

The Proceedings of the Cambridge Historical Society, Volume 13, 1918

Volume Thirteen

Table Of Contents

OFFICERS.....	4
PROCEEDINGS	
FORTY-THIRD MEETING.....	5
FORTY-FOURTH MEETING.....	6
FORTY-FIFTH MEETING.....	7
PAPERS	
NO-LICENCE IN CAMBRIDGE.....	9
BY FRANK FOXCROFT	
BURGOYNE AND HIS OFFICERS IN CAMBRIDGE, 1777-1778.....	17
BY SAMUEL FRANCIS BATCHELDER	
GERRY'S LANDING AND ITS NEIGHBORHOOD.....	81
BY MARY ISABELL GOZZALDI	
THE SCHOOLS OF CAMBRIDGE, 1800-1870.....	89
BY GEORGE GRIER WRIGHT	
ANNUAL REPORTS	
SECRETARY AND COUNCIL.....	113
CURATOR.....	116
TREASURER.....	119
NECROLOGY	
FLORA VIOLA ALLEN.....	122
FRANK AUGUSTUS ALLEN.....	122
GEORGE VASMER LEVERETT.....	123
JOHN McDUFFIE.....	124
CAROLINE KING WYMAN.....	125

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY

1917-1918

President.....William Roscoe Thayer

Vice-Presidents.....Andrew McFarlane Davis

Worthington Chauncy Ford

Hollis Russel Bailey

Secretary.....Samuel Francis Batchelder

Treasurer.....Henry Herbert Edes

Curator.....Edward Locke Gookin

Council

HOLLIS RUSSEL BAILEY

EDWARD LOCKE GOOKIN

SAMUEL FRANCIS BATCHELDER

MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI

FRANK GAYLORD COOK

GEORGE HODGES

RICHARD HENRY DANA

WILLIAM COOLIDGE LANE

ANDREW McFARLANE DAVIS

ALICE MARY LONGFELLOW

HENRY HERBERT EDES

FRED NORRIS ROBINSON

WORTHINGTON CHAUNCY FORD

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER

PROCEEDINGS

OF

THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

FORTY-THIRD MEETING

THE FORTY-THIRD MEETING OF THE SOCIETY was held 22 January, 1918, at the residence of Mrs. Robert de Wolfe Sampson, 108 Brattle Street, Cambridge.

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

In the absence of FRANK FOXCROFT, his paper on "The History of No-License in Cambridge" was read by the Rev. Henry Bradford Washburn. (Printed, pp. 9-16, post.)

The Secretary read a paper on "Burgoyne and His Officers in Cambridge, 1777-78." (Printed, pp.-17-80, post.) In connection with this paper, a Hessian sword owned by William Read was exhibited.

There being no business, the meeting then adjourned.

5

PROCEEDINGS

OF

THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

FORTY-THIRD MEETING

THE FORTY-THIRD MEETING OF THE SOCIETY was held 22 January, 1918, at the residence of Mrs. Robert de Wolfe Sampson, 108 Brattle Street, Cambridge.

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

In the absence of FRANK FOXCROFT, his paper on "The History of No-License in Cambridge" was read by the Rev. Henry Bradford Washburn. (Printed, pp. 9-16, post.)

The Secretary read a paper on "Burgoyne and His Officers in Cambridge, 1777-78." (Printed, pp.-17-80, post.) In connection with this paper, a Hessian sword owned by William Read was exhibited.

There being no business, the meeting then adjourned.

FORTY-FOURTH MEETING

THE FORTY-FOURTH MEETING OF THE SOCIETY was postponed from its regular date, the fourth Tuesday in April, to 15 June, 1918, and was then held at 4 P.M. in the rose garden of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Grant Tremayne Webster at Gerry's Landing, Cambridge.

The President called the meeting to order and explained that the postponement had been made to try the experiment of a "garden party," and an opportunity for better acquaintance among the members.

The peculiarly varied and interesting associations connected with this locality — the starting point as it were of the history of the entire community, since it affords the first practicable landing beach in ascending Charles River from the ocean — were considered in a series of informal addresses.

MRS. WILLIAM GILSON FARLOW spoke on the traces of houses built here by the Northmen in the year 1000, discovered and identified by her father, Eben Norton Horsford.¹

MRS. SILVIO M. GOZZALDI read a paper on the various owners of Gerry's Landing and its neighborhood. (Printed, pp. 81-88, post.)

WILLIAM ALLEN HAYES spoke on "Sir Richard's Way" and the early ferry that here crossed the river; also on the beautiful house built by Colonel Winchester on the site of the old Stone farmhouse, and the Colonel's interest in the military organizations of the state.²

SAMUEL ATKINS ELIOT spoke on Forsyth Wilson, the poet, who for a time lived here as a neighbor of James Russell Lowell.³

The members then adjourned to the eastern terrace, over-looking the river, and refreshments were served. Many also accepted the invitation of Mr. Hayes to inspect his historic house and beautiful garden next door.

¹ See his *Leif's House in Vineland* (Boston, 1893), and *The Landfall of Leif Erikson* (Boston, 1892), containing valuable descriptions, maps, and photographs of this locality before the advent of modern improvements.

² See pp. 82 and 85, 86, post. The Winchester repeating rifle was named for him.

³ See p. 87, post.

FORTY-FIFTH MEETING

FOURTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING

THE FORTY-FIFTH MEETING, being the fourteenth annual meeting of the Society, was held (by adjournment) 30 October, 1918, at the residence of Mrs. William Gilson Farlow, 24 Quincy Street, Cambridge.

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

Voted that the President appoint a committee of three members to nominate officers for the ensuing year.

On this committee the President appointed Joseph Henry Beale, Mrs. Farlow, and George Grier Wright.

The Secretary read his annual report, with which was incorporated the annual report of the Council. (Printed, pp. 113-115, post)

Voted that the above reports be accepted and referred to the Committee on Publication.

The Curator being absent on war work, no report was received from him at this time, but a list of accessions was subsequently received. (Printed, pp.116-118, post.)

The Treasurer read his annual report, including an appeal for an endowment fund, or foundation, together with the certificate of the auditor. (Printed, pp. 119-121, post.)

Voted to accept the Treasurer's report and refer it to the Committee on Publication.

The Committee on Nominations brought in the following report:

President..... WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER
Vice-Presidents.....ANDREW MCFARLAND DAVIS
WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD
HOLLIS RUSSELL BAILEY
Secretary..... SAMUEL FRANCIS BATCHELDER
TreasurerHENRY HERBERT EDES
Curator..... WILLIAM COOLIDGE LANE

HOLLIS RUSSELL BAILEY WOBTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD
SAMUEL FRANCIS BATCHELDER MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI
FRANK GAYLORD COOK GEORGE HODGES
RICHARD HENRY DANA WILLIAM COOLIDGE LANE
ANDREW MCFARLAND DAVIS ALICE MARY LONGFELLOW
HENRY HERBERT EDES FRED NORRIS ROBINSON
WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER

Voted to accept the report and discharge the Committee. On motion of the Reverend Prescott Evarts it was Voted that the Secretary cast one ballot for the officers as nominated.

The President declared the above persons to be duly elected as officers of the Society for 1918-1919.

The President made a brief address, announcing that 912 copies of the Letters of John Holmes, issued under the auspices of the Society, had been sold to date. He read an appeal from the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities, urging support for the constitutional amendment to be submitted on election day, November 5, authorizing the Commonwealth to acquire historic buildings and similar property.¹

GEORGE GRIER WRIGHT then read a paper on "The Schools of Cambridge, 1800-1870." (Printed, pp. 89-112, post.) A general discussion followed: several members gave reminiscences of their school days, old school medals and other rewards were exhibited, and Mr. Richard H. Dana presented an enlarged photograph of the old Jennison house next the Washington Elm, long used as a school, with a group of pupils in front of it, almost all of whom were identified.

The President gave notice of the public meeting of the Society to be held February 22 next, to commemorate the centenary of the birth of James Russell Lowell.

The meeting then adjourned, and light refreshments were served.

1. 'This amendment (Art. LI) for "the preservation and maintenance of ancient landmarks and other property of historical or antiquarian interest" was duly passed.

NO-LICENSE IN CAMBRIDGE

BY FRANK FOXCROFT

Read 22 January, 1918

As A member of the Citizens' No-license Committee of Cambridge for twenty fighting years, and Chairman of the Committee for fifteen years, it will be pardoned me, I hope, if my personal recollections sometimes blend with what should be an impersonal and historical review of the conditions under which No-license — regarded at first as a hazardous experiment — came to be the established policy of this city of more than one hundred thousand inhabitants.

It was in December, 1881, that the voters of Cambridge, under the recently enacted local-option law, were called upon to determine whether the sale of intoxicating liquors should be licensed in this city. It was not until December, 1886, after five years' experience with the licensed saloon, that a majority of the voters decided that they had had enough of it. For thirty-one years, almost the lifetime of a generation, they have repeated this decision. The majorities have varied, but they long ago passed the danger point; and when, once or twice in recent years, the liquor interests of Boston have been cajoled into putting up money for a license campaign in Cambridge, the only result has been to increase the No-license majority.

The methods of the first No-license campaign were simple. In October, the Home Protection League was formed, for the sole purpose of arousing the voters to the importance of the issue, and securing the largest possible vote against license. An appeal to the voters was issued, signed by one hundred and fifty representative citizens. Public meetings were held in the churches and elsewhere, culminating in a crowded meeting in Union Hall the night before the election, at which addresses were made by Mayor Fox, Dr. McKenzie, Col. Higginson and others; and provision was made for printing "No" ballots and distributing them at the polls, for those were the days before the Australian ballot, and a cause which wished the endorsement of the voters furnished its own material. There were a

9

few hours of rejoicing on the evening of the election, when the vote, as declared, showed a No-license majority of 46, in a total vote of 5,226. But, on a recount, errors were discovered, and the revised returns gave the city over to License by a majority of 6 votes.

In the second campaign, the same methods were followed as in the first, though more meetings were held, the direct cooperation of the various church and temperance organizations was invited, and a rallying committee of twenty from each of the five wards was appointed and did effective work. But the No-license vote fell off, and the License majority rose to 393 in 1882, to 594 in 1883, and to 1,137 in 1884. It would have been easy, after that, to give up the cause as hopeless; but the idea of doing so did not occur to any of us. I remember that, in the following fall, when I went around to collect money for the 1885 campaign, I assured the contributors that we intended to cut down the adverse majority one half that year, and to wipe it out altogether the next year. I was aware that I seemed a silly optimist. Yet that is exactly what happened. We reduced the License majority to 530 that year; and in 1886, we came back from the polls with a No-license majority of 566.

*And what was it that accounted for this first No-license victory? One reason for it was an intensified No-license campaign. The Home Protection League gave place to a Citizen's No-license Committee, with branch committees in each precinct. The work of the Law and Order League, organized in 1883 by about two hundred conservative citizens to aid in the enforcement of the liquor laws, and whose first blow had been the conviction of the six leading hotel and saloon keepers in the city for Sunday selling, had made an impression upon public sentiment. The first number of *The Frozen Truth*, sent to every name upon the voting list, brought to the voters direct information about what was going on in the saloons and at City Hall. Father Scully, who came to be such a power in the cause, preached his first*

No-license sermon. Nineteen churches of various denominations arranged union services for the Sunday night before the election. The members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union assisted in the distribution of "No" ballots at the polls. The personal canvass of voters, work upon the check lists, and

10

arrangements for covering every precinct with workers, and providing carriages for forgetful, careless or invalid voters, were carried to an approximate perfection never before reached. It was well that it was so; for the election took place in the midst of the worst blizzard of the winter, and voters made their way to the polls through blinding snow and bitter cold.

But among the agencies which helped to secure the victory of 1886, the aid unintentionally given by the saloon keepers themselves should be gratefully acknowledged. They carried themselves with an arrogance which aroused public antagonism. They took such an active part in politics as to control the election of aldermen, and they bossed them afterward. Their pressure for a multiplication of saloons reached its climax in the application of one Dewire for a license in a building on Kirkland Street, nearly opposite the Norton estate. The Board of Aldermen granted the license, in spite of the remonstrances of residents in that vicinity, and in accordance with the declaration of the Chairman of the Committee on Licenses that moral interests were entitled to no consideration in such matters. The city wanted the license fees and it made no difference where the saloons were planted or who objected. At about the same time when the saloon dominance over the city government in the Dewire case, and also in the lax enforcement of the laws, was under discussion, two saloon murders, one of them the act of a saloon keeper, directed public attention to the moral fruits of the liquor traffic.

Outside of Cambridge, the first No-license victory in Cambridge was pretty generally regarded as a spasm of public sentiment, which would soon pass. The 122 saloon keepers took this view. The law permitted them to carry on their business until the first of May, and most of them kept open through the year, ostensibly for the sale of the lighter drinks, but enough of them reverting to their old practices to furnish considerable business to the courts.

Happily, however, neither the outside observers nor the Cambridge saloon keepers took account of the fact that the city was blessed with a mayor, in the person of William E. Russell, who could not easily be cowed. He had not favored No-license, but he promptly announced his purpose to see that it was thoroughly and impartially enforced, and he kept his word. The

11

police department acted accordingly. Happily also, there was no disposition to make in Cambridge the mistake made in so many communities — that of settling back comfortably after a first No-license victory, with the feeling that the contest is over.

On the contrary, it was felt that the success at the election of 1886 was not the end, but the beginning, of the fight. Immediate steps were taken to secure the fruits of the victory. The Law and Order League, which had rendered great service during the license years in prosecuting saloon keepers for Sun-day selling and other violations of the law, gave place to the Law Enforcement Association, which, with an enrolled membership of more than a thousand citizens, furnished a stimulus to the authorities to do their full duty, gave them practical aid from time to time with information which it secured and sifted — though it did not undertake prosecutions on its own account — and, through the publication of a Bulletin,

pre-~~pared~~ by its Secretary, Mr. Edmund A. Whitman, and sent to every voter, kept the public well posted as to what was going on.

*This work, pursued all through the summer of 1887, was followed in the fall by a house-to-house canvass of the voters, by close attention to registration and naturalization, by rallies, by the distribution of two numbers of *The Frozen Truth* to every voter, and by other activities. The No-license workers awaited the election of 1887 with the cheerful feeling that, whatever the result might be, they had done everything in their power to "hold the fort"; and their confidence was justified by the fact that the counting of the votes, on election night, exhibited one of the most astonishing coincidences in the history of politics. The total vote was nearly three thousand larger than in the preceding year; and this enormous additional vote was split exactly in two, and the No-license majority was again 566.*

The next years were all of them fighting years. The saloons struggled desperately to get back, and they were financed by the Boston liquor interests — wholesalers, brewers and distillers — who missed their patronage. In the old days, they had been sureties on the bonds of the Cambridge saloon keepers, one wholesale dealer in Boston having signed thirteen bonds, and others from eight to ten each, showing that most of

12

the Cambridge saloons were practically distributing agencies for the wholesale houses of Boston. Now they fought hard to get back, and it was no easy task to defeat them. The No-license majority dropped to 493 in 1889, and to 486 in 1891, and was only 599 so late as 1894; but, after that, rose to secure figures.

*The identity of the real enemy that was being fought through these years was disclosed in 1894 by the printing in *The Frozen Truth* of the facsimile of a typewritten circular letter, intended for the brewers and wholesale liquor dealers of Boston, which deplored the "desultory, wavering contest" which had been made by Cambridge ex-liquor dealers on the license side, and put forward a Cambridge ex-Representative in the legislature, who was described as an "open and valued champion of the liquor interests in the House," as the manager of the new campaign. The publication of this secret letter wrought havoc with the license campaign that year, and the "open and valued champion of the liquor interests," in spite of his financial backing, made no headway. The next year, the No-license majority rose to 1503.*

The general principles which governed the No-license campaigns through these fighting years, and which help to explain why it is that Cambridge is the only city of its size which has steadily maintained a No-license policy, may be briefly stated. There is no patent upon them, and the more widely they are copied the better.

In the first place, the importance of a single vote was always emphasized. The lesson of the first election, which was lost by a margin of only six votes, was never forgotten. From year to year a record was kept of No-license voters who, for one reason or another, failed to vote, and courteous reminders were sent, telling them that their votes were needed. No-license checkers, at each voting place, drew off, early in the afternoon, lists of No-license voters who had not voted, and carriages and messengers were sent to their homes, with special reminder cards.

In the second place, the No-license cause was always kept distinct from all other issues, and from all questions of municipal parties or candidates.

A third principle, always kept in mind, was the avoidance of

13

all extravagance. The appeal was made to moderate men, and in a moderate way. It was never claimed that No-license would bring in the millennium, nor that it would be perfectly enforced. There was no vituperation of men who were not convinced that No-license was best. What was wanted was votes; and votes are not secured by vituperation. The un-convinced were treated as open to conviction; and, year by year, increasing numbers of them were won over by the visible, tangible results of No-license.

The most important principle of all remains to be mentioned. The platform was always made broad enough to hold any man who simply did not want the saloon back in Cambridge. No political, social or religious differences were allowed to separate No-license workers. All shades of political opinion were represented in the Citizens' No-license Committee; but political questions never were discussed in the Committee, and men worked together there, year after year, who could not have told each other's politics if they had tried. Even less, if that were possible, did religious differences count. Catholics and Protestants were closely associated in the Committee, and in all No-license activities, his relations of mutual respect and good will. Catholic priests and Protestant clergymen sat on the same platform and addressed the same audiences. Probably most of those who took an active part in the campaigns would agree that, next to the immediate gain of banishing the saloons, no advantage had been secured which was better worth the effort than the bringing together of men of different faiths upon a common platform for a common work. If I close my eyes for a moment, I can see now Dr. McKenzie, speaking from the platform of Union Hall in the unsuccessful years, declaring that we were about to close every saloon door, and throw away the key; and I can hear Father Scully, from the same platform, denouncing by name individual saloon keepers who had made themselves especially obnoxious. On election nights, I often sat beside Father Scully at City Hall, while the returns came in; and, when the figures seemed decisive, he would turn to me to ask whether it was safe to assume that No-license had won, and then he would hurry forth, with a smile upon his face, to ring his church bells. I remember well when he began to address me, in his letters, as

his "honored brother citizen"; and the phrase expressed well the mutual respect and regard which workers of different religious faiths entertained for each other.

The experience of Cambridge has refuted all of the old arguments against No-license. Some of them now sound so obsolete that it is hard to realize that sensible men ever used them. We used to be told that No-license was an interference with vested rights. We got by that at our first No-license victory. Since the first of May, 1887, there have been no vested rights in the liquor traffic in Cambridge. Since that date, every glass of liquor that has been sold for use as a beverage has been sold in violation of law; and every man who sold it, whether keeper of a kitchen barroom or of a gilt-edged drug store, has been a law breaker, no more deserving of sympathy than any other criminal.

We used to be told also that No-license could not be enforced in Cambridge; but it has been, under mayors who were in sympathy with it, and under those who were not. It used to be insisted that just as much liquor would be sold under No-license as under License; but that has been disproved. The arrests for drunkenness in Cambridge are vastly fewer than in license cities of corresponding size. In years in which direct comparisons were made, it was found that in Worcester, for example, the arrests in six months were more than twice as many as in Cambridge in twelve months; and in Lowell, they were more than two and a half times as many. That this improvement is not an accident or a mere coincidence is shown by the official figures of our State Bureau of Statistics of Labor, from which it appears, not only that arrests for drunkenness are much more numerous in License than in No-license communities, but that in the same communities which were for a part of the year under

License, and a part of the year under No-license, the arrests in the License months were two to three times as many as in the No-license months.

It used to be strenuously insisted that No-license would injure local trade. We were told that men who went to Boston after liquor would do all their other trading there, and that local merchants would suffer accordingly. But we have got well by that argument. After a few years of No-license, 257 Cambridge merchants in all parts of the city and in all depart-

15

ments of trade signed for publication this statement: "The undersigned, business men of Cambridge, believe that No-license has benefited the material interests of Cambridge, and we hope for its continuance." One would have to scour the city today to find a recognized business man who wants the saloon back. How different would the moral conditions be, at this moment, if the thousands of young men in training for the military, aviation and naval services in this city were beset by the temptations of two hundred open saloons.

We used to be told with great vehemence that we could not afford to lose the license fees. But experience has proved that we cannot afford to take them. During ten years of License, the valuation of Cambridge declined more than three million dollars; during ten years of No-license it increased more than twenty-three million dollars. This increased valuation brought into the city treasury four or five times as much money as would have come from license fees, and every dollar of it honest money, without the stain of the dramshop on it. Any-one in Cambridge who should advance the revenue argument in favor of license would be as far behind the times today as a scientist who essayed to prove that the world is flat.

Any other comparison of material conditions would yield similar results. During the last ten License years, the population of Cambridge increased at the average rate of 1,182 per annum; during the next ten years, under No-license, the annual increase was 2,198, or nearly twice as much — a difference which seems to justify the conclusion that a city which votes the saloons out and keeps them out is a better place to live in than a city which tolerates them, and people find it out and move in. So, during the License decade, the increase in the number of houses in Cambridge was 1,516, compared with a gain of 3,325 during ten saloonless years. Also, during the ten License years, the average net annual increase in savings bank deposits was only \$155,333.75; while in the following decade, under No-license, the average annual increase was \$366,654.42, or more than twice as much.

Tested either by moral or material results, no reason can be found for deploring the decision which the voters of Cambridge reached in that blinding blizzard in December, 1886, and to which they have adhered ever since.

16

A List of British Prisoners now in Hand

British prisoners by Capitulation	2412
Foreigners	2198
Sent to Canada	1100
Lt Genl Burgoyne's Staff Officers among whom are some Members of Parliaments	12
Prisoners of War before the Capitulation	400
Sick & Wounded	598
Deserters	300
Killed Wounded & taken at Benington	1220
Ditto Ticonderoga	113
Ditto Fort Schuyler	300
Ditto Battle Genl. Haskinor Sept. 17 th 1777	600
Cannon	9583

At Benington	2	12	Drum
	2	6	do
	2	3	do
Fort Schuyler	2	6	do
Battle 7 th Octob ^r	2	12	do
Capitulation	2	6	do
	2	24	do
	2	12	do
	12	6	do
	9	3	do
	2	8	do
	2	10	do

400 set of Harness

A No. of Ammunition Waggon complete
51 Indians taken with their Arms after Capitulation

A List of the Staff Army of Genl Burgoyne made Prisoners in Canada

- Lt Genl Burgoyne
- Maj Genl Phillips
- Capt Lord Peter Sharr A.D.C. to his Excellency
- Lt Wilford A.D.C. do do
- Lt Turp A.D.C. to Maj Genl Phillips
- Capt Grair D. to do
- Major Kingdon A.D.C. to Genl
- Doct Wood Surg
- Lt Vallance
- Lt Baile
- Lt Campbell
- Capt Craig

A 2^d Genl
D. I. Advocate

L^d Governor Scane

Major Brigade Skane

M^r David Graden & Pay Master Gen^l

M^r Jonathan Clark D. C. Gen^l


Brigadier Gen^l Hamilton

Maj^r Brigade Kirkman

Maj^r Brigade of the Advance Corps En^l Freeman

M^r Plockley & W^o Gen^l

L^d Noble orderly Officer to Gen^l Phillips

Signed by
Robert Kingston D. A. Gen^l


Original In Possession of Mrs. S. M. Gozzaldi, Cambridge

BURGOYNE AND HIS OFFICERS IN CAMBRIDGE

1777-1778

BY SAMUEL F. BATCHELDER

Read (in part) 22 January 1918

OF ALL the episodes connected with the history of the old mansion on Brattle Street still associated with the name of Colonel Henry Vassall,¹ its owner from 1741 to his death in 1769, and occupied by his widow Penelope until the exodus of the Tories from Cambridge in 1775, none is more piquant than the part it played in that almost forgotten chapter of Cambridge Revolutionary annals beginning on the sixth of November, 1777. On that date the little village, which had suffered so severely from its occupation by the American army during the Siege of Boston, found itself again invaded — and this time by the enemy. But it was a peaceful invasion, and an enemy without hostility, indeed without weapons, being in short the heterogeneous horde of British and Hessian ²prisoners under Lieutenant-General John Burgoyne — commonly known as the "Convention Troops" on their way from the fatal field of Saratoga to the transports that were expected soon to embark them at Boston and return them to England, according to the terms of their surrender.

Nevertheless the prospect even of their temporary stay in town was thoroughly alarming. "Is there not a degree of unkindness," exclaimed the wife of Professor Winthrop, "in loading poor Cambridge, almost ruined before this great army seemed to be let loose upon us? What will be the consequences, time will discover. ... It is said we shall have not less than seven thousand persons³ to feed in Cambridge and its environs, more than its inhabitants. Two hundred and fifty cords of wood will not serve them a week. Think then how we must be distressed." ⁴

1. This study was originally undertaken as an addendum to the author's account of Col. Vassall which appeared in these Proceedings, vol. x, pp. 5-85. See particularly p. 54.

2. "Hessian" is used throughout this paper in its generic sense only. The mercenaries from Hesse-Cassel who have given their name to all the German troops in the Revolution were not in this campaign. Burgoyne's auxiliaries, originally numbering about 4500, were furnished almost entirely by the Duke of Brunswick.

3. In reality about five thousand three hundred.

4. Mrs. Winthrop to Mrs. Warren. Cambridge, Nov. 11, 1777. Ellett, Women of the Revolution, i, 98. Although we often picture our ancestors as embowered in the forests, this does not seem to have been true of eastern Massachusetts, and long ere this date the question of firewood had become serious. Most of it was then being brought from Maine. The local emergency supplies had already been exhausted during the Siege of Boston. Wood for the Convention Troops therefore was one of the most difficult problems that the authorities had to face, and a deal of correspondence on the subject still survives

The first difficulty that presented itself was the lodging of the captive host. The ragamuffin rank and file, after surging through the streets for a few days of confusion, were securely if uncomfortably bestowed on Prospect and Winter Hills, a mile and a half away to the northward of the town (in what is now Somerville, then a part of Charlestown) in the rickety barracks left from the days of the Siege of Boston. "The whole neighborhood between Cambridge and Boston," wrote Captain Cleve of the Brunswick Battalion,¹ "is filled with these bare and barren hilltops, for the most part covered with barracks. Winterhill and Prospecthill, lying close by, have so many barracks that the former can lodge the German and the latter the English corps. These barracks have been erected without foundations, and with bare boards, through which, from above, below, and all around, drive in the wind, the rain, and the snow. They have no windows, only holes. . . . For five miles around, one sees neither trees nor bushes."²

The hardy British veterans and their stolid German allies were well accustomed to privations, but the prospect of passing a winter in such bird-cages was almost insupportable. They had left their warm clothing in Canada, and now could scarcely obtain a pair of mittens. In the mere hope of getting warm and dry, many deserted into the country — to the delight of the Yankee farmers, who obtained their services for little or nothing. But their story is a tale by itself, and with the fighting men of the force we shall have here little more to do. With the haughty officers the case was more complex. Almost

1. A valuable series of "Confidential Letters from New England, Nov. 15, 1777-Oct. 10, 1778" was published at Gottingen in 1779 by Prof. A. L. Schlozer in the fourth volume of his "Letter Exchange" (Briefwechsel). These confidential letters were by one of the German prisoners at Cambridge, whose name Schlozer somewhat ostentatiously concealed. Translations of these letters, and of other interesting Revolutionary material contained in the Briefwechsel, have been published by W. L. Stone in 1891 and by K. W. Pettingill in 1924; but neither is quite satisfactory, and neither, in spite of copious notes, gives any hint as to the writer. In the Library of Congress, however, there is an old German manuscript identical with these letters — either the original or a contemporary copy — which is signed by Heinrich Urban Cleve, a captain in the regiment of Bhetz, acting as brigade major to General Specht. In quoting from these letters therefore I have referred to them as by Cleve, citing the volume and page of Schlozer.

2. Letter of Dec. 18, 1777. Schlozer, Briefwechsel, iv, 375. For a detailed history of these structures, see "Barracks on Cambridge Common," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, xxviii, 598

three hundred¹ of them filled the streets of Cambridge, "prancing and patrolling in every corner of the town, ornamented with their glittering side-arms," and "in a manner demanding our houses and colleges for their genteel accommodation."² Despite the resentment and indignation of the inhabitants, the newcomers had right on their side. A solemn promise had been made them by General Gates, in the seventh article of the "Convention" under which they had laid down their arms, that during their detention they should be "quartered according to rank." But the attempt to fulfil this promise presents a series of complications as curious and involved as perhaps any episode in local history — and very little to the credit of Cambridge.

To follow the ramifications of the plot we must examine almost every set of contemporary records: The Parliamentary Register, the Journal of the Massachusetts House, the minutes of the Council in executive session, their records as a concurrent legislative body, the Massachusetts Archives, the Cambridge town records, the books of the Harvard Overseers, Corporation, and Faculty, the papers of the military department of which Boston was the headquarters, and the letters of Burgoyne, Heath, and many other and subsidiary actors —

documents which are scattered from the Massachusetts Historical Society to the London Record Office.

And it is a rather remarkable circumstance that these records are so complete and so well preserved. The various parties involved were all more or less known to each other, and all within a radius of half a dozen miles. There was often need for haste; and one might expect that much of the business would have been arranged at hurried personal interviews, without documentary records. Today nine-tenths of it would have been transacted by telephone or at the luncheon table, leaving no trace behind. But a spirit of meticulous accuracy seems to have pervaded the affair. Not a conference was held, not a suggestion made, without being committed to writing. Documents were drafted, fair-copied, duplicated, engrossed, and even printed; and each of these forms was carefully docketed, filed, and preserved, so that every detail can still be followed in extenso.

Nor was speed sacrificed to accuracy. Letters were exchanged (by special messengers) with almost the rapidity of modern telegrams;

1. See the signatures of 192 British and 101 Hessian officers attached to the original parole, now in the Boston Public Library. Printed in condensed form in O'Oallaghan, Burgoyne's Orderly Book, Appendix. There were a few more who never signed.

2. Mrs. Winthrop to Mrs. Warren, ubi supra.

and a note, a reply, and the ensuing official action frequently occurred within twenty-four hours. In as short a space of time committees were appointed, met, made their investigations, and reported their recommendations. Thus the whole story forms an unusually interesting example of our ancestors' methods of procedure in an emergency. Piecing together this complicated mosaic, we obtain a narrative substantially as follows:

MAKING READY – CROSS QUESTIONS AND CROOKED ANSWERS

It was on October 22, 1777, that the General Court of Massachusetts, then in session, was officially informed that on the 7th Burgoyne had surrendered to Gates at Saratoga, under articles known as a "convention," by virtue of which the prisoners were to embark at Boston and sail for home, being quartered at Cambridge until their transports should arrive. The news was received with delirious joy in town and country. Cambridge took its full part in the celebrations. That night "the colleges were beautifully illuminated"; and the next, "the town of Cambridge was universally illuminated in high taste and elegance. A bonfire was made upon the common, where were fired a number of cannon,¹ answered by musketry from the troops stationed in Cambridge, in honor of General Gates. A number of principal gentlemen, both of the town and army, spent an agreeable evening in company, when [a long list of] toasts were drunk, with the discharge of cannon. The rejoicings were introduced by the discharge of thirteen cannon in honor of the thirteen United States of America."²

On the 23d the legislature (Council and House of Representatives) appointed Messrs. Phillips, Gray, Hosmer, Gushing, and Austin a joint committee "to consider what Provision &c. is necessary to be made for the Reception of the Prisoners taken at the Northward . . . and for fulfilling Gen. Gates Engagement concerning them."³ Two days later, on the report

of these gentlemen, both chambers resolved that another joint committee — Messrs. Taylor, Gushing, Gray,

1. Probably including those which still stand there, having been left behind after the Siege of Boston.
2. *Boston Gazette*, Oct. 23, 1777. For some time after the Evacuation, Cambridge, with its numerous barracks, etc., continued to be used as a recruiting station for new levies. See Drake, *Old Landmarks of Boston*, 383.
3. *House Journal (printed)* — "Court Records" (Council minutes), xxxviii, 145. It is significant that the latter clause was added by the Council.

Hutchinson, and Crane — should fix the limits within which the officers were to be confined, and obtain therein suitable houses for the general officers and proper rooms for the other officers of rank, "so far as may be consistent with a strict fulfilment of the Convention." ¹ (These clauses are italicized to show the honorable intentions of the civil authorities.) For these purposes they were to advise with General William Heath, the commander of the local military department, who was of course to be in immediate charge of the prisoners, their guards, their rations, firewood, etc.

The House thereupon adjourned, leaving all details to the Council in executive session (there being no governor during this period). The latter body shortly discovered an important matter had been overlooked — the taking of the officers' paroles, a formality which had been stipulated by Article XI of the Convention. On November 1 therefore the Council voted that "whereas Major General Heath has at the desire of this Board undertaken to supply the army lately under the Command of General Burgoine. . . with their rations & with quarters," the taking of the parole should also be entrusted to him."²

On the 4th Heath replied with some irritation that he did not wish to get mixed up in an affair which, as it then stood, was bound to make trouble. "I find by conversing with the Committee lately appointed . . . that the parole which I am to take must be within such Limits as they perfix: And as it appears to me that a restriction to the Limits proposed will tend rather to disgust than gratify the Officers, I must desire to be excused from taking the Parole." In a supplementary letter he did however "take the liberty to present to your Honors what has appeared to me as proper Limits ... altho' this Business seems by the Resolves of the Two Houses and the Opinion of the Committee to be out of my Jurisdiction." ³ The Council nevertheless insisted that as everyone else was too busy to take the paroles, and as "this Business naturally falls within his Department," it should "be therefore refered to him."⁴

The limits proposed by Heath were as follows:

Charles Town Neck at Swan's Shop, from thence the Cambridge road to the crossway which communicates with the said road between

1. "Court Records," xxxviii, 153.
2. *Council Records*, xxi, 848.— Copy in *Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS.*, vii, 26.— *Engrossment in Mass. Archives*, 173 /522.
3. *Mass. Archives*, 198 /268 and 274.— *Drafts in Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS.*, vii, 22.
4. Nov. 4, 1777. *Council Records*, xxi, 853.

Mr. Codman's house and fort No. 3, the said crossway out to the road by Mr. Inman's house, said road up by Mr. Dana's house, and Captain Stedman's tavern round the corner down to Cambridge bridge, the bridge from the North end of Cambridge causeway by Mr. Welsh's shop, the Water Town road to the first turn beyond the late Lieutenant Governor Oliver's house, from Deacon Mills' house down the Charles Town road on to Cambridge Common, to the Menotomy road, said road up to Cooper's tavern, from Snow's tavern, the road down by the stone magazine, Med-ford bridge, and Charles Town road by Winter Hill down to the first mentioned bounds (the intermediate roads are within the parole).

P. S. If General Burgoyne should not be Quartered in Inman House the Limits may be restrained to the Road from Charlestown neck up to the Colleges from thence down to the Bridge.¹

This on its face was an excellent arrangement, inasmuch as it included the considerable number of abandoned houses in Cambridge formerly owned by the local loyalists. That group of capitalists and wealthy government officials — Sheriff Phipps, John Borland, Major John Vassall, Judge Sewall, Widow Penelope Vassall, Judge Joseph Lee, Lieutenant-Governor Oliver, etc. — had been forced to flee the town when the Revolution began, leaving their elegant mansions to be confiscated by the patriots. On the road from Cambridge village towards Watertown, especially, these fine estates were so numerous that the street was known as "Tory Row." The small tenants who were now in precarious possession could be easily disposed of, and the many handsome and spacious apartments would make unexceptionable quarters for large groups of officers — just as they had sheltered many of the American militia two years before, during the Siege of Boston. These limits the Council were accordingly inclined to approve.

But while this game of cross purposes was in progress the town of Cambridge had added its voice, and that in no friendly tone, to the general discord. The fears expressed by Mrs. Winthrop were an accurate epitome of the sentiment of the community; and before the prisoners reached Cambridge the inhabitants had hurriedly taken concerted action to protect themselves. On the 3d of November a special town meeting, held at the court house in Harvard Square, had passed the following vote:

1. Parliamentary Register, xii, Appendix, p. iii. These limits occur in a draft of a parole which Heath submitted to the Council, and which he dated Nov. 9, apparently thinking that matters would surely be adjusted by that time. "Deacon Mill" was a copyist's error for Deacon [Aaron] Hill.

That Abraham Watson Esqr, the Honbl John Winthrop Esq Thaddeus Mason Esqr Col^o Bridge & Mr Samuel Whittemore Junr or the Major part of them Be a Committee to apply to the Committee of the General Court appointed to assign limits to the officers of the British Army lately made Prisoners by Major General Gates, who are to be on their parole, and to request of them that such limits may be no larger than what the Officers aforesaid are entitled to by the Articles of Convention lately agreed on by General Gates & Lt. General Burgoyne, & particularly, that those Officers may not be permitted to have the range of the Town of Cambridge which the town are of the opinion they are not entitled to. And if they fail of success in their application to the Committee of the General Court, then they are to present a Petition to the Honble Council of this State, for the purpose aforesaid. They are also to apply to Major General Heath if they find it necessary.¹*

Amid such clashes and contradictions it may be imagined that the conferences between Heath and the joint committee were not exactly harmonious: they culminated in the following remarkable effusion:

Boston November 6th, 1777

Sir

The Committee of both Houses of Assembly appointed to Procure Houses for General Burgoyne and his General Officers, & Suitable Rooms for his other Officers of Rank, and to establish the Limits for the Officers and Privates in General Burgoyne's Army and Limits to prevent the Inhabitants from Coming to the Prisoners, have attended that Service, and agreeable to your Desire we agreed with Mr. Robert Temple for his House for General Burgoyne after which you advised us to omit that and to procure Mr. Inmans House we then told you we understood, Doctor Warren had taken Mr. Inmans House for a Hospital on which you Assured us that should not hinder our taking it for the General; and Advised us to Procure it, accordingly the Next morning we went and agreed with a Tenant living in said House, that General Burgoyne should come there, then discharged Mr. Temples House and since which we are informed that by your Order Doctor Warren has taken said House for a Hospital and the Tenant now refuses to let the General have it, & Assigns the above as a reason for his refusal — Now Sir the Committee are determined to take no further Steps relative to procuring a House for General Burgoyne, we are of Opinion it is Entirely oweing to you that the Committee have had so much Trouble, and all proves abortive, and we expect you will yet put General Burgoyne into Inmans House, You informed the Committee that three or four Houses would be Sufficient for the other General Officers, and that you had Officers Barracks Sufficient for the Field and other Officers since which the Committee have obtained the following Houses in Charlestown for the General Officers Mr Phille-

1. Cambridge Town Records. It is to be observed, in connection with a later stage of proceedings, that Mason was a graduate, and Winthrop a professor, of Harvard College.

brown's, The Widow Rands, The Widow Prentices except the West chamber, in, Mr Hunnewells House two Front Rooms and one Chamber, and one half of Mr Adams's house ¹ which is full equal to what you said would be enough and they are not only the best we could obtain near where the Troops are to be Quartered which the Articles of Convention require, & they are such as the Committee judge quite sufficient — And agreeable to the Order of the two Houses we have also agreed that the outside Bound for the Non Commissioned Officers and Privates shall be the line of Gentry boxes, if placed where you informed the Committee they should be, And that the Inhabitants shall not pass any nearer to the Camp than the Line of Stakes Placed or immediately to be placed about Thirty yards distance from the Gentry boxes, and also we have Determined, That the Generals and other Officers shall not Exceed the Following Bounds on any pretence whatever Vizt — Beginning at Charlestown neck at Mr Swans Shop & from thence the Road Leading toward Cambridge till it comes to a Middle Road beyond Mr Pipers Tavern, thence up said Road till it intercects the road leading from Medford to Cambridge thence the right hand road by the Powder House and so on till it meets the road leading from Medford to Charlestown; thence that road to the first mentioned Place, and all within them Limits also the lane to Inmans House near Mr Codmans and the whole of Inmans Farm & no more — We are Sir with due respect your's

JOHN TAYLOR

The Committee

THO^s CRANE

of the Two Houses

It will be seen that the committee had lent an attentive ear to the deputation from Cambridge, and had altered Heath's proposed limits by leaving out that town altogether except Inman's farm (now the region around Central Square), virtually confining the officers to the present Somerville. Such an arrangement appeared logical enough, since it followed strictly the provision of the Convention that "the officers are not, so far as circumstances will admit, to be separated from their men," and Somerville included the barracks already described. It also included "Ten Hills Farm," the magnificent seat of Robert Temple, Esq., to which the committee referred. That gentleman was a moderate loyalist, who after a somewhat inglorious

1. From subsequent claims for compensation it appears that the following houses in Charlestown were actually occupied: Thomas Filiebrown's, Rebecca Rand's, Rebecca Prentice's, William Hunnewell's (where General Hamilton was quartered), Peter Tufts's, Mary Frost's, and Thomas Brooks's. These were in the part of Charlestown now Somerville, along "Charlestown Lane" near the British barracks on Prospect Hill. In several cases the houses were vacated altogether, the "families and effects removed." See Mass, Province Laws, xxi, 295; also 478 for damages done by the troops.

2. Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 24.— Copy in Mass. Archives, 167 /431.

retreat in 1775 had been allowed to return and reoccupy his mansion, and who would make a capital host to Burgoyne.

Yet the committee, in spite of all their bombast, must have been aware that their scheme of limits was entirely too small. Half a dozen ordinary farmhouses for the number of officers expected would never do, to say nothing of proper quarters for several more generals, British and Hessian. The Cambridge deputation could thus flatter themselves that they had already put a spoke in the Englishman's wheel, and ensured him plenty of vexation and delay. For these shifts time that matters were approaching a crisis. The long column of prisoners could almost be descried on the outskirts of Cambridge; and from Burgoyne, who was travelling a day or two behind the main body, had arrived an express rider with a formal demand for quarters to be in readiness.

The Massachusetts Council fully realized the gravity of the situation. With the policy of the Cambridge men and the joint committee they did not concur in the least. Taking official notice that "a disagreement" had arisen between Heath and the committee, in consequence of which "suitable houses have not as yet been provided . . . which it is necessary should be immediately done to prevent the Conventions being broke," they promptly "Ordered that General Heath be & hereby is advised to take the Parole of the said Officers agreeable to the form he has exhibited & the Limits he has therein required & that he procure suitable houses for the accommodation of General Burgoyne & the Officers aforesaid within said Limits."¹

Thus endorsed, Heath at once took energetic measures. Throwing aside the committee's narrow scheme, and returning to his own plan, he issued orders to Col. Chase, his quartermaster, as follows:

Headquarters, Boston, Nov. 7, 1777.

You will Immediately obtain proper Houses upon the best Terms you Can, for the Accommodation of Lieut. General Burgoyne, Major Genl Phillips, Major Genl Riedesel, Brigr Genl Hamilton, and two German Brigr Generals [Specht and de Gall], having proper regard to their Rank, after which you will If Possible accomodate the Field Officers with proper rooms if attainable, you will procure the Houses between Charles-town Neck and Lieut. Governor Oliver's House on the Water Town Road in the Body of the Town of Cambridge on the Menotomy Road any where on this Side Cooper's Tavern, on the Road from Cambridge to Medford

1. Nov. 7, 1777. Council Records, *xxi*, 861.— Copies in Mass. Archives, 167/430 and Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 26.

25

any where on this side the Stone Magazine, or on any of the Intermediate Roads within the before mentioned outlines. You will wait on Genl Burgoyne, and acquaint him with this my order, and full Determination, to do all in my Power to make his Situation as Easy and agreeable as Circumstances will admit — and in every Instance Strictly adhere to the Convention ¹

WELCOMING A LIEUTENANT-GENERAL

The last sentence hints at the miserable situation presented by this time in Cambridge. The travel-stained officers were pouring into town with their men, only to find everything in confusion and no arrangements completed for sheltering them. Not a single householder had either honor or humanity enough to offer them even a temporary asylum. The highest ranks received no more consideration than the youngest subalterns. "The generals, Burgoyne, von Riedesel, and Phillips, wandered about some time without a roof over their heads, until they found lodgings at a high price in a Cambridge inn — a gloomy hole."²This was Bradish's (afterwards Porter's), the famous "Blue Anchor," just off Harvard Square. Their baggage was unceremoniously dumped in the middle of Cambridge Common.³ Their plight was pictured by Burgoyne with a bitterness which few can blame: "After being pressed into Cambridge through bad weather, inconvenience and fatigue, without any preparation made to receive the superior officers, I was lodged in a miserable public-house; and, in ill health,⁴ obliged to partake with Major-General Phillips two very small dirty rooms for ourselves, our aid-de-camps, and the staff of the army then present."⁵ Phillips made an equally pungent comment of his own:

1. Draft in Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii. 27.

2. Eelking, *Deutschen Hilfstruppen*, i, 334.

3. Burgoyne to Heath, Nov. 12, 1777. *Parliamentary Register*, xii, Appendix, p. vii.

4. "My mind is broken down by agitation and my body with fatigue." Burgoyne to Howe. Oct. 20, 1777. Hist. MSS. Commission, *Report on American MSS.*, i, 141. General Glover, who was in charge of the escort, reported to Gates on Nov. 16: "After a troublesome journey of 13 days (some part of which time was very stormy — this with the badness

of the roads was almost too much for Gen' Burgoyne's shatter'd constitution) we arrived safe in Cambridge." N. Y. Hist. Soc., Gates MSS.

5. Burgoyne to President of Congress. Cambridge, Feb. 11, 1778. Parliamentary Register, xi, 211. He used very nearly the same language to Gates: "I and General Phillips, after being amused with promises of Quarters for eight days together, are still in a dirty small miserable Tavern, lodging in a Bed Boom together, and all the Gentlemen of our suite lodging upon the Floor in a Chamber adjacent, a good deal worse than their servants have been used to." Public House at Cambridge, Nov. 14, 1777. Copy in Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 37.

Sir,

I was last Sunday informed that a quarter was provided for me and that I could occupy it on Wednesday morning — the House formerly belonged to a Mr. Phips and is now held of the Committee by Mr. Mason. This morning I receive a message that Mr. Mason and Family cannot go out and consequently I have no quarter. ... I require a quarter suitable to my rank of Major General, and that I will not interfere about it myself, but depend on you, Sir, for fulfilling the 7th Article of the Convention.

I have the honor, etc.

W. PHILLIPS

Major-General Heath¹

Now William Heath was a Roxbury farmer, but he was also an officer and a gentleman to the tips of his work-hardened fingers. His instincts of military courtesy towards a vanquished but equally high-spirited foeman (who was but asking for simple justice) were deeply revolted; and in much chagrin he wrote to Burgoyne:

I am exceedingly unhappy that your Excellency and General Phillips have not as yet such quarters as I sincerely wish or you desire; no endeavours of mine shall be wanting to effect it, and I can assure you it is the desire of the Council also.

I must desire your Excellency to move into one of the best houses that have been taken up, viz: Mrs. Vassall's or Mr. Inman's. It will be much more comfortable to yourself and agreeable to others, than being in a public house, and such removal shall not in the least abate our endeavours to procure you better quarters.²

Simultaneously he addressed a remonstrance to the Council, setting forth "the unhappy and disgraceful situation of General Burgoyne and his officers."³ That body, plainly realizing the gravity of the situation, instantly advised him to extend the parole limits so as to take in Temple's house, and procure the same for Burgoyne and his general officers, "allowing Mr. Temple to remain in the house with him."⁴

The implied reproof did not pass unnoticed by the original joint committee. They at once sought an interview with the Council in order to justify themselves. The conference seems to have been as stormy as those they had held with Heath. Finally they were asked to state in writing what further steps they proposed to take to relieve

1. Magazine of American History, xiv, 91.

2. Nov. 11, 1777. Parliamentary Register, xii, App., p. vi.

3. Nov. 11,1777. Mass. Archives, 198/289. See post, p. 38.

4. Nov. 11,1777. Council Records, xxi, 867.— Copies in Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 34 and Mass. Archives, 173 /559.

27

the situation. This was a poser for the politicians who had promised to protect their friends in Cambridge, and they could think of nothing better than to throw up their job, in a queer mixture of pomposity and pettiness.

May it please your Honors

The Committee of the Genl Court appointed to procure Houses for Genl Burgoyne & his Officers & to appoint Commissaries to supply them with such Articles as are usually brought to the Boston Market the produce of these States; also to affix Limits both for Officers & Privates of sd Army & Limits to prevent the Inhabitants from mixing & trading with the Prisoners &c — also being advised by your Honrs to supply Genl Burgoyne & his Officers with Wines, Rum, Brandy Sugar & other Articles the produce of the W. Indies, having most faithfully & constantly attended that Service & after frequent Consultations with Genl Heath appointed good & faithful Commissaries who are now on the Spot & have been for some Time & are supplying both Officers & Privates agreeably to the Resolves of Court & Advice of yr Honors — the Committee also have affixed Limits for the Officers & Privates & for the Inhabitants — & have procured the best Houses possible within those Limits for the Officers agreeable to the Requisition of Genl Heath — & agreeable to yr Honors Desire, last Week reported to Genl Heath a Copy of which Report has been presented to your Honors; neither has he signified to the Committee any Deficiency in the Preparations made as set forth in sd Report But inasmuch as yr Honors have been pleased this Day to inform us that Genl Heath has represented to your Honors that there is a deficiency of Houses for the Officers of Genl Burgoyne's Army; also that yr Honrs had advised Genl Heath to extend the Limits of the Officers beyond the Limits prefix'd by the Committee & also had advised Genl Heath to procure Houses any where in those extended Limits for them & desired us the Committee to inform yr Honors in writing what the Committee would do further — therefore in Compliance with yr Honors Request permit us to inform your Honors that inasmuch as Genl Heath has recd your Advice to extend the Limits & it seems he is determined to do it & as he has also been advised by yr Honors to procure Houses any where within those Limits we trust & believe he will also do that if in his Power & if not in his Power we trust your Honors will give him all the Assistance he can reasonably Desire.

We are very respectfully

Yr Honors mo. obed. servts

Committee of the Genl Court --- JOHN TAYLOR, ELLIS GRAY, THO^s CRANE, ISRAEL HUTCHINSON

Boston Nov. 12, 1777.¹

1. "Report of Com^{ee} to prepare Quarters for Genl Burgoyne's Army in Consequence of a Conference wth Council." Mass. Archives, 168/11.

28

Meanwhile, to Heath's anxious offers Burgoyne rather tartly replied:

The houses you mentioned yesterday are so exceedingly inconvenient, the one in point of size, and the other in being deficient in every article of furniture,¹ that to occupy either would make my condition worse than it is. The house of Mr. Temple would certainly suit me exceedingly well, and should the great essential matters of public faith again take such a turn as might justify me

in accepting a favor, I should certainly hold myself obliged to you for your good offices to procure me that particular quarter.²

It is no wonder that the Englishman felt bewildered and aggrieved. For a week, after the signing of the Convention of Saratoga, he had been honorably entertained, with every attention befitting his rank, at the luxurious town house of General Schuyler at Albany, where "a table of twenty covers" had been spread for himself and his party. On the road to Cambridge, also, he had been treated with the greatest consideration. At Hadley, tired out and half sick, he had spent several days at the house of Sheriff Elisha Porter, who had shown him such kindness that upon leaving he had presented his host with his dress sword "in token of high esteem and gratitude."³ His present position therefore was a contrast as violent as it was unexpected. "Our treatment is new to us," he wrote to Heath, "though we are not Strangers to what it is to be in the hands of an Enemy."⁴

The efforts to make him the personal guest of Temple, therefore, were evidently made in imitation of the example so handsomely set by Schuyler. But the much-discussed mansion at Ten Hills Farm was not to receive the British commander after all. (It ultimately became the quarters for the main guard of the militia who kept watch over the prisoners at the barracks nearby.) No recorded reason can be found for giving up the plan, but of course if he had become the recipient of Temple's private hospitality, he would not have paid the handsome amounts for rent and subsistence which the citizens of Cambridge evidently hoped to extort from him. Strong pressure was probably brought to bear on the authorities not to forego so

1. A temporary tenant of the Inman house after the Siege of Boston found nothing in it but a single bed, some broken chairs, and an iron skillet. Letters of James Murray, Loyalist, 245.

2. Nov. 12, 1777. Parliamentary Register, xii, Appendix, p. vii.

3. This sword is still preserved as a priceless heirloom by the Porter family. It is at present in the possession of Francis K. Cooley, Esq., of Hartford, Conn. See Conn. Soc. Sons of the American Revolution, Year Book, 1893-94, p. 222.

4. Nov. 10, 1777. Parliamentary Register, xii, Appendix, p. v. — Mass. Archives, 198/287

considerable an amount of the coveted "hard money " that was known to be piled in the British pay chest. That this was the case is pretty clearly shown by the ultimate solution of the problem. On November 14, Burgoyne wrote to General Gates, enclosing a return of the troops as of the date of the surrender (apparently in fulfilment of a promise), and reporting that the march to Cambridge had been made in safety and good order. But, he added,

I cannot speak with satisfaction upon what has passed and still passes here. The officers are crowded into the Barracks six and seven in a Room of about ten feet square and without Distinction of Rank. The General Officers are not better provided for. . . .

The only prospect that remains to me personally is that I shall be permitted to occupy a House without a Table, Chair or any one Article of Furniture for the Price of an hundred and Fifty pounds sterling till the first of April,¹ but the same sum is to be paid though I should embark in ten Days.

While I state to you, Sir, this very unexpected Treatment I entirely acquit M. Gen. Heath and every Gentleman of the military Department of any Inattention to the publick Faith engaged in the Convention. They do what they can, but while the supreme Powers of the State are unable or unwilling to enforce their Authority, and the Inhabitants want the Hospitality or indeed the common Civilization to assist us without it, the public Faith is broke, and we are the immediate sufferers.²

*Touching this letter and its momentous sentence (here italicized) there will be more to say anon.*³

The house described by the indignant Briton still stands just across the road from Harvard College. It had been built some fifteen years before by the Rev. East Apthorp, first rector of the Episcopal church in Cambridge, in such handsome style that it was sarcastically dubbed "The Bishop's Palace." It had subsequently been bought by John Borland, a wealthy loyalist who had absconded at the beginning of the war. During the Siege of Boston it had been occupied by the American forces, and badly knocked about. It was at this period leased by a Captain Henley. That astute warrior had driven perhaps as hard a bargain as Cambridge landlords have ever made — which is saying a good deal in a town where the systematic fleecing of students has rendered the inhabitants past masters of extortion.

1 This was the extent of Henley's lease. Of course £150 stg. represented an enormously greater sum in the depreciated American paper of this date.

2. Public House at Cambridge, Nov. 14, 1777. Copy in Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 37.

3. See post, p. 69 et seq.

30

Heath was utterly scandalized. "The sum which he gave for it," he declared, "was most exorbitant, as was the case in some other instances." "Why," he demanded, "line the pockets of some Individual who perhaps will ask three times so much for a house for a month or two, as he gives for the House and farm for a year?"¹

Burgoyne himself waxed ironic over the appellation of his dilapidated domicile. "Having been amused, from day to day, for near a fortnight, with the expectation of proper accommodations, I was only at last relieved by consenting to pay, upon a private bargain, a larger sum for an unfurnished house out of repair, than would have been required for a palace in the dearest metropolis of the world."² Before he could move in he was obliged to apply for the loan of such elementary furniture as "18 Chairs, 3 Small Tables & Green Cloath, 4 Setts Andirons, a few Trammels and Hooks."³ It was about November 20 when he seems to have taken possession.⁴

Meantime Friedrich Adolph, Freiherr von Riedesel, the commander of the German contingent, was getting equally scurvy treatment. This was the more outrageous in his case because, besides his personal staff of seven persons, he was accompanied by his wife and three little girls, with a maidservant. After a few days at Bradish's, common decency compelled the removal of his party to a separate house, and they were transferred to the cottage close by, formerly owned by Judah Monis, the one-time teacher of Hebrew at Harvard. Here, subject to the impositions of a termagant landlady, they remained for some three weeks, sleeping on straw in one room and a garret, with their servants pigging in the passageways as best they might.⁵ During this interval they lost all their personal baggage, probably stolen by the very militiamen set to guard it.⁶

In the end of November the Riedesels were assigned to the Sewall-Lechmere place, a mile away up "Tory Row" (Brattle Street).

1. Heath to Council. Headquarters, Boston, Apr. 6, 1778. Mass. Archives, 199 /97. The nature of the transaction may be judged from the remark that the "whole interest" of the tenant in a similar estate was "but £4 per annum." See p. 44 post.

2. Burgoyne to President of Congress. Cambridge, Feb. 11, 1778. *Parliamentary Register*, xi, 212. — Original in Public Record Office, London: Colonial Office, Class 5, vol. 95, p. 385.

3. Nov. 17, 1777. *Mass. Archives*, 173/577.

4. After Burgoyne's departure the "Palace" was occupied by Phillips, the second in command. *Mass. Archives*, 199/97 and 100; 217/436 (Apr. 6, 1778).

5. Stone, *Memoir of Riedesel*, i, 217.

6. Rosengarten, *German Allied Troops*, 143. The Hessians seem to have been unmercifully swindled on every hand at first. There was a good deal of wholesome awe felt for the British, but the outlandish "foreigners" excited nothing but contempt

This was even more desolate than the "Palace." To make it habitable at all they were forced to hire from the American Commissary "two and a half dozen chairs, one large breakfast table, four tables, one night chair, two bedsteads with beds, two looking glasses, one tea board, two bureaus, and one large water kettle." ¹ Yet in comparison with their former lodgings they were charmed with their quarters; and under the good German housekeeping of the Baroness the mansion became the centre of the social life of the foreign contingent.

HOW TO RECEIVE BRITISH OFFICERS

Thus far we have considered only the pitiful pettifogging by which the sensitive and high bred commanders were cozened out of their rights under the Convention. The experiences of the junior officers were even worse. Arriving, after a most trying journey, at the destination where they had been promised suitable shelter, they found nothing open to them but the street. This was the more dumbfounding because all along the road from Saratoga they had received every mark of compassionate kindness, and a rude but hearty courtesy. Indeed their hospitable and generous usage had been so surprising that they almost suspected it must proceed from some deep ulterior motive.² At their journey's end, however, in some equally mysterious manner, the conditions were suddenly reversed. Had they been so many lepers they could not have been more thoroughly outcast.

To get a roof over their heads they were obliged to squeeze into the little cubicles built into the corners of the crazy barracks where their men were confined. November was a bitter month that year, and the searching northwesterners on the hilltops drove through the loose boarding as if it were so much mosquito netting. Ensign Anburey of the 21st Regiment has left a vivid account of their sufferings:

We reached the barracks on Prospect Hill very late in the evening, which were unfortunately in the worst condition imaginable for the reception of troops, being so much out of repair that we suffered severely from the inclemency of the weather; the barracks were in fact bare of everything; no wood, and a prodigious scarcity of fuel, insomuch that we were obliged

1. "Court Records," xxxviii, 164.

2. "The treatment of the officers and troops in general is of so extraordinary a nature in point of generosity that I must suppose it proceeds from some other motive than mere kindness of disposition." Burgoyne to Howe. Albany, Oct. 20, 1777. *Hist. MSS. Commission, Report on American MSS*, i, 141.

to cut down the rafters of our room to dry ourselves. The method of quartering was dreadfully inconvenient, six officers in a room not twelve feet square.¹

Sergeant Lamb, of the Royal Welsh Fusileers, speaks from the point of view of the rank and file:

It was not infrequent for thirty or forty persons, men, women, and children, to be indiscriminately crowded together in one small, miserable, open hut. The officers, without any regard to rank, were frequently crowded six or eight together in one small hut. In the night time, those that could lie down, and the many who sat up from the cold, were obliged frequently to rise and shake from them the snow which the wind drifted in at the openings.²

An additionally cheerful circumstance (which seems to have been successfully concealed from the new arrivals) was that these barracks had just been used as an "inoculating hospital" for the smallpox.³

Even their jailers were mortified at their condition. Col. Lee, in charge of the guards, reported them

exceeding uneasy with respect to their Quarters, as the cold weather approaches fast, & but very little wood renders their situation very disagreeable. . . . This morning rode round the lines and found the Field Officers & some Others walking by their Barracks to keep themselves from perishing with cold; not one stick of Wood to put into the Fire, & if some other method cannot be found to supply them they must either perish or burn all the Publick buildings.⁴

As a final insult, they seem to have been told that they were getting all they deserved, and need look for no improvement in their situation.

In spite of such a reception, so different from what they had been led to expect, the officers maintained the traditions of the service by exhibiting an admirable self-restraint and cheerfulness. Anburey, it will be noticed, makes no recriminations; and the committee of the Council reported "the Officers of the British Army much disposed to peace & good order," and ready to sign the parole "as soon as furnished with proper Quarters," or even promised them "within eight

1. Letter of Nov. 30, 1777. *Travels through America*, ii, 59.

2. *Journal of Occurrences in the American War*, 195.

3. Resolve of Apr. 8, 1777. *Mass. Archives*, 213 /170.

4. Lee to Heath. Cambridge, Nov. 14, 1777. *Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSB.*, vii, 38. In a supplementary report he complains of their pulling off barn doors and carrying away fence rails for fuel. Heath mentions on Jan. 27, 1778, that a bakery and dwelling house built by one Blodgett near Winter Hill during the Siege of Boston had been gradually stripped "until nothing remains." To Laurens. Heath Letters. MSS. Library of Congress

or ten days."¹ But that promise was not forthcoming; and the unfortunate officers, packed into tumbledown sheds that a self-respecting dog would have sniffed at, seemed doomed to shiver on their hilltop until the freezing of the nethermost pit.

Now John Burgoyne, whatever his merits or demerits as a wit, a playwright, or a parliamentarian, had as a military man at least one trait that deserves remembrance. He was one of the most humane and considerate officers of his day, one of the first commanders to break away from the iron rigidity that Frederick the Great had imposed on the profession as the ideal of army discipline, and to adopt the modern view that the soldier is a thinking human being, with feelings as sensitive as (and in many instances far more sensitive than) those of the politician who sends him out to stop a bullet. If he was nicknamed "Gentleman Johnny" it was because he was a gentleman, and possessed to the full that characteristic which is said to lie at the very foundation of a gentleman's nature — regard for his inferiors. As a result he was adored by his men. In the words of one of his Irish sergeants, "he possessed the confidence and affection of his army in so extraordinary a degree that no loss or misfortune could shake the one, or distress or affliction weaken the other." ²

He was equally adored by his officers, not only because he demanded (and obtained) the very best professional service that in them lay, but because he made them his personal friends, watched over their comfort with fatherly care, and protected their interests with jealous promptitude. Although thoroughly alive to his own prerogatives, he was no less determined to secure the rights of those for whom he was responsible. He felt the full force of those weighty words noblesse oblige; and like the captain who is the last to leave the sinking ship, he did not propose to take advantage of his rank to abandon his subordinates to their fate — or, as he expressed it, "to separate my lot from that of the army." ³

Thus at the court of enquiry held on the American Colonel Henley for maltreating some of his prisoners, Burgoyne would not entrust the prosecution to any of his staff, but appeared in person to press the charges and champion his men.⁴ Thus while his whole army was

1. 50. Nov. 13, 1777. Council Records, xxi, 871.— Mass. Archives, 168 /12.

2. Roger Lamb, *Journal of Occurrences in the American War*, 184.

3. Burgoyne to Heath, Nov. 12, 1777. *Parliamentary Register*, xii. Appendix, p. vii.

4. During these long-drawn proceedings Cleve notes: "General Burgoyne has more than once proved himself a great pleader — has even caused the entire court to shed tears." Letter of Jan. 13, 1778. Schlozer, *Briefwechsel*, iv, 383.

shivering around empty fireplaces, he announced in general orders that in the matter of fuel "every favor and preference has been refused by the Officers in general till Justice could be done to the Private Men." ¹ Thus when Gates, immediately after the signing of the Convention, obsequiously offered him a private passage to England at once on a government vessel, the offer was declined as "unacceptable"; and the American general, who had no more conception of such a code of ethics than of Vedic philosophy, could never for the life of him understand the reason why. ² His own code being merely to look out for number one, he would have regarded it as the height of foolishness had he known that Burgoyne was writing to Sir William Howe, the commander in chief, "I set out immediately for Boston, where I shall spare no pains for the arrangement and convenience of the troops till your orders arrive." ³

So when Heath offered the Englishman, stived up in the public house at Cambridge, the first choice of the best quarters, he replied:

Sir,

I have the Honor of your letter of the date of this day; and have only to return in Answer, that till the infringements of the Convention are redressed in regard to the quartering of Officers particularly, I cannot consistently with my duty or principles accept personally of any other accommodations than such as I have the misfortune to be Subjected to at present; should it please the will of your Government to make them worse, I persuade myself, I shall continue to persevere as becomes me.⁴

And so the first protest which he made was in behalf not of himself but of his subordinate officers. After a personal inspection of their situation, he wrote, overflowing with indignation, to Heath as follows:

Public House at Cambridge, Nov. 10th, 1777.

Sir,

I am under the Necessity, and I am persuaded you will partake my concern, of returning to you the proposed parole unsigned, the British regiments having unanimously insisted that the Convention is infringed in several circumstances but particularly in the Article expressing that every Officer shall be quartered according to his rank. . . . Since I have had occasion to visit the barracks myself, I am in honour & duty, and the fullest conviction, compelled to join my voice with the other Officers, and assert that the Quarters allotted to them would not be held fit for Gentle-

1. Nov. 16, 1777. Hadden's Orderly Book, 329.

2. Hist. MSS. Commission, Report on American MSS., i, 142.

3. Albany, Oct. 25, 1777. Hist. MSS. Commission, Report on American MSS., i, 144.

4. Nov. 11, 1777. Mass. Archives, 198/290.— Parliamentary Register, xii, Appendix, p. ii.

men in their situation in any part of the World. I have seen many jails preferable; and in the worst of them a man willing to purchase space may generally be indulged so far as not to Cook, eat, and lie at the rate of six persons or more in a room about ten feet square.... There are many other complaints; & circumstances in the regulations which the Officers in general think want farther explanation, that I will not trouble you with, Sir, because it is my hope and belief, if reasonable men take them into consideration, they will be easily settled. But that the Article regarding Quarters shall be properly fulfilled, before any Parole is signed, is a Resolution that no Individual will depart from. In regard to General Phillips and myself I shall say little. Our treatment is new to us, though we are not Strangers to what it is to be in the hands of an Enemy.

We are fully convinced, Sir, we should have no cause of complaint were the Power of redress in you; but if the Bodies in which the great Authorities of your State are vested have not means or inclinations to enforce, nor the people hospitality nor Civilization voluntarily to grant, compliances in matters of public faith, we have only to Protest, and to claim a removal to some other district, not imagining it possible that the same ideas should subsist in two parts of America.

I have the honour to be, with great personal regard, and a due sense of your attentions

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

J. BUEGOYNE ¹

M. Gen. Heath.

The quartering of the lower ranks thus became the crux of the whole situation. Upon it depended the signing of the parole, the pacification of Burgoyne, the good name of the town and the state, and, to no small degree, even the international reputation of the new republic: for the composite force of "Convention Troops" was soon to cross the water, and would spread far and wide, through both England and the Continent, the story how the American government stood by its obligations. Upon it Heath and his assistants expended their most anxious efforts. We have seen his prompt and comprehensive orders to his quartermaster on November 7th. But those orders were singularly barren of results. Chase reported the next day that he had visited house after house within the assigned limits, only to be refused. With a sinister and baffling unanimity the inhabitants of Cambridge declined to recognize his authority or to relieve the tension of an impasse that was rapidly becoming dangerous as well as humiliating. Heath found in short that in a very literal sense he had reckoned without his host.

36

1. Mass. Archives, 198 /287.— Parliamentary Register, xii, Appendix, p. iv.

In this crisis he bethought himself of the buildings of Harvard College. These had all been used as barracks for the provincial forces two years before, and to concentrate all the officers in one or two of them now would solve the problem admirably, especially since it would prevent their " boarding promiscuously in families ... which it is the wish of the legislature as much as possible to avoid." ¹He therefore addressed the Harvard Corporation as follows:

Head Quarters, Boston, Nov. 8, 1777

Rev^d Sirs,

Finding it extremely difficult if not impossible to obtain proper Quarters for the Field & Commissioned Officers of our Guards, and those of General Burgoyne's late Army without greatly distressing the Inhabitants, I am constrained to request the use of one or more of the Colleges, if you should think proper, which I submit to your Wisdom.

I am

Rev^d Sirs

Very respectfully

Your obed. H'ble Serv^t

W HEATH M G ²

Rev^d. Corporation of Harvard College

But to the exasperation and dismay of the American general, Harvard College adopted the same obstructionist tactics as the rest of Cambridge. For several days the dons maintained a pained and dignified silence, affecting to consider Heath's request as a demand (in the

words of a professor's wife) for "the first university in America being disbanded for their [the officers'] more genteel accommodation."³ Nothing of course was farther from Heath's thoughts. At this period the principal college dormitories were Massachusetts Hall, Stoughton Hall, and Hollis Hall. For many years their accommodations had been insufficient, and a large proportion of the students lodged in the town: the number of these would simply be augmented if one of the halls were turned over to the officers. To a stranger indeed the entire personnel seemed already to be scattered about Cambridge. Anburey remarked, "Neither the professors or students

1. Heath to Burgoyne. Nov. 11, 1777. *Parliamentary Register*, xii, Appendix, p. vi.

2. *Harvard College Papers*, ii, 34.— Draft in Heath MSS., *Mass. Hist. Soc.*, vii, 30. In this draft the words, "N.B. Hollis Hall" are added, but struck through with the pen.

3. Mrs. Winthrop to Mrs. Warren. Nov. 11, 1777. Ellett, *Women of the Revolution*, i, 98.

reside in the University; the former live in their own houses, and the latter board in the town."¹

Such considerations however the Corporation ignored. Taking advantage of the fact that the president (Langdon) was away on business in Maine, they simply referred Heath's letter to the Overseers, the ultimate academic authority,— after which subterfuge several of the Corporation also found it convenient to leave Cambridge for the time being.

After waiting three precious days for a reply, therefore, Heath felt he could waste no more time with the Corporation, and laid his case directly before the Massachusetts Council, from whose attitude he had much more to hope.

The unhappy and disgraceful situation of Genl Burgoyne and his officers is the only reason that constrains me again to write you on the Subject of providing them with proper Quarters. . . . Ever since your Order of the 7th Instant my Quarter Master has exerted himself to the utmost of his power to procure suitable accommodations, but without effect.

The Officers now begin to appear disgusted as your Honors will observe by the inclosed. Without speedy redress the unfavorable impressions will have taken too deep root to be easily eradicated —

The honor of the State is in danger,— the public Faith responsible —-circumstances will no longer admit of delay,— decisive measures must be immediately adopted and I cannot conceive of any so effectual as the appropriation of at least one of the Colleges,— to your Honor's Wisdom it must be submitted, as the means are not in my power, without offering violence to the Rights of the Constitution, which I wish ever to hold sacred.²

The enclosure referred to is probably the following:

Substance of the remonstrances made to the general by the commanding officers of the troops of the convention, soon after their arrival at Cambridge.

... It was agreed, that the officers should be conveniently lodged, according to their different ranks. Instead of this article being fulfilled, we are put into barracks, made of single boards; five, six, and seven officers in one room, without any distinction of rank.

The soldiers barracks, in general, are so very bad, that the men are not sheltered from the cold, or rain, though they have offered themselves to repair their barracks, upon materials being delivered to them; they are twenty, and twenty-four in a room, three in a birth, are without candle, and scarce receive wood enough to cook their victuals, much less to warm their rooms....

62. *Travels through America*, ii, 67.

63. *Head Quarters*, Boston, Nov. 11, 1777. *Mass. Archives*, 198 /289.— *Draft in Mass. Hist. Soc.*, Heath MSS., vii, 34.

We feel much less concerned for our own private convenience, than for that of the troops under our command.

. . . We are well assured, that you will insist upon and obtain those advantages to which the convention intitles the troops; we imagine they ought, in justice, to be put upon the same footing as in the winter of 1775, when the British troops were in garrison in Boston.

*Signed by the brigadier-generals, and officers commanding corps.*¹

At the same time Heath wrote to the impatient Burgoyne, concealing his real feelings under a mask of sternness evidently intended to "save his face":

*I can by no means admit that the Convention is infringed in any instance. Necessity has compelled me to quarter a larger number of captains and subalterns in a room than usual, but this was by no means to remain. The procuring new quarters for the field officers would make room for others; and as I assured your Excellency no care or attention should be wanting in me to make the situation of the officers as easy and agreeable as circumstances would admit of; I have been endeavouring to effect it, and hope I shall succeed. . . . That the article regarding the officers quarters shall be properly fulfilled is my determination, and that as soon as possible, but that they shall not take the liberty of the limits of a parole before they have signed it, is a resolution that I will not depart from, and I expect that they govern themselves accordingly.*²

*Now in putting his dilemma before the Council, and begging for their assistance in obtaining a college dormitory, Heath had done a very shrewd bit of business. For he had also stirred up the Harvard Overseers, a body whose views were very different from the Corporation's. This double result came about from the fact that by the system then in force the Council were ex-officio members of the Overseers, and indeed made an overwhelming majority there.*³ *The situation was precisely that of modern "interlocking directorates";*

1. *Parliamentary Register*, xi, 215. Of the "Humble Representation" addressed by Riedesel to Burgoyne on the same subject. *Stone, Memoirs of Riedesel*, i, 219.

2. Nov. 11, 1777. *Parliamentary Register*, xii, Appendix, p. v.

3. The members of the Council who are recorded as present at these meetings — mostly with praiseworthy regularity — were Jeremiah Powell (President), Benjamin Austin, Nathan Gushing (A.B. 1763), Thomas Gushing (A.B. 1744), Timothy Danielson (Hon. A.M. 1779), Richard Derby, Jabez Fisher, Abraham Fuller, Henry Gardner (A.B. 1750), Samuel Holten, Daniel Hopkins, Oliver Prescott (A.B. 1750), David Sewall (A.B. 1755), Josiah Stone, John Taylor, Artemas Ward (A.B. 1748), John Whitcomb, and Benjamin White (A.B. 1744). At the Overseers' meetings appeared Powell, Austin, N. Gushing, Danielson, Derby, Fisher, Fuller, Gardner, Holten, Hopkins, Prescott, Stone, Taylor, Ward,

so that by appealing to the Council the harassed general was really killing two birds with one stone.

The consequences were both gratifying and instantaneous. The Council, qua Council, refrained, it is true, from intermeddling at once with the private affairs of the college, and contented themselves with appointing Messrs. Derby and Austin a special committee "to proceed immediately to the Town of Cambridge & endeavor to procure suitable houses for General Burgoine's officers in such ways & manner as they shall think most adviseable."¹ But qua Overseers they were, in baseball parlance, "on their home grounds." That same day they had held a meeting to consider Heath's application of the 8th to the Corporation, which, as we have seen, the Corporation had passed on to them. The brief and formal terms of that note, however, had not impressed them very strongly, and "after some debate and conference on the subject" they had adjourned to the next afternoon without taking any action.²

On the 12th they accordingly reconvened after the meeting of the Council, and indeed without leaving the council chamber. This time they so far exceeded their technical status as to consider also the general's appeal to the Council. Its alarmingly plain language woke them up most effectually, "and having been informed by General Heath that after repeated attempts to procure Quarters for said officers among the dwelling houses in Cambridge, he has not been able to succeed, tho' the most generous price has been offered; and being willing in a case of such public importance & necessity to do all in their power to secure the public honor, peace, and safety, do earnestly and unanimously recommend it to the Corporation to consent that one or more of the buildings of the College be allowed to the above-mentioned Officers." (This was as far as they could go, since the actual ownership and management of the college property was vested in the Corporation.) They also voted that in the absence of President Langdon "Dr. Appleton the Senior Fellow of the College be served with a Copy of the preceding vote and be desired immediately to call a Meeting of the Corporation to take it into consideration." Then, evidently thinking that the Corporation would bear watching, they adjourned to the next day.³

1. Nov. 11, 1777. Council Records, xxi, 867.- Copy in Mass. Archives, 168/8.

2. Overseers' Records, iii, 122.

3. *Ibid.*

THE GREAT CAMBRIDGE CONSPIRACY

Matters were now moving rapidly. On the 13th Messrs. Derby and Austin, the special committee of the Council, reported that they had "spent the Day at Cambridge on that Business," that the officers' quarters "at present are in several Respects Inconvenient & not Such as they have a Right to Expect," that they had done their best to hire sufficient private houses" for the Genl Officers & such Commission Officers, as are not furnished with Quarters, & such as are Crouded where they now are, but the Committee are Led to think, that some pains had been taken, to prevent the People who have Hired the Houses Lately owned by Persons who have Joined the Enemy, Letting said Houses for that purpose, and therefore have only been able to agree for one, Namely for the House Lately the Widow

Vassalls." As to the use of a college building they reported that so many of the Harvard Corporation were absent that a meeting could not be held till the next day; "but without one or more of the college houses we are of opinion that sufficient houses cannot be obtained," — although Mr. Hall, one of the tutors, had promised that he would procure several other houses and so relieve the college.¹

The chief interest of this report lies in the way that Derby and Austin, in their disgust and irritation, had fairly and officially let the cat out of the bag. The committee appointed at the Cambridge town meeting had not confined themselves, it appeared, to their specified duties, but (acting doubtless on the unrecorded "sense of the meeting") had instigated the householders of the village to enter into a regular conspiracy to exclude the British officers from the quarters which Heath originally intended for them. Such townsmen as were ready and willing to do their part in carrying out the Convention had been coerced into the opposite course, in order that the whole town should form a sort of mare clausum to the bearers of his Majesty's commission. Let the officers herd with their men in the barracks! Even that was too good for the bloody lobsterbacks. Never mind what they had been promised. The promise to send them home to England was bad enough, and a mistake that never should have been made; Compared to that, what did this signify? Let them have a taste of hardship before they started!

The plot of course was obvious long before it was officially noted

1. *Council Records, xxi, 871.— Mass. Archives, 168/12.*

by the committee of the Council. No collection of diverse and disparate humanity could present such an unbroken front without concerted intent. Even the prisoners themselves knew the story. "The Officers," wrote Burgoyne in his first letter to Heath, "feel these hardships the more grievously as they have reason to believe there are many inhabitants within the limits proposed willing to receive them as lodgers were they at liberty so to do."

¹ *At a later date he stated the case more fully:*

There were, at the time of the above complaints, houses more than sufficient for the purpose, some of them, as I have been informed, under sequestration, and possessed only by tenants at will, over which the council of the Massachusetts had consequently controul; others possessed by persons who would have been willing to receive officers, had they not been prevented by the committee of Cambridge.²

Ensign Anburey was not so specific, but was sufficiently accurate, when he wrote, "Permission was denied us to accommodate ourselves with rooms in this town, till General Burgoyne arrived, and represented our situation to the Council at Boston, when it was reluctantly granted." ³ Heath himself admitted in his published account of the affair that "some individuals were refractory," upon this point,⁴ but was too politic to enlighten posterity further as to the failings of their ancestors.

It is thoroughly characteristic of the atmosphere which surrounded this miserable business that, in the face of such evidence, official and unofficial, as has been given above, and will be adduced hereafter, the committee of Congress, appointed later to consider Burgoyne's conduct, tried to whitewash the Cantabrigians with such pitiful excuses as "the sudden and unexpected arrival of so large a body of troops, the concourse of strangers in and near Boston, the devastation and destruction occasioned by the British army, not long since blocked up in that town, and by the American army which besieged them; and considering that the officers were not to be separated from their men, and that the troops could not be quartered with equal convenience in any other place within the limits pointed out and described in the convention, as there are not a sufficient number of barracks in any

1. Nov. 10, 1777. *Parliamentary Register*, xii, Appendix, p. iv.—*Mass. Archives*, 198 / 287.

2. Burgoyne to President of Congress. Cambridge, Feb. 11, 1778. *Parliamentary Register*, xi. 211.— *Original in Public Record Office*, London: Colonial Office, Class 5, vol. 98, p. 385.

3. Letter of Nov. 30, 1777. *Travels through America*, ii, 59.

4. Nov. 14, 1777. *Memoirs* (ed. 1901), 127.

other part of that state."¹ From such disingenuous paltering, such pressing of side issues, one might suppose that the Congressional board had never heard of the Cambridge committee nor the determination of the town meeting that the officers should not "have the range of the town."

Nevertheless, that committee had done its spiteful work thoroughly and well. Not only the householders of Cambridge, but the staff of Harvard College, had received their cue. In consequence, the unusual housing facilities to be found in Cambridge — the numerous deserted mansions of the Tories and the ample halls of the university — were absolutely unavailable, and the unfortunate officers were, so to speak, starving in a land of plenty. They might have done better in the poorest frontier settlement.

THE SIEGE OF HARVARD COLLEGE

Against this barrier of prejudice and selfishness, now openly acknowledged, the Council (or, in other words, the Overseers) threw themselves in support of the gallant exertions of General Heath. At their adjourned meeting on the 13th, the Overseers considered Derby and Austin's report to the Council, and also the news, communicated by Dr. Eliot, one of the Corporation, that Dr. Appleton had called a meeting for the morrow. To await the action of that body, they thereupon adjourned to the next day.²

On the 14th accordingly the Corporation at last gathered their scattered forces to consider the situation that in spite of their evasions had been forced upon them. Very ungraciously ignoring Heath's request of the 8th, they confined their attention to the vote of the Overseers recommending the use of a building for the officers. Nor would they meet even that issue squarely. One reason for their delay, it appeared, had been to give time for Mr. Tutor Hall to make a fresh canvass of Cambridge, so as to avoid their obligations by showing that there were, after all, plenty of houses available. Hall's success, where both civil and military authorities had failed so completely, shows at a glance the Cambridge men's selfish duplicity. What they had unanimously refused at the call of honor and the demands of humanity, they were instantly able to grant when danger threatened the college, by which (in one way or another) most of

75. *Journals of Congress*, X, 32.

76. *Overseers' Records*, iii, 123.

them made their livelihood.¹ Indeed the report unblushingly admitted as much:

The following Accommodations can be had for y^e Officers of Mr. [sic] Burgoyne's late army.

At Lieut. Governor Oliver's late house.....7 Rooms encumbred only by Mr. Treadwell, whose whole interest in s^d house is but £4:0:0 p^r Ann.

At Judge Lee's A field Officer.....2 Rooms

At Judge Sewall's late house.....8 Rooms

the State remitting to y^e present possessors y^e Rent of y^e current year & removing their Effects

Mrs. Vassall's house.....10 Rooms

Mrs. Wendell gives encouragement, that if giving up her house will preserve y^e Colleges from y^e possession of y^e British Troops, she will endeavour to accommodate with.....7 Rooms

At Mr. Bradish's (Hunt's late house).....8 Rooms encumbered only by Dr Foster's present Residence

At Dr. Kneeland's A field Officer, or two.....2 or 4 Rooms

At Mr. Wigglesworth's two of our own field Officers

At Mr. Prof. Sewall's.....3 Rooms

Mr. Borland's late house may be had.....12 Rooms upon some conditions, or other

At Mr. John Hastings's.....1 Room

At Capt Stedman's.....2 Rooms

At Dr Moore's.....2 Rooms

At Mrs. Hicks's.....2 Rooms N.B. y^e two last mentioned places are Rooms already occupied by Officers.

S. HALL²

On the strength of this list the Corporation professed to consider the grounds of the Overseers' vote "now in a great measure, if not wholly removed. Nevertheless to demonstrate their readiness to comply with every Recommendation of the Board, & to promote y^e publick Honour, Peace & Safety, the Corporation consent that y^e House lately purchased by them for y^e Residence of y^e Students, containing 12 Rooms, be employed to y^e above mentioned purpose, upon reasonable terms, in case it cannot be otherwise accomplished."³

1. In 1782 the French traveller Chastellux observed, "Cambridge is a little town, inhabited only by students, professors, and the small number of servants and workmen they employ."

2. *Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 37.*

3. "College Book," vii, 334.— Copy in *Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 37.* Present: Dr. Appleton, Dr. Winthrop, Dr. Eliot, Dr. Cooper, Mr. Hall, Treasurer Storer. The rent afterwards agreed on was \$8 a week.

44

The house referred to was the somewhat notorious "Wiswall's Den" (bought by the College in 1772), occupying a part of the site of the present College House, in Harvard Square. It was "an ugly, three-story, brick-ended, wooden fronted" dwelling,¹ unsavory in more senses than one, and not what Heath wanted at all. The Overseers were equally disgusted with the Corporation's grandiloquent equivocation, and at their meeting on the afternoon of the same day, on reviewing the above action, decided to clear the decks altogether by recommending to the Corporation "immediately to dismiss the Students to their several homes."²

This appalling vote, by which the Overseers of Harvard seemed to abandon their allegiance and literally go over to the enemy, fell upon the Corporation like a bombshell. Well might they feel that they had been wounded in the house of their friends! Their artifice had not only failed, but had left them far worse off than before, since they now faced the evacuation of all the dormitories instead of only one, and the real "disbanding" of the university. Again they played for time by waiting till the 17th, when a regular adjourned meeting of their board was due. At that meeting the guardians of the college property held an agitated discussion. They could not openly oppose the Overseers, to whom they had voluntarily referred the question; and yet they were determined to hold the fort to the last shot in the locker. After much quibbling, they arrived at an apparent acquiescence, couched in terms at once dignified and mysterious. As there were "some matters of great importance to y^e College, that are necessary to be Adjusted before y^e Students are dismissed," the Faculty were "desired" to dismiss them "as soon as possible."³ What these matters of great importance were has never been explained.

By thus bringing in the Faculty — the third and lowest collegiate board, consisting of the actual teaching force and concerned with the immediate administrative details of the institution — and by leaving the matter to their discretion, the Corporation had still further complicated the situation. As the Faculty were of course all residents of Cambridge, their hostile bias was the most pronounced of anyone's. This they showed at once, together with their interpretation of the responsibility entrusted to them. The holiday of Thanksgiving was close at hand (Nov. 20), when the students were always

80. John Holmes. *Harvard Book, ii, 30.*

81. *Overseers' Records, iii, 125.*

82. "College Book," vii, 336.

45

given a few days' vacation. But the very next day after the affair had been committed to them, the Faculty, fearful that the military authorities might steal a march on them if the college buildings were vacated for even a week, voted that whereas "the peculiar critical circumstances of the College at present render it highly inexpedient that the Scholars should be absent from the College at this time," therefore "no leave of Absence be granted to any of the Scholars to go home to Thanksgiving this Year."¹ Thus the attempt of the Overseers to get rid of the students at once, resulted only in making them sit tighter than ever!

The Massachusetts Council (virtually, we must remember, the Harvard Overseers) had also been watching the course of events with steadily increasing irritation and alarm. On Nov. 18 they appointed a new committee, Messrs. Gushing and Holten, to pierce if possible the fog of evasion and delay by enquiring of Heath whether enough houses really could be provided in Cambridge for the officers "Exclusive of the Colleges, & if not, How many Rooms are still Wanting." ² On the same day Heath again addressed the Council, setting forth the situation in detail, since "the Officers are still extremely uneasy as to their Quarters." Either anticipating or replying to the new committee's enquiries, he observed:

I was informed the last evening, that it was reported that near ninety rooms could be obtained, and that it would be needless to take any part of the Colleges, but if every room from the Garret to the Seller are counted in those Houses allotted to the General Officers, as there are twelve in the House occupied by General Burgoyne & his Suit, more than one half of the Ninety rooms pretended to be procured will be those of the General Officers, and we shall but deceive ourselves by such enumeration. ... I most sincerely wish that the matter might be accommodated, and it appears to me that it might be easily done.³

Apparently feeling that he had not been sufficiently explicit, he summarized the matter in a supplementary note, which hints at fresh activities by the Cambridge committee:

Quarters are not as yet provided at Cambridge sufficient for the accommodation of the Officers of Genl Burgoyne's late army, neither do I conceive it practicable to obtain them Exclusive of at least one of the Colleges, as the Officers do most peremptorily insist upon being Quartered

1. Nov. 18, 1777. Faculty Records, iv, 74.

2. Council Records, xxi, 880.— Mass. Archives, 173/587.— Copy in Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 45.

3. Mass. Archives, 198 /296.— Draft in Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 44.

according to rank; besides several Houses which were supposed to have been engaged are now refused.¹

This last touch of impudence brought the Council to the point where patience ceased to be a virtue. In their capacity of Overseers they had shot their bolt with little effect: they now determined to exert their full power as the supreme civil authority, and since all other means had failed, to take a college building by executive enactment.

Council Chamber, Nov. 18, 1777

Whereas Major General Heath has represented to this Board that there has not been sufficient Houses taken up for the accommodation of the Officers Belonging to General Burgoyne's Army now Prisoners in the Town of Cambridge and that it is not practicable to obtain them exclusive of at least one of the colleges, and it appearing to the Council of the utmost Importance that the said Officers should be immediately Supplied with suitable rooms for their accommodation

Therefore Ordered that Major General Heath be and he hereby is Authorized to take up such and so many rooms in one of the Colledges viz Massachusetts Hall as will be necessary to accomodate the Officers belonging to General Burgoyne's Army, now Prisoners in the town of Cambridge. Provided he cannot procure rooms sufficient for the accomodation of the said officers in the dwelling houses within the limits prescribed for the officers aforesaid. And Provided also the said

Officers that shall be Quartered in the rooms in the Colledge will be answerable for all the damages that shall accrue to the Colledges by reason of their being placed there and pay a reasonable rent for the same. And General Heath is hereby desired to give due notice To the immediate Governors of the Colledge or the major part of them That the Students may have sufficient time to move their effects therefrom and secure the same.

To The Rev^d Doctor Nathaniel

Appleton senior fellow of

Harvard College, Cambridge.²

This unique document, unparalleled in the history of the college and of the state, was aimed directly, it will be seen, at the "immediate government," or Faculty, but was addressed to the chairman pro tem of the Corporation. It was also officially known to the Overseers, who met by adjournment the afternoon of the same day and reviewed the whole situation to date, but contented themselves with awaiting the outcome of the new developments by a series of further adjourn-

1. *Mass. Archives, 198/302.— Draft In Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 45.*

2. *Council Records, xxi, 880.— Draft in Mass. Archives, 168 /23.— Copy in Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 44.*

ments.¹ The commands of the highest civil authority, in short, were unmistakably heard in every corner of Harvard College.

Accordingly on the 19th General Heath, with the whole power of the Commonwealth behind him, had the satisfaction of writing to the "Governors of the College" as follows:

Head Quarters Boston Nov^r. 19, 1777.

Rev^d Sirs

The Hon^{ble} Council of this State by an order of yesterday have directed that the Rooms in Massachusetts Hall should be taken up for the accommodation of the Officers of Genl Burgoyne's late Army if rooms sufficient for their accommodation cannot be procured in the Dwelling Houses in the Town of Cambridge, the latter after repeated endeavours appears impracticable. I would therefore request that you will be pleased to give directions to the Students in Massachusetts Hall to remove their Effects as soon as possible. It is with great reluctance that I ask this favor, and nothing but necessity could induce me to do it.—

I am

With great respect

Your Most Obd^t Servant

W HEATH M G ¹

Revd Fellows of Harvard College

Here was something that to the meanest intelligence must appear conclusive. Yet incredible as it may seem, the Faculty managed once again to stave off the issue by a mixture of the thinnest technicality and the weakest sentimentalism.

To the Hon^{ble} Council of the State of Massachusetts Bay 20 Nov. 1777

May it please your Honors

An Order of the Hon^{ble} Council of this State (accompanied with a Letter from Major General Heath) has been communicated to the immediate Governors of Harvard College . . .

Upon which we, the major part of the immediate Governors of Harvard College, beg leave to observe that the Students are not to remove their effects, but only in consequence of the Provisos above specified — With regard to the first Proviso, we think it our duty to acquaint the Honble Board that it appears from a Schedule laid before us by Mr. Hall, who was desired by a Committee of the Council to procure Rooms, that he has already engaged a greater number of Rooms than was proposed as necessary.— With regard to the second Proviso, we are at a loss to know, whom the Hon^{ble} Board supposes these officers are to be answerable to, for the damages that may accrue to the College, and with whom they are to agree for the Rent to be paid. We conceive, that we have no authority

1. Overseers' Records, iii, 126.

2. Harvard College Papers, ii, 35.— Draft in Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 46.

to transact affairs of this nature. The College Estate is vested in the Corporation as Trustees; and we are humbly of opinion that every matter relating to that Estate lies with the Corporation.— As to the Students removing their effects and, what must be the immediate consequence, returning to their respective homes, we humbly apprehend, that it cannot be done upon very short notice, without subjecting the Students to great difficulties. Most of them cannot do it without assistance from their Parents, several of whom live at considerable distances.

All which is humbly submitted

J. WINTHROP

E. WIGGLESWORTH

STEPHEN SEWALL

STEPHEN HALL

JA. WINTHROP

BENJ^a GUILD¹

At the Faculty meeting when this interesting document was prepared, it was also voted "that Mr. Hall be desired to wait upon the Honble Council, and lay before them the Schedule of the Rooms already provided; and the foregoing Representation; and also wait upon General Heath with Copies of the same." ² This Schedule was an amplification of Hall's first list, dressed out in livelier colors, and including the latest acquisitions, but (as Heath had pointed out) shamelessly padded by including the quarters already occupied by the generals and their staffs.

State of quarters for Genl Burgoyne & his Officers in the Town of Cambridge, already possessed, or ready to be taken possession of.

Mr. Borland's late House, 12 Rooms completely finished, besides upper Rooms fit to lodge in.

Late Judge Sewall's, 10 Rooms; 7 upright & handsome; one large convenient kitchen; two handsome & convenient upper Rooms fit to lodge in; also a garret fit for Servants to lodge in.

Mrs. Vassall's, a large house with many Rooms, ten, I am told, at least fit to quarter in.

Capt: Stedman's 2 large Rooms.

Mrs. Morse's 2 Rooms

Mr. Prof. Sewall's, Commissary Higgins & family.

Half of Widow Borland's late house, a large square house.

Colⁿ Thacher's, an handsome Room, completely furnished.

1. Mass. Archives, 168 /24.— Copies in Harvard College Papers, ii, 35 and Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 47. John Winthrop was professor of mathematics, Edward Wigglesworth, of divinity, Stephen Sewall, of Hebrew, Stephen Hall and Benjamin Guild were tutors, and James Winthrop was librarian.

2. Memorandum in Harvard College Papers, ii, 35. In the Faculty Record Book there are no minutes of this meeting of Nov. 20, but a space is left on the page.

College house, 12 Rooms.

Mr. John hastings's, one Room.

Mrs. Gookins's, one Room.

Six houses occupied by Officers on Charlestown Road.¹

One field Officer at Mr. Marshes

A Commissary at Judge Lee's.

A field Officer at Mr. Howe's

Two Cap^{ts} at Mr. Warland's

Two Cap^{ts} at Dr. Moore's

A Cap^t & Lieut: at Mrs. Hicks's.

Two, or three Officers at Mr. Welsh's

One Room occupied at Mr. Boardman's Quarters that may be had.

At late Gov. Oliver's house, 7 Rooms.

Deacon Hill's 2 Rooms.

Mr. Barrett's 2 Rooms.

*Heath, however, was not to be put off by this sort of thing. On Nov. 22 he ordered his quartermaster, Col. Chase, to arrange for the rent of College House, and also "for the Rent of Massachusetts Hall, as it appears impracticable to procure proper quarters for the officers of Gen1 Burgoyne's army without the improvement of that College.... You will also wait upon the immediate Governors of the College & acquaint them of the necessity of Massachusetts Hall being cleared without further delay."*³

And still, with the insensate tenacity of limpets on a rock, the Faculty clung to their hall. The Quartermaster might thunder on their doors; he was to realize as never before that the pen is mightier than the sword. The Council might issue its legal fiats; it had over looked the maxim that possession is nine points of the law. The Overseers might impotently insist on their ultimatum; they were learning that the cloistered seclusion of academic life was no empty phrase. Had Harvard College existed under Henry VIII, that redoubtable dissolver of monasteries would there have met his match. Blind to the consequences, deaf to every order, and now dumb (as far as written records show) the "Immediate Government" literally held their own against all comers.⁴ Another avenue of escape was open-

1. See note, p. 24 ante.

2. Mass. Archives, 168 /27.

3. Copy in Harvard College Papers, 11, 39.— Draft in Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 51.

4. Cf. the acute summary of Sergeant Lamb: "It is true that the Court of Massachusetts passed resolutions for procuring suitable accommodations for them; but from the general unwillingness of the people to administer the least civility, and from the feebleness of the authority which the American rulers had at that time over the property of their fellow citizens, their situation was rendered truly deplorable." *Journal of Occurrences in the American War*, 195.

ing before them. The House of Representatives was due to reassemble on November 26, and might take a more favorable attitude towards the college, its original creation and the recipient of its immemorial favors.

Sure enough, on the 27th the legislature, blandly ignoring the long-drawn battle that had been waged during its recess, began de novo by appointing a joint committee, Farley, Brown, and Gushing, with the novel (?) instructions "to confer with General Heath on the subject of procuring quarters for the officers of the Army lately under the Command of General Burgoyne, and report what is proper to be done."¹

This was a crushing blow to the American commander. Dazed and exhausted by his fruitless struggle for Massachusetts Hall, he could not bring himself to reopen the whole question with the new committee. He determined instead on a fresh line of action. According to the report of the committee, he "informed them that he found it impracticable to provide Quarters for all the officers in the Houses in the town of Cambridge, that he was averse to taking up either of the Colledges for that purpose if it could be prevented, that he thought it might be avoided by Quartering some of the officers at Medford and Menotomy." The committee approved of this solution, "as less Inconvenience and Expense will arise than by taking up one of the Colledges." By a joint resolution of both chambers, therefore, the general was "desired to procure quarters for such officers as are not yet provided for, at Medford and Menotomy agreeable to the above report."²

Again Heath lost no time in trying to relieve the long-suffering officers, and to meet a situation that now contained a new element of discredit. On November 28 he reported to the Council:

I this Day received the Resolve of the Hon. Assembly for Extending the Limits of the officers and soldiers of the Convention and promising Quarters for them in Menotomy & Medford — I immediately sent up my Quarter Master With Directions, to ask the company & assistance of Mr.

1. Mass. Archives, 216 /29.— Engrossed copy in Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 49.— Journals of the House, Nov. 27, 1777.

2. Mass. Archives, 216 /29.— Engrossed copy in Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 59.— "Court Records," xxxviii, 163. Menotomy was the present Arlington.

51

Hall one of the Tutors of the College with whom He would proceed to the before mentioned places and see what Houses can be possibly obtained. He is not returned but I fear the number will be few from the Intelligence I have received. From the supposed certain prospect which presented itself a few Days since, I ventured to give my Honor to the Officers that they should have proper Quarters within Eight Days from the 25th Instant, upon the pledge of which they have signed their paroles. If Quarters are not obtained I need not mention the disagreeable Situation which I shall be in.¹

And now the Harvard Faculty, seeing the tide of attack begin to flow safely past the college into new channels, suddenly emerged from its shell and took its most insolent action of all. The regular long winter vacation was by this time drawing near, scheduled to begin the first Wednesday in December. On the previous Saturday, November 29, the "immediate governors" affected to recollect their instructions to dismiss the students "as soon as possible," and with a great show of alacrity resolved that

Whereas the Hon^{ble} & Rev^d Overseers & Corporation have recommended to the immediate Governors of the College to dismiss the Students as soon as possible, after some matters of great Importance to the College should be adjusted,— therefore

Voted.— That all who can, or are desirous to go home this day, may have Leave by applying to a Tutor; & that the Remainder be dismissed next Monday Morning, to return on the first Wednesday in Feby next, unless they shall receive public Notice to the Contrary.

Voted. That if any Scholars should be detained in Town they shall acquaint a Tutor therewith; & if he give them Leave to tarry, upon returning their Names to the Steward, he be directed to make Provision for them till Wednesday next, & no longer, & charge it as sizings [i.e. extras].²

This slight anticipation of the vacation, now nothing but a piece of effrontery, might just as well have been made a few weeks earlier, when it would have saved the honor of the college, the town, and the state. That however seems to have been no concern of the Faculty. They had succeeded in distressing the inoffending officers, in incommoding both civil and military authorities, and in blocking the good intentions of the Overseers, to the utmost of their power; and their petty spite took a final triumphant fling in subsequently extending

1. Draft in Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 60. This whole passage is struck across with the pen, and may not have been sent. It is to be noted that Heath records in his private journal, "Nov. 25. This day Gen' Burgoyne &c signed their paroles." MS. at Mass. Hist. Soc.

2. Faculty Records, iv, 78.

the vacation to the first Wednesday in March; so that while the unfortunate officers were scattered far and wide under every form of discomfort, the college halls that might have gathered them so conveniently remained totally vacant nearly all winter — perhaps the most ungracious spectacle ever presented in the College Yard.¹

THE FINAL PAROLE LIMITS

*Having followed the complicated moves in this protracted game of dog-in-the-manger as played in Cambridge, it remains for us to accompany General Heath into the surrounding towns in the last stage of his endeavors to fulfil the Convention and assign proper quarters to the officers who had surrendered on the faith of its terms. A week was spent in ransacking the possibilities of Medford and Menotomy according to the order of the legislature. During this time Burgoyne, who had been watching the American's honest efforts with sympathetic appreciation, took a hand in lightening those labors as much as he could. Seeing that the houses of Cambridge were to be very nearly, and the halls of Harvard were to be absolutely, closed to his officers, so that their stay on Prospect Hill was to be more than an uncomfortable but temporary makeshift, he did his best to assuage their feelings by giving them a *raison d'etre* and a professional status there. On Dec. 4 he issued orders that, to prevent desertions and preserve discipline, "as many Officers as can possibly be lodged in the Barracks without danger to their Health, or very unusual Inconvenience, must for the present constantly reside there." At the same time he could not forbear the satiric comment, "It is expected they will cheerfully forego the prospect of any extension of Quarters in Cambridge."²*

Perhaps stung by this shaft, Heath the next day reported to the General Court that despite every effort of his quartermaster and the ubiquitous Mr. Hall, only a few houses had been obtained in Medford,

1. Much of this episode has already been told by FitzHenry Smith, Jr., "Were Burgoyne's Officers Quartered on the College?" *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, xi, 50. The success of the college authorities in forcing the officers to occupy private lodgings had an unexpectedly awkward sequel. The widely attended festival of Commencement, which had been discontinued since the beginning of the war, had to be omitted again in 1778, this time because of two grievous afflictions — a visitation of the smallpox and "the want of necessary Accommodations in the Town of Cambridge, the Houses being crowded with British Officers." Corporation vote of June 10, 1778. "College Book," viii, 2,

2. Hadden's *Orderly Book*, 332.

and these had been assigned to the "Officers of the Foreign Corps"; so that the number of British officers unprovided for remained nearly the same as before.¹ He therefore asked whether he might include Watertown in the parole limits.²

But the legislature, having saved Harvard College, the apple of its eye, was disposed to be difficult. After delaying three days, and some wrangling in committee, it advanced a counter-proposition, allowing houses to be taken (with permission of the owners) on the road to Lexington, and up "as far as Lexington meeting House if Needs be."³ Four days later, after a faithful search of that district, Heath fairly boiled over. The Lexington scheme, he reported, had been a total failure;

Not more than two or three rooms can be obtained at any rate on that road, and indeed how are Quarters to be expected from an extension to Fields and scattered Farm Houses? Your Honors are sensible that it is in large public Buildings, in populous Towns and Villages, that they are found. The subject of Quarters has been long debated — they are not as yet provided: Every principle of

Interest and policy call for our attention to the fulfilment of the Convention. The probable short stay of the Troops still more engages it, as they will wish to catch at every pretext as an infringement, and will avail themselves of improving it to our disadvantage. If the Colleges are not to be taken, why should Watertown be refused where Quarters can be procured with ease? Can one material objection of disadvantage to the public be alledged against it, that upon one moment's reflection does not at present almost equally exist? Public Faith, Honor & Interest compel me immediately to find proper Quarters, I wish — I need,— I ask your Assistance that it may be compleated this day for reasons which I cannot mention; If I should not be so happy as to obtain your assistance to effect it, I hope that such measures as necessity may compel me to take will not be disagreeable.

I have the honor to be

with great respect

Your obed. Serv^t

W. HEATH⁴

Such a frank statement of the dangers of the situation, and such an open threat of summary action, brought the legislature to its senses.

1. There is a not unpleasing tradition that at one of the Medford taverns within the parole limits the German officers had the good fortune to discover a stock of Rhenish wine, which they hugely enjoyed — while it lasted.

2. Dec. 5, 1777. Mass. Archives, 216/126.— Draft in Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS. vii, 78.

3. House Journal, Dec. 8, 1777.— Mass. Archives, 216 /102.

4. Dec. 12, 1777. Mass. Archives, 216/118.— Draft in Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 94.

54

On the same day they issued an order allowing Heath to take up quarters in private houses "with the permission of the owners" (an ominous clause), on the road to Watertown as far as Mr. Remington's dwelling, over the Watertown bridge as far as Angler's Corner, and on the North Road in Watertown.¹

The Watertown extension was the final addition to the parole limits, which, by the stages and for the causes traced above, had gradually expanded from the district immediately around the barracks to the whole vicinity of Cambridge. The completed parole (see Appendix) is dated Dec. 13, the day Heath assured Burgoyne that all officers unprovided for should have quarters in Watertown.² On the faith of this promise many officers signed.³ Others (including apparently Burgoyne himself) had signed a fortnight before, when Heath felt so sure of getting Massachusetts Hall that he had given his word that all officers should be comfortably housed by the end of November.⁴ A few, it may be added, in whom their treatment rankled most deeply, never signed at all. But the incredible perversity of public opinion continued to block every move, and nullify every promise, of the American commander, who was now struggling singlehanded against this really serious diplomatic crisis, and to spin out the wretched business to unimaginable lengths. The men of Watertown adopted the same obstructive policy as their brethren of Cambridge, and in an even bolder form. Again therefore the disgusted Heath unbosomed himself to the General Court in a burst of wrath that does him credit:

My Quarter Master went on yesterday to Watertown in order to take up Quarters for the Officers agreeable to the Resolve of both Houses of Assembly of the 12th Instant. Upon his arrival he was met by the Selectmen of the Town and Committee, who Informed him that they had been to the

Owners of the several Houses which He had engaged, and had forbid them admitting any of the British Officers, and would still continue to forbid them until it was allowed by a Vote of the Town.—

As the foregoing needs no comment, I shall not make any.—

On Saturday [Dec. 13] I assured Genl Burgoyne that his officers should

1. *House Journals, Dec. 12, 1777.— "Court Records," xxxviii, 197.— Mass. Archives, 216/118.*

2. *See below.*

3. *The well-informed editor of the Annual Register says the officers signed, not because they considered that their grievances were redressed, but mainly to do what they could "in order to remove this new difficulty" caused by Burgoyne's indiscreet letter of Nov. 14. Annual Register for 1778, p. 213.*

4. *See p. 52 ante.*

have Quarters immediately in Watertown; I then imagined that I might give such assurance with safety — as I had the Resolve of both Houses before me for it. But if this is to be disputed by a COMMITTEE or SELECTMEN of a TOWN I think it may justly be called a PHENOMANON in Government.¹

The Roxbury man knew his audience. They might be callous as to the violation of the Convention, and indifferent as to the consequences thereof, but they were sensitive enough as to their own dignity. The very day that Heath made his report, they resolved that the selectmen and committee of Watertown be served with an attested copy thereof, and directed to attend the Council on the 17th "and answer to the matters alleged against them." ² This decisive action had the desired effect — if it had been taken with the Cambridge committee in the beginning, the whole controversy would never have occurred — and no further objection seems to have been made to quartering a considerable group of officers in Watertown.

For those that were still left unprovided with proper lodgings after this six weeks of confusion, nothing remained but the barracks; and there a number of them appear to have passed the winter, exposed to quite unnecessary, and very humiliating, hardships. Ensign Anburey records:

We laboured under many distresses and difficulties; every species of provision was very dear, and to add to our misfortune, could hardly be procured for money. You do not, I believe, in England, rank milk in the catalogue of luxuries; yet we were obliged, ourselves, to traverse a deep snow for a full mile, to get a small quantity for our breakfasts, as our servants were not permitted to pass the centinels. ... To preserve order and regularity among the troops, three officers of each regiment constantly reside in the barracks.³

Captain Cleve writes:

I am lodged in the same miserable house with my Brigadier. My room is in the attic, and the cracks in the boarded walls are so large that you can see everything going on outside. I never felt so cold before in my life. I can't go a step from my fire-place, and the ink has frozen on my pen more than a hundred times. During the recent snow-storm, accompanied by a high wind, the snow was a foot deep in my room. The

1. Dec. 15, 1777. *Mass. Archives*, 198 /351.— *Draft in Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 99.*

2. "Court Records," xxxviii, 208.

3. Letter of Nov. 30, 1777. *Travels through America*, ii, 60.

56

*poor fellows in the barracks endure even greater hardships, for they have neither straw nor covering.*¹

To set this picture in its true colors, we must recall that the men to whom such treatment was meted out were not a crowd of dunder-headed subalterns, bottle-nosed majors, and superannuated garrison colonels (as British officers have been only too often represented by American writers), but the flower of the English fighting aristocracy, including scions of the peerage, sons of the great landed families, and men of wealth and fashion in the most exclusive clubs of London. The older among them had acquired wide experience, and won well-deserved honors, in various crack corps of the British army. The younger were keenly set on their profession, and had bright prospects of advancement: no less than thirty-three of them subsequently rose to the rank of general. Among the staff officers alone there were six members of Parliament. "It must be admitted," says the biographer who has most closely studied the personnel, "that rarely has so brilliant an array of British officers been marshalled under one commander." ²Had these high-spirited and highly disciplined gentlemen been forced to spend the winter among the savages in the wilderness, not a murmur would have escaped them. But to be treated like pariahs in the midst of a well-to-do and well-nurtured community of their own race, ³in a town famous for its standards of religion and morality, was an insult which they could ill brook — nor can we wonder.

Thus were Burgoyne's officers finally quartered — a poor makeshift at the best of it. The consequences were both unfortunate and unforeseen. Although by the original intentions of all parties the stay of the Convention Troops in Cambridge was to be but brief, so that the lodging of the officers would have been only a temporary inconvenience, yet through the very fact that their quarters were so bad it fell out that they were forced to occupy them for almost a year. The reasons for this "vicious circle" are of extreme interest. But before we examine them we may glance at the daily life of the captives, especially those in the Vassall house mentioned at the beginning of this paper.

1. Letter of Dec. 18, 1777. *Schlozer, Briefwechsel*, iv, 376.

2. Horatio Rogers, editor of *Hadden's Journal and Orderly Book*, p. xlvii.

3. "Rumor in many tongues, cries out a French War. Should it be so, I shall hope to join you in Fields where we have fought and conquer'd. There conquest becomes a gratification and the mind exults. Here pity interposes and we cannot forget that when we strike we wound a Brother." *Phillips to Clinton. Cambridge, May 20, 1778. Hist. MSS. Commission, Report on American MSS., i, 254.*

57

PRISON LIFE IN CAMBRIDGE

Amidst all the inhospitable selfishness of the inhabitants of Cambridge that has been set forth above, the conduct of Captain Adams, ex-innkeeper of Charlestown and temporary

possessor of the confiscated mansion of Col. Henry Vassall,¹ stands out in grateful relief. Perhaps as a stranger in town he did not share the bitter animosity shown by the old residents; perhaps he felt reminiscent prickings of his former legal duty to provide entertainment for man and beast; perhaps he realized from experience the golden harvest that awaited the sickle of a tactful and not too scrupulous Boniface. At all events, as we have seen,² his door was the first to open at the knock of the quartermaster; nor did he embarrass that functionary with provisos or restrictions.

Here, therefore, we may infer were immediately quartered as many and as important officers of the Convention Troops as the house would hold, comfortable with their own punctilious ideas on questions of dignity and rank. Tradition has always run that they were members of Burgoyne's staff, or "general officers." The possibilities therefore include Charles Green and R. R. Wilford, aides de camp, R. Kingston, deputy adjutant general, Jonathan Clarke, commissary general, George Vallancey, assistant quartermaster general, David Geddes, deputy paymaster general, Robert Hoakesly, wagonmaster general, together with such of the chaplains, surgeons, etc., as the fanciful reader may care to select from the useful list in the appendix to O'Callaghan's edition of Burgoyne's Orderly Book.

Certainly they were as diametrically opposite to the last military occupants — when the house had been used as a hospital for the Americans two years before — as can easily be conceived. Indeed for the average Yankee the idea of professional soldiers was inconceivable. Captain Cleve, one of the German prisoners, observed: "Since the guards here are militia regiments, and almost all officers in them are manual laborers, it has cost us much trouble to impart the idea that our officers had no handicrafts: they had believed that our officers did not follow their trades out of mere whim."³ Equally

1. See *Camb. Hist. Soc. Proceedings*, x, 54.

2. See p. 41 ante.

3. Letter of Dec. 18, 1777. Schlozer, *Briefwechsel*, iv, 378. In the same way Lafayette, on his triumphal progress through the country after the war, was everywhere greeted with the question, "What do you do for a living?"

baffling was the status of members of the nobility and gentry engaged in such a pursuit. "Well, if that be a lord," ejaculated a farmer's wife after a critical inspection of the bedraggled representative of the house of Napier, "if that be a lord I never desire to see any other lord but the Lord Jehovah!"¹

In effect, the folk of Cambridge were sore perplexed how to deal with these strangers. Captain Cleve wrote on Nov. 15, 1777: "The existence we endure is a tragic compromise between that of free men and slaves. . . . The Americans themselves (who for policy's sake we no longer openly refer to as rebels) are often at a loss to know to which class we actually belong." Mrs. Professor Winthrop confided her doubts about the officers to her friend Mrs. Warren: "Some polite ones say we ought not to look on them as prisoners,— that they are persons of distinguished rank. Perhaps, too, we must not view them in the light of enemies. I fear this distinction will soon be lost."²

The distinction was lost despite the strenuous efforts of the Englishmen to preserve it — efforts which well illustrate the attitude of the Convention Troops during the whole period. "The American Congress," wrote Phillips (who succeeded Burgoyne) to Clinton, "as well as many others of the Americans, have industriously used the word Prisoners as explanatory of the situation of the Troops of the Convention. Lieutenant General Burgoyne always asserted the Contrary — that we were not Prisoners — I have ever both in sentiment and conduct done the same. . . . By the Treaty of Convention of Saratoga, we were to have a safe passage to Europe, and to march through the Country to the Port of Boston under the

*protection of the parties with whom the Treaty was formed and executed; we have Considered ourselves as passengers under the sanction and virtue of a Treaty, not as Prisoners."*³

It is hardly necessary to point out the inconsistency of the Americans' position. They spoke of the troops as prisoners, but carefully kept the various units together, and allowed them to be paraded, inspected, and disciplined by their own officers, in a manner totally at variance with the usages of an ordinary prison camp. They spoke of the officers as prisoners, but permitted them to retain their swords

1 Letter of Nov. 25, 1777. Anburey, *Travels through America*, ii, 52.

2. Ellet, *Women of the Revolution*, i, 98.

3. Cambridge, June 14.1778. Hist. MSS. Commission, *Report on American MSS.*, i, 267

and the command of their men, and forced them to quarter and subsist themselves as if in garrison. They talked of prisoners, referring to an intact army on its way home, and under temporary detention only. They bragged about their prisoners, while treating the entire force as a species of "paying guests." Military history has seldom recorded a more anomalous state of things.

A still further source of mystification to the Provincials, with their loose militia system, was the lifelong discipline and ingrained morale which enabled the officers, in spite of every effort to break their spirit by insult, deprivation, extortion, and chicanery, to preserve their professional pride, and even "now and then to play the gentleman in the midst of our conquerors." The British, it is true, did so with but an ill grace, being chiefly occupied in keeping a stiff upper lip. "Poor Burgoyne & his brave Britons bear up against their fate — He dined [after the surrender] with Gates; not a word passed on the Event or Contest." ¹ Their natural arrogance was intensified by the mortification of defeat by their former fellow-subjects; and they carried matters with a high hand, "talking at large with the self-importance of lords of the soil."²

A portion of that soil, according to tradition, they employed for the thoroughly British purpose of a race-course. The few horses they still possessed were probably barred, but plenty of money can change pockets on the result of a foot race. The track, it is said, ran from the old burying ground in Harvard Square up the road towards Menotomy (Massachusetts Avenue), through "Love Lane" (Linnaean Street), and down Garden Street to the starting point — a distance of nearly two miles.³ Another thoroughly characteristic light in which the Englishmen regarded the countryside was that of a game preserve. Scarcely, for example, had Brigadier-General Hamilton unpacked his trunks before he requested "permission of shooting within the Limits assigned the Officers," ⁴ and the Germans followed suit.

On the other hand the Hessians, who as hired fighting men felt no personal animosity towards anyone, could afford to indulge their Continental suavity in a situation which to them was merely the

1. Wentworth to Eden. Paris, Dec. 18, 1777. Stevens, *Facsimiles*, etc.. No. 317.

2. Mrs. Winthrop to Mrs. Warren. February, 1778. Ellet, *Women of the Revolution*, i, 100.

3. *Historic Guide to Cambridge*, 7.

4. *Cambridge*, Nov. 21, 1777. *Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS.* vii. 49.

60

fortune of war. "Clothed in blue cloaks" they promenaded the parole limits, greeting with "polite bows" the people of Cambridge,¹ which they voted "a friendly little place."² General Von Specht, upon asking for the privilege of fowling, was specifically complimented by Heath for "your civil and polite behavior since you have been at Cambridge";³ and the following epistle is probably only a Sample of many others:

Cambridge, May 14, 1778.

Sir.

Major Hopkins, Dept. Quar. Mast'r General, has informed me, that you intended doing me the Honor of a visit at Cambridge. Give me leave to assure you that I shall be very happy in seeing you at my House, and beg that you will favor me with your Company at dinner, on any Day which you will be so good as to fix.

I have the Honor to be with Esteem

Sir,

Your most obed't

humble Serv't

RIEDESEL.

The Hon'ble MAJ. GEN'L HEATH, Boston.⁴

With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again. The Hessians had, on the whole, very considerate treatment. Madame Riedesel frequently speaks of the kindness of her guards. "We lived very happily and contented in Cambridge," says she, "and were therefore well pleased at the idea of remaining there during the captivity of our troops."⁵ Her quarters were the social center for the German officers. There they gave dances⁶ and suppers, made the perilous but successful experiment of a dinner on the king's birthday, and even held an illumination that aroused dire suspicions among their captors, who scented a horrid conspiracy in the smoke of their innocent candles. Their men amused themselves with an extraordinary collection of pets, from squirrels to bears, which they had accumulated

1. Mrs. Winthrop to Mrs. Warren. Nov. 11, 1777.

2. *Ein kleiner, freundlicher Ort. Eelking, Deutschen Hulfstruppen*, i, 335.

3. Sept. 10, 1778. Heath, *Memoirs* (ed. 1901), 178.

4. From the Emmet Collection, New York Public Library.— Quoted in Hadden's *Journal*, 353.

5. *Letters and Journals* (ed. Stone), 143.

6. The Germans were characteristically well supplied with music. Each regiment had its band, in some cases of considerable size. In the return for June 1, 1777, the Grenadier Battalion, for example, with 452 privates, had 20 musicians — and the 19 officers had 28 servants! Stone, *Memoirs of Riedesel*, i, 102.

on their marches — the only things, observes a chronicler, that they had been able to capture in America.¹

The mercenaries indeed form the happiest and most fortunate group in our picture. They were living, as an eminent historian observes, in a sort of financial paradise. They had no desire to fight either for or against King George so long as they could draw his money. Without being harassed by drills, or fatigued by marches, or exposed as a mark for bullets, they were earning four times the regimental pay that they would have received in their own fatherland; and those of them who practiced handicrafts were permitted to go round the neighborhood, working for the exceptionally high wages which skilled labor commanded in the United States.²

The tedium of the winter nevertheless was nearly insupportable for British and Hessians alike, fresh from the activities of a campaign which among all its failings had certainly never lacked excitement. The one professional occupation that remained to the commanders was the care of their men. Although between officers and private soldiers there was then fixed a gulf the greatness of which is now incomprehensible, yet the former — eagerly following the noble example of their general — showed a solicitude for the latter that throws an odd gleam of paternal tenderness into that atmosphere of pipe-clay and the "cat." They constantly visited the wretched barracks and personally assisted in strengthening and weatherproofing them. They supplied the men with money under the pretence of buying the poor fellows' rags of old clothes and cast-off boots. They kept up regular drills, in which the surrendered arms were represented by stout sticks; and on holidays and accustomed anniversaries they turned out the whole motley crew for a pathetic parody of dress parade.

The lack of proper raiment, by the way, was one of the most obvious hardships suffered by the prisoners. The English regiments, by established usage, were clothed at the expense of their commanders, who by this time owed them two suits of uniform.³ Plenty of warm things had been stored in Canada, and great efforts were made to get them sent forward; but much anxious correspondence (still on file) shows that as late as August, 1778, the "clothing ships" were still at Quebec; and the next month "all idea of receiving the baggage or

1. W. L. Stone, *Burgoyne's Campaign*, 254.

2. Trevelyan, *American Revolution, Part III*, p. 206.

3. Stone, *Memoir of Riedesel*, ii, 186.

clothing from Canada must be given up."¹ In consequence, the most grotesque devices had to be resorted to in order to escape actual nakedness. Riedesel mentions the ingenious expedient of cutting off the men's coat tails with which to repair what thus became their jackets.

The Germans were in like evil case. "The soldier has now worn his regimentals more than three years," lamented Cleve, "on shipboard, in the forests, and during a winter in barracks. The officers have taken out of Canada nothing but their most necessary and worst clothes, and sigh for new."² In September of 1778 General de Gall returned a list of "men who have had no clothing for four years." In spite of such handicaps, the officers did their best to keep up the morale by holding rigorous inspections, "and the old patched clothes were

examined just as sharply as the spruce uniforms used to be at a grand-ducal parade in the home garrison." But with all these efforts for cleanliness, the Hessians were hopelessly dirty. "Such effluvia filled the air while they were passing," wrote Mrs. Winthrop on their first arrival, "that had they not been smoking all the time, I should have been apprehensive of being contaminated." ³

However, "towards the end of January a transport arrived from New York with cloth breeches and some other necessities for the troops. The old regimentals had been hitherto scarcely made to hold together even with the most outrageous patches; so that the men were not a little heartened up at being able to appear more prosperous, as well as to better withstand the extraordinary cold of the winter." ⁴ For the New England climate was a revelation to these Europeans. "The Canadian winter is golden compared to this!" exclaims poor Cleve; while some unfortunates who had been interned at Rutland nicknamed the place "Siberia."

Thus passed a heavy year in the history of the old Vassall house. Never had it sheltered more hopeless hearts. Its occupants were strangers in a strange land, the remnants of an enormous and epochal failure, a prey to chagrin and half dead with ennui, waiting, ever waiting for the transports that never came and the exchanges that were never negotiated.

1. Phillips to Hamilton. Cambridge, Sept. 14, 1778. Hist. MSS. Commission, Report on American MSS., i, 290.

2. Letter of March 18, 1778. Schlozer, Briefwechsel, iv, 386.

3. Ellett, Women of the Revolution, i, 97.— Cf. Stone, Burgoyne's Campaign, 254.

4. Eelking, Deutschen Hulfstruppen, i, 339.

Moreover, they were shamelessly exploited by their greedy guards. The exorbitant house rent extorted from Burgoyne himself ¹ was only one example of the tribute levied on the unwilling sojourners in Cambridge. Heath bewailed the fact that the Yankee traders were unable to resist "the bewitching allurements of gain and the expectation of catching hard money." ²For the strangers, it must be remembered, were paying for everything in gold, then considerably scarcer than diamonds. Farmers, householders, shopkeepers, craftsmen, soldiers, and politicians all joined the mad scramble to spoil these Egyptians. "Exaction is added to scarcity at Cambridge," wrote Burgoyne, "and every article of life is at an unprecedented price."³ "All food and necessities were terribly dear, costing often four times more than at other nearby places. The guinea, which had been fixed by Congress at 28 shillings, was given in exchange for 90, in paper money.... This not insignificant profit went into the pocket of the Commissary and (it was whispered) of the Governor of Boston." ⁴ As to "everything which only remotely resembles luxuries,... it is unbelievable what profit the tradesmen in America make on their wares — double at the least. If I buy anything at fourth hand, i. e. at the fourth remove," complains Cleve, "I can figure that I have had to pay almost sixteen times more for it than it cost at first hand in Boston." ⁵

What wonder that, heartsick and idle, the Englishmen fell back on the time-honored distractions of garrison existence? "The British officers," declared Mrs. Winthrop, "live in the most luxurious manner possible, rioting on the fat of the land."⁶ Loud complaints were raised at their revels — styled "a most enormous abuse"—in Bradish's tavern on Christmas, a festival unrecognized by their Puritan captors.⁷ Not for nothing, we may suspect, did the staff include an "Assistant Commissary of Beer," and a "Deputy Assistant Commissary of Beer." Special stipulations, too, had been made in the original rules for the camp "that the officers should be supplied

1. See p. 30 ante.
2. To the General Assembly. Headquarters, Boston, Dec. 5, 1777. *Mass. Archives*, 216/126.
3. To Howe. Rhode Island, Apr. 9, 1778. *Parliamentary Register*, xii. Appendix, p. lxxviii.
4. *Eelking, Deutschen Hulfstruppen*, i, 338. A paper dollar was then worth thirty cents.
5. Letter of Dec. 30, 1777. Schlozer, *Briefwechsel*, iv, 379.
6. To Mrs. Warren. February, 1778. Ellet, *Women of the Revolution*, i, 100.
7. Heath, *Memoirs* (ed. 1901), 141.

*with liquors at the market price. "Horrid traditions linger yet of the Britons' carousals in the great dining room of the Vassall house; though the legend that during a particularly lively evening they pricked a negro boy to death with their swords may probably be disposed of via the underground passage that was long reported to extend from the cellar to some mysterious destination."*¹

*A favorite amusement of a milder type was tenpins, on which the Germans, in particular, gambled inordinately.² It is not unlikely that the practiced ingenuity of Captain Adams provided for his guests and their friends a form of dissipation then almost unheard of, and so scandalous as to be made the subject of a general order from Boston. On the information "that some of the Officers of the Convention have set up a billiard table in an house near the centre of the town of Cambridge, and that company is frequently there at very unseasonable hours, to the disquietude and uneasiness of the inhabitants...All officers of the Convention are to be at their quarters, and not to be abroad after nine o'clock in the evening."*³

*In spite of this salutary rule, certain of the more adventurous spirits, making to themselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, indulged in unlawful nocturnal excursions under the guidance of such venal natives as were willing, for a due consideration, to "show them the town." In the middle of January Heath reported to the Council that three British officers had been smuggled into Boston the previous evening by "one [Jeremiah] Snow, a tavern keeper" of Cambridge. Nothing seems to have happened to the officers in consequence, but their hapless conductor was haled before the Council for a severe reprimand, in the mean time being actually cast into "the common gaol."*⁴

Heading in the opposite direction, many officers foregathered at Richardson's tavern in Watertown, famous for its cockpit.⁵ A deal of "chicken fighting" was indulged in here, and the neighborhood was scoured for good gamecocks. The reply of one poor old woman who

1. Historic Guide to Cambridge, 98.— Cambridge Hist. Soc. Proceedings, x, 14, 73, note. The yarn doubtless originated in the lurid imagination of the old negro "Tony." It certainly hints, nevertheless, at the presence of some slaves still faithful to the place.

2. Stone, Memoir of Riedesel, ii, 17.

3. Jan. 28, 1778. Parliamentary Register, xii, Appendix, p. xlvii.

4. Mass. Archives, 168 /147 et seq. For Snow's tavern, cf. p. 22 ante,

5. This hostelry was at the junction of the present Mt. Auburn Street and Belmont Street. The cockpit is said to have been the curious semicircular depression close by, now better known to fame as the "Norsemen's amphitheatre."

was asked to sell a couple of promising birds shows that there was as much spirit in the human as in the feathered bipeds: "I swear now you shall have neither of them; I swear now I never saw anything so bloodthirsty as you Britonians be; if you can't be fighting and cutting other people's throats, you must be setting two harmless creatures to kill one another. Go along, go!" ¹

On the whole, then, we may agree in substance with the indignant Mrs. Warren, who declares: "This idle and dissipated army lay too long in the neighborhood of Boston for the advantage of either side. While there in durance, they disseminated their manners, they corrupted the students of Harvard College, and the youth of the capital and its environs, who were allured to enter into their gambling parties and other scenes of licentiousness." ²

The efforts of the authorities to protect their young people from these demoralizing influences sometimes took a pretty stringent form. Captain Cleve notes in his diary letter:

General Burgoyne, and also General Phillips, gave a ball to which they invited some ladies from Boston as well as from this neighborhood. Whereupon all the Committees issued a prohibitory order to the effect that no one was to be bold enough to appear there. So, of those invited, only two daughters of General Schuyler, one of whom is married to a Mr. Carter, dared disregard the prohibition on both occasions, and accept the invitation. Since General Schuyler had himself given General von Riedesel his daughters' address, the Boston Committee said nothing against their being present. ³

Although the attempts of the British officers to "break into society" in Cambridge were thus sternly repressed, very little objection seems to have been made to the characteristic social instincts of the Germans, who, as already noted, were regarded with more favor. The dances and entertainments at Madame Riedesel's have been alluded to above; nor did the officers lack for partners. "There are quantities of pretty girls here," observes a gallant Brunswicker, "who on all questions of the war are wholly neutral, and govern themselves entirely by the Jus Naturae."

The more serious-minded betook themselves to reading, that blessed solace of all captives. A surprisingly modern note is sounded in their demand for newspapers, magazines, and books. Pigot wrote

1. S. A. Drake, *Historic Fields and Mansions of Middlesex*, 345.

2. *History of the American Revolution*, ii, 45.

3. Letter of Dec. 15, 1777. Schlozer, *Briefwechsel*, iv, 377.

to Burgoyne from Newport that in answer to the latter's request he had sent all the old papers and pamphlets he could lay hands on.¹

DEATH AND BURIAL OF LIEUTENANT BROWN

So winter wore into spring, beguiled for the most part by the pleasures of the table, the dice, and the bottle. Burgoyne himself was permitted to return to England, suffering (appropriately enough) from gout in the stomach, and Phillips took his place. And now occurred a melancholy incident, destined again to link the name of Henry Vassall with this regrettable chapter of Cambridge history. Hospitable even in death, the Colonel, whose spirit (we may fancy) had welcomed the King's officers to his mansion, was now to share with one of them the narrow limits of his tomb.

On June 17, 1778, Richard Brown, second lieutenant of the Twenty-first Regiment of the Line, in a chaise with two young women from Boston, driving at a fast pace down Prospect Hill, was challenged by the Continental sentry at its foot. Apparently having some trouble with his horse, Brown made a gesture which the guard took for a threat or an insult, raised his musket, and shot the officer dead.

This tragic accident caused universal excitement. To the British at least it seemed the culmination of a long series of injuries and persecutions, some of which had already caused stormy courts-martial. General Phillips determined to make the funeral a public function. He bitterly informed Heath that "if the body of the murdered officer is to be allowed Christian burial, I would wish to deposit it in the vault appropriated for strangers, in the Protestant church at Cambridge." (The Vassall tomb being the only one beneath Christ Church, the reference is unmistakable, in spite of the slip in the description.) To this Heath, who was greatly concerned at the contretemps, immediately consented, and added, "I have also given orders that decency be exhibited by our troops during the time of procession of interment. .. and from the universal respectful behaviour of the people of this country on such occasions, you may be sure that not the least insult will be offered." ² Despite his confident words, he was not above taking precautions on that score. "The funeral party was joined by the German officers and by several important Ameri-

1. Jan. 13, 1778. Public Record Office, London; Colonial Office, Class 5, vol. 179, p. 349.

2. Heath, *Memoirs* (ed. 1901), 156, 157.

cans," says Eelking; "but we could not determine whether the latter really wished to show their sympathy or whether their presence was to restrain the exasperated mob, since it was feared the latter might disturb the solemnities." ¹

The event proved that the American commander had put too much confidence in the self-control of the Cantabrigians, irritated out of all bounds of academic courtesy. "The remains of poor Brown," wrote one of his fellows, "were interred in the church at Cambridge; all the officers at Cambridge and the environs attended — a most mournful sight!... I cannot pass over the littleness of mind, and the pitiful resentment of the Americans, in a very trifling circumstance; during the time the service was performing over the body, the Americans seized the opportunity of the church being open, which had been shut since the commencement of hostilities, to plunder, ransack and deface every thing they could lay their hands on, destroying the pulpit, reading-desk and communion-table, and ascending the organ-loft, destroyed the bellows and broke all the pipes of a very handsome instrument." ² This impious desecration must have occurred after the service in the body of the church was over, and the cortege had retired to the tomb in the cellar for the actual interment. Phillips's original request was that the funeral should take place "on the evening" of the 19th, probably meaning at sunset, a common time for such ceremonies.

Thus the dastardly work of the populace was done, suitably enough, under cover of darkness.

This miserable exhibition of spite by the inhabitants of Cambridge was but one of the numerous unhappy circumstances which seemed to conspire to make the ill-starred affair as notorious as possible. "The centinel who shot him," adds Anburey, "was a little boy scarce fourteen" — an interesting commentary on the make-up of the Continental militia at that stage of the war.³ Immediately after his act, "the prisoners who were near, seized the sentry and dragged him by the heels up the hill, which tore his face considerably, and otherwise much abused him, before he was released by the picquet. The Adjutant of the same regiment, on hearing the affair, and being on

1. *Eelking, Deutschen Hiilfstruppen, i, 349.*

2. *Anburey, Travels through America, ii, 233.* The organ had been presented in 1764 by Barlow Trecothick, Lord Mayor of London.

3. *Heath very early complained of the difficulties he should encounter because "by the drafted Men's hiring others to do their duty a number of Lads and old Men will be returned" in the regiments called out to act as guards. To Council. Nov. 4, 1777. Mass. Archives, 198 /274.*

horseback, set off furiously, and just before he got to the place, his horse stumbling pitched him off, and broke his collar bone." ¹ General Phillips, for his insolent letters to Heath on the matter, was confined to his house for the rest of his stay in town, a proceeding of which Congress officially approved July 7, 1778. Meantime the unfortunate sentry was court-martialed and acquitted, in spite of the bitterest protests from all the ranking British officers.

By another of fortune's ironies therefore Henry Vassall, who, as chairman of the building committee, had done so much to secure the beautiful furnishings of Christ Church, became the underlying cause of their fanatical demolition.²

BURGOYNE'S FATAL LETTER

The reader who has perused the foregoing pages has seen how the article of the Convention regarding quarters, reasonable and easy as it first seemed, was converted by the venomous meanness of the Cambridge folk into a formidable stumbling-block and rock of offence. The treatment of the officers, from the lieutenant-general to the youngest ensign, was not only a breach of the letter of the Convention, but was a gross violation of the spirit and intent breathed in every line of that document, as well as of the protocol which preceded it and the parole which followed it — the intent that since the officers were not only soldiers but gentlemen they were to be used as such. And that they were properly cared for the Americans never even pretended: the most prejudiced partizans of the patriot cause, such as the Congressional committee, could do no more than make excuses. With the possible exception of the Harvard Corporation, everyone tacitly or openly admitted the truth.

In other words, when Burgoyne wrote to Gates that as long as things continued as they then were, "the public faith was broke," ³ he was but putting into plain language what all parties had been

1. *Almon, Remembrancer, vii, 346.*

2. *There seems no doubt whatever that Brown lies today in the Vassall tomb. Baron Riedesel speaks of him as being "buried with all military honors and entombed in the church at Cambridge," where the Colonel's vault, as already*

stated, is the only one that ever existed. Phillips's reference to it as appropriated to strangers was evidently due to imperfect information, or to the hurry and excitement of the moment. When the vault was last examined, a coffin was found containing the bones of an unidentified man over forty-five years of age, the lower limbs covered thickly with hay, indicating transportation. See Cambridge Hist. Soc. Proceedings, x, 78.

3. See ante, p. 30.

unmistakably hinting at from the beginning (as shown in the passages italicized in the foregoing quotations), and what Heath continued to harp on until the very end. He was stating a fact.

Also let it be observed that the unhappy phrase occurred in a letter to the officer who had drawn up and signed the Convention, and who would naturally have a prime interest in knowing how it was being observed — to the officer, moreover, who had treated the writer with every courtesy and entertained him honorably at his own table. The letter, in short, was in the nature of a confidential communication between friends, not of an official protest. If that were intended, Gates, who had nothing to do whatever with the management of the prisoners, was certainly not the man to address. Burgoyne himself considered the letter so informal that he did not even keep a copy of it.¹

The correctness of this view is corroborated by the circumstance that Burgoyne did prepare an official protest, very properly addressed to the highest military authority, and with the sanction (or at any rate the knowledge) of Heath himself. The latter, however, for his own reputation and for the good name of Massachusetts, begged the indignant Englishman to delay action in despatching it. "General Burgoyne," he informed the Council on Nov. 18, "the last Saturday [Nov. 15] demanded a passport for an officer to proceed to His Excellency General Washington and to Congress to represent to them that the Convention was broken as to Quarters. I granted his request, but desired him to defer sending until this day, by which time I was in hopes proper Quarters would be provided. He will I suppose this afternoon pursue his Resolution of sending his Express."² Nevertheless, Heath seems to have managed to appease the commander with fresh promises (which were again nullified by the imbecility of the Cantabrigians), so that the protest was never sent. Instead, he himself wrote to Washington as soon as he had got Burgoyne safely housed, alluding guardedly to the situation and putting as good a face upon it as he could. "We are not a little Embarrassed in obtaining Quarters for the officers, who frequently inform us that they are to be Quartered according to rank.— General Burgoyne is in Mr. Borland's House Formerly General Putnam's Quarters, and the other principal officers in the Town of Cambridge."³ This was as much as

1. Parliamentary Register, xi, 211.

2. Mass. Archives, 1981296.— Draft in Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 44.

3. Nov. 21, 1777. Draft in Mass. Hist. Soc., Heath MSS., vii, 54.

he could creditably say; as to the junior officers he made no specifications whatever.

Such, then, was the essentially personal nature of Burgoyne's remark to Gates. But Gates, who was at heart a sneak, soon took the opportunity of currying favor by communicating

the letter to Congress. And before we can understand its effect there we must appreciate the temper that body was in when it arrived.

For the little group of jobbers and politicians at Philadelphia who at this date unfortunately constituted the only central authority of the new government were frothing at the mouth, so to speak, over the whole business of the Saratoga Convention. None realized more bitterly than they that although Burgoyne, by the inconceivable incompetence of his superiors at home, had been marched into a death trap where it was a perfectly simple matter to dispose of him once and for all, yet by his own firmness and spirit, and by the weakness of Gates, he had managed to emerge from that trap not only with most of his officers and men intact but with the astonishing guarantee that they should all be transported safe home to England. And although he guaranteed on his side that none of them should again take part in the war, yet since as soon as they got home they would release an equal number of effectives from garrison duty to be placed in the American field, Gates's whole campaign, so far as the prime object of reducing the enemy's man power went, was patently a flat failure.

The whole effort of Congress therefore was bent upon some method of invalidating the Convention which had produced such a fiasco. As Trevelyan¹ points out, there were two ways of doing this. By the first, the legislators, as the supreme power of the state, might have repudiated the whole treaty as contrary to public interest, throwing over Gates and declaring he had no right to make such a preposterous promise. But Gates was their spoiled darling, and rather than repudiate him they would gladly have repudiated Washington himself — as they several times came very near to doing. They preferred therefore the second and ignobler way, to lie in wait like a parcel of pettifogging lawyers and watch their chance to pick some flaw in the performance of the contract whereby they might declare it had been violated and need no longer be observed. But so far it had been extremely hard for them to show a breach on the

1. *American Revolution, Part III, p. 203.*

Englishmen's side. They were trying to make something out of the circumstance that the prisoners had not surrendered their side arms, or furnished descriptive lists of the rank and file — neither of which had been required by the Convention — when blind chance, that favors the knave quite as often as the just man, suddenly put into their hands the very excuse they were looking for.

Pouncing upon Burgoyne's phrase, stripping it of every qualifying clause, and ignoring the fact that it was a private protest against the conduct of their own side, they gleefully drew the monstrous inference that the British commander had publicly announced he should no longer consider himself bound by the compact. ¹ That document, in consequence, they announced that they should in turn disregard on their side, particularly the promise (the backbone of the whole) to allow the troops to return to England.²

The politicians' point was gained. In vain Burgoyne protested that he meant nothing of the kind, that he was only entering an objection, in hopes "to see the complaint redressed." In vain he pointed out that he and his officers, by signing the parole after the date of his ill-starred letter to Gates, showed that they still considered the Convention as binding.³ Their behavior, too, upon receipt of the news from Philadelphia, was obvious evidence to the same effect. They were completely taken aback by this unexpected collapse of all their anticipations, and could not conceal their anxiety as to their fate. "General Burgoyne and his officers," reported Heath, "appear much disappointed, and exhibit an appearance rather of concern and uneasiness than of sulkiness or resentment, and endeavour to palliate their former expressions and conduct." ⁴ But all would not answer. An

unconsidered word had undone everything that the Briton's resolute diplomacy had gained; and from that time forward (thanks

1. "It is a strong indication of his intentions, and affords just grounds of fear, that he will avail himself of such pretended breach of the convention, in order to disengage himself and the army under him, of the obligation they are under to these United States, and that the security which these states have had in his personal honour is hereby destroyed." From the vote of Congress, Jan. 8, 1778.

2. "Our situation daily grows worse. . . . The Americans are declaring openly even now that they should not be bound by the terms of the Convention. They would like to saddle the whole thing on us, but in a manner most unfair— as though we had violated the terms." Letter of Capt. Cleve, Feb. 5, 1778. Schlozer, Briefwechsel, iv, 384.

3. Burgoyne to President of Congress. Cambridge, Feb. 11, 1778. Parliamentary Register, xi, 211, 212. See note, p. 55 ante.

4. To President of Congress. Boston, Feb. 7, 1778. Trevelyan, American Revolution, Part III, p. 205, note.

to the churlishness of the Cambridge men) the Convention of Saratoga, for its intended purposes, ceased to exist.

A new problem, however, now preyed on the congressional mind. By virtue of the unusual stipulations of the Convention, the troops which had surrendered to Gates were not to be regarded as ordinary prisoners of war to be maintained at public expense, but as travellers bound for England, and hence, like all travellers, paying their own way. To declare the compact utterly at an end, therefore, would not only cut off the precious stream of gold that they were dispensing in a country almost ruined by depreciated paper, but would also force the Americans to the enormous cost of subsisting, like any other prisoners, their entire army. Burgoyne's whole force would be turned from a valuable asset into a heavy liability. Hence, to postpone killing the goose that laid such golden eggs, the unscrupulous schemers at Philadelphia hit on the plan of declaring the Convention not absolutely void, but "suspended" until "a distinct and explicit ratification" of its terms "shall be properly notified by the Court of Great Britain to Congress." (The ratification, it will be noticed, was to be all on one side!) The treaty in short was not to be really binding, but only just binding enough to give the patriots its benefits without its responsibilities.

The phraseology of this vote, passed January 8, 1778, showed an ingenuity worthy of Machiavelli himself. For it was obvious that the British government could not negotiate directly with Congress without virtually recognizing the insurgents as an independent nation.¹ Yet so besotted were the plotters that no sooner had they passed their resolve than they were seized with panic lest a ratification might somehow actually take place. In that case there would be nothing for it but to allow these doubly valuable troops to go home after all, to the military profit of England and the financial loss of America. They therefore not only took good care not to notify Downing Street of their action, but even tried to prevent definite word of it from leaking out at all. "Good policy," wrote the president of Congress to Heath on Jan. 14, 1778, "dictates that we should keep the Court of Great Britain from a knowledge founded on authentick accounts of the Act of Congress of the 8th as long as we can fairly do so."² They

1. Phillips at first refused to pay bills rendered in the name of "The United States of America."

2. Heath Letters. MSS. Library of Congress.

thus put themselves in the preposterous position of one who makes a demand on his adversary and at the same time endeavors to keep him in ignorance of it — of an intrepid David defying his Goliath in a whisper carefully calculated not to reach him.

Acting on this honorable and dignified principle they actually kept the news from Heath himself for almost a month;¹ and following their instructions the American general was obliged to refuse Burgoyne "the liberty of sending it to Genl Howe till I had certified Congress I had delivered it to himself."² But from such a nightmare of inconsistency they were soon awakened. The enterprising printer of the Boston Gazette scored a magnificent "scoop" by getting hold of the whole proceedings, and publishing them (much to Heath's mortification) as the "front page feature" in his issue of Feb. 16 — an early instance of "shirtsleeves diplomacy" in the American press.

The politicians might have spared themselves their trepidation as to a possible ratification of the Convention of Saratoga. That extraordinary suggestion, at length circuitously received by the home government, was of course officially ignored. The English commanders, more astute in such matters than the Yankees, foresaw the result from the first. "General Burgoyne and his officers," wrote Heath to Laurens on Feb. 19, 1778, "express themselves with much modesty under their detention; But General Phillips observed to me the day before yesterday that Great Britain would never ratify the Convention; That as it was made between General Gates and General Burgoyne, and neither the United States nor Great Britain mentioned, the Ministry would have nothing to do with it."

Nevertheless, short of committing such a capital error in diplomacy as would have been involved by formal ratification, Downing Street did everything it could to comply with the terms of Congress and get the captives home again. The royal commissioners on conciliation, sent over in the summer of that year, offered a ratification signed by themselves; but Congress quite naturally, though rather intricately, resolved "that no ratification which may be tendered in consequence

1. 1778, Feb. 3. This Day received per Express [!] a resolve of Congress directing that the Embarkation of Genl Burgoyne & his Troops be deferred untill the Court of Great Britain shall ratify the Convention." Heath's MS. Journal, Mass. Hist. Soc.

2. Heath to Laurens, Feb. 19, 1778. Heath Letters, ubi supra. So long and so successfully was the news concealed from the British headquarters at Newport, that Burgoyne had the exquisite disappointment of hearing, two months after the action of Congress, that the transports had actually arrived in Massachusetts Bay, and an officer had come ashore to ask where the troops were to embark!

of powers which only reach that case by construction and implication, or which may subject whatever is transacted relative to it to the future approbation or disapprobation of the parliament of Great Britain, can be accepted by Congress."¹

On the failure of such civilian advances, a strictly military method of approach was tried. Sir Henry Clinton, the British commander in chief, wrote to Washington, offering "by express and recent Authority from the King, received since the Date of the late Requisition made by His Majesty's Commissioners, to renew in his Majesty's Name all the Conditions stipulated by Lieut. General Burgoyne in Respect to the Troops serving under his Command."² This proposal, duly transmitted by Washington, came so alarmingly near fulfilling the original terms that the congressional ranks were thrown into consternation. Unable in their agitation to formulate any properly diplomatic reply, they fell back on mere bluster, and with incredible boorishness informed Clinton "that the Congress makes no answer to insolent letters,"³ or in brief told him to shut up. Having thus unmistakably shown their

hand, the politicians might well flatter themselves that in the date of ratification they had devised an ingenious substitute for the Greek calends.

WHY THE PRISONERS LEFT CAMBRIDGE

We have seen that long before this time the Americans had come to look upon the Convention Troops as a standing source of cash — a sort of private mint. Early in January, to be sure, when Heath, having advanced his last dollar in feeding and warming his prisoners, had called on Burgoyne for a payment on account, ⁴ the Englishman had proffered him the depreciated Continental bills, suavely observing that an American would hardly refuse his own currency! Heath however had been able to point to a resolve of Congress that all debts of the troops should be discharged in provisions or coin. Burgoyne had been a good deal disconcerted by this. ⁵ While willing to replace

1. Journals, Sept. 4, 1778.

2. New York, Sept. 19, 1778. Hist. MSS. Commission, Report on American MSS., i, 298.

3. Secretary Thompson to Clinton. Philadelphia, Sept. 28, 1778. Stevens's Facsimiles, etc., No. 1168.

4 Though Heath was desperately short of cash, he was too shrewd to admit his total poverty to Burgoyne, merely stating that the appropriation for the Convention Troops was temporarily exhausted. Heath to Laurens, Jan. 6, 1778.

5. Clarke, his commissary, had so far lost his temper as to declare "that demanding hard money was so extraordinary that he imagined Great Britain would not hesitate at paying £30,000 stg. to publish such a proceeding to the World." Same to same, Jan. 18, 1778. Heath Letters, MSS. Library of Congress.

some of the beef and flour, if practicable, from the British headquarters at Newport, "he cannot yet well digest the payment in solid coin, alledging that every hard dollar will fetch him three of paper currency," as Heath reported to Laurens. Nevertheless, after correspondence with Howe and his paymaster Pigot, Burgoyne had yielded the point, and the rebels had the gratification of receiving almost unlimited specie payments.

Their satisfaction might have been less had they known the Englishmen's motives, based on economic laws which their adversaries understood much better than they did. For the British commanders realized that every additional golden sovereign they put into circulation depreciated still further the value of the ceaseless emissions of Yankee paper dollars. As Pigot put it, "It would be better to pay hard Money when you conveniently can than send Provisions to Boston, for that will be immediately carted away to General Washington's Army, who stand in great Need of Salt Provisions, whereas the hard Money coming amongst them depreciates greatly their Paper."¹ Heath, with his characteristic sound sense, soon detected and protested against this financial stratagem, the Massachusetts Council early tried to block it, and Washington was sadly perturbed at it; but the fatuous congressmen had no inkling of the economics of the situation, and the more hard money that came their way the better they were pleased. ²

From another point of view, too, this payment in coin proved more of a hindrance than a help to the Americans. Everybody wanted it at once. By the resolve of Congress, all specie received by Heath was to be "immediately transmitted to the Treasury." But as Heath bluntly enquired, what good did that do him? If the money was to go elsewhere, how was he to continue to subsist the prisoners? They were costing him \$20,000 a week for food and fuel alone. His own supply of paper currency was exhausted. He had borrowed every dollar he could find in private hands. Finally he was forced to appeal to the Massachusetts

Assembly for help, although fully aware of the impolitic nature of such a transaction. His letters to Congress

1. Pigot to Howe. Newport, Apr. 10, 1778. Hist. MSS. Commission, Report on American MSS., i, 229.

2. Fiske, American Revolution, i, 341. .

during this period are full of the annoyance and perplexity he suffered from that body's greedy determination to get the coveted gold into its own hands.

Nevertheless, the gold was paid, and paid in incredible amounts. When Burgoyne, sick in body and in heart, was permitted to sail from Newport for home, in April, 1778, a general settlement of accounts to that date was made a condition precedent to his departure; and the enormous sum of twenty-seven thousand pounds "in solid coin" (equivalent to three hundred thousand dollars of the depreciated paper) was counted out in a single transaction to the Continental commissary. At the same time, twenty thousand pounds more was supplied the British paymaster for further expenses of the prisoners. ¹ And this too vanished like dew before the sun.

On, therefore, for the whole weary summer went the exorbitant charges, and on went the protesting payments, in the desperate hope that the Convention would yet be somehow acknowledged and fulfilled. Clinton, having succeeded Howe as British commander in chief, continued to drain his military chest to supply the needs of his captive brothers in arms so impatiently tarrying at Cambridge. At length confidence began to weaken. "Should the ratification of the Convention so eagerly awaited be prevented," confessed Phillips to Clinton on August 27, "precautions should be taken for the convenience and safety of the men." ² Finally it became plain that the public faith was indeed broken — by Congress — that the prisoners were to remain prisoners indefinitely, and that nothing was to be gained by keeping up the fiction that they were paying their own way as passengers bound for England.

Realizing, then, that hope was at an end, especially after the insult-

1. Pigot to Howe. Newport, April 10, 1778. Report on American MSS., 1, 229. These payments, added to the £10,000 liquidated by Phillips (see p. 79 post), amount to £57,000 stg. Assuming that there were other payments I have not traced, and counting in the sums extorted directly from the officers at Cambridge, the grand total was probably considerably larger.

What the rebels did with all this ill-gotten store of precious metal is something of a mystery. Undoubtedly the greater part, following the invariable rule when specie is at a premium, was immediately "hoarded" and withdrawn from circulation. Certainly very little of it seems to have reached the Treasury. At least, for the year 1778 Congress admitted spending but \$78,666 (about £7,000) in gold and silver received from all sources, as against the gigantic figure of over \$62,000,000 in bills. Most of these specie payments were used in transactions with the enemy (where paper was of course useless), such as pay and expense money for spies, relief for American prisoners, etc. See Bolles, Financial History of the U. S. from 1774 to 1789, p. 69.

2. Report on American MSS., i, 283.

ing reply he had received from Congress,¹ Clinton changed his policy, and declined to be bled any longer. He ceased his remittances of gold to Cambridge. He also declined to furnish provisions, throwing the burden of subsisting their prisoners upon the Americans, to whom

it now evidently belonged. The Convention Troops therefore could no longer look to their friends either for food or for money with which to buy it and the other necessaries of life. The officers began to find their pockets growing empty. By the anniversary of the Convention the financial crisis was acute. "I declare to you," wrote Phillips to Prescott on November 1, "that there is not Fifty Pounds among all the Troops under my Command."² Credit had consequently been strained to the breaking point. As one of the officers exclaimed, " We are all drowned in debt to the inhabitants."

This was indeed a turn in the tide of affairs. Burgoyne's army, so to speak, had ceased to pay dividends. The politicians had overreached themselves. Had they been clever enough to temporize with Clinton's offer they might have continued for months to jingle fresh British gold in their pockets, but now the fat was in the fire with a vengeance. The Convention Troops were assuming the unwelcome status of ordinary prisoners in fact as well as in name, and something must be done about it. Indeed the approach of such an eventuality had been foreseen for some time, and during the summer one or two of the regiments had been hustled out to Rutland, Mass., on the excuse that they would be safer there, but really because it cost less to maintain them in the back country. The same procedure, and for the same reasons (true and pretended), was now decided upon for the whole force, but in a far more aggravated form.³ On Oct. 15 Congress resolved that the entire body of Convention Troops should be marched seven hundred miles southward to the little hamlet of Charlottesville, Virginia, the cheapest, warmest, and most inaccessible habitat that could be found for them.

To the officers in particular this was a heavy blow. They had absolutely no ready money for the expenses of the march; in fact it seemed doubtful whether many of them would be allowed to march at all. For with the news of their intended departure the Cantabrigians,

1. See p. 75 ante.

2. Hist. MSS. Commission, Report on American MSS., i, 331.

3. This step was hastened by the arrival of the French fleet in the beginning of September, for a long stay at Boston, thereby increasing the population (according to some estimates) by nearly 9,000, and causing a sharp advance in the already high cost of food, fuel, etc.

to whom they owed staggering sums, suddenly manifested a most uncomfortable solicitude for the safety of their persons. "Numbers of the officers have been arrested for the hire of their lodgings and other expenses," observed Phillips.¹ To add to their humiliations, the indignity of a fresh parole was forced upon them. Yet their soldierly spirit remained unbroken. "I sincerely wish it was in my power," reported Major Forster to Phillips, "to assist those Gentlemen, but that is out of my power, as I have only Five Guineas left, and in course if money does not arrive we shall be obliged to live on our Rations, and fare as our Fellow Soldiers, but this we shall not repine at." ²

In the end, the pecuniary problem was solved by Phillips becoming personally responsible for the debts of his officers to the extent of £10,000, and by his remaining in Cambridge "in pawn," as he expressed it, until that amount could be forwarded to him by Clinton.

While the commanding officer thus continued at his quarters in the Borland house till the middle of December, the rest of the army set out for the southward in detachments during the second week of November, exactly one year from the time they had arrived in town. Our civic history is not concerned with the further misadventures and the gradual disintegration of that force, which had set forth so gallantly on one of the most promising and strategically perfect campaigns of the war. But we may well ask ourselves whether the course of the Revolution would not have been altered, and whether our national honor

would not have been spared a dark blot, had Burgoyne and his officers received decent and humanitarian treatment in Cambridge.

1. To Clinton. Cambridge, Nov. 15, 1778. Hist. MSS. Commission, Report on American MSS., i, 346.

2. Rutland, Nov. 3, 1778. Idem, i, 334.

79

APPENDIX

PAROLE SIGNED BY THE CONVENTION TROOPS

(From the original at the Boston Public Library)

We whose Names are hereunto subscribed being under the restrictions of the Convention made on the sixteenth of October last between Lieutenant General Burgoyne and Major General Gates do promise and engage on our Word & Honor and on the Faith of Gentlemen to remain in the Quarters assigned us for our Residence in Cambridge, Watertown, Medford and Charlestown in the State of Massachusetts Bay, and at no time to exceed or pass the following Limits viz. Swans Shop at Charlestown neck, the Cambridge road up to the Cross way between Mr. Codmans House & Fort No. 3. the said cross way out to the road by Mr. Inmans House taking in the Hospital Barracks, from thence a strait line to Cambridge Bridge, from thence the north brink of Charles river to Watertown Bridge, from thence the Boston road as far as the crotch of the way at Angers Corner, from Watertown Bridge up the road to the Northwest Corner of Mr. Remingtons House, and from Learneds Tavern the Cambridge road, on to the Common to the Menotomy road, up said road to Cooper Tavern taking in the Menotomy pond, but not to pass the Beach on the South, West, or north sides thereof, from Coopers Tavern down to the east end of Benjn Tufts House in Medford, and from Medford Bridge the Boston road to Swans Shop the first mentioned bounds, the intermediate roads are within the Parole, and the back yards of the respective Quarters to the distance of Eighty yards from them, during our continuance in this State, or until the Continental General Commanding in this State, His Excellency General Washington, or the Congress of the United States shall order otherwise; and that we will not directly or indirectly give any intelligence whatever to the Enemies of the United States, or do, or say anything in opposition to or in prejudice of the measures and proceedings of any Congress for the said States during our continuance here as aforesaid, or until we are duly exchanged or discharged; and that we will at all times duly obey and observe the Rules and Regulations already Established for the Government of the Troops in Quarters —

Given under our Hands at Cambridge in the State of Massachusetts Bay this Thirteenth Day of December, In the Year of Our LORD, 1777 —

80

GERRY'S LANDING AND ITS NEIGHBORHOOD

BY MRS. S. M. GOZZALDI

Read 15 June, 1918

WHEN we visit a city or country that is new to us, we try to find out what is of interest in the place, what famous people have lived there and what important events have happened there. I venture to think that Gerry's Landing, under the old name revived, is not well known to all of you, and so will try to bring to mind those who formerly lived here, whose homes are no more and who themselves have long vanished from these scenes.

Many of us can remember when our present surroundings looked very differently from these well-kept lawns and gardens, and when these two stately houses, where we are guests, were not thought of. All this bluff was rough pasture land. At its foot the Charles River pursued its winding way among marshes; it was tide water and at flood overflowed its banks, making a wide lake as far as Brighton. The eastern part of the bluff was called Simon's Hill; it has now been leveled, and on any summer's day the boys might have been seen there taking their first lessons in swimming.

All this part of Cambridge west of Sparks Street belonged to Watertown until the new boundary was made in 1754. Watertown was settled before Cambridge, and this especial tract of land where we are was set off to Sir Richard Saltonstall, who was one of the few among our earliest settlers who had the right to bear a title.

Sir Richard Saltonstall was Justice of Peace for the West Riding of Yorkshire, and Lord of the Manor of Ledsham, near Leeds. He was not one of the six who purchased Massachusetts Bay from the Plymouth Colony but soon became associated with them and is named in the charter granted by Charles I, March 4, 1629. He was chosen one of the Five Undertakers who were to go to America in October. On arriving at Salem he came here at once with Rev. John Phillips, and planted the church in Watertown. He was the first sub-

81

scriber to the Church Covenant. This first settlement was just a little west of this place.

Sir Richard brought with him his two daughters and three sons; his wife had died in England. They sailed on the Arbella March 22 from Southampton, and after many adventures arrived in New England on June 22, 1630. On July 28 he and Mr. Phillips were already in Watertown planting the church. A glimpse of the etiquette of the period is vouchsafed us when we learn that he and his family ate on shipboard at the same table with the Lady Arbella Johnson, sister of the Earl of Lincoln, her husband, Governors Winthrop and Dudley and their young people.

Sir Richard Saltonstall only remained in this country one year, and never took up the land granted him in Cambridge, now called Winthrop Square. He returned with his two daughters and one of his younger sons. He remained a proprietor at Watertown until about 1642 when his two sons, who then lived here, had become of age. In 1635 he sent over a barque of forty tons with twenty servants. He was always interested in anything pertaining to the prosperity of the colony and from his position in England was able to be of great service to it. He was made ambassador to Holland, and while he was there his portrait was painted by Rembrandt. I think a copy is owned by Harvard. A narrow path leading down to the river near here has always been called "Sir Richard's Way."¹

The eldest son, Richard, was made a Freeman of Watertown May 21, 1631, he being then twenty-one years of age. He had left his studies at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, in order to accompany his father to this country. He returned to England and is said to have studied

law there. He married and came with his wife in 1635 to Ipswich. He was the ancestor of the large and well-known Saltonstall family. His son, Nathaniel, graduated from Harvard in 1659, married the daughter of Rev. John Ward, was judge and colonel and held many important offices at Haverhill where he settled. Sibley says this is the only family that sent eight generations of the name to Harvard.

Another son of Sir Richard, Henry, was probably the largest

1. Apparently the same as the "Bank Lane" of provincial days. Within living memory the strip of gravel at the waterside was known as "Sir Richard's Beach." —Ed.

82

proprietor of Watertown. When he graduated at Harvard in 1642, he owned a farm here of three hundred acres and eighty acres of meadow land. He returned to England and went to Holland, took the degree of M.D. at Padua in 1649, and at Oxford in 1652. His older brother, Samuel, retained possession of his lands here until his death in 1696. Robert, another brother, lived here until his death, unmarried, in 1650. After the death of the last Saltonstall at the end of the seventeenth century, the land seems to have belonged to a number of small holders. Later part of it came into the hands of one of the new aristocracy, the rich West Indians whom we call Tories.

In 1746, after the death of his wife, Colonel John Vassall sold his house on Brattle Street to his younger brother, Henry Vassall, who was about to marry Penelope Royal of Medford, and bought fifty acres of land on this bluff. It is described in the deed as bounded north by the road to Watertown, south by Charles River, east by the marshes of Henry Vassall, and on the west by Cornelius Waldo and Stephen Coolidge. What the house he built here was like, we have no means of knowing, for neither stick nor stone of it has remained as far as I can tell. Here he came with his three small children, John, who built the Craigie House, and Elizabeth who married Thomas Oliver, who built Elmwood. To them he brought, as a stepmother, a young girl of eighteen, Lucy, daughter of Jonathan Baron, of Chelmsford. Her baby was born November 15, 1747, and twelve days later Colonel John Vassall died, leaving the house, grounds, the handsome furniture, pictures, library, etc., to his nineteen-year-old wife, who had to have a guardian, and a thousand pounds to his yet unchristened daughter.

The one summer that Mistress Lucy Vassall spent here as a bride there graduated at Harvard two brothers of good family, from Newport, Rhode Island, Benjamin and William Ellery. We can easily imagine that they were frequent guests in this house overlooking the river, and had many sociable parties here with the Henry Vassalls and other connections and friends. Two years after the death of Colonel John Vassall his widow married Benjamin, the elder brother, who six months earlier had been made the guardian of Baby Lucy, when he is described as "late of Newport, now of Cambridge." Their married life

83

was short; they had no child and three years later Mrs. Ellery died. William, the younger of the two brothers, became a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and was the husband of Ann Remington, ancestor of the Richard H. Dana family.

The Coolidge farm lies to the south of where we are, on the bank of the river. The first owner, John Coolidge, came from Cambridge, England in 1630; he was selectman of Watertown many times between 1636 and 1677, and was in great request for signing wills, taking inventories, and settling estates. He died in 1691 and his son inherited the farm; he

married the only daughter of Roger Wellington. His descendants have occupied this holding until the present day, marrying into many noted families of Cambridge and Watertown; one married Samuel Locke, president of Harvard; another, Professor Edward Wigglesworth, whose daughter married Professor Stephen Sewall; and others married into the Apthorp and Bulfinch families. They have been through these centuries deacons, schoolmasters, workers at many trades, and husbandmen, Godfearing and respected in their generations, fighters in colonial and subsequent wars, good citizens.

At the easterly corner of Mount Auburn Street and Coolidge Avenue stood the house of Colonel Samuel Thatcher of Revolutionary fame. The land was granted to his great-grandfather in 1642, Deacon Samuel Thatcher, a person of importance, often chosen selectman, and representative at the General Court between 1665 and 1669. Colonel Thatcher was also Representative in the important years 1775-76-79, and from 1784 till 1786. He was a Minute Man, lieutenant-colonel of the Cambridge men at Lexington and Concord, and when Colonel Gardner was fatally wounded at Bunker Hill the command of the regiment devolved on him. He was selectman of Cambridge 1773-76, 1780-86, and on the committee to instruct the representatives in 1772; this was the declaration of independence of this town, a document worth your reading if you want to know how the people felt at that tune. He was also one of the committee to instruct the representatives in 1783 as to what should be done with the Tories who wished to return and have their forfeited lands again – another patriotic

84

document of which we have no reason to be ashamed. In 1793 Colonel Thatcher sold his land to Elbridge Gerry, who had bought "Elmwood" in 1787.

Elbridge Gerry is the only Vice-President of the United States whom Cambridge can claim. He was the son of Thomas Gerry, a merchant of Marblehead. He graduated at Harvard in 1762, and ten years later represented that town in the Provincial legislature. He married the daughter of Charles Thompson, of Philadelphia, an accomplished and beautiful lady, who had been educated in Europe. He was a member of the First and Second Continental Congresses, and of the Provincial Congress at Watertown in 1775. It was he, who with Azor Orne was at a meeting of the Committee of Safety and Supplies at the Black Horse Tavern on the road to Lexington, who warned Hancock and Adams, who were sleeping at the Clarke House, that the British were coming, and so saved their lives. Gerry was elected governor of Massachusetts by the famous "Gerrymander." He was a signer of the Declaration of Independence and was sent by President Adams to France as commissioner during the French Revolution. While he was Vice-President of the United States he died on the way to the Capitol, was buried in the Congressional Burying Ground, and by special act of Congress a monument was erected over his grave bearing this inscription "Every man though he have but one day to live should devote that day to the good of his country."

John Gerry Orne was the son of a niece of Elbridge Gerry, daughter of his brother John. He bought a strip of land on the edge of the river of his great-uncle in 1807 and built there a solid storehouse; his plan was to bring goods there by water and sell to the neighbors. It was not a successful venture and two years later he sold the land and material back to Elbridge Gerry, reserving the right to remove the storehouse and shed. John Gerry Orne married Ann, the daughter of Moses Stone, direct descendant in the fourth generation of Simon Stone, whose grant of land in 1635 comprised twelve acres now included in the southerly part of Mount Auburn Cemetery, which was called Stone's Woods, and also running along the river bank, where Simon's Hill was named for him, and em-

85

bracing a part of the Cambridge Cemetery. An old pear tree standing on a knoll by the river marks the site of his farmhouse, which was burned in 1844.

On a corner of the Stone farm, now the corner of Mount Auburn Cemetery, stood a little white house, where in the nineteenth century Mrs. Howard lived with her three daughters and two sons. She was the widow of Samuel Howard, of North Square, Boston, who, as an "Indian," took part in the famous Boston Tea Party. Her eldest daughter married Judge Samuel Phillips Prescott Fay. It was a runaway match, not that there was any reason why it should be but simply because it was more romantic. Judge Fay hired a man to stand in front of the banns, which were then put up at the entrance of the meeting house, so that Mrs. Howard should not see them. Judge Fay lived in this neighborhood, but the exact location of his house I have not been able to fix. Another daughter of Mrs. Howard was Caroline, who married Rev. Samuel Oilman, of Charleston, S. C., author of "Fair Harvard," and a writer herself when women authors were not so plenty as now. She wrote "The Southern Matron." The third daughter was the wife of Abijah White, of Watertown, and mother of the first Mrs. James Russell Lowell, Mrs. Estes Howe, Mrs. Montgomery Parker, Mrs. Devens and Mrs. Charles Wyllis Elliott. It was the Misses Howard who gave the name of Sweet Auburn to Stone's Woods, afterwards changed to Mount Auburn when bought for a cemetery.

*The storehouse and shed on the river bank were moved up to the top of the high ground, a strip of land was bought from the owner of the Coolidge farm to add to that bought of Mr. Gerry, and a comfortable dwelling house made of it, in which the Orne family lived. John Gerry Orne died in 1838. His daughter, Caroline F. Orne, the poetess, was born here September 5, 1818; she published two books, *Songs of American Freedom* and *Sweet Auburn*. She often spoke of the wild beauty of this part of Cambridge in her day, of the charming old farm house of her grandfather, Moses Stone, and told how she and Miss Maria Fay used to roam up and down the banks of the river dreaming of their futures. She outlived Miss Fay, dying in 1905. In 1826, Mrs. Orne sold the house to Loring Austin.*

86

Later Forsyth Wilson, the poet, lived in it. In 1867 it was bought by the trustees of the Episcopal Theological School, and the first Dean, Rev. John S. Stone, lived here for two years with his family. It was then exchanged for the house on the corner of Phillips Place and Mason Street owned by Mr. John Lord Hayes, and ever since then has been occupied by the Hayes family.

We have traced the history of Gerry's Landing through the three centuries, have noted the early settlers, Saltonstall, Coolidge, Stone, Thatcher, of the seventeenth century; Vassall, the rich West Indian gentleman, Colonel Thatcher, the Revolutionary hero, Vice-President Gerry of the eighteenth century; and spoken of Judge Fay, the Howards and Ornes of the nineteenth century. In this twentieth century, Gerry's Landing has come into its own in the stately houses erected by our hosts, Mr. Edward W. Forbes and Mr. Kenneth G. T. Webster.

*I will close with a quotation from Miss Orne's poem *Sweet Auburn*, describing this place a hundred years ago. We cannot imagine the young people of today enjoying the festivities so lovingly depicted:*

Oft on Moss Hill I've spread the mimic feast,

With gay companion for my merry guest.

Their smooth broad leaves the oak trees would afford

For polished plates to grace our festal board;

*But gayer feasts Sweet Auburn thou hast seen
Upon thy velvet moss of emerald green,
When gallant youths and gentle lovely maids
Held joyous festival beneath thy shades.
The daughters of the city, gentle, fair,
In light and graceful beauty wandered there;
And gay of heart and of most gladsome mien
Extolled with high delight the sylvan scene;
There too more favored maidens who each day
Saw the bright earth in loveliest array,
The soft and rosy hue of whose fair cheek
Seemed of sweet health and happiness to speak;
And Harvard's sons, forgetting scholiast's lore,
Conned a more pleasant lesson gaily o'er;
Wearing fresh garlands of the young leaves green,
Lightly they gathered round their youthful queen;*

87

*Or where the Maypole, twined with wreath and crown
Seemed from its lofty honors to look down
And nod approval with a smiling glance,
They wove with flying feet the airy dance.*

*Here where the moon shed down her brightest beams,
Paling to silver all thy rippling streams,
Oft would the lover's lute, in pensive strain,
To his cold mistress sighingly complain.
And here in youthful beauty and in grace,
Fairest and loveliest in form and face,*

The Queen of Fays oft struck the light guitar

While joyous echoes bore the notes afar.

88

THE SCHOOLS OF CAMBRIDGE, 1800-1870

BY GEORGE GRIER WRIGHT

Read 30 October, 1918

It being one chief project of Sathan to keep men from the knowledge of Scripture, as in former times keeping them in unknown tongue, so in these latter times, by persuading from the use of Tongues, that so at least the true sense and meaning of the original might be clouded and corrupted with false glosses of deceivers; to the end that learning may not be buried in the graves of our forefathers in church and commonwealth, the Lord assisting our endeavours;

It is therefore ordered by this court and authority thereof that every township within this jurisdiction, after the Lord hath increased them to the number of fifty householders, shall then forthwith appoint one within their towns to teach all such children as shall resort to him to write and read, whose wages shall be paid him either by the parents or masters of such children, or by the inhabitants in general, by way of supply, as the major part of those that order the prudentials of the town shall appoint; provided that those who send their children be not oppressed by paying much more than they can have them taught for in other towns. And it is further ordered, that where any town shall increase to the number of one hundred families or householders, they shall set up a grammar school, the master thereof being able to instruct youth so far as they may be fitted for the University, and if any town neglect the performance hereof above one year, then every such town shall pay five pounds per annum to the next such school, till they shall perform this order. — Colony Laws. Chapter 88, 1647.

"This law," it was said by Justice Story, "has contributed more than any other circumstance, to give that peculiar character to the inhabitants and institutions of Massachusetts, for which she, in common with the other New England States, indulges an honest, and not unreasonable pride." While this law authorized the establishment of free public schools it also allowed the establishment of schools supported by the parents of those receiving instruction, and until about 1800 such it appears was the character of the public schools of Cambridge. Dr. Paige in his History of Cambridge places the establishment of the grammar school as prior to 1643, but the town of

89

Dedham claims the honor of having established in 1644 the first public school supported by general taxation.

Rev. William A. Stearns, Chairman of the School Committee, in his address at the dedication of the second high school building in 1848, says that he does not know when the first free school was established in Cambridge. "When I was a member of the college [he graduated 1827] there was an old one-story building northwesterly of the Common and nearly under the shades of the great Washington Elm and I believe on the site of the present Washington Schoolhouse; there was also a small one-story schoolhouse in the North Village on the site

of the present North School near what is now Porter's Tavern. These were all the public school accommodations which the town of Cambridge furnished within your memory, sir [the Mayor], and I had almost said within my own." The schoolhouse on Garden Street was built in 1769 and was the first one built at the expense of the town. It was a building almost square, one story high, with a hip roof. It was removed to Brighton Street, corner of Eliot Street, in 1832 and used as a dwelling house until 1917 when it was torn down. The oak timbers were then in good condition showing the marks of the axe in hewing them.

The first school in Cambridgeport was opened in 1800, at which time there were twelve families living within its borders. Mrs. Boardman having learned that many of these families had children wrote to Miss Mary Merrim, a resident of Lincoln, that there might be about twelve scholars, and if she would come and take charge of them she would give her a room and her board. Miss Merriam commenced with twelve pupils at twelve and one half cents per week and an extra charge of two dollars for fuel during the season. "Miss Merriam gave perfect satisfaction, teaching all the useful as well as ornamental branches." She continued to teach for more than thirty years and died in 1852 at the age of 83 years 7 months.

When the school was opened, and for many years afterward, a large portion of Cambridgeport was undrained marsh, and a still larger portion was covered with a heavy growth of timber with no bridges, no roads. The first free public school-house in Cambridgeport was built in 1802 and the first in East

Cambridge in 1818, the one in East Cambridge being described as "a dark miserable den of a place." In 1831 the number of schools had increased to six, as follows:

<i>Old Cambridge</i>	<i>2 schoolhouses, 2 rooms, 2 teachers, 100 scholars</i>								
<i>Cambridgeport</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>160</i>	<i>"</i>	
<i>East Cambridge</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>140</i>	<i>"</i>	

These buildings were erected in part at the expense of the town and in part at the expense of the inhabitants of the district, which fact gave rise in 1851 to a question as to their ownership, in connection with the question of the power of the School Committee.

The school buildings erected in the period beginning 1832 appear to have been of the same general character — about 40 to 50 ft. by 25 to 30 ft., two stories high, with a cupola, sometimes with a bell, sometimes without. Until 1838 it would appear that there were no backs to the seats, for in that year the School Committee was authorized to provide backs wherever deemed expedient by them, which order was made imperative for all the schoolhouses in 1839. In 1840, chairs were substituted in place of the plank benches in the grammar and middle schools.

A former scholar in 1848 thus describes the old district school-house: "It was a common square building, had been painted once but none of the people's money was wasted again on the outside. The inside was a stranger to paint and had a weather-beaten appearance. The desk of the teacher was on one side, facing a vacant space in the centre and looking toward the door. The desks on both sides, with the girls on one side facing the boys on the other; the tops of the desks were immovable, bearing the initials of almost every scholar who had ever used them cut in good-sized letters. Near the door were conveniences for hanging coats, hats, &c. In the entry was stored a goodly pile of fuel; the building was protected by neither blinds, trees nor fences."

Mr. George Livermore, born in 1809, a graduate of the Franklin School, gives the following description in 1848 of the school in his day: "More than thirty years ago he was a scholar in the Franklin school. There was then but one school for the various

91

grades of scholars which are now divided into five. The large boys — old enough to earn their own living and employed during all but the winter term in some honorable manual labor — used then to attend and occupy the back seats and desks near the windows where they would shiver and shake; while the little alphabet scholars were perched upon straight uncomfortable benches so close to the great two-story stove that they were in as much danger of being roasted as the larger ones were of being frozen. Hardly a comfortable seat in the whole house. The old school books were The Primer, Perry's Spelling Book, an indifferent geography and a poor arithmetic."

Another graduate of the school writes as follows about the master. "Master F. was a true son of his time. The then theory of education required the rod. The moment a boy crossed the threshold of his school prison, the brandished cowhide made his heart beat responsive to the anticipated vibrations of that terrible instrument. A woodcut, if true to life, would represent a master of those days as a spindle-shanked little man, dressed always in black, with a head broken up into all sorts of acute angles, the nose being especially bony and transparent, the lips razor-like and steely, the chin broad, elongated, wedgy, and an eye that from its culminating point would penetrate the evil one if he were to come in a shape porous enough for the entrance of light. . . . Doubtful upon the soul's location, Master F. was free to admit that blows — whether inflicted by the hand as in plucking up hairs by the roots — by the ferule as in hurling it point blank at the head of a suspected urchin — by the cowskin as applied to the back or legs — or by the rattan as kid upon the knuckles with a velocity known only to the paddle wheels of a ten days steamer across the Atlantic — that blows upon any part of the corporeal system might not disturb the mechanism by which that more than questionable entity, soul, operated."

Another graduate, Miss Sarah S. Jacobs, well known to many of us who attended the school in the twenties, gives the following description of the school in her time:

"Though the schoolhouse was a building of two stories, only the lower one was occupied by the school. The outer door

92

opened into a little vestibule where were nails for hanging coats and hats; here too was another door to a stairway with which we had nothing to do. The school room itself — there was but one (a fine contrast to the spacious halls and classrooms of today) — was furnished with clumsy desks or tables, having a narrow shelf beneath, and long benches. It accommodated perhaps sixty children. In the middle of the room was a huge stove for burning wood; also a long crack useful for keeping a class in line. . . . The principal of the school — in white flannel dressing gown — not free from ink spots caused by frequent wipings of his pen, with cowhide in hand, running with noiseless slippers along the tops of the desks to reach that boy in the far corner, unaware of his approach, and now at work on the core of an apple — would no doubt give the scholars of today reason to suppose that the master had suddenly become crazy. . . . Much of a teacher's tune was taken up with pen making and mending, for writing was well taught, and steel pens were still in the future."

In 1848, the editor of the Cambridge Chronicle points to the coming day of relief. "Schools twenty years ago were indeed places of misery and long periods of recreation were necessary to restore the worn out faculties of all concerned. Far different are they now.

Children love to go to school. They learn vastly more than they could possibly do then, when sour looks, cross words and corporal infliction constituted the educational system."

In his address at the dedication of the high school in 1848 Hon. Edward Everett says, "A school forty years ago was a very different affair from what it is now. The meaning of the word has changed. A little reading, writing and ciphering, a very little grammar, and for those destined for college a little Latin and Greek very indifferently taught were all we got at a common town school in my day. ... I hold, sir, that to read the English language well, that is with intelligence, feeling, spirit, and effect; to write with despatch a neat handsome legible hand (for it is after all a great object in writing to have others able to read what you write) and to be master of the four rules of Arithmetic, so as to dispose at once with accuracy

93

of every question of figures when it comes up in practical life — I say I call this a good education."

It is difficult to determine when the first high school was established in Cambridge, our predecessors not having been given to printing the annual reports of its officials — so far as I have been able to learn, prior to 1833, even the financial reports of the town were printed on a single sheet — and the earliest printed report of the School Committee known to me was that of 1841. Judge Ladd in 1850 states that the statistics of the schools were not preserved prior to 1839. The earliest record of the School Committee begins in 1834 and furnishes no information in regard to the high school.

The Regulations of the public schools in 1811 contain the following provisions:

I. Children to be admitted into any of the schools, excepting the Female, shall possess the qualifications required by the law regulating Public Schools, viz.; "They shall have learned in some other school or in some other way to read the English language by spelling the same." (Laws of Massachusetts, Vol. 1, Chap. 19.)

II. In all the schools shall be taught Reading, Writing, English Grammar, Composition, Arithmetic and Geography and in the Grammar School in addition to these branches the Latin and Greek languages.

In May 1811 the town was divided into four districts and it was voted that No. One is to have a Latin Grammar school 12 months in each year.

A committee appointed by the town August 4, 1834 to consider the subject of a reorganization of the public schools of the Town of Cambridge says, "Inasmuch as the law of the Commonwealth makes it obligatory upon the town to provide a public school in which shall be taught the elements of the Latin and Greek languages and as the grammar school in District No. one has been established as the Latin school for this town," they recommend "that the sons of any citizen in either of the wards who are sufficiently advanced in their English studies may be received into this school for the purpose of learning Latin and Greek." It would appear from this that originally

94

only boys were admitted to the school which was partly a Latin and partly a grammar school.

The objection to the mixed character of the high and grammar schools was fully appreciated by the School Committee. In 1845 they say in their report, "We would urge

upon our successors immediate attention to the High schools — or rather to those Grammar schools (for such they now are) in which scientific and classical instruction is given. They are at present suffering from a too great variety of studies and from the attempt to unite under one instructor a good High school and a good Common school department.... We are not prepared to propose an adequate remedy; but would suggest that, unless the town were prepared to unite once more in sustaining one and only one Classical school for the whole people, the number of pupils in the High schools and the number of studies ought to be diminished." As an alternative to a central high school it was suggested that arrangements might be made for the admission of a larger number of pupils into the Hopkins Classical School, the town at that time being entitled to send only nine boys.

In 1838 a building was erected on Broadway, corner of Windsor Street, for a classical or high school for the whole town. This was a two-story wooden building 70 x 30 ft. which cost \$5,791.05, including the lot of land containing 10,000 sq. ft. Candidates for admission were required to bring from their guardian, former teacher, or the clergyman whose meeting they attended a certificate of fair moral character and to pass an examination in grammar, geography, history and arithmetic. The course of study required two years only and covered twenty-four subjects. It was considered a hardship by many of the citizens of the First and Third Wards, so the Committee report, to send their children so far to school, and in 1843 each section of the town was furnished with a grammar school master capable of giving instruction in classical studies, which arrangement continued until 1847. The influence of a strong sectional feeling was undoubtedly fully as potent as the inconvenience of the location in preventing the continuance of one school for the whole town.

It is interesting to note that in 1846 the legal authority of

cities and towns to provide at the public expense for instruction in the branches higher than those taught in the grammar schools was questioned. In the case of Gushing vs. The Inhabitants of Newburyport, the plaintiff sued the town to recover the amount of his tax on the ground that such use of the public money was illegal. In the opinion given by the Chief Justice such schools are town schools within the proper meaning of the term, and taxes levied for their support are not illegal.

The Auburn School in Ward One appears originally to have been a mixed school for high and grammar scholars, but in some way not entirely clear to see from the reports it had become in 1841 a high school for girls. While only the common branches of grammar school instruction should be taught there, the Committee report in 1842 that under the present faithful teacher it had in fact been raised to the rank of a high school; and in 1845 it was known as "the Female High School," the girls in Ward One having been some years previously gathered into one school — the boys into another. The girls, being more advanced than many of the boys, were placed under a classical instructor and the school was formally called "The Female High School."

In 1846 the Committee report that "Just at the close of the last school year a request was presented to the board by citizens interested for the establishment in Ward One of a high school for boys that the boys might have equal advantages with the girls but that the two sexes be still kept in distinct schools if the proposed arrangement could be made without uniting them." As it was found that not more than 10 or 12 boys would attend a high school the Committee decided to place the grammar school scholars of both sexes in a grammar school and the high school scholars of both sexes in a high school. To this arrangement much objection was made and some parents withdrew their daughters from the school. In their report the Committee discuss very fully the advantages and disadvantages of coeducation, and mention the suggestion of a citizen in one of the country towns that "a squinting board" should be erected between the boys and girls "to prevent any 'casting of sheep's eyes' to the detriment of the morals of the school." In the brick building erected for the Washington

School in 1852, the girls' side was separated from that of the boys by a solid brick wall, each having a separate stairway and a separate yard for their own use. As I recall it, the girls did not sit in the same rooms with the boys until they reached the top floor in charge of Mr. Mansfield. In this room, which covered the entire width of the building (a room 50 ft. square and 11 ft. high), the girls were seated on one side, the boys on the other.

In those early days there appears to have been a lack of confidence in the public schools, so much so that in 1839 there were 504 children in private schools as against 1140 in the public schools — this however had been changed in 1846, much to the gratification of the School Committee, to 244 in private schools, 44 at schools out of town, probably private schools, against 2151 in the public schools.

In 1849, in addition to the Hopkins School, there were six private schools in Cambridge, of which no information is available. As they appear to have been kept in private houses they were probably for children under the school age, which was the case of the one I attended.

The reasons for this objection to the public schools were frankly stated by the Committee in their report for 1845, as well as in previous reports. In 1845 they say, "Whether new houses are erected or not, something should be done immediately for the purification of the old ones — not excepting (we are sorry to add) some of those which have been more recently erected. The committee have no words to express the shame and indignation, which the vile disfigurations of these edifices are calculated to excite. They are among the principal causes which have heretofore brought town schools into disrepute and driven the opulent, and frequently the indigent, to seek private instruction. High-minded and pure-minded parents are unwilling to have the moral sensibilities of their children daily violated and their young hearts vulgarized and defiled by such exhibitions. . . . Let our schoolhouses be sanctuaries of purity and not dens of uncleanness." In other reports the Committee refer to the moral education of the pupils and mention the efforts made "to eradicate habits of lying, swearing, indelicacy of speech and behaviour, petty thieving, truancy and

all other vices." Even as late as the Civil War there was much depravity among the scholars, so extreme that parents were compelled to protest to the teachers and to object to their children being seated near certain scholars. Young children were addicted to habits of smoking, chewing tobacco and even intemperance. Many scholars came to school in such a condition of personal uncleanness that the first instruction given them was the proper use of soap and water and a comb. It was not unusual for teachers to ask contributions to provide proper and necessary clothing for these children also. Schools were kept in low, ill-ventilated vestries, in public halls, without any proper conveniences, as well as in private dwellings and even in an old saddler's shop ventilated only by a hole in the roof. Of one school the Committee report, "It is in a dwelling-house, the lower part of which was occupied by a family who showed a strong predilection, in their cookery, for onions and other odoriferous articles of the kitchen. The crevices in the floor gave the school the full benefit of the fragrance of every sacrifice made on the domestic altar below."

When a new building was erected on School Court, the old schoolhouse was first taken over the tops of the gravestones to the most unoccupied corner of the burying ground where it was proposed to have it remain until the new building should be ready. A protest against this use of the burying ground, signed by Edward Everett and 102 others, was presented to the City Council. In consequence of this and other strong protests the Committee rented the Baptist vestry, but this plan fell through, and after ten days, during which there were no sessions of the school, it reassembled in Lyceum Hall. Having finally settled the old schoolhouse about a mile away, the school again moved to a location near Linnaean Street

on North Avenue until with the approach of winter the school was driven to the Baptist vestry. All this in one year!!

The coming of the foreign population also began to affect the schools, presenting new problems for the School Committee in dealing with children from much different home conditions. In 1848 the North Alphabet School in East Cambridge, with one hundred members, contained only three children of native American parentage, and in 1851 with one hundred and twenty

98

members this number had dropped to only one. In the Broadway Primary in 1851, there were four different races — Anglo-Saxon, Teutonic, Celtic and African.

In their reports the Committee constantly appeal for the support of the schools by the citizens. In one report they refer to the appointment in the early history of the town of a committee to visit every family and urge upon them the importance of sending their children to school, and they suggest whether it might not be a wise proceeding to take such action again. At the close of their report in 1845 the Committee say, "Your committee beg leave to urge upon all good citizens the importance, which most of them already deeply feel, of generously sustaining the schools; to the selfish, as well as to the philanthropic, we say sustain the schools; public order, freedom, thrift, the security of property and the comforts of a civilized and Christian community depend upon them. To the benevolent, we say sustain the schools. You cannot confer a greater benefit upon the masses around you than by securing to them a just and thorough education. To the patriotic, we say sustain the schools. It is for you to decide to what sort of population, ignorant or instructed, unmoral or virtuous, you will intrust the destinies of this ancient town and your country. Let the wise and pious sustain the schools."

There was also a tendency on the part of parents to take their children from the schools before the age of 16 years, of which the Committee say, "Since this is the fashion of the age we must conform our instruction to it when it cannot be altered." In 1849, however, the Committee report that the ages of the scholars in the North Grammar School on North Avenue varied from 10 to 22 years, rendering the work of the school more difficult; and in 1851 they report several pupils in the Auburn Alphabet School over 14 years of age. The average age of the scholars in the first class in the three high schools in 1846 was 14 years 4 months in Ward I, 15 years 2 months in Wards II and III, and the number of scholars was only 43 out of a total connected with all the schools of 2132. Until 1846 children were admitted to the alphabet schools at the age of four, but in that year the limit was raised to five years.

99

The hours of the schools and the length of the school year were somewhat different from those of the present day. In the morning the hours were 8 to 11 from May to October, 9 to 12 from October to May — in the afternoon 2 to 5 from March to November, 1.30 to 4.30 from November to March. The holidays were confined to Wednesday and Saturday afternoons, Fast Day, May Day, July Fourth, and Christmas. The vacations were one week at the close of the winter term, the week preceding the first Monday in June, Commencement week and the week preceding, and Thanksgiving week. In 1846, the Committee report that a little more time than usual had been allowed for vacations with the idea that the children should be given more to do in school and more time for recreation out of school. To this increased vacation there was much objection on the part of parents and others; but apparently the opposition did not cause the Committee to reconsider their action in making the June vacation four weeks.

It is not surprising that the Committee were constantly complaining of the lack of regular and punctual attendance. In 1842 they report that with 1625 children on the register, the average attendance was only 1004 — less than two-thirds of the whole number. In 1844 they report that it is not unusual for a quarter part of the scholars to be absent at the same time and in many cases without evidence of sickness or other reasonable excuse. Many who did attend were fifteen to thirty minutes and even one hour behind the tune. To check this evil the Committee adopted a regulation requiring a written excuse from the parents or guardian for absence or tardiness. To this some parents objected and the Committee say, "We are pained to add that in a few instances inconsiderate parents have so far forgotten themselves as to accompany their notes of excuse with language calculated to insult and wound the feeling of the teachers." In one school of 150 pupils all the excuses handed in during one quarter were carefully preserved and made a total of 1905 absences, 1064 tardinesses—an average of 13 absences, 7 tardinesses to each. The excuses for absence included company at home, care of an infant brother or sister, visit to a neighboring town, chance to earn a shilling by helping to drive cattle to Brighton. Some of the children were re-

100

ported to be addicted to truancy, idling away their time on the streets or around the wharves, stables, or bowling alleys. In addition to these evils in some of the schools there was a constant change of membership throughout the year.

In 1845 the Committee present a damaging report upon the condition of the schoolhouses in their care, a report which is somewhat surprising when it is considered that half of the buildings were less than ten years old. No means of ventilation; only partially ventilated; the lower floor badly burned, being the floor of its predecessor which had been destroyed by fire; plastering in bad condition; water in the cellar; without blinds or ventilators; roof old and leaky; floor and plastering in a bad state; cellar overflowing with water, are among the defects mentioned. One building was nearly destroyed by a friction match falling through the cracks in the floor and setting fire to the shavings carelessly crowded beneath when the house was built. In 1842 the Committee on Finance had recommended that the town discontinue the allowance for making fires and taking care of the schoolhouses, suggesting that the scholars might do the work without pay. This had resulted in a lack of uniformity; in some schools the work was done by the scholars, in others contributions were collected from the school to pay the expense, and in a few the work was done at the expense of the town. Finally in 1846 the protest of the School Committee caused a beginning to be made to improve conditions.

In 1834 a committee was appointed by the town to consider the subject of a reorganization of the public schools in the town. They report that "the five school districts into which the town is at present divided are very unequal both in territory and population and afford very unequal accommodation to the children of the different parts of the town.... The present system of public schools does not admit of such a classification of the pupils generally as is best adapted to their intellectual improvement. ... It is manifest that the benefits resulting from such a classification cannot be had from the present organization of the schools nor from any system which (like the present) divides the town into small districts.... The numbers in the several sections of the town will at present justify a division of the children into schools of three different

101

grades. It is believed that the progress of the children may by such a division be much increased without any increase in the expense of supporting the schools." In 1853 the Mayor claimed as a result of this report that Cambridge was the first city in this state to break up the old district school system and to establish a system of regular grades. The number in each school varied from 68 to 218 and the greatest distance from the school any

scholar lived varied in different schools from five-eighths of a mile to one and eleven-sixteenths miles. Apparently progress was slow, as in 1841 the Committee say, "The schools contain each more scholars than one teacher can properly govern, many more than one can instruct. The committee have been compelled to employ several assistants. They have done this with reluctance because they are persuaded that better order is generally preserved in smaller schools and less instruction ordinarily given in rooms where two or three recitations are being heard at the same time."

In 1844 there were five grades of schools —alphabet, primary, middle, grammar and high. The tune required to complete the work of the five grades was as follows — alphabet 2 years, primary 2 years, middle 2 years, grammar 3 1/2 years, high 4 to 5 years. The middle school was claimed to be a peculiarity of the Cambridge school system; in other places such a school was merged with the grammar schools. The Committee say that there are certain classes of children, particularly those of foreign parentage, of whom few advance beyond this grade. This classification was retained until 1863 when the alphabet schools were merged with the primary and the middle schools were joined to the grammar, making only three grades in all.

During all this period, and until the passage of the free textbook law in 1884, parents were required to provide the textbooks needed, except in cases where their means would not allow them to do so. Rule 13 of the Regulations was, "No scholar shall be allowed to remain connected with any of the schools unless furnished with the proper books, slates, &c." That this was no small expense is shown by one list of the books which I was required to provide at the commencement of one term at a cost of \$8.40 — bills of \$2.00 and \$3.00

102

were not uncommon at the opening of each term. The cost of the books required by me in the high school was about \$50.00 for the entire four years. It was provided by the statutes that the School Committee should furnish books if the parents neglected to do so and send a statement of the cost to the Assessors who were directed to add the same to the assessment of the parents if they were of the opinion their circumstances would allow them to pay the amount. This law was practically a dead letter, the Committee stating one year that the Assessors had neglected to assess bills transmitted to them amounting to \$1,000. Of these books the Committee say in 1851, "Generally it may be said that the mechanical execution of school books is bad, the paper being dingy and flimsy, the type minute and often imperfect, and the impression a faint one, that there is cause for loud and just complaint." While there is much to be said upon both sides in regard to furnishing textbooks free, on the whole it has appeared an advantage to the schools if they are to be free public schools. When textbooks were changed in the old times the publishers usually took the old books and furnished the new at a reduced price — an experience familiar to the parents of the scholars 60 years or more ago. In 1859 a statute was passed that when any change was made the scholars should receive the new books at the expense of the city. A not uncommon practice on the part of the publishers was to make a low price to introduce a textbook and increase the price shortly after its adoption, to which the School Committee recorded a vigorous protest.

The schools were always opened with simple devotional exercises which consisted in reading a short passage of the Scriptures by the teachers, the singing of a hymn and the repeating of the Lord's Prayer by the children. In 1847 the Committee say, "We are satisfied that most of our schools perform this morning exercise with as much reverence and decorum as such services are usually performed by assemblies of adults." In 1855 the Committee say, "We believe the opposition hitherto made to the reading and use of the Bible in our schools is about to disappear. Teachers have experienced but little difficulty in this matter the present year. . . . The want of

103

moral power in our schools is one of their most prominent defects. In many of the children the moral sense has no culture at home; they have no knowledge of moral law. Remove the Bible from them, and allow the teachers to suspend the devotional exercises, the repetition of the decalogue, and the prayer of our Lord, and it would be found that the moral forces now possessed would be greatly diminished." The present regulations indicate that the opposition extending from that day to more recent times had not caused the change desired.

The Committee in their annual reports urge that more attention be given to reading and that the work should be commenced in the primary schools, expressing a wish that parents would aid by conversing correctly with and in the presence of their children. In the study of arithmetic the children were expected to commit the multiplication table thoroughly to memory in the primary schools, become thoroughly acquainted with Colburn's First Lessons in the middle schools and complete the study in the grammar and high schools. The committee note an unaccountable reluctance to use the Spelling Book, "a book which in the days of our fathers was acknowledged the only sure guide to the English Tongue." They refer to the days twenty or thirty years previous, the days of "spelling matches," "choosing sides," and "taking places," when spelling was the most spirited and interesting exercise in the school. Even in those days seventy years ago the Committee deplore the tendency to "many books with superficial knowledge which characterizes the age."

Music was first introduced in 1845 by Joseph Bird, a resident of Watertown near Mt. Auburn, well known to many of our older citizens. Mrs. Clark says that Mr. Bird drove down from Watertown in a covered wagon and sometimes brought pails of brilliant gold and silver fish for those who had paid good attention to his teaching. In 1850 Nathan Lincoln commenced his long service as teacher of music which ended on December 31, 1890. In their report the Committee say, "The exercise affords an agreeable relief from the weariness produced by other studies too long continued, increases the interest felt by the children in the school, thereby contributing to secure a more ready and constant attendance, and exerts an influence

the most happy in repressing the passions, refining the manners, elevating the feelings, and instilling sentiments, conveyed by the words they sing, of love, reverence and devotion."

In 1830 the town annually authorized the School Committee to provide medals or books for such scholars as in their opinion were most worthy of such donation on account of their improvement in the branches of education taught in the schools. An old scholar writes about them as follows: "The medals were tasteful in their form and finish and after being awarded, were taken and marked on one side as given by the committee to such a scholar and on the reverse was the name of the study for proficiency in which they were awarded. Then they were returned to the master to be given to the fortunate ones. The tasteful blue ribbons which suspended them from the neck were the admiration of the winners and the envy of the disappointed." ¹

The Committee from time to time note with great satisfaction the frequent visits of parents at the quarterly examinations of the schools when the schools were examined by the whole committee. They urged upon parents to attend more numerous, expressing the hope that it may become a common thing to meet visitors in every schoolroom on other days as well. They hope that the semiannual examinations will show the schools in their ordinary character, believing show exhibitions injurious. These examinations were periods of much preparation by the teachers, and I doubt not of some anxiety. Until the erection of the high school house on Fayette Street in 1864 there were no halls in the schoolhouses in which the entire body using the building could be assembled, the exhibition of the high school being held in the old City Hall. Consequently the parents and visitors who came to the examinations were crowded around the schoolroom on settees and other temporary seats,

sometimes in the seats of absent scholars. The members of the Committee with their guests were seated upon the teacher's platform, while the class being examined was ranged upon a slightly raised platform in the rear of the room behind the desks, the blackboard being upon the rear wall. In some schools the scholars rose upon the entrance of the Committee

1. *Some of these medals were exhibited at the close of the address*

105

and remained standing until they were seated. It was not uncommon for some of the guests of the Committee to take a hand in asking questions. While at the time it appeared serious to us all, as I look back after these many years, it had some amusing features. The pompous manner of some of the examiners and the knowing look they assumed in asking some difficult question might lead one to think the occasion was intended to show the learning of the Committee rather than that of the school. In some schools, in addition to the regular examination, some of the children recited set pieces with more or less effect, but in all cases after many hours of hard drill by the teachers. Miss Sarah S. Jacobs thus describes these occasions: —

My sketch were faulty, with entire omission

Of our great crowning glory, Exhibition.

Though scarce could you expect one of my age

All that was spoke in public on the stage

To recollect, yet Shylock's knife, Lochiel

And Young Pretenders haunt the memory still;

And one named Norval of his Grampians vaunting,

And grinding organs — nor the monkey wanting.

One beau worth having I remember well;

Shall I confess? — the bow of William Tell.

Nor is it soon forgot how once a quarter

Sore trembled every mother's son and daughter.

The vain, the timid, all felt perturbation

Upon the morning of Examination.

For there would come that day strange visitors,

Part conscript fathers, part inquisitors,

Not men susceptible of mirth or pity,

Not friends and ministers — but the Committee.

How truly awful was the warning hum,

And the announcement, "Here they are, they come!"

The boys look bold and saucy, and each girl

Gives the last finish to her favorite curl.

It was the custom even then for one of the Committee to make a set speech at the close of the examination.

Our trials o'er, "the chair" made an oration,

Found some improvement in our "pronounsation";

We heard the words "deportment," "approbation,"

Took a long breath, and a whole week's vacation.

106

In 1848, referring to the fact that no young men were elected to the Committee, a correspondent of the Chronicle suggested that a spokesman for the scholars might in reply address them in the words of Daniel Webster: "Venerable men! You have come down to us from a former generation. Heaven has bounteously lengthened out your lives, that you might behold this joyous day."

The position of teacher was not in all respects attractive. In 1839 the Regulations say, "The instructors of the several schools, deriving their authority from this board, shall be responsible to it for a faithful discharge of their duties, and no preferment or continuance in office shall be predicated on any principle but those of literary and moral merit, and practical skill." That the standard set for a teacher was no mean one may be gathered from the report of 1841. "It is not a matter of secondary importance that a teacher should cultivate mildness, gentleness, pleasant tones, and kind looks in the schoolroom. We regard it as of vital moment, so much so, that we should deem it our duty to remove a teacher for deficiency in this respect, however he or she might excel in the art of instruction."

It was for many years the practice of the School Committee to present in then- annual report a table showing the condition of each school. In 1847 they were classed as "excellent," "very good," "unproved," "backward," "very disorderly," "unsatisfactory," accompanied in the body of the report with a fuller statement explaining the reasons for the same. In other years full reports of the attendance of each school were given and in 1850 a table was printed showing the percentage attained by the members of the first class in all studies in all the grammar schools. In this way the work of every teacher was presented to every voter.

Should a teacher offend a parent however, political influence was often exerted to punish the offender — on the other hand did the Committee deem it necessary to remove a popular teacher the same influence was freely used to prevent the change. In 1842 the Committee say, "Cases may arise, in which a teacher is employed, whom the parents and guardians of the children believe incompetent for his place. But the

107

Statutes require the Committee to use their own judgment of the qualification of teachers. If they err, and parents suffer in consequence of that error, the blame must rest on the law. You may think the law should be such that Committees could only nominate candidates for teachers and refer their choice to the people. But this is not the law and is it well, while it remains as it now is, for parents to proceed as though it were." In 1845 the Committee say,

"Some children have a habit of always behaving as bad as they can upon the introduction of a new teacher. In some instances, one or two whole quarters have been nearly lost by this means, till it has been found necessary to expel the refractory, or use severe punishment to bring them to subjection. Parents should not give hasty credence to the reports of children respecting a new teacher, nor encourage any remarks tending to diminish his influence, till they have reason to be fully satisfied of his incompetence."

The long service however of many of the teachers would indicate either firmness on the part of the School Committee or great tact upon the part of the teachers, possibly both. Among the earlier teachers who taught for many years may be mentioned Daniel Mansfield 1842-1886 — Adeline M. Ireson 1842-1892 — Benjamin W. Roberts 1848-1900 — Mary F. Pierce 1852-1886 — William F. Bradbury 1856-1910 — Lucy A. Downing 1858-1896 — Abby M. Webb 1860-1896. The frequent resignations of teachers caused by ill health, in some schools as many as three in one year, coupled with the report of the Committee upon the work of the school, would indicate that keeping school was not an easy task in those days.

In the early days discipline was enforced by a free use of the rod, sometimes unduly applied by a teacher of infirm temper; but even at the best the punishment was vigorous to say the least. Among other punishments, beside the cowhide, Miss Jacobs mentions standing on a bench with a bag of unbleached cotton tied over the head for the boys and wearing a split stick shaped like a clothespin on the nose for the girls. In the case of some girl it was not uncommon for her faithful admirer to shake his fists behind the teacher's back while the punishment was being administered. As early as 1843 however there were teachers who entirely discarded the use of corporal

punishment as well as others who seldom resorted to it. As years passed the punishment gradually became less vigorous until in the latter part of the 50's it was confined to blows of a wooden ruler upon the open palms of the children's outstretched hands. There was a theory among the boys that if the hands were well rubbed with powdered rosin the pain would be greatly lessened. To some of the scholars this punishment was a serious matter as it was followed by a much more vigorous one at home.

The use of corporal punishment was not however finally abolished until 1869, although the regulations began to place restrictions upon it in 1863. In 1866 the punishment of a girl in one of the grammar schools led to the prosecution of the master in the police court and to a vigorous campaign in the municipal caucuses, in the public press, and through the mails, for its abolition. At that time the question was also brought before the courts in other states. As a result the punishment of girls was prohibited in 1868, followed by similar action in regard to boys in 1869. In 1871 it was however again permitted for boys under very careful restrictions which would seem to have made its use very difficult. The present rules make no distinction as to sex. Some effort however was required at first to prevent the substitution of more injurious forms of punishment by some of the teachers.

In the earlier part of the last century the town of Cambridge was divided into five school districts and the schoolhouses were built in part at the expense of the district and in part at the expense of the town. There were annual schools and six months' schools, male schools and female schools, and the appropriations by the town were for specified periods of each kind. The schools previous to 1795 appear to have been hi charge of the Selectmen but many matters in regard to them were acted upon hi town meeting almost to the tune of the adoption of the City Charter. Committees had hi earlier years been appointed to examine specified schools but the vote of the town on March 23, 1795, appointing a committee of seven for the purpose of superintending the schools in the town and of carrying into effect the school act, was the first appointment of a committee to have charge of all the schools. There was in

addition to the School Committee of seven, a Prudential Committee of one in each district whose duty appears to have been confined to the heating and repair of the school buildings in his district. This division was abolished in October 1834, the town was divided into three wards, and after 1842 no Prudential Committee was chosen, and in 1858 the number of the Committee was increased to ten. The schools were visited monthly by one member of the Committee and at the close of alternate quarters the whole Committee visited every school. In 1841 the Committees say, "When we consider the trust reposed in them by the State, the examination and in some cases the employment, of all candidates for teachers, the monthly visitation of all the schools, the selection of books for the children, the quarterly examination of each school, the giving counsel to the teachers, and the general charge and superintendence of all the schools, we cannot fail to perceive that no office in the town is more difficult and responsible than this." This was continued until the election of a superintendent of schools in 1868. In addition to this the regulations required the members to examine the yards and outbuildings and to take cognizance of difficulties between parents and teachers. The salary paid by the town does not appear to be uniform, varying from \$25.00 to \$40.00 per annum; after the adoption of the City Charter it appears to have been increased from \$80.00 to \$145.00 per annum. I suppose the variations were based upon the time given by each member.

The chairman of the Committee for some years prior to 1843 was Rev. Artemas B. Muzzey of the Austin Street Unitarian Church. In 1843 he was succeeded by Rev. William A. Stearns of the Congregational Church on Norfolk Street, later President of Amherst College. Among others who served on the School Committee in those days were Prof. Cornelius C. Felton, Prof. Francis Bowen, Rev. Joseph W. Parker of the Baptist Church on Magazine St., Rev. John A. Albro of the Shepard Church, Rev. Nicholas Hoppin of Christ Church, Rev. Massena Goodrich of the Universalist Church, East Cambridge, and Dr. William W. Wellington, 18 years a member of the Board and for 31 years Secretary of the Board.

In considering the schools of these early days it must not be

overlooked that the population was small and the wealth of the town was corresponding. In 1800 the population was only 2453 including the territory of West Cambridge and Brighton (then called Little Cambridge). Of this population only 1200 were within the present limits of Cambridge, a majority of whom were within half a mile of the college. The business depression in the early part of the last century had very seriously affected the prosperity of the town, many of its citizens having been rendered bankrupt. Yet even in the midst of this depression the town in 1817 with a population of about 3000 expended almost \$2200.00 for the schools, about one-fifth of the total paid out for all purposes. In 1851 the total expended for the schools was about one-third of the total ordinary expenses of the city. The lack of railroad facilities has always seriously retarded the growth of Cambridge so that the increase in population has always been gradual and moderate. In 1846 when the City Charter became effective the population was only about 12,500 and the valuation about \$9,300,000. Even in 1870 the population was only 39,634 with a valuation of \$43,097,200 while the city debt had increased from \$22,000 to \$1,671,072, with no sinking fund or other provision for its payment.

I look back upon the fourteen years I spent in the public schools of my native city with the greatest pleasure, and as one of the graduates of the old schools I do not hesitate to challenge comparison with the schools of the present day if judged by results. Whatever may have been their shortcomings the work of the schools was done with a thoroughness which will not suffer by comparison with the schools of today. What we learned we knew, which is not I think so generally true of the present generation. The relations between the teachers and the scholars were to a great extent those of friends and advisers. If we are able to deal with the apparently larger problems of the present day may it not be that our ability to do so is in some measure owing to the labors of those who have gone before us?

While their difficulties may appear small in comparison with ours should it not be said that considering the conditions at that time they were relatively as difficult?

In conclusion I am in hearty accord with the words of Mr.

111

George Livermore (a member of the School Committee), as true today as when they were printed 70 years ago. "Much was said and very truly at the dedication of the schoolhouse about the superior liberality of the present day. I fear we neglect to do full justice to the struggles and sacrifices of our ancestors in laying the foundations of free schools. Let us not ignorantly be guilty of sounding our own praises for liberality at the expense of our honored ancestors. They in their days of weakness laid the foundation, in toil and trial, in want and danger. We in peace and plenty from our abundance carry up the edifice a little way or perhaps add the capstone and then foolishly forget their struggles, or only mention them to compare their immediate results with ours and boastingly take to ourselves the glory of success."

112

ANNUAL REPORT OF SECRETARY AND COUNCIL

During the past year the regular functions of the Society have continued successfully. The annual meeting was held 23 October, 1917, at the house of Prof. Robinson. The officers of last year were re-elected and the usual reports read and accepted. Prof. William Morris Davis spoke upon the "Historical Aspects of the Geology and Geography of Cambridge," and answered numerous questions.

The winter meeting was held 22 January, 1918, at the house of Mrs. Sampson. A paper by Mr. Frank Foxcroft was read on "The History of No-License in Cambridge," and the Secretary read a paper on "Burgoyne and His Officers in Cambridge, 1777-1778."

The spring meeting was postponed until June 15, in order to be held out of doors at "Gerry's Landing," under the joint hospitality of Mr. and Mrs. Webster, Mr. and Mrs. Forbes and Mr. William A. Hayes. Addresses were made appropriate to the historic sites in the immediate vicinity. Mrs. Farlow spoke on the "Long House of the Northmen," Mrs. Gozzaldi on Sir Richard Saltonstall, John Vassall, and other early owners of the neighboring estates, Mr. Hayes on "Sir Richard's Way," and Mr. S. A. Eliot on Forsyth Wilson, the poet and neighbor of James Russell Lowell. The whole occasion, with the perfect weather, the extensive view, and the roses in their full beauty, proved a delightful innovation and should be followed by similar outdoor gatherings in Junes to come.

During the year the Council has held five meetings — on 27 November, 1917, and 18 January, 12 April, 6 June and 21 October, 1918, all at the house of President Thayer. Little business of general interest has been transacted, the matters considered being mostly the arrangements for the stated meetings and the elections of new members. At the last meeting a committee was appointed to revise the by-laws and another to arrange for the public meeting on the 22d of February next to commemorate the centenary of James Russell Lowell.

113

The Great War, in spite of the unprecedented demands it has made on our community, has had surprisingly little effect on our Society. A few resignations made on conscientious grounds left places that were easily and quickly filled. The meetings have been well attended; and the papers and addresses have been of a high order and of a pleasing variety, not confined to personalia, but also touching on some of the broader aspects of local history.

The most notable event to be chronicled by the Secretary has been the determined and successful campaign whereby the active membership has once more reached its maximum of two hundred — for the first time in several years. We have been fortunate in securing a group of new members whose presence is a distinct gain to our meetings, and to each and all we bid a hearty welcome.

The volume of the Letters of John Holmes, prepared by a committee of the Society and published last November, has met with a gratifying reception by the general public. Under arrangements with the publishers a copy was supplied gratis to every member of the Society, in lieu of the royalty on the first one thousand copies, and all profits on further sales are to accrue to the Society's treasury. The point is now close at hand where this source of income will be realized, 912 copies having been sold to date.

The past year has seen the virtual completion of one of the most important tasks undertaken under the auspices of the Society — the index to Paige's History of Cambridge. Originally begun independently by Hon. Charles J. McIntire, it was taken up by our indefatigable member, Mrs. Gozzaldi, the incidental expenses being defrayed from the Society's current funds. After years of patient and accurate work this invaluable manuscript is practically ready for the printer. The cost of publication is estimated at about \$2000, which would doubtless be recouped in time from the sales. Unfortunately, the Society has no pecuniary reserves available for such an enterprise ; so that, if the volume is to be issued, it must be through a special subscription. The attention of all well-disposed members is earnestly bespoken for this object. Nothing could more greatly redound to the credit of the Society than to follow

the Letters of John Holmes with such a publication. It is in fact much more than an index, being more accurately a genealogical key to all Cambridge families for nearly two hundred and fifty years. When we recall that it is the indispensable complement of a volume prepared by express request of the Congress of the United States, we may safely assume that it will secure attention all over the country, and every effort should be made to expedite its appearance. Subscriptions for this purpose will be gratefully accepted by the Treasurer.

The Council would once more impress upon all members its earnest wish for their co-operation in making this Society all that it should be. Nothing is further from its intentions than to act as a sort of star chamber. It has no ambition to direct the fortunes of the organization in secret, along lines either arbitrary or antiquated. It desires only to act as the steward of the members and to carry out their wishes, fully persuaded that they have as great and as intelligent an interest in the success of the Society as the Council has. It therefore once more renews its request for the aid and advice of the individual members. While suggestions of any kind will always receive careful attention, the following points will be especially valuable: proposals for new memberships, offers of houses for meeting places, topics for papers, names of new speakers (not necessarily members), information as to manuscripts of local interest, and gifts of all kinds for the Society's collections, including not only objects of historical value but appropriate books, documents, pictures, autographs, maps and all other material bearing upon the history of Cambridge.

SAMUEL F. BATCHELDER,

Secretary

Cambridge, 30 October, 1918.

115

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CURATOR
ADDITIONS TO THE SOCIETY'S COLLECTION
FOR 1917-18

AMERICAN IRISH HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Journal. Vol. 16, nos. 3, 4 (1917).

ANONYMOUS SOURCE

Order of exercises at the dedication of the Soldiers' Monument, July 13, 1870.
Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts. Vols. 2, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, and 14.

BLISH, MISS ARIADNE.

Cap made by Mrs. Bezabel Shaw, of Nantucket, for her little daughter, Betsy Shaw, afterwards Madam Craigie.

BROOKLINE HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Proceedings at the annual meeting, January 24, 1918.

ENSIGN, MRS. DWIGHT W.

One hundred years ago: or, A brief history of Cambridgeport and East Cambridge, by S. S. S. Boston, 1859.

ILLINOIS STATE HISTORICAL LIBRARY.

Publications of the Illinois State Historical Library. Nos. 22, 23. Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society. Vol. 9, no. 4; vol. 10, nos. 1, 2 (1917).

INDIANA STATE LIBRARY.

Publications of Indiana Historical Society. Vols. 1, 2, 3, 4 (bound); vol. 6, no. 2; vol. 7, nos. 1, 2.

IPSWICH HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Publications, no. 22 (1918).

LANCASTER COUNTY (PA.) HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Papers read before the . . . Society. Vol. 21, nos. 6-10; vol. 22, nos. 1-5 (1917-18).

LANE, WILLIAM C.

Ten reports of various Cambridge societies and institutions.

LONDON PUBLIC LIBRARY.

London, Ontario, Canada. Transactions of the London and Middlesex Historical Society. Part 9 (1918).

LYNN HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Register. Vol. 20 (1916).

MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Proceedings. Vols. 50 and 51 (1916-17 and 1917-18).

MEDFORD HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Historical register. Vol. 20, no. 4 (1917); vol. 21, nos. 1-3 (1918).

MIDDLESEX COUNTY (CONN.) HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Pamphlet, no. 15 (June, 1918).

116

MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Minnesota History Bulletin. Vol. 2, nos. 3-7 (1917-18).

MISSOURI HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

List of members (1917).

STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF MISSOURI.

Missouri Historical Review. Vol. 12, nos. 2-4; vol. 13, no. 1 (1918).

MOUNT VEHNON LADIES ASSOCIATION OF THE UNION.

Annual reports for 1916 and 1917.

NEW HAMPSHIRE HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Manual (1918).

NEW JERSEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Proceedings. New Series, vol. 2, no. 4 (1917); vol. 3, no. 1 (1918).

NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY.

Bulletin. Vol. 21, nos. 9-12 (1917); vol. 22, nos. 1-8 (1918).

OHIO STATE ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly. Vol. 26, no. 4 (1917); vol. 27, nos. 1-3 (1918).

OREGON HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Quarterly. Vol. 18, nos. 2-4 (1917); vol. 19, nos. 1, 2 (1918).

PENNSYLVANIA SOCIETY.

New York City. Year book for 1918.

COMMERCIAL MUSEUM.

Philadelphia. Annual report of the Philadelphia Museums for the year 1914.

INDEPENDENCE HALL.

Philadelphia. Catalogue of portraits and other works of art in Independence Hall. (1915)

POTTER, ALFRED C.

Manuscript records of the East Cambridge Anti-Slavery Society, 1837-1840.

RHODE ISLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Proceedings at the dedication of a tablet to the memory of Major Samuel Appleton, November 3, 1916.

SAUNDERS, Miss MARY.

Framed view of Cambridge, 1831.

SCHENECTADY COUNTY (N.Y.) HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Historical sketches and points of interest in Schenectady.

SHAW, Miss JOSEPHINE M.

Account book containing copy of the will of Mrs. Elizabeth Craigie and inventory of her estate. Collection of receipted bills, accounts, etc., of Andrew and Elizabeth Craigie.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

Washington. Proceedings of the 12th annual Conference of Historical Societies, 1917.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY.

Review of historical publications relating to Canada. Vol. 21 (1916).

UNITED STATES. LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Report of the Librarian of Congress for the year ending June 30, 1917.

VINELAND (N.J.) HISTORICAL AND ANTIQUARIAN SOCIETY.

Annual report for the year ending October 9, 1917. Vineland Historical Magazine. Vol. 3, nos. 1, 2 (1918).

VIRGINIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Virginia Magazine of History and Biography. Vol. 25, no. 4 (1917); vol. 26, nos. 1-3 (1918).

VIRGINIA STATE LIBRARY.

Bulletin. Vol. 10 (1917).

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Washington Historical Quarterly. Vol. 8, no. 4 (1917); vol. 9, nos. 1-4 (1918).

WESTERN RESERVE HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Tract, no. 97 (1917).

WHITE, MRS. ALICE MERRILL.

Engraving of Joseph Warren Merrill, Mayor of Cambridge 1865-67.

WISCONSIN ARCHEOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

Wisconsin Archeologist. Vol. 16, nos. 3, 4 (1917-18); vol. 17, nos. 1, 2 (1918).

STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF WISCONSIN.

Proceedings at its 65th annual meeting, October 25, 1917. Wisconsin Magazine of History. Vol. 1, nos. 1-4 (1917-18); vol. 2, no. 1 (1918).

DEPOSITED

By MRS. OLIVER McCOWAN. --- Manuscript account book of Henry Vassall, 1753-1759.

EDWARD L. GOOKIN,

Curator

118

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE TREASURER

CASH ACCOUNT

In obedience to the requirements of the By-laws the Treasurer herewith presents his annual report of the receipts and disbursements for the year 1917-18.

RECEIPTS

<i>Balance, 22 October 1917</i> -----	<i>\$63.41</i>	<i>Admission fees</i>
-----	<i>\$82.00</i>	<i>Annual assessments: Regular Members ---</i>
<i>Associate Members</i> -----	<i>12.00</i>	<i>576.00</i>
<i>Interest</i> -----	<i>8.39</i>	<i>Society's publications sold</i>

----- 10.00 Use of the Society's plates ----- 14.40 690.79
\$754.20

DISBURSEMENTS

McCarter & Kneeland, printing notices of meeting----- \$10.25 University Press, printing,
repair of plates, etc----- 7.50 Caustic Claflin Co., printing notices ----- 2.00
Elsie E. Minton, clerical services rendered the Treasurer ----- 25.00 Mary I.
Donovan, clerical services rendered the Secretary ----- 25.00 Richard H. Jones,
services reporting lecture of Professor Davis and furnishing transcript ----- 16.50
Sarah L. Patrick, typewriting reports, papers and envelopes -----
10.00 Helen E. Lilly, addressing envelopes, cataloguing and stenographic work
----- 10.00 Julia Freedman, preparing accounts of MS. diaries for theprinters
----- 7.00 Helen L. Lund, stenographic work -----
3.00 Postage, stationery and all petty items ----- 15.11 \$131.36 Balance in
National Shawmut Bank, 28 October, 1918 ----- 622.84 \$754.20

119

In the opinion of several of our members the time has arrived when the Society should consider what steps ought to be taken in the near future to secure an endowment. While the present war conditions preclude the possibility of a successful campaign at this time, when the calls for money are many and urgent, it is not too soon to call the attention of our members and of the generously disposed among our citizens at large and of all persons interested in the history of Cambridge, to the needs of the Society and the ends which the Society might accomplish if its financial resources were once established on a firm basis.

One important work that might be undertaken now is the printing of the valuable Supplement to Paige's History of Cambridge, which Mrs. Gozzaldi has compiled within the past decade. It includes a complete index of Dr. Paige's classic genealogical or biographical sketches of many of the persons mentioned in his book. It will fill four or five hundred printed pages, and it will be indispensable to all libraries and individuals owning the History. This work has been a labor of love with Mrs. Gozzaldi, and should be published by this Society as one of its publications.

The possession of an endowment would enable the Society to publish many valuable public and private records which would be helpful to historical students and scholars, and at the same time enhance the reputation of the Society.

Perhaps the most important end to be attained through the possession of an adequate foundation would be the securing of a permanent home for the Society. Our members are generally aware of the fact that the heirs of Mr. Longfellow have wisely and patriotically secured the Longfellow House from the vicissitudes which often overtake historical landmarks. The estate has been placed in trust and a fund has been set aside to provide for its upkeep. There is also a provision in the deed of trust under which this Society might, under certain conditions, find its permanent home in Washington's headquarters, but only if the Society is possessed of an ample endowment, sufficient to maintain itself and a proper force of officers. Such an endowment should not be less than one hundred thousand dollars.

120

It is hoped, therefore, that by gifts or bequests of money or securities our permanent funds may be largely augmented in the near future to enable the Society to avail of the

opportunities which are already abundant and of the still greater ones which may be within our reach hi the future.

Respectfully submitted,

HENEY H. EDES,

Treasurer

Cambridge, 30 October, 1918.

I find the foregoing account from 22 October, 1917 to 28 October, 1918 to have been correctly kept and to be properly vouched. I have also verified the cash balance of \$622.84.

FRED N. ROBINSON, Auditor

Boston, 29 October, 1918.

121

NECROLOGY

FLORA VIOLA ALLEN

Mrs. Flora Viola Allen was born April 2, 1844 at Pomfret, Vermont, and died at her home, 22 Centre Street, Cambridge, on April 11, 1917. She was the daughter of Roswell Allen, Jr. and May (Snow) Allen, his wife. Her maternal grandfather, Eben Snow, Sr., was a soldier in the War of 1812. On her father's side she was descended from Elnathan Allen of Pomfret, who was a soldier in the Revolution and was a first cousin of the famous Ethan Allen of the "Green Mountain Boys."

October 20, 1865, she married in Chelsea, Mass., Oscar Fayette Allen. They removed to Cambridge in 1878, where Mr. Allen was for many years thereafter the Treasurer of the Cambridge Savings Bank.

Mrs. Allen lived in Cambridge for almost forty years and was in a quiet but effective way a helper in many good causes. She was a member of the Cantabrigia Club, the East End Christian Union, a life member of the Anti-Tuberculosis Society of Cambridge and of the Visiting Nursing Association. She was a charter member of the Cambridge Historical Society, a member of Signet Chapter of the Order of the Eastern Star, and of the Daughters of Vermont. She was buried in her native town of Pomfret, Vermont.

FRANK AUGUSTUS ALLEN

Frank Augustus Allen was born in Sanford, York County, Maine, January 29, 1835. He graduated from the public schools of his native town and then attended the academy at Alfred, Maine. At seventeen years of age he began work as a bobbin boy in a cotton mill at Biddeford, Maine, but at twenty-one left the mill to found a dry goods business on his own

account at Saccarappa in the same state. After this he engaged in manufacturing in Boston and New York and finally settled in Cambridge in 1871.

122

Mr. Allen became interested in public affairs in Cambridge and was a member of the Common Council in 1876-77, mayor in 1877, member of the Board of Sinking Fund Commissioners, and of the Water Board, from 1895 to 1899. He was also trustee of Dowse Institute, 1877-1901.

He was one of the earliest members of the Cambridge Historical Society, having been elected in November of 1905. He was also a member of the Boston Art Club, Boston City Club, and of the Mizpah Lodge of Masons.

He married Annie G. Scribner of Gorham, Maine, who died in 1865, leaving two children, Annie E. and Herbert M. In 1866 he married Elizabeth M. Scribner. He died May 22, 1916. His funeral took place at his residence, 263 Harvard St., and he was buried in Cambridge Cemetery. His portrait may be found in the Cambridge Tribune for May 27, 1916.

GEORGE VASMER LEVERETT

George Vasmer Leverett was born at Charlestown, Massachusetts, in 1846, the son of Daniel and Charlotte (Betteley) Leverett. He was graduated from Harvard University in 1867 and took the degree of LL.B. in 1869 and A.M. in 1870. He married Mary E. L. Tebbetts of Cambridge, April 3, 1888.

He was a practicing lawyer and trustee in Boston from 1871 until his death. He was associated with Professor James B. Thayer of the Harvard Law School until the latter's death in 1902, and was highly esteemed by him. From 1886 he was with the American Bell Telephone Co. and the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. In the latter company he was at first official attorney, later counsel and finally general counsel. He was a director of the Conveyancers' Title Insurance Co., State Street Trust Co., and many other important companies. He was a life member of the Cambridge Historical Society, also a member of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, member of the Harvard Club of New York, and of the University Union, the University Club, Chicago, the Boston Athletic Association, and the Oakley Country Club. He died at his home, No. 66 Beacon Street, Boston, October 18, 1917.

123

JOHN McDUFFIE

John McDuffie, called by Mayor Good, in accepting his portrait presented to the city in 1914, "the grand old man of Cambridge," was born in Cambridge, December 23, 1828. His ancestors migrated from Scotland to Londonderry, Ireland, which took part with William of Orange in the revolution of 1688 and resisted the forces of James II. Mr. McDuffie often referred to the part which his family took in sustaining the memorable siege of

Londonderry, which lasted 105 days, the inhabitants enduring extremes of privation, until a man-of-war brought relief and the siege was raised.

John McDuffie of Cambridge was of the sixth generation from Daniel McDuffie, born in Londonderry, Ireland, who came to this country about 1720 and settled in Londonderry, New Hampshire. The line of descent is: (1) Daniel; (2) Hugh; (3) John; (4) John; (5) John; (6) John.

The subject of this sketch began his education in the Cambridge public schools; but, as his father died when he was twelve years old, he was obliged to leave school and begin to earn his own living. His first place was in Warren's dry goods store, on Washington Street, Boston. In 1849 he became bookkeeper in Hovey's seed store on Merchants' Row, Boston, where he remained until 1861, when he was appointed by President Lincoln postmaster of Cambridge. In 1866 and 1867 he was a member of the Cambridge Common Council, having as a fellow-member Charles W. Eliot, later president of Harvard University. He was a member of the Massachusetts legislature in 1868, 1871, 1872, and was elected clerk of committees of the Cambridge city government in 1876. This position he held until 1913, when he resigned. In 1901, after twenty-five years of service, a loving cup was presented to him with a sum of money for a trip to Europe for himself and his wife.

Mr. McDuffie married in 1860 Hannah Elizabeth Givens who was, like himself, a member of the Parker Fraternity of Theodore Parker's church. They had two sons, Dr. John MacDuffie (as the name is now spelled) of the MacDuffie

124

School, Springfield, Massachusetts, and Rufus MacDuffie of the Wendell & MacDuffie Company, New York City; also a daughter, Caroline Elizabeth, now Mrs. Charles W. Sherman, of Belmont. Mrs. McDuffie died in 1911 and a few months later Mr. McDuffie went to live with his daughter, Mrs. Sherman, in Belmont, where he died April 15, 1915.

Mr. McDuffie's mind was a storehouse of historical and genealogical knowledge, and he also had at his tongue's end all the laws and ordinances concerning the city of Cambridge. He was extremely useful in preparing for the City Council its resolutions and ordinances during his term of service. With his useful qualities he combined a charm of manner and a real friendliness which made it a pleasure to transact business in the departments of the city government where he was to be found.

He was a Freemason, a member of Mizpah Lodge, R.A. Chapter, Cambridge Council and Cambridge Commandery. He was also a Son of the American Revolution.

CAROLINE KING WYMAN

Mrs. Caroline King (Hooper) Wyman was born in Boston, September 12, 1828. She was the daughter of Henry Northey Hooper and Priscilla Langdon (Harris) Hooper, his wife. Mr. Hooper was born in July, 1799, in that part of Manchester, Massachusetts, now known as Smith's Point but then called Kettle Cove. Her marriage to Edward Wyman, of Roxbury and Cambridge, took place in Roxbury, September 22, 1864.

Until Mr. Wyman's death she attended with him the First Parish Church in Cambridge, but later became a member of St. John's Memorial Church on Brattle Street.

Mrs. Wyman was a charter member of the Cambridge Historical Society and was greatly interested in its work. For many years she worked actively for the Cambridge Hospital and for the Grenfell Hospital in Labrador. She was a member of the Church Periodical Club and of the Cambridge Basket Club and at the time of her death was president of the latter. She

died in Cambridge, January 25, 1915, and was buried in the Wyman lot in Mount Auburn cemetery.