Choices, the Firsts and Seconds were added together. Then the leading candidate, Bannister, provided he had had a majority, would have won.

There being no majority by combined Firsts and Seconds, the First, Second and Other Choices were added together, and Todd, the candidate then leading, won.

Under the usual system the minority would have beaten the majority and elected Bannister.

Under the Berkeley, Des Moines, Haverhill, or Lynn plan, that of second elections, there would have resulted a bitter contest between Aupperle and Bannister, and a forced choice between two candidates, neither of whom had a majority of the people behind him. Moreover the practical certainty of having to go through such a campaign in order to be elected may well deter most men of the desirable sort from accepting a nomination. Such an ordeal is no legitimate test of fitness for office. It has few terrors for the cheap self-seeker, but does deter the candidates we need. It is one of the great evils of our old style politics from which the system of second elections does not free us, but which the preferential system in great measure, at least, destroys.

One of the features of all our charter meetings is to hold a mock election which shows exactly how this new system of election

works. When this method of voting was first proposed, we used to hear occasional remarks about its being complicated. At the suggestion of a lady much interested in the charter, it was proposed that we make a practice from the start of giving the voters an opportunity actually to vote such a ballot. This had the expected effect. No talk of the ballot being complicated ever comes from a voter who has had a chance to try it. The only opposition left is that readily ascribable to a firm belief that it would actually work as intended. In other words, the opposition is now confined to the machine politicians, and those in their train. Even they make little effort to make it appear that it is complicated.

You will now be given an opportunity to hold such a mock election, using the ballots which have been distributed. One vote in the first column for first choice; one vote in the second column for second choice. You are not compelled to vote against your second and other choices, as under the present system. With only one vote you have to treat all but your first choice - good, bad, and indifferent - alike"; and under the new system of nominations there may be a dozen in the running for whom you

would be prouder to vote than any that come up under the present system. This ballot enables a voter to vote for all candidates of an acceptable type and against all candidates of other types, and thus, with the direct nomination power, for the first time to express him- self satisfactorily at the polls. All this ought to help to arouse interest in politics among those who have lost it, or who, for better reason than they were aware of, never could get interested.

Will you please mark your ballots ?

If the ballots are ready and if you will be good enough to pass them to the aisles they will be collected and counted. It will not take very long to produce the results.¹

We observe that the prime reason that the public will has not prevailed in our cities is because selfish interests have succeeded in getting in between the people and their business. Those minor interests generally operate through the political party machine. Now the machine is a necessity under our cumbersome system.

¹ The result of this mock election was soon reached by tellers and announced to the audience. The result was of no permanent value and so is not recorded, but the experiment appeared to give complete satisfaction to the meeting.

The traditional ramshackle form of government could not be run without it. But its largely irresponsible character, its great power, and its need for money make it a tempting mark and in many cases an easy prey for those who find cash returns in making the city government serve their private ends to the injury of the mass of citizens.

To correct this kind of evil the system of nomination above de- scribed goes a long way. The elimination of the party label helps also. Together they go far to destroy monopoly of nominations. The preferential ballot strikes at the likelihood of electing such candidates as the machines put on the ballot, and brings into the field against them citizens of a type whom it _was perfectly unreasonable to ask to run under the old system.

To back up all this the short ballot principle is introduced. This greatly aids the voter, and still further works against the machine system. The idea on which the short ballot is based is to fill by popular election so few offices and only such important and conspicuous ones as will get and hold the critical interest of the voter. The five supervisors proposed in this charter, in place of the thirty-four now chosen by popular vote to do the same work, fall in with this principle - and this point is much intensified by the fact that they go out of office only one or two per year, leaving only one or two to be elected in anyone year, and, including the school committee, only three to four city offices to be filled by the voters in anyone year. The ballots as passed around, calling for the filling of all five supervisors at one election, would appear only at the first election under the charter.

Under the proposed charter, five supervisors replace the mayor, board of aldermen, and common council- thirty-four men in all-- and have all the executive and legislative powers of the city, save such as are reserved to the school committee and the people them- selves, as I will explain later. Any fifty

citizens can put on the ballot the name of the candidate acceptable to them, and he accepts the nomination on just as good terms as any body of politicians can confer. There is no party label to float the nominees into power in the face of incompetence, previous obscurity, or bad record.

All this puts the government right into the hands of the people,

66

with fair hope of success. With men in positions of great publicity, the opportunity to get credit for good work is a powerful incentive. The spirit of this modern democratic movement is that human nature is pretty sure to be sound, but that it should be given at least half a chance. If we put these carefully selected men in a position of power, where the good they do will be appreciated and credited to the right ones, we shall get good results. There is an opportunity for good to be done, some of it long neglected, in any city. Cambridge is no exception.

Then, under the proposed charter, the people themselves are given power, if anything seriously objectionable happens or is threatened, to step in and exert direct control of their business, through the Initiative, Referendum, and Recall. These are the best means that have been devised for such emergency work, and they have already done great service in this country and elsewhere. They furnish the means for final and effective control that the public requires for its safety.

Then we provide a reasonably long term for these supervisors, three years, in which a man can learn his business and work out and execute a policy. We propose to pay a salary large enough so that men of the type generally believed to be capable of doing this work could at least live on it. Then, by this system of elections, by which a man can take a nomination with a minimum of risk to peace of mind, pocket, or reputation, we could hope to get the right kind of man into office. We have given them great power to do desirable things, and the least possible power to do un-desirable things. We have arranged it so that credit would go to whom credit is due. We have arranged it so that the government and the citizens shall be in the closest possible relations, so that citizens 'with right purposes can be of the greatest possible effectiveness with the least possible sacrifice. This will train the citizens to increasing efficiency, and make good results permanent, and in large degree self-sustaining.

In this charter we have brought together all the best features of work of the last decade of American city charter making, carefully adapted to Cambridge and Massachusetts conditions.

We have in this charter these characteristics which have been productive of nothing but success so far in this country, and it is

67

believed that they are sound principles, namely, simplicity, concentration of authority and responsibility, and responsiveness to the public will.

At this point it seems appropriate to record the names of the four others included with the speaker in the group of five who took it upon themselves to prepare the original draft of the charter and

introduce it into the legislature in the session of 1910. They were Lawrence G. Brooks, Arthur N. Holcombe, John R. Nichols, and Russell A. Wood. F. Lowell Kennedy also gave the work cordial and important encouragement from the start, and appeared as one of the petitioners for the bills in the legislature. Messrs. Holcombe and Nichols, not at that time registered voters in Cambridge though since having become such, did not appear in the list of these four petitioners. Of course, many others, too numerous to mention here, and generally included in published lists of committees of the Charter Association, helped with encouragement and suggestions of the greatest value, but out of this long list no one who knows the high quality and great extent of his unheralded assistance as counselor and executive will grudge a special record here of the name of Reginald Mott Hull.

Now, as an illustration of how charters of this kind actually operate, the experience in Spokane may interest you. There is a city the size of Cambridge, with five offices to fill, each office with a four-year term, each with a five-thousand-dollar salary, requiring for nomination only twenty-five signatures. The result was ninety-two candidates for five offices, offering an adequate range of choice to the voters. The number of votes cast was 22,058; 7000 women had registered in the few months that had elapsed since their enfranchisement by the state. This was their first election of any kind, and the first experience of the men with this kind of ballot. There was no difficulty and no confusion. Of those ninety-two candidates, the five men who won had none of them held an elective city office. The politicians were down and out. The citizens for the first time in their history had a chance at something different and seized upon it. The highest man, Robert Fairley, got a majority of first-choice votes. He was the only one who did. Moreover, he had the support in first, second, or other choices of three quarters of the voters in the city. He had become widely

and favorably known as an appointive city officer. He had long served as city comptroller.

The four men next in favor were as follows:

No.2 in popular choice, W. J. Hindley, was a leading Congregational clergyman. He had never been in public life before except as a leader in the single tax movement, and an active, virile defender of civic righteousness generally. A fine orator, and widely respected.

The next man, C. M. Fassett, was the President of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce, one of the most successful and most respected business men of the Northwest, like Mr. Hindley, a single-taxer. He was elected during his absence from the city, indicating a kind of politics we have not yet enjoyed in this part of the country. He took no part in the campaign beyond signing his acceptance of the nomination, and writing two or three letters home which were published in the local papers.

The next, D. C. Coates, had been a leader in the charter campaign, formerly Lieutenant-Governor of Colorado, member of a typographical union, a socialist who had won the respect and confidence of former opponents and of the public generally.

The fifth, L. A. Hayden, was a prominent lumberman, a very successful man of high ideals.

None of these four, by the way, was then sufficiently widely known to secure the votes of a majority, even upon the addition of first, second, and other choices.

The correspondent who furnished me the foregoing information was careful to point out that they were not only men of responsibility and standing, but they were men of high civic spirit, interested in the public good. Those five men were chosen, and the people were delighted not only with the result, but with the high tone of the campaign.

You do not strike a politician until you get to No. 13. Not only the first five, but the first twelve names in the list were names of people who had never been in elective office; they were men, successful in business and ordinary vocations, of a type quite different from the ordinary politician. The ex-mayor, the man who was mayor when the charter was adopted, was a man against whom little or nothing could be said, but he was a member of the old

regime and came in no better than thirteenth. No. 17 was the next of a similar type, and so on down. The fact remains that Spokane has had an entire change in the rules, and they are very pleased with it.

We may take a little satisfaction here in Cambridge from the fact that they adopted this preferential ballot in Spokane very largely because they knew it had obtained such favor here in Cambridge ; it is very gratifying to me to feel that we here in Cambridge have helped teach the Pacific Slope progressivism. They simply worked out the charter and voted on it and got it into operation in a total campaign of six months. But there they require no action by the legislature for such a step. They have home rule for cities.

Here in Cambridge we mean that these five supervisors shall be elected to specific office. Each candidate knows what office he is to fill, and the voter knows to what office he is electing him. This is no attempt to elect experts, but to secure men interested in their departments, with a taste for their work, and in a position of responsibility to the voters for its execution. This is worth a moment's notice, for it is a somewhat new idea, but likely to gain in favor. Grand Junction, Lynn, and Oklahoma City already enjoy this system, and Haverhill's experience with the more usual system led Lynn to take the step. The usual practice has been to nominate the men and elect five of them merely to the council at random to parcel out the work among themselves as best they may - a practice tending to irresponsibility and inefficiency unless exceptional men are put in power.

Now, having devoted so much time to the history and contents of the proposed new charter for Cambridge, it becomes an easy and short task, in closing, to point out its meaning.

It opens the brightest opportunity we have ever had in this city for an actual realization of the principles laid down a century and a third ago in this city, on the soil of this University, by a graduate of this University, John Adams, and ratified by the people of this Commonwealth as the foundation of their organic law, namely:

"All power residing originally in the people, and being derived from them, the several magistrates and officers of government, vested with authority, whether legislative,

executive, or judicial, are their substitutes and agents, and are at all times accountable to them. . . .

In order to prevent those who are vested with authority from becoming oppressors, the people have a right, at such periods and in such manner as they shall establish by their frame of government, to cause their public officers to return to private life; and to fill up vacant places by certain and regular elections and appointments....

"Government is instituted for the common good; for the protection, safety, prosperity, and happiness of the people; and not for the profit, honor, or private interest of anyone man, family, or class of men."

These are principles as impregnable to-day as when they were written. In fact, I think it may be said that their violation, particularly the violation of the last sentence quoted, is the cause in a nutshell of our political and economic troubles. I think we need no new doctrine, only effective ways to get the old doctrine into effect. To get the full result desired we must, in these later days, add two things, - more effective means for the use of the people in asserting their supremacy, and more favorable conditions for the development of the right leadership. The people must have more power to do with, and more knowledge what to do against those who would pervert government to the profit of some one man or set of men. This charter, I consider, includes as complete a list as is to-day practicable of what the people must have to secure the requisite power. The existence of this power, within the reach of all the citizens, will foster and develop the leadership, if anything will, - our great educational system, and the memory and example of the unselfish leaders of the past greatly assisting.

The nine striking features of the charter which, I believe, will operate so powerfully to bring into effect the purposes of our Massachusetts Bill of Rights are:

1. Direct and Easy Nominations, without regard to ward lines: to check party domination and give voters wide choice.
2. Short Ballot: to permit easy and intelligent voting.
3. Preferential Voting: to eliminate primaries, to encourage competent men to stand for office, and to permit a real choice from a large number of candidates, with minimum cost and effort.
4. Long Term and Adequate Salary: to render public office acceptable to competent men.
5. Small, compact Council with large powers, combining the executive and legislative functions: to secure efficiency.

6. Publicity	}	to permit effective control of city
7. The Initiative		affairs by the voters.
8. The Referendum		
9. The Recall		

This list, if supplemented by two other items, would include about the whole that has been accomplished since the adoption of the constitution of this Commonwealth in the way of improved governmental machinery and practices, and little in this list dates in this country at least from before the last decade.

The two items which I have not mentioned and which it is a particular pleasure to mention here in this presence - in the presence of your President, Mr. Dana, who has so efficiently led in their adoption - are the merit system and the Australian ballot, and without the latter, at least, this charter could not have come to pass.

More still must be done to complete this kind of work in State and nation, and various corrupting economic fallacies and abuses must be eliminated from our thought and life before we can secure permanent security and peace, but, whatever form such work may take, I believe it is bound to be part and parcel with this charter in attempting to establish a government "for the common good; for the protection, safety, prosperity, and happiness of the people; and not for the profit, honor, or private interest of anyone man, family, or class of men."

At the conclusion of Professor Johnson's paper the meeting adjourned.

GIFTS TO THE SOCIETY

October 26, 1910 - October 24, 1911

Donor	Description
CAMBRIDGE, CITY OF	Address of the Mayor of Cambridge, with the Annual Reports, 1908-1910. 2 v.
CAMBRIDGE, PUBLIC LIBRARY	Harvard Graduates' Magazine, missing nos. (see below, under Howe, A. M.); Oliver Wendell Holmes,

	1809-1909: works of Holmes. From the Cambridge Public Library Bulletin
CHICAGO HISTORICAL SOCIETY	Annual Report, Oct. 31, 1910
COX, GEORGE HOWLAND	[Framed] Page of Vicksburg Newspaper, printed on back of wall paper, July 2, 1863
DANA, RICHARD HENRY, 3D	Speeches in Stirring Times, and Letters to a Son, by R. H. Dana Jr., 1910
GOZZALDI, MRS. MARY ISABELLA	Souvenir Postals (2) of the Cooper-Austin and the Stone Houses
HOLMES, JOHN ALBERT	Typewritten Manuscripts (2), on the Estate of Ebenezer Frost on Menotomy Road, and Elder Edmund Frost - his Homestall
HOWE, ARCHIBALD MURRAY	Blue Book of Cambridge, 1908; Harvard Graduates' Magazine, Vols. I-XIX, Oct., 1892-June, 1911, partial set (complete from above); Historical Sketches of some Members of the Lawrence Family. 1888; John Wilson, by Frank E. Bradish

Donor	Description
	Quinquennial Catalogue of the Officers and Graduates of Harvard University, 1636-1895; Who's Who in America, 1908-1909
ILLINOIS STATE HISTORICAL LIBRARY	Collections, Vols. VI-VII. 2 v.
ILLINOIS STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY	Journal, Vol. II, No. 4, Jan., 1910

LANCASTER COUNTY (PA.) HISTORICAL SOCIETY	Papers read, Vol. XIV, No. 4, Vol. XV, Nos. 1-7, Oct., 1910-Sept., 1911
LANE, WILLIAM C.	An Old-Time Society [The Cambridge Humane Society], by Arthur Gillman; Two Civilizations: an Oration, by J. A. Fox
LEOMINSTER HISTORICAL SOCIETY	Exercises at the Unveiling of the Boulder marking the Site of the First House erected in Leominster, 1725
LOWELL HISTORICAL SOCIETY	Contributions, Vol. I, No. I, July, 1911
MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL SOCIETY	Proceedings, Vol. XLIII, Oct. , 1909-June, 1910
MATTHEWS, ALBERT	Letters of Dennys De Berdt, 1757-1770. Reprint from the Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts; A Sacrament Certificate, 1673. Reprint from the Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts; Sir Matthew and Lady Holworthy. Reprint from the Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts
MEDFORD HISTORICAL SOCIETY	Historical Register, Vol. XIV, Nos. 1-2, January and April, 1911
NEW ENGLAND HISTORIC GENEALOGICAL SOCIETY	New England Historical and Genealogical Register, 1910-1911

Donor	Description
NORTON, RUPERT	Cambridge Epitaphs
OHIO STATE ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL SOCIETY	Quarterly, Vol. XIX, Nos. 3-4, Vol. XX, Nos. 1-3, July, 1910-July, 1911
OKLAHOMA HISTORICAL SOCIETY	Historia, Vol. I, Nos. 3-4, March 15 and Dec. 20, 1910

OREGON HISTORICAL SOCIETY	Quarterly, Vol. XI, No. 4, Vol. XII, No. 1, Dec., 1910-March, 1911
PENNSYLVANIA SOCIETY	Year Book, 1911
SAUNDERS, MISS MARY	Seven Pictures
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO	Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada, Vols. XIV and XV, 1909-1910
UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT AND STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE	Catalogue, 1910-1911
VINELAND HISTORICAL AND ANTIQUARIAN SOCIETY	New Jersey Annual Report, Oct. 11, 1910
VIRGINIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY	Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, Vol. XIX, Nos. 1-4, 1911
WILLARD, MISS SUSANNA	Address to the Members of the Bar of Worcester County, Massachusetts, Oct. 2, 1829, by Joseph Willard John Bartlett. From the Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Vol. XLI Naturalization in the American Colonies, by Joseph Willard. 1859 Prayer, by the Rev. Dr. Lathrop, and Eulogy, by Professor Webber, at the Funeral of the Rev. Joseph Willard, with a Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Holmes Story of a Concord Farm and its Owners [Thirty-seven Manuscript Sermons] by Rev. Joseph Willard

NECROLOGY

The original obituary sketches, of which most of the following are abstracts, are kept on file in the Society's collection.

REGULAR MEMBERS

BOUTON, MRS. ELIZA JANE, died at Cambridge, May 20, 1911. She was born at Lowell, Mass., August 19, 1836, the oldest child of the Hon. John Nesmith, of Lowell, Mass., and Eliza Thom (Bell) Nesmith. Her mother was the daughter of John Bell, who was Governor of New Hampshire. Her early years were spent in Lowell, where her father was a man of wealth and prominence. She was educated at Bradford Academy. She married, December 4, 1873, John Bell Bouton, then of New York, who was also a grandson of Governor John Bell. Mr. Bouton was a graduate of Dartmouth College, and was one of the editors and owners of the "New York Journal of Commerce." For many years Mr. and Mrs. Bouton lived in New York, and at East Orange, N. J. In 1889 Mr. Bouton retired from business, and they came to Cambridge to live, and thereafter made it their home, though spending much of their time in foreign travel. Mr. Bouton died November 18, 1902. Both Mr. and Mrs. Bouton were intensely patriotic. Mr. Bouton was the author of a number of books, but the one in which they both took an especial interest was entitled "Uncle Sam's Bible." Mrs. Bouton possessed much literary ability and was much interested in art and literature as well as in public affairs. She was fond of travel. She was a charter member of the Society of Colonial Dames of New Hampshire, and a charter member of the Hannah Winthrop Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution of Massachusetts. She wrote patriotic odes for each of these societies and was much interested in their work. She was a Unitarian in religion, and was active in the work of the Unitarian Church at East Orange.

DURANT, HON. WILLIAM BULLARD, died in Cambridge, October 4, 1911. He was born in Barre, Mass., September 29, 1844, the son of Rev. Amos Bullard and Mary Ann Durant. He graduated at Harvard in 1865, received the degree of A.M. in 1868, and in 1869 received the

degree of LL.B., from the Harvard Law School. He was actively engaged in the practice of the law until his death, having his office in Boston. In 1879 he married Caroline B. Aldrich, daughter of Judge P. B. Aldrich, of Worcester. She and three sons, Aldrich, Henry W., and William B., survive him. Soon after finishing his education he changed his name to William Bullard Durant. In 1880 and 1881 he was a member of the Cambridge Common Council. From 1890 to 1892 he was a member of the House of Representatives and was a State Senator in 1894 and 1896. From 1899 to 1906 he served as President of the Cambridge Water Board. At the time of his death he was a Director of the Charles River National Bank and a Trustee of the Cambridge Savings Bank. He was a regular attendant at the Shepard Congregational Church.

HALL, the REV. EDWARD HENRY, died in Cambridge, February 22, 1912. He was the eldest son of the Rev. Edward Brooks Hall and Harriet (Ware) Hall, and was born in Cincinnati, Ohio, April 16, 1831. He fitted for college at the High School in Providence, R. I., where his father was settled for more than thirty years as the pastor of the Unitarian Church. He graduated from Harvard with the Class of 1851. He attended the Harvard Divinity School, where he graduated in 1855. In 1902 Harvard conferred on him the degree of S.T.D. He was a member of the Massachusetts Historical Society, and served as a member of its Council for two years following the annual meeting of 1907. He was also a member of the American Antiquarian Society and a member and councillor of The Colonial Society of Massachusetts. Dr. Hall held three pastorates over Unitarian churches - the first at Plymouth, the next

at Worcester, and the last in Cambridge. He was installed as minister of the First Parish and First Church in Cambridge (Unitarian), March 30, 1882. He resigned his pastorate March 31, 1893.

HIGGINSON, THOMAS WENTWORTH, died in Cambridge, May 9, 1911. He was born in Cambridge, December 22, 1823. He graduated from Harvard in 1841, and from the Harvard Divinity School in 1847. He married, September 30, 1847, Mary Elizabeth Channing, daughter of Dr. Walter Channing. She died September 2, 1877, at Newport, R.I. In 1847 he became the pastor of the First Religious Society at Newburyport, then ostensibly Unitarian, and remained as such for over two years. While at Newburyport he became an anti-slavery candidate for Congress. From 1852 to 1858 he was in charge of the Worcester Free

77

Church. In 1854 he was indicted, with Theodore Parker, Wendell Phillips, and others, in connection with the attempted rescue of Anthony Burns, a fugitive slave. November 10, 1862, he became Colonel of the First South Carolina Volunteers, afterwards the Thirty-third United States colored troops. He was wounded and disabled, July 10, 1863, and resigned in October, 1864. In February, 1879, he married Mary P. Thacher and settled in Cambridge. He was President of the Colonial Club, and his portrait hangs in its club house. He served in the Legislature of Massachusetts in 1880 and again in 1881. For three years he was a member of the State Board of Education. For seven years he served as state military and naval historian. He was honored by the Western Reserve and by Harvard University with the degree of LL.D. He was President of the Harvard Chapter of the Phi Beta Kappa Society. He was Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Corresponding Member of the Royal Society of Canada, Member of the American Academy of Arts and Letters, and Member of the Massachusetts Historical Society. His wife and daughter, Mrs. Margaret W. Barney, survive him. For a fuller account of Mr. Higginson, see the report of the meeting held in Sanders Theatre, which will appear in Vol. VII of the Proceedings of this Society.

NICHOLS, DR. JOHN TAYLOR GILMAN, died at Little Boar's Head, N.H., August 25, 1911. He was born in Portland, Me., August 11, 1837, the eldest son of Dr. George Henry Nichols and Sarah (Atherton) Nichols. His early years were spent at Standish, Me. He graduated from the Harvard Medical School in 1859, being one of those selected to read his thesis at the graduating exercises. Dr. Nichols settled in Cambridge in 1859 and continued a resident until his death. He married, October 2, 1867, Helen Williams Gilman, daughter of Dr. John Taylor Gilman of Portland, Me., and Helen Augusta, his wife, daughter of Hon. Renel Williams of Augusta, Me. He was a member of the Standing Committee of the First Parish in Cambridge, and was Chairman of the Committee from 1887 to 1902. He was a visiting physician at the Cambridge Hospital from 1884 until 1903. He was President of the Cambridge Savings Bank from 1904 to 1911. His wife and two of his children survive him. For a fuller account of Dr. Nichols, see the paper read by Mr. Oscar F. Allen, which will appear in Vol. VII of the Proceedings of this Society.

78

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY

1911-1912

President

RICHARD HENRY DANA

Vice-Presidents

ANDREW McFARLAND DAVIS

EDWARD HENRY HALL

ARCHIBALD MURRAY HOWE

Secretary

ARTHUR DRINKWATER

Treasurer

HENRY HERBERT EDES

Curator

CLARENCE WALTER AYER

The Council

CLARENCE WALTER AYER

HENRY HERBERT EDES

HOLLIS RUSSELL BAILEY

MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI

FRANK GAYLORD COOK

EDWARD HENRY HALL

RICHARD HENRY DANA

ARCHIBALD MURRAY HOWE

ANDREW McFARLAND DAVIS

WILLIAM COOLIDGE LANE

ARTHUR DRINKWATER

ALICE MARY LONGFELLOW

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER

COMMITTEES APPOINTED BY THE COUNCIL

1911-1912

On the Early Roads and Topography of Cambridge.

STEPHEN PASCHALL SHARPLES,

EDWARD JOHN BRANDON,

EDWARD RUSSELL COGSWELL.

On the Collection of Autograph Letters of Distinguished Citizens of Cambridge.

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART,

WILLIAM COOLIDGE LANE,

HENRY HERBERT EDES.

On Sketches of Noted Citizens of Cambridge.

MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI,

EDWARD RUSSELL COGSWELL,

SAMUEL FRANCIS BATCHELDER.

On the Collection and Preservation of Printed and Manuscript Material.

WILLIAM COOLIDGE LANE,

CLARENCE WALTER AYER,

EDWIN BLAISDELL HALE.

On Publication.

CLARENCE WALTER AYER,

WILLIAM COOLIDGE LANE,

HENRY HERBERT EDES.

On Memoirs of Deceased Members.

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER,

HOLLIS RUSSELL BAILEY.

On the Collection of Oral Tradition and Early Letters and other Documents of Citizens of Cambridg

MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI,

MARGARET JONES BRADBURY,

RACE OWEN SCUDDER,

ELIZABETH ELLERY DANA,

GEORGE GRIER WRIGHT,

MARY HELEN DEANE,

SUSANNA WILLARD.

On Auditing the Accounts of the Treasurer.

ANDREW MCFARLAND DAVIS.

On the Longfellow Centenary Medal Prize.

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER,

EDWARD BANGS DREW,

CLARENCE WALTER AYER.

80

REGULAR MEMBERS

ABBOT, MARION STANLEY

BULFINCH, ELLEN SUSAN

ALLEN, FLORA VIOLA

BUMSTEAD, JOSEPHINE FREEMAN

ALLEN, FRANK AUGUSTUS

ALLEN, MARY WARE

CARRUTH, ANNA KENT

ALLEN, OSCAR FAYETTE

CARRUTH, CHARLES THEODORE

ALLISON, CARRIE JOSEPHINE

CARY, EMMA FORBES

ALLISON, SUSAN CARLYLE	CLARK, ELIZABETH HODGES
AUBIN, HELEN WARNER	COES, MARY
AUBIN, MARGARET HARRIS	COGSWELL, EDWARD RUSSELL
AYER, CLARENCE WALTER	COOK, FRANK GAYLORD
BAILEY, HOLLIS RUSSELL	CORNE, WILLIAM FREDERICK
BAILEY, MARY PERSIS	COX, GEORGE HOWLAND
BANCROFT, WILLIAM AMOS	CROTHERS, SAMUEL MCCHORD
BARNARD, CLARA EVERETT	CUTTER, WATSON GRANT
BATCHELDER, CHARLES FOSTER	
BATCHELDER, LAURA POOR	DALLINGER, WILLIAM WILBERFORCE
BATCHELDER, SAMUEL FRANCIS	DANA, EDITH LONGFELLOW
BEALE, JOSEPH HENRY	DANA, ELIZABETH ELLERY
BELL, STOUGHTON	DANA, HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW
BIGELOW, FRANCIS HILL	
BIGELOW, MELVILLE MADISON	DANA, RICHARD HENRY
BILL, CAROLINE ELIZA	DAVIS, ANDREW MCFARLAND
BLAKE, JAMES HENRY	DAVIS, ELEANOR WHITNEY
BLISH, ARIADNE	DEANE, GEORGE CLEMENT
BLODGETT, WARREN KENDALL	DEANE, MARY HELEN
*BOULTON, ELIZA JANE NESMITH	DEANE, WALTER
BRADBURY, MARGARET JONES	DODGE, EDWARD SHERMAN

BRADBURY, WILLIAM FROTHINGHAM DREW, EDWARD BANGS
BRANDON, EDWARD JOHN DRINKWATER, ARTHUR
BROCK, ADAH LEILA CONE DUNBAR, WILLIAM HARRISON
BROOKS, ARTHUR HENDRICKS

* Deceased

81

*DURANT, WILLIAM BULLARD HORSFORD, KATHARINE
DURRELL, HAROLD CLARKE HOUGHTON, ALBERTA MANNING
EDES, GRACE WILLIAMSON HOUGHTON, ELIZABETH HARRIS
EDES, HENRY HERBERT HOUGHTON, ROSERHYSS GILMAN
ELIOT, CHARLES WILLIAM HOWE, ARCHBIALD MURRAY
ELIOT, GRACE HOPKINSON HOWE, ARRIA SARGENT DIXWELL
ELIOT, SAMUEL ATKINS HOWE, CLARA
ELLIS, HELEN PEIRCE HUBBARD, PHINEAS
EMERTON, EPHRAIM
EVARTS, PRESCOTT IRWIN, AGNES
FARLOW, LILIAN HORSFORD JACKSON, ROBERT TRACY
FENN, WILLIAM WALLACE KELLNER, MAXIMILIAN LINDSAY
FESSENDEN, MARION BROWN KENDALL, GEORGE FREDERICK
FISKE, ETHEL KERSHAW, JUSTINE HOUGHTON

FOOTE, MARY BRADFORD

KIERNAN, THOMAS J.

FORBES, EDWARD WALDO

LAMB, HARRIET FARLEY

FORD, LILIAN FISK

LANE, WILLIAM COOLIDGE

FORD, WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY

LEAVITT, ERASMUS DARWIN

FOSTER, FRANCIS APTHORP

LONGFELLOW, ALICE MARY

FOX, JABEZ

LONGFELLOW, WILLIAM PITT PREBLE

FOXCROFT, FRANK

LOWELL, ABBOTT LAWRENCE

GAMWELL, EDWARD FRANCIS

GOODWIN, AMELIA MACKAY

MARCOU, PHILIPPE BELKNAP

GOZZALDI, MARY ISABELLA

McDUFFIE, JOHN

GRAY, ANNA LYMAN

McINTIRE, CHARLES JOHN

GRAY, JOHN CHIPMAN

McKENZIE, ALEXANDER

HALE, EDWIN BLAISDELL

MELLEDEGE, ROBERT JOB

HALL, EDWARD HENRY

MERRIMAN, DOROTHEA FOOTE

HALL, WILLIAM STICKNEY

MERRIMAN, ROGER BIGELOW

HARRIS, ELIZABETH

MITCHELL, EMMA MARIA

HART, ALBERT BUSHNELL

MORISON, ANNE THERESA

*HIGGINSON, THOMAS WENTWORTH

MORISON, ROBERT SWAIN

HILDRETH, JOHN LEWIS

MUNROE, EMMA FRANCES

HILL, FREDERIC STANHOPE

MYERS, JAMES JEFFERSON

HODGES, GEORGE

*NICHOLS, JOHN TAYLOR GILMAN

HOPPIN, ELIZA MASON

NORTON, GRACE

* Deceased

82

NORTON, MARGARET

TAYLOR, FREDERIC WESTON

NOYES, JAMES ATKINS

THAYER, WILLIAM ROSCOE

PAINE, JAMES LEONARD

THORP, JOSEPH GILBERT

PAINE, MARY WOOLSON

TICKNOR, FLORENCE

PARKER, HENRY AINSWORTH

TICKNOR, THOMAS BALDWIN

PARLIN, FRANK EDSON

TILLINGHAST, WILLIAM HOPKINS

PARSONS, CAROLINE LOUISA

TINDELL, MARTHA WILLSON NOYES

§PEABODY, CAROLINE EUSTIS

TOPPAN, SARAH MOODY

PERRIN, FRANKLIN

TURNER, FREDERICK JACKSON

PICKERING, ANNA ATWOOD

PICKERING, EDWARD CHARLES

VAUGHAN, ANNA HARRIET

PICKERING, WILLIAM HENRY

VAUGHAN, BENJAMIN

PIPER, WILLIAM TAGGARD

POTTER, ALFRED CLAGHORN

WALCOTT, ANNA MORRILL

RAND, HARRY SEATON

WALCOTT, ROBERT

READ, ELISE WELCH

WARE, THORNTON MARSHALL

READ, JOHN

WASHBURN, HENRY BRADFORD

READ, WILLIAM	§WENTWORTH, ANNIE LOUISE LOCKE
REARDON, EDMUND	WESSELHOEFT, MARY LEAVITT
REID, WILLIAM BERNARD	WESSELHOEFT, WALTER
ROBINSON, FRED NORRIS	WHITE, MOSES PERKINS
ROPES, JAMES HARDY	WHITTEMORE, ISABELLA STEWART
RUSSELL, ETTA LOIS	
SAUNDERS, CARRIE HUNTINGTON	WHITTEMORE, WILLIAM RICHARDSON
SAUNDERS, HERBERT ALDEN	WILLARD, SUSANNA
SAWYER, DORA WENTWORTH	WILLIAMS, OLIVE SWAN
SAWYER, GEORGE AUGUSTUS	WINLOCK, MARY PEYTON
SAWYER, GEORGE CARLETON	WORCESTER, SARAH ALICE
SCUDDER, GRACE OWEN	WRIGHT, GEORGE GRIER
SEAGRAVE, CHARLES BURNSIDE	WYMAN, MARY MORRILL
SHARPLES, STEPHEN PASCHALL	WYMAN, MORRILL
SMITH, EMMA GRISCOM	
STEARNS, GENEVIEVE	
STONE, WILLIAM EBEN	YERXA, HENRY DETRICK
STORER, SARAH FRANCIS	

§ Resigned

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

BARKER, JOHN HERBERT

GOODWIN, ELLIOT HERSEY

CARTER, CHARLES MORLAND

LEVERETT, GEORGE VASMER

DAVENPORT, BENNET FRANKLIN

LOVERING, ERNEST

FELTON, EUNICE WHITNEY FARLEY

§NICHOLS, JOHN WHITE TREADWELL

WADHAMS, CAROLINE REED

HONORARY MEMBERS

CHOATE, JOSEPH HODGES

HOWELLS, WILLIAM DEAN

RHODES, JAMES FORD

§ Resigned

84

BY-LAWS

I. CORPORATE NAME.

THE name of this corporation shall be "THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORICAL SOCIETY."

II. OBJECT.

The corporation is constituted for the purpose of collecting and preserving Books, Manuscripts, and other Memorials, of procuring the publication and distribution of the same, and generally of promoting interest and research, in relation to the history of Cambridge in said Commonwealth.

III. REGULAR MEMBERSHIP.

Any resident of the City of Cambridge, Massachusetts, shall be eligible for regular membership in this Society. Nominations for such membership shall be made in writing to any member of the Council, and the persons so nominated may be elected at any meeting of the Council by a vote of two-thirds of the

members present and voting. Persons so elected shall become members upon signing the By-Laws and paying the fees therein prescribed.

IV. LIMIT OF REGULAR MEMBERSHIP.

The regular membership of this Society shall be limited to two hundred.

V. HONORARY MEMBERSHIP.

Any person, nominated by the Council, may be elected an honorary member at any meeting of the Society by a vote of two-thirds of the members present and voting. Honorary members shall be exempt from paying any fees, shall not be eligible for office, and shall have no interest in the property of the Society and no right to vote.

VI. ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP.

Any person not a resident, but either a native, or formerly a resident for at least five years, of Cambridge, Massachusetts, shall be eligible to

85

associate membership in the Society. Nominations for such membership shall be made in writing to any member of the Council, and the persons so nominated may be elected at any meeting of the Council by a vote of two-thirds of the members present and voting. Associate members shall be liable for an annual assessment of two dollars each, payable in advance at the Annual Meeting, but shall be liable for no other fees or assessments, and shall not be eligible for office and shall have no interest in the property of the Society and no right to vote.

VII. SEAL.

The Seal of the Society shall be: Within a circle bearing the name of the Society and the date, 1905, a shield bearing a representation of the Daye Printing Press and crest of two books surmounted by a Greek lamp, with a representation of Massachusetts Hall on the dexter and a representation of the fourth meeting-house of the First Church in Cambridge on the sinister, and, underneath, a scroll bearing the words *Scripta Manent*.

VIII. OFFICERS.

The officers of this corporation shall be a Council of thirteen members, having the powers of directors, elected by the Society, and a President, three Vice-Presidents, a Secretary with the powers of Clerk, a Treasurer, and a Curator, elected out of the Council by the Society. All the above officers shall be chosen by ballot at the Annual Meeting, and shall hold office for the term of one year and until their successors shall be elected and qualified. The Council shall have power to fill all vacancies.

IX. DUTY OF PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT.

The President shall preside at all meetings of the Society and shall be Chairman of the Council. In case of the death, absence, or incapacity of the President, his powers shall be exercised by the Vice-Presidents, respectively, in the order of their election.

X. DUTY OF SECRETARY.

The Secretary shall keep the records and conduct the correspondence of the Society and of the Council. He shall give to each member of the Society written notice of its meetings. He shall also present a written report of the year at each Annual Meeting.

86

XI. DUTY OF TREASURER.

The Treasurer shall have charge of the funds and securities, and shall keep in proper books the accounts, of the corporation. He shall receive and collect all fees and other dues owing to it, and all donations and testamentary gifts made to it. He shall make all investments and disbursements of its funds, but only with the approval of the Council. He shall give the Society a bond, in amount and with sureties satisfactory to the Council, conditioned for the proper performance of his duties. He shall make a written report at each Annual Meeting. Such report shall be audited prior to the Annual Meeting by one or more auditors appointed by the Council.

XII. DUTY OF CURATOR.

The Curator shall have charge, under the direction of the Council, of all Books, Manuscripts, and other Memorials of the Society, except the records and books kept by the Secretary and Treasurer. He shall present a written report at each Annual Meeting.

XIII. DUTY OF COUNCIL.

The Council shall have the general management of the property and affairs of the Society, shall arrange for its meetings, and shall present for election from time to time the names of persons deemed qualified for honorary membership. The Council shall present a written report of the year at each Annual Meeting.

XIV. MEETINGS.

The Annual Meeting shall be held on the fourth Tuesday in October in each year. Other regular meetings shall be held on the fourth Tuesdays of January, and April of each year, unless the President otherwise directs. Special meetings may be called by the President or by the Council.

XV. QUORUM.

At meetings of the Society ten members, and at meetings of the Council five members, shall constitute a quorum.

XVI. FEES.

The fee of initiation shall be two dollars. There shall also be an annual assessment of three dollars, payable in advance at the Annual

87

Meeting; but any Regular Member shall be exempted from the annual payment if at any time after his admission he shall pay into the Treasury Fifty Dollars in addition to his previous payments; and any Associate Member shall be similarly exempted on payment of Twenty-five Dollars. All commutations shall be and remain permanently funded, the interest only to be used for current expenses.

XVII. RESIGNATION OF MEMBERSHIP.

All resignations of membership must be in writing, provided, however, that failure to pay the annual assessment within six months after the Annual, Meeting may, in the discretion of the Council, be considered a resignation of membership.

XVIII. AMENDMENT OF BY-LAWS.

These By-Laws may be amended at any meeting by a vote of two-thirds of the members present and voting, provided that the substance of the proposed amendment shall have been inserted in the call for such meeting.