

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OFFICERS.....5

PAPERS

THE STORY OF THE EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL.....7
BY CHARLES L. TAYLOR

THE CURTAIN-RAISER TO THE FOUNDING OF RADCLIFF COLLEGE.....23
BY MARY HUME MAGUIRE

THE Y.W.C.A. IN CAMBRIDGE.....41
BY FRANCES COOPER-MARSHAL DONOVAN

THE HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL.....53
BY HENRY WILDER FOOTE

FIRE IN CAMBRIDGE.....75
BY SOUTHWORTH LANCASTER

SOME ASPECTS OF THE EAST CAMBRIDGE STORY.....93
BY JOHN W. WOOD

THE FOUNDER AND THREE EDITORS OF THE CAMBRIDGE CHRONICLE.....107
BY ELIOT B. SPALDING

ANNUAL REPORTS.....123

MEMBERS.....133

BY-LAWS.....137

**IN GRATEFUL RECOGNITION OF
THE SERVICES TO THIS SOCIETY OF**

Robert Walcott

OCTOBER 17, 1874 - NOVEMBER 11, 1956

VICE-PRESIDENT 1925-1927

PRESIDENT 1928-1954

HONORARY PRESIDENT 1955-1956

4

THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORICAL SOCIETY PROCEEDINGS FOR THE YEARS 1955-56

LIST OF OFFICERS FOR THESE TWO YEARS

Honorary President: Hon. Robert Walcott

President: Mr. David T. Pottinger

Vice-Presidents: Miss Lois Lilley Howe

Mr. John William Wood

Miss Penelope B. Noyes

Treasurer: Mr. John T. G. Nichols

Curator: Mrs. Laura Dudley Saunderson

Secretary: Mrs. Rosamond Coolidge Howe

Editor: Mr. John R. Walden

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

The foregoing and the following:

1955

Mrs Dudley Clapp

Miss Katherine F. Crothers

Mrs. Anna Davenport Holland

1956

Mrs Anna Davenport Holland

Mrs. Elinor Gregory Metcalf

Mr. Robert Clapp

Mrs Elinor Gregory Metcalf

Mrs Dorothy Tenney Foss

Mr. Charles Conrad Wright

Mr. Arthur E Sutherland

5

THE STORY OF THE EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

BY CHARLES L. TAYLOR

Read January 25, 1955

A **BLIND** man whose sight has been restored describes his cure in terms other than those of the doctor who performed the operation. For the Norwegians who sang *Ein Feste Burg* outside Trondheim Cathedral, from which they had been debarred by the Nazis, that event went down into history in quite a different light from the report of resistance given in Germany. In other words, there are two kinds of history — the history to which we belong, which we prize, the story of our fathers' loyalty and of our hope, and the account of events apart from living, human associations and judgments of value; there is living history and moribund history, inside history and outside history. No illustration of this, to my knowledge, surpasses H. Richard Niebuhr's juxtaposition of a few words from Lincoln's Gettysburg Address with the Cambridge Modern History's description of the beginnings of this nation.¹ "Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created free and equal." "On July 4, 1776, Congress passed the resolution which made the colonies independent communities, issuing at the same time the well-known Declaration of Independence. ... It sets out with a general proposition so vague as to be practically useless. The doctrine of equality of men, unless it be qualified and conditioned by reference to special circumstance, is either a barren truism or a delusion." On the one hand, our fathers, on the other, the Congress; on the one, Four-score and seven years ago — that is, in a time linked to ours — on the other, On July 4, 1776; on the one, dedicated to the proposition, on the other, a barren truism or a delusion.

From one who has spent more than half his life in the Episcopal Theological School, who looks unto the rock whence he was hewn and to the hole of the pit whence he was digged, you will not expect a cold, critical appraisal. Not that such appraisals are unimportant. The enthu-

¹ H. R. Niebuhr, *The Meaning of Revelation*, New York (Macmillan), 1941, pp. 60-62.

7

siast may gladly suffer the rebuke of the dispassionate scientist, because the truth is greater than our little conception of it and our narrowness needs larger perspectives. Yet

external history, after all, has its beginnings in internal history, in our fathers, in our times, in the propositions to which we are dedicated. Was Abraham Lincoln wrong when he spoke as he did? If we acknowledge our prejudices, and try to be honest, may we too tell our story from the inside?

It was four-score and seven years ago this month when the teaching of this School began, although a chapel service had been conducted on December 15, 1867, and Dean John Seely Stone for two months with Professor A. V. G. Allen for one had already been waiting for the first pupil. Two houses had been secured as temporary quarters on the south side of Mount Auburn Street near Coolidge Hill Road. Some thought the school was likely to move into the cemetery opposite. Dr. Allen thus describes the birth: "It was on the first day of January, 1868, and it was at four o'clock in the afternoon that a student by the name of Sylvester — from Danvers — presented himself. I remember well the day. It was a dark winter afternoon and rather cold. We had a large fire in the open grate, and at four o'clock he came into the study and sat down, and we talked over Church History. That was the opening of the Theological School."²

Later in that same year, 1868, the Trustees acquired the first part of the ship-shaped property which the School now occupies — eastward from Craigie House along Brattle and Mason Streets to the corner of Phillips Place, westward along Phillips Place and Hastings Avenue to the backs of the houses on the east side of Berkeley Place — and St. John's Chapel, the first building to be constructed, was begun. In the following year, 1869, the houses on Mount Auburn Street were left behind; the Chapel was completed. The house at 2 Phillips Place, already standing, became the residence of Dean Stone; another at the corner of Brattle and Brown Street (Irving Place), which has since been torn down, was large enough for the rest of the School. In 1873 half of Lawrence Hall (the dormitory seen most easily from Brattle Street) was ready; in 1875 Reed Hall, which contains offices and class rooms, appeared; in 1879 came Burnham Hall — the refectory — and the deanery, and in the next

²Muller, *The Episcopal Theological School, 1867-1943*, p. 33. In the following footnotes, page references are to Dr. Mutter's book when no other source is indicated.

year the second half of Lawrence Hall was added. Later followed a second dormitory, Winthrop Hall (1893), the Library (1912), and various dwellings, until in recent times the School acquired (1950) 101 Brattle Street, which had been the home of its earlier dean, Bishop Lawrence, built two faculty houses (1954), and bought an apartment house at 37-41 Kirkland Street (1954) to round out its complement of eighteen buildings.

But the story of this School is not to be told in bricks and mortar; it is the story of persons or of truth embodied in people. When Cuddesdon College, outside of Oxford, was founded in 1854 for the training of ministers, Bishop Wilberforce made a brief memorandum: "Threefold object of residence here: i. Devotion. 2. Parochial work. 3. Theological reading." Whether Dean Washburn in his inaugural address in 1920 consciously echoed Wilberforce or not, he must be the one to say, but in calling for "an inner life of a very high order" he stipulated that this life should be built upon a "simple, vital religion," "sound scholarship,"

and "a practical purpose." These three ingredients provide a convenient outline for the telling of the story of those people who have been most influential in the life of the School.

I. "A SIMPLE, VITAL RELIGION"

Was it Woodrow Wilson who said that the business of the minister is not so much to do something as to be something? We strive for ways in which to express this truth. It is not enough that our students be professionally trained; their character must be such that men respect them as authentic ambassadors of their Sovereign. In a sense religion is always caught more than taught. One says to another: "Behold now, I perceive that this is an holy man of God, which passeth by us continually." (2 Kings 4:9.) A former Bishop of London put the matter in this way: "If ministers are to win people to Christ, they must be winsome." No scholarship alone, no cleverness, no capacities for directing a religious cult, certainly no oratorical powers take the place of the stamp of the man of God.

We need not linger on this point, yet it is vital to remember why the School exists, and to be thankful that its faculty and graduates have in some measure reflected this purpose not only in their words, but in their

lives. Dean Washburn, in the same address just referred to, said that as "Young men training for the ministry want religion before anything else," so the faculty "must look upon religion as their primary concern. ; . . . We must try very hard to be Christians in our homes, ... in our communities, ... in our class rooms." ³ Or in the words of Bishop Lawrence, "the public character of an educational institution is not made by the speeches of its deans or president moving about the country, but by the graduates." ⁴ And he might have added, the graduates are molded partly by their homes and their fellows, partly by precept, but even more by the glimpses of greatness of spirit which they learn to love and emulate in the formative years of their preparation for their high calling.

The first dean of the School, John Seely Stone, "was revered for his simple piety, his unquestioning faith, his large minded spirit, his manliness, his tolerance, his gentleness, his unfeigned humility." ⁵ It is a noble, strong, clean face that stands before me in his portrait as I write. And the men who were associated with him were no small men.

The shape of the School and its subsequent traditions were largely due to Francis Wharton, advisor to the Founder, Benjamin Tyler Reed, and the rector of St. Paul's Church, Brookline, attended by three of the first trustees (Robert C. Winthrop, James Sullivan Amory, and Amos Adams Lawrence). Wharton, indeed, was dean of the School for eleven weeks in spring of '67. In the eleventh edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica he is characterized as "the foremost American authority on International Law." ⁶ His Criminal Pleading went into a tenth edition in 1918, his Criminal Evidence into an eleventh in 1935, and his Criminal Law into a twelfth in 1932. It was he who advocated the location of the School near Harvard in Cambridge; it was he who provided in a unique way for a band of lay Trustees who should be free from ecclesiastical control. Rotund in body, he was also well rounded in

mind and comprehensive in spirit, as the following quotation shows. "Our Articles (The thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England) were meant as the symbols of peace and comprehension. ... Wherever we have deviated from this policy our glory and our power have been proportionately diminished.

³ P. 167.

⁴ P. 85.

⁵ P. 56.

⁶ P. 22.

It was by the application of the doctrine of compulsive uniformity that we lost the passionate eloquence of Whitefield, the sagacious sense of Wesley Through it we lost something more — the works and examples of those great confessors, the Puritan Divines of the Restoration, who in their exodus spoiled us of the jewels and wealth of an orthodoxy which we were too indifferent to appreciate, and of a literature whose depth and fulness we were too luxurious and inert to fathom There go John Bunyan, and Baxter, and Owen . . . and there, taking with him as he goes from this his mother church, the glory of the greatest epic poet (Milton) whom the world ever knew. What, indeed, might the Church not have been had her heart been as comprehensive as her standards!" ⁷

*Here was greatness which profoundly affected the School not only in the fourteen years of Wharton's connection with it, but throughout its history. His mind and heart set the tone. I shall speak of Professors Allen and Steenstra in another connection; their combined service of eighty-one years established the pattern which Wharton had prepared. Then, for nearly four years (1882-85) came as lecturer another of the greatest minds of his time, Elisha Mulford, the author of two important books, *The Nation* (1870) and *The Republic of God* (1881). Mulford was called by Dr. Allen "the ablest and profoundest student of political philosophy that the country had yet produced." And Whittier wrote of him:*

Unnoted as the setting of a star

He passed; and sect and party scarcely knew

When from their minds a sage and seer withdrew

To fitter audience where the great dead are

In God's Republic of the heart and mind,

Leaving no purer, nobler soul behind.

I am trying to say that the School's greatest legacy has been its great men, who have themselves illustrated what the minister's calling may be at its best. We hesitate so to describe our closer contemporaries — these were giants in the earth in those days, not ours — and yet the flame has not entirely gone out in men whom we have known and even now

are among us, men of a "simple, vital religion," shining as the brightness of the firmament and turning many to righteousness.

⁷P.26 f.

Perhaps one of the clearest evidences of this largeness of spirit and one of the chief links that have bound the saints together for half a century has been the little collection of prayers of the elder Professor Nash, the father of the present Bishop of Massachusetts, teacher of New Testament from 1882 to 1912. Here is the spirit in which he taught:

O Christ my Master, these Gospels are a portrait of thee. I follow thee because thou art the truth. Then must I be truthful. Because I love thee so dearly, I must not tell the least, the whitest lie to thy glory. Thou needest not that I should lie. Thy cause doth not hang on my arm. I must not then by dogmatic stratagem seek to win the fight unfairly. Here am I set as one little candle in the midst of many stronger than I. Thy cause is to be maintained by me against doubters. But, unless I am sure that these doubters are wholly forsaken by thee, why may it not be that thy cause is to be maintained in some measure by them against me? If I know that my opinion of thee is profoundly unworthy of thee, then I must expect to be tutored by thee in a thousand unexpected ways. Help me then to go to the study of thy life and times, taking nothing for granted. Help me to lay all dogmas aside. It is hard, very hard, for how ill doth it seem that one ray of glory should be taken from thy crown; and because it is hard, I need thy help. Thou my first love canst alone keep me from telling lies, from forcing the facts to square with my dogmas, instead of patiently waiting all my life long to learn whether there was or was not a dot over some i in the story. Thou needest not my pious frauds. But I need thy love. O help me for thy dear sake to keep myself from all manner of untruth and untruthfulness.⁸

A sufferer from Hodgkin's disease, for five years giving no sign to others that he knew he was under the shadow of death, saddened by the illness of his son, sharing through his passion for the poor and neglected the sorrows of his neighbors, constantly overworked and burdened with the problems of support for his family, he has left us these memorable words:

O master of the hearts of men, make us ill content with any peace save that of our Saviour, who won his peace after he had made the world's ills his own. Hold us back when, in our vulgar pride, we would go apart from the path and life of the lowly. As our Saviour made the carpenter's shop his school, and from it passed to the perfection of Calvary, so may we keep ourselves close to the lives of the great body of men, and pass through things common into the things eternal.

O God, Author of the world's joy, Bearer of the world's pain; make us glad that we are men and that we have inherited the world's burden; deliver us from the luxury of cheap melancholy, and, at the heart of all our trouble and sorrow, let unconquerable gladness dwell.

⁸ Prayers and Meditations, p. 30 f.

We ask thee not, O Lord, to rid us of pain, but grant in thy mercy that our pain may be free from waste, unfretted by rebellion against thy will, unsoiled by thought of ourselves, and enobled by devotion to thy kingdom.

O God, with whom a thousand years are as one day: Accept our service, though our lives pass like a watch in the night. That our work need not be undone, stay, we beseech thee, the fever in our hearts, and help us to walk in the light of Thine own eternity.⁹

With these men already mentioned was associated another whose name may be remembered the longest of all, the preacher in St. John's Chapel from 1869 to '76 on the third Sunday afternoon of each month, the subject of Dr. Allen's biography, called unsuccessfully while in Philadelphia to be dean of the School, always its friend and guide, of whose death Bishop Slattery, then a student in the School, wrote: "To young men who had felt that for once they had seen a man of the stamp of Plato or Dante — one of the few greatest souls of all time — it seemed as if the props of the world had fallen away."¹⁰ Such was the impression made by Phillips Brooks. And there were others, star differing from star in glory, Dean Gray a New Yorker never quite at home here, William Lawrence, and Dr. Drown, Max Keller, George Hodges, and, as a student, Henry Washburn. Truly in the School in the last thirty years of the nineteenth century was a generation of God's children.

2. "SOUND SCHOLARSHIP"

We turn now to consider more particularly the intellectual history of the School, its connection with Harvard, its scholarly ambitions and standards, and a few of its attainments. Wharton, Mulford, and Nash have already been mentioned. Wharton, we have said, was largely responsible — together with Frederic Dan Huntington, rector of Emmanuel Church, Boston — for the location of the new venture in Cambridge. Some did not like the proximity of the university and radical ideas. Dean Stone, for example, wrote in 1873: "Our position here in Cambridge is a trying one, unwisely chosen as a place for a school of theology; and then our Church throughout the land is more than cold towards the institution."¹¹ "More than cold" is an understatement. At one time only

⁹ *Prayers and Meditations*, pp. 13, 4, 5, 6.

¹⁰ *Muller*, p. 89.

¹¹ *P.* 45.

three of the bishops favored the School. Even the Bishop of Massachusetts from 1873 to 1891 (Benjamin Paddock) sent his candidates elsewhere.¹² Up until 1887 Harvard University's catalogue had contained a section about the School, similar to the descriptions of the Medical School and the Law School, but Dean Gray stopped this because of "frequent misapprehensions as to our relations to Harvard and possible injury to the School because

of the strong prejudice against Harvard from a religious point of view"¹³ — a prejudice which contagiously extended to the School.

Over the years, however, the record shows both an intimate relation of the School to the University and great benefit to the School because of this association. Sometimes the influence has been indirect. In advocating with Dr. Wharton the location of the School in Cambridge, Dr. Huntington said pertinently about the selection of men for the faculty: "Obscure men will not do. Small men will not do. One-sided men will not do. There must be exemplary piety, unquestioned ability, unimpeachable learning, and a large style of manhood," all of which qualities were particularly needed in Cambridge "where the genuineness, the thoroughness and the comprehensiveness of a teacher's mind would be subjected to more trying tests" than elsewhere.¹⁴ In other words, the School was deliberately set down in the midst of the most severe intellectual competition and friendly stimulus.

But the contribution of Harvard to its little neighbor has also been direct.

As now in 1955 committees of the Harvard Divinity School and the Episcopal Theological School are working on the possibilities of increased cooperation, it may be pertinent to recall that as early as 1868 Andrew Preston Peabody wrote to Mr. Rand of the School: "The Corporation of Harvard College will be most happy to give to your Theological School a beneficial connection with the University and to assign to it the same place in the annual Catalogue which is given to the professional schools immediately under their control."¹⁵ Dr. Muller points out that the benefits were not all in one direction; in those early days, as

¹² *The public, including Bishop Paddock, feared the Unitarians at Harvard, feared historical criticism, feared those who thought more clearly or ventured more rapidly than themselves.*

¹³ *P. 65.*

¹⁴ *P. 30.*

¹⁵ *P. 52.*

Dean Gray's words have reminded us, Harvard was feared and suspected throughout the land because of strong Unitarian influence. I do not mean that the caboose drew the locomotive, but the men in the cab were glad to have non-Unitarians in the train. Harvard gave the School full access to its libraries, lectures, and other facilities; it also advertised the School in the Atlantic Monthly and Harper's as one of its departments. Hence it was not surprising that a newspaper account of June, 1871, should say, "The first Commencement of the Episcopal Theological School, which is a constituent part of Harvard University, took place on the 21st." That statement was wrong, but up until 1879, as Muller points out, "there was nothing to lead the uninformed reader to suppose that the School was anything but part of the University." ¹⁶

Broken by Dean Gray, the close ties were renewed in 1914 when Professor Washburn and Dean Hodges took the steps leading to the affiliation which is thus described in the Catalogue: "Students in each institution may take courses in the other without payment of fee; students in each have free use of the libraries and museums of the other, and graduate students in theology at the Episcopal School may, under certain conditions, become candidates for the higher degrees of the University." Athletic privileges are also included. Much could be added on this subject — how the traffic across the Common runs in two directions, how Dean Washburn dreamed of St. John's College in Harvard University, and how the time now seems ripe for a high degree of mutual assistance between the two theological faculties — but I prefer to dwell on the University's influence upon the School's scholarly standards and aims.

Dean Gray who, you recall, was jealous for the School's independence, nevertheless wrote boldly: "This, then, is what the School stands for: candid, advanced, unpartisan, manly preparation for the ministry of Christ in this comprehensive Church. Nothing else is feasible in the presence of a great university, where men have learned to think for 'themselves.' It is clearly demanded that our methods be modern in a place where the art of instruction has reached so high a development The studies must be pursued in a mature way, books prepared for scholars are to be used, and no issue is to be evaded." ¹⁷

"No issue is to be evaded." Dean Hodges wrote of Peter Henry

¹⁶ P.53 f.

¹⁷ P.75.

Steenstra, "He is a teacher in whom faith and fearlessness meet He has a fine impatience of superficial work, of pleasant fallacies, of conclusions which cost nothing, and of opinions whose chief merit is that for the moment they are 'safe.' He believes that nothing is permanently safe except the everlasting and inconvincible truth." ¹⁸ It was Steenstra who led the students into the historical critical study of the Old Testament at a time when literal inspiration had only just begun to be questioned. There is a familiar story of a conversation between Bishop Lawrence and the deaf, Dutch ex-Baptist that illustrates the revolutionary thinking of those days:

Lawrence: "Aren't you coming to the Matriculation dinner?"

Steenstra: "No, I have to prepare my lecture for tomorrow."

Lawrence: "Why not use last year's?"

Steenstra: "I can't, I no longer believe it."

But the remark about him that I cherish most comes again from Dean Hodges: "He has never been nervously orthodox, that is, he has never been in fear lest something should

happen to the truth. He has been in no more distress as to the effect of the critics on the Bible than as to the effect of the astronomers on the stars." ¹⁹

Howard Chandler Robbins, who transferred from a very conservative seminary, described his experience thus: "It was like stepping out of the eighteenth century into the nineteenth The great note of this liberal school was the note of reality. Its atmosphere was the atmosphere of freedom Truth was not looked upon as a frail thing, to be defended by human ingenuity, but as something so mighty that all it demanded of us was loyalty, and courage to follow it in whatever direction it might guide." ²⁰

*The School's greatest teacher, in all probability, was A. V. G. Allen, Professor of Church History for forty-one years, author of *The Continuity of Christian Thought*, *Jonathan Edwards*, *Christian Institutions*, *The Life and Letters of Phillips Brooks*, and according to Dr. Drown, the superior in the classroom of *Palmer and Royce and Harnack*. The best single illustrative anecdote about him was told by the elder J. W.*

¹⁸ P. 94.

¹⁹ P. 93 f.

²⁰ P. 120.

Suter: "You would come into his class and he would, let us say, begin to talk about the Novations. Up to that time you had probably not heard that there were such people as Novations. Dr. Allen would explain their significance and add, 'But there is one point still unexplained, a very important point, one that should be cleared up.' You would go out of the class feeling that the most important thing for the welfare of the Church was that this point about the Novations should be cleared up, and that probably you were the man to do it." ²¹

"Sound Scholarship"! Time would fail me to tell of other teachers of more recent periods, of Drown and Fosbroke, of Washburn and Hatch, of the younger trio to whom I personally owe so much, Thayer Addison, Norman Nash, and Angus Dun, and of Muller, the historian of the School out of whose book this paper is written. George Hodges, dean of the School from 1894 to 1919, though not primarily a scholar, was a unique popularizer of enormous influence through his thirty-five books. Norman Nash was one of the two best teachers I have had in half a dozen colleges or universities on three continents. Dr. Drown shaped the thinking of about thirty living bishops of the Episcopal Church. Of him Professor George Herbert Palmer, who, by the way, lived in the Deanery for four years while Dean Lawrence lived at 101 Brattle Street, said: "I have had no man his superior and I do not know that I can say that I have ever had a man his equal in my department of philosophy." Addison, despite ill health, produced nearly a score of books, including the definitive history of the Episcopal Church. Hatch has been one of the world's leading authorities on the manuscripts of the New Testament, and recently Professor Shepherd, a leading liturgical scholar, provided the standard commentary on the Book of Common Prayer. This list omits much; its emphases may be erroneous; the point is that the School has consistently sought,

demanded and hitherto secured scholarship of a high order, consistent with the intellectual leadership given the world by our neighboring university.

3. "A PRACTICAL PURPOSE"

On the School's shield are the words Veritas et Vita. "Veritas," said Dean Hodges, "suggests our neighborhood to Harvard; and the addition

²¹ P.101.

of the words et Vita denotes our purpose, which is to apply truth to life."²² The founding fathers not only put the School in Cambridge; they were careful to see that it kept "close to the lives of the great body of men," and therefore made a unique venture in control: they established a lay Board of Trustees. Why the curious anomaly of a theological school without theologians on its governing board? This was Bishop Lawrence's answer: "Students of theology . . . must always be intellectually ahead of the average and if in theology a man is ahead of the average, he is liable to be dubbed a heretic by the average and pulled back." "Those who planned the foundations of the School decided that laymen, who did not necessarily know theology, would be better administrators of a theological school than bishops or clergymen who, knowing something of theology, might in their differences forget to notice the more important things."²³ Far be it from us to suggest that theological administrators are inferior. The reason for the success of the system has been that the lay Board has supported a forward-looking, intelligent, and practical-minded faculty in ventures which often timid ecclesiasticism might have quashed. The Bishops of Massachusetts, notably Lawrence, Sherrill, and Nash, have perhaps exercised greater influence upon the School through wise advice, voluntarily sought, than they could have done by official command. The School itself trained these leaders who have known how to lead, not drive, to persuade, not coerce. The Church at its best is not a club of authoritarian prelates; it is a body in which lay men, and women, too, have a large share in the work which brings the good news to them and the world.

As examples of the School's constant connection with life, its "practical purpose," from a wealth of material we may mention briefly the following:

1. Bishop Lawrence was unalterably opposed to anything akin to oratory in the pulpit, and drilled his students in translating theological language into terms which the people in the pews could easily understand, insisting on simplicity and naturalness in delivery. Beginning in 1890, a voice teacher has assisted in this work.

2. The elder Nash had a great passion for social betterment, a zeal which he passed on to his son. For thirteen years H. S. Nash led a club

²² P. 127.

²³ P. 23.

the purpose of which was to study the Church's social responsibility. A number of the leaders in this movement have been Cambridge men. In 1944 the Cincinnati School of Social Work was moved to and combined with the School at 99 Brattle Street. For many years Bishop Dun was also a leader in the Family Welfare Society of this city and Chairman of the Budget Committee of the Community Chest.

3. Dean Hodges brought to his work here valuable experience from Calvary Church, Pittsburgh, and initiated many into the mysteries of running Sunday Schools, preparing candidates for confirmation, parish visiting, administration, and preaching. Muller quotes from Hodges on Chrysostom a passage applicable to himself: "What he said was clear and definite; nobody could mistake what he meant; he had emotion, he had humor, he had sympathy, he had passion And he addressed himself straight to common life." ²⁴ From the beginning the School has found pastoral training important.

4. Under Henry Washburn and Angus Dun the School not only held an honored place in the Episcopal Church; it assumed leadership in the Ecumenical Movement. The two clerical members of this Church on the present Central Committee of the World Council of Churches are graduates.

5. As early as 1933 clinical training at the Massachusetts General Hospital was begun; in fact, five years before physicians and social workers lectured to the students.²⁵ Now in 1955 there is a highly developed program of supervised work for students in near-by parishes, and a prescribed summer of clinical training in well-directed centers. Many of the students also have training in ministering to penal institutions.

6. In 1940, because she was the best in her field, Dean Dun brought to the School Dr. Adelaide Case to teach Christian Education, thereby indicating both the importance of the subject and the School's continuing readiness to explore new paths — the inclusion of a woman on the faculty of a theological school. Her death in 1948 brought a loss from which the School still suffers.

7. From the beginning the School has been concerned with the missionary outreach of the Church. One member of the Class of 1874

²⁴ P. 106.

²⁵ Long before that, from 1895 to 1914, Robert A. Woods had taken our men to settlement houses and taught part-time in the School.

went to Japan. Now on Tuesday mornings we pray for some thirty graduates overseas. Whereas once the School was spurned by the bishops, now thirty-two of its graduates hold that office, comprising about one-fifth of the total number of bishops. Wherever the Episcopal Church is at work, there is the School, in the persons of pastors, teachers, college presidents, headmasters, chaplains, or specialists pioneering in some new area of the Church's life.

8. The "practical purpose" in this present area involves also a certain amount of help to the wives of students, for half of the 107 students currently enrolled are married. In the first decade of the School's life there were only about a dozen students annually. From 1889 to nearly 1930 the average was about forty; in 1940 there were sixty-two; after the war the number rose to nearly one hundred for each of the past six years. But the community has grown even more, for whereas until 1940 only a few considered that at that stage of life it was not good for man to be alone, now a new era is upon us. The wives must also be housed and fed, and be taught the meaning of Christian fellowship, to which also they very richly contribute.

Library, music, curriculum, tutorial and preceptorial methods, the grounds — the old walnut-butternut tree of which Longfellow wrote, and "the little tower" on the top of Reed Hall that came down as the result of the 1938 hurricane — the present School, the record of the alumni, and the periodical raiding of the faculty to fill other important places in the Church — of how much there is little or no mention here!

But in conclusion, is it not in order to ask again what has been the secret of the School? What has enabled her to give the Church some of its outstanding leadership? To what fundamental principles is she to adhere if she is to keep her usefulness in the future?

In a paragraph, the answer is this. She has understood the right relation between the sacred and the secular, never withdrawing from the world except for the purpose of returning to it refreshed by the love of the Lord. Her latest book, *Dr. Fletcher's Morals and Medicine*, shows her again venturing into a field that most men are content to leave out of religious concern. She has never thought of the ministry as a calling in which a few individuals glorify themselves at the expense of Church people: rather, ministers and lay folk alike go forth to spend and be spent in the service of their fellows in the service of the Lord. She has trained

men for this. She has understood that the minister must be both professionally highly equipped and non-professionally a godly man. His authentic humanity is not to be lost in his clerical collar. She has not taken herself too seriously, but with humor and humility kept steadily at her task. She has known how to bring laboriously garnered learning to bear on present problems, so that Thayer Addison, for example, could step from the classroom to the direction of the Church's overseas mission, or, better, that the faculty could reply with a book, *Creeds and Loyalty* (1924), to an effort of a group of bishops to enforce upon the Church conformity to a questionable theological opinion. She has understood the relationship between freedom and authority, between the individual and the group,

*between faith and works. Loyal to the Episcopal Church, she has pioneered in the Ecumenical Movement, in the spirit of Amos Adams Lawrence, who almost a century ago wrote: "I believe the Protestant Episcopal Church is the best. On that account I joined it nearly forty years ago, and my love of it has increased ever since. But this does not prevent my loving Christians of other denominations and acting with them; and especially it does not prevent my living and acting with those of my own denomination who entertain opinions in which there are 'shades of difference.' "*²⁶ *Especially she has kept the balance, the vital balance, between a "simple, vital religion," "sound scholarship," and "a practical purpose."*

*Although a paper such as this might well end with Phillips Brooks' tribute to the School (Muller, p. 83) may I echo, after thirty years of life in it, what Bishop Lawrence wrote to Dean Hodges on the day of the former's consecration, the day after the latter's election to be dean: "In all soberness I can say that it is the one position which in attractiveness, effectiveness, hope, opportunity, and joy, stands first in the Church."*²⁷

²⁶ P. 15.

²⁷ P.106.

THE CURTAIN-RAISER TO THE FOUNDING OF RADCLIFF COLLEGE

THE SEARCH FOR A "SAFE, PROMISING, AND
INSTRUCTIVE EXPERIMENT"

BY MARY HUME MAGUIRE

Read April 26, 1955

LAST Autumn Radcliff College observed her seventy-fifth anniversary. This joyous occasion brought hundreds of alumnae back to celebrate with their Alma Mater. It also produced an unprecedented spate of articles in magazines and newspapers and one charming small book, *An Acre for Education*, by David Mcord, all describing the founding, early history, and growth of the college. Consequently when I came to grips with the problem of selecting the specific aspect or episodes of Radcliff history as requested by the invitation of this Society, I ruefully realized that much of the cream had now been skimmed off the top of the bottle. Furthermore, I suspected that many members of this Society not only might have read these recent publications but also might have listened to parents and older friends who had been participants or spectators tell vivid personal stories of what have been called "Annexdots." What could I bring that would be fresh and interesting, add to common public knowledge, and be covered adequately within the time allocated to me this evening? One or two excellent topics like the developing relation between Harvard and Radcliffe which culminated in the present peculiar constitutional relation between the two institutions, is too long and complicated for a single paper. There is, however, an interesting tale, which I have never found anywhere in print in its completeness, of what

Harvard offered to women before Mr. Gilman produced his plan in 1879. This I call "The curtain-raiser to the founding of Radcliffe."

You are all aware that unlike her sister colleges, Radcliffe cannot claim a founder. She has no Matthew Vassar or Sophia Smith eager to endow an institution of higher education for women to bear his or her name. There is no counterpart of Mary Lyon crusading up and down

23

the Connecticut valley and through the New England countryside with her little black bag in which she collected contributions of varying amounts, none large, some even in dimes or pennies, in order to secure permanent advanced instruction for women. There is no ardent feminist like Carey Thomas who dominated the early development and established the characteristic tone of Bryn Mawr. As a matter of fact, had any such crusader for women's rights entered the picture in Cambridge, the doors of Harvard might have shut tight for many decades before any key could have been shaped to open them. Radcliffe alone among the women's colleges follows the tradition of the renowned universities of medieval Europe which arose out of the demands of students flocking to study under famous teachers.

Radcliffe College grew out of the desire to secure Harvard instruction for women. To achieve this goal several abortive or short-lived experiments were conceived and tried before Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Gilman finally hit upon the device destined to foliate in the unpretentious Circular No. 1 which appeared on February 22, 1879, announcing "Private Collegiate Instruction for Women," later affectionately nicknamed The Harvard Annex. Radcliffe was born of an idea, and as Mrs. Agassiz remarked later, "The idea was in the air."

After the Civil War a vigorous movement sprang up to secure more adequate educational opportunities for women. Independent colleges led the way with the opening of Vassar in 1865. Smith and Wellesley followed in 1875. Women gained admission to various state universities throughout the Middle West and were promised access to new privately endowed institutions like Cornell, which in 1868 opened its doors to both men and women, the first coeducational university in the East. Its founder, Ezra Cornell, was a Quaker who wished to provide a non-sectarian place of learning where "any person can find instruction in any subject." Some years later Henry W. Sage, a trustee, gave Sage Hall for women to fulfill the promise that "Cornell University is pledged to provide and forever maintain facilities for the education of women as broadly as for men." ¹

Harvard could not remain untouched by all this. Contrary to commonly-held assumption, during the years 1869-79, the decade preceding

¹ Finch, Carey Thomas of Bryn Mawr, pp. 53-54.

24

Mr. Gilman's proposal, Harvard did not act the role of deaf-mute when the women came a-wooing.

At this strategic moment Charles William Eliot was elected president of Harvard and his attitude became all-important in formulating the answer of Harvard to the women on her threshold. Most of these at that particular moment, 1869, had already received their bachelor's degree and, longing to qualify for the learned professions, came knocking at the University gate. Mr. Eliot was of course aware of the coeducational policy established at Ithaca by President White. He had read the charter granted to Boston University only the preceding month, in May, 1869, opening all parts of that institution to women.² He had undoubtedly learned of recent attempts by several women to gain admission to the Harvard Medical School in 1867 and 1868 which failed because of strong opposition on the part of the Medical Faculty. His inaugural address immediately gave notice of innovation, experimentation, and new emphasis in Harvard educational goals and methods. Nor was he afraid to face the problem of higher education for women and Harvard's share, if any, in it.

The attitude of the University in the prevailing discussions touching the education and fit employments of women demands brief explanation. America is the natural arena for these debates; for here the female sex has a better past and a better present than elsewhere. Americans, as a rule, hate disabilities of all sorts, whether religious, political, or social. Equality between the sexes, without privilege or oppression on either side, is the happy custom of American homes. While this great discussion is going on, it is the duty of the University to maintain a cautious and expectant policy. The Corporation will not receive women as students into the College proper, nor into any school whose discipline requires residence near the school. The difficulties involved in a common residence of hundreds of young men and women of immature character and marriageable age are very grave. The necessary police regulations are exceedingly burdensome. The Corporation are not influenced to this decision, however, by any crude notions about the innate capacities of women. The world knows next to nothing about the natural mental capacities of the female sex. Only after generations of civil freedom and social equality, will it be possible to obtain the data necessary for an adequate discussion of women's natural tendencies, tastes, and capabilities. Again, the Corporation do not find it necessary to entertain a confident opinion upon the fitness or unfitness of women for professional pursuits. It is not the business of the University to

² *The School of Theology was the first to function. The College of Liberal Arts opened in 1873.*

decide this mooted point. In this country, the University does not undertake to protect the community against incompetent lawyers, ministers, or doctors. The community must protect itself by refusing to employ such. Practical, not theoretical, consideration determine the policy of the University. Upon a matter concerning which prejudices are deep, and opinion inflammable, and experience scanty, only one course is prudent or justifiable when such great interests are at stake — that of cautious and well-considered experiment. The practical problem is to devise a safe, promising, and instructive experiment. Such an experiment the Corporation have meant to try in opening the newly established University Courses of Instruction to competent women. In these courses the University offers to young women who have been to good schools as many years as they wish of liberal culture in studies which have no direct professional value, to be sure, but which enrich and enlarge both intellect and character. The University hopes thus to

*contribute to the intellectual emancipation of women. It hopes to prepare some women better than they would otherwise have been prepared for the profession of teaching, the one learned profession to which women have already acquired a clear title. It hopes that the proffer of this higher instruction will have some reflex influence upon schools for girls – to discourage superficiality and to promote substantial education.*³

President Eliot thus came forward at the very beginning of his presidency with the prospect of cordial welcome to women within certain limits by Harvard. They must not ask for a Harvard degree. They must not inject complications into social supervision of the student body by becoming students in residence. But the University would gladly try an experiment by admitting women with satisfactory secondary school background and records to certain liberal arts courses which should enrich their minds and train them to be better teachers. Each student might if she so wished continue these courses over a period of several years, thus gaining considerable proficiency. This in time should stimulate better secondary schooling for girls and prove a substantial contribution to women's education. Few people are aware that the original offer to open certain educational resources at Harvard was freely initiated by President Eliot and the Corporation and that it was not the consequence of insistent demands on the part of women themselves.

What were these "University Courses of Instruction" and what happened in this first cautious experiment? President Eliot lost no time after his inauguration in June in organizing them. The Corporation minutes

³ Morison, *Development of Harvard University, 1869-1929*, p. lxx. Morison gives Eliot's inaugural address in full.

are evidence of an immediate desire to implement this policy. On August 28th the Corporation voted "that the fees for the University Courses in Philosophy and Literature be as follows – for either course one year \$150, payable \$100 at the beginning of the first term and \$50 at the beginning of the second term. For either course one term \$100 payable in advance. For both courses one year \$200, payable \$135 at the beginning of the first term, \$65 at the beginning of the second term. For both courses one term \$135." They further voted that the fees received from the students in each University Course be divided among the lecturers in proportion to the number of lectures given by each respectively. At their next meeting on September 18th, the Corporation voted to confer with a Committee of the Overseers on the subject of an examination for honors of those persons who would attend the University lectures. Richard Henry Dana, Jr. and Charles Francis Adams represented the Overseers in the exchange of views with the Corporation about such an examination. The Corporation delegated another obvious problem of administration by referring questions concerning the use of the library by graduate scholars, non-resident medical students, and persons attending University Courses of Instruction to the Committee on the Library.

The Harvard catalogue for 1869-70 contains this announcement. "The following systematic courses of instruction are given this year to graduates, teachers, and other competent

*persons (men and women). There is no examination for admission. Residence in Cambridge is not essential. At the end of the year an examination for honors will be held in each of the two subjects; but attendance at these examinations will be voluntary. The precise nature of the honorable mention is not yet determined. Similar instruction will be given next year, but in greater variety."*⁴

In Modern Literature six courses were listed with the following lecturers: Maxime Bocher, Francis J. Child, Elbridge L. Cutler, William Dean Howells, James Russell Lowell, W. D. Whitney. The hours were Monday, Wednesday, Saturday at 3 P.M. throughout the academic year. In Philosophy we find an even richer offering of seven courses by an outstanding group of professors: Ralph Waldo Emerson, Francis Bowen, John Fiske, C. S. Peirce, F. H. Hedge, J. Elliot Cabot, George Park Fisher. The registration, however, proved disappointing. Three men

⁴ Pp. 102-103.

signed up for both courses; four students registered for Philosophy, of whom three were men and one was a woman, Mrs. B. F. Brooks, of whom we shall hear more presently; six, all women, elected Modern Literature. These women pioneers were Miss Mary Prentice Allen of Marblehead, Caroline Earle of Jamaica Plain, Harriet Minot Pitman of Somerville, two sisters from Providence, Emma Graves Shaw and Sarah Shaw, and Mary Angeline Wright of Boston. Miss Allen later married and her daughter, Mrs. Mary Fabens Boles, Radcliffe '03, has sent me a photostat copy of the bursar's receipt for her mother's payment of \$150 for this course. Unfortunately Mrs. Boles could tell me nothing further about her mother's experiences at Harvard. She only knew that Miss Allen had had a most exciting time as a teacher of Negro children in Charleston, South Carolina, immediately after the Civil War.

The best description of this whole experiment is given by Dr. Francis G. Peabody, Harvard '69, in an article on "The Germ of the Graduate School" in the Harvard Graduates' Magazine.⁵ He was one of the six men enrolled. Interestingly enough another of the group, Joseph B. Warner, was intimately connected with the Annex ten years later. Dr. Peabody stressed the importance of the University Courses as the first serious attempt to prolong the period of liberal studies beyond the term required for the A.B. and thus to convert Harvard College into a university. "The two groups [of professors] made a constellation of talent more brilliant than had ever been seen, or perhaps has been seen again, in American academic life, and the announcement of the list of philosophers was greeted by friends of the new administration with enthusiasm, and by conservatives with outspoken condemnation or dismay." The results were, however, most disappointing. President Eliot in his report merely states that four graduates of Harvard presented themselves for the examination in Philosophy but "no one desired to undergo examination in the course in Modern Literature." Dr. Peabody describes vividly his fellow students, the professors, and lectures and concludes sadly, "The new opportunity was greeted for the most part as an intellectual recreation, and the first chance ever offered to women to secure academic credit by a Harvard examination was lost. . . . The courses in Literature had been accepted as a form of intellectual recreation by casual listeners. The

⁵ December, 1918, pp. 176-181.

courses in Philosophy had been meagerly attended and seriously, though stumblingly, followed by but four youths." The most important product, according to Dr. Peabody, was four notable books by various professors and the final summary of Emerson's thought. It is not surprising that with so little demand the experiment was not repeated.⁶ Here, however, is the forerunner of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and less directly of the Annex.

In addition to these University Courses there were also University Lectures intended for college graduates, teachers, and other competent adults, men and women.⁷ These consisted of groups of eighteen or thirty-five lectures in eleven courses, the fees varying from \$5 for eighteen to \$10 for thirty-five. The enrollment was much larger, 65 men and 90 women registered. Their names are not given. The catalogue for 1871-72 also lists a set of lectures, but the demand again was so slight that Eliot confessed that the scheme had "failed hopelessly."⁸ The University Lectures demonstrated that for real, steady development the University must place its reliance upon resident, paid, professional teachers.⁹ Consequently in January, 1872, a Graduate Department was created with a reformed A.M. and the establishment of higher degrees, Ph.D. and S.D.

Why did the women fail to seize this golden opportunity which might have greatly hastened the day when Harvard education would become available to women students at the undergraduate level also? I can find no specific contemporary explanations. In fact, the total lack of comment and reference to this experiment at that time outside the president's report is significant. To take a dark view of the whole matter, perhaps we in later years have exaggerated the demand by women in this period for higher education. It may have been more vocal, more theoretical, than genuine. To me this seems too harsh a judgment. Various other possible answers immediately suggest themselves. Few women then had the necessary background for work at the graduate level. The first class, a small one, had graduated from Vassar only that very June. Cornell had just opened the preceding year. Smith, Wellesley, and Colorado College, which sent students in those first years to the Annex a decade later, were still unborn. Those women who were knocking at the gates of Harvard

⁶ Morison, *Development of Harvard University, 1869-1929*, p. 453.

⁷ *Harvard Catalogue, 1870-71*, p. 108.

⁸ Eliot, *Annual Reports, 1869-70*, pp. 19-20; 1871-72, p. 13.

⁹ Morison, *Development of Harvard University, 1869-1929*, p. 453.

around 1869-70 and who did have college background sought a different type of professional training, namely medical or legal. Why did no teacher covet this opportunity for further instruction in literature or philosophy which she in turn could have used in her own classes? Perhaps there was not enough advance notice so that she could be freed from her teaching contract in order to register this first year. Furthermore, the fees which seem modest to us today were very high for that period. However that may be, it is evident that the specific demand and the proffered opportunity did not at that moment mesh. Probably the six women who registered for the Modern Literature Course were not adequately prepared and hence hesitated to present themselves for the examination. Neither did the three men. Instead of being "casual listeners" or treating the lectures as "intellectual recreation," as Dr. Peabody contended, they may have found themselves far beyond their depth and so like other untried swimmers sank without a trace. We shall never know.

Time does not permit me to describe in detail the first efforts of women to gain entrance to the already existing schools of medicine, law, and theology at Harvard. These also commenced in the decade, 1869-79, which we are discussing. It is a most exciting tale, so well documented in minutes of the Corporation and Board of Overseers and frequently with vivid comments on the debates in the minutes of the faculties concerned that it merits a full chapter to itself.

Briefly, the story is this. Women first tried to crash the gates to the Medical School. More frequent and determined efforts over a longer period of time were made by women to secure medical training at Harvard than any other form of professional education. Interestingly enough the Governing Boards were apparently sympathetic to this pressure, the Medical Faculty militantly opposed. In Law, the early story is quite the reverse. Here the Faculty were sympathetic and ready to provide the substance of legal training if not technical admission to a law degree, but the Corporation refused. Only one woman applied for admission to the Divinity School, in July, 1869. The Faculty promptly rejected her request.

The Bussey Institute was more hospitable and became the one professional school to welcome women. On April 28, 1871, the Corporation voted "that women may be admitted to the courses on agriculture, horticulture, and entomology at the Bussey Institution." Apparently they

could not take courses for credit, for on January 12, 1891, Mr. Watson was voted permission to give instruction in horticulture to a class of young women on special terms, "provided that they are not registered as students of the Bussey Institution."

Last of all came the demand for work in courses in arts and sciences at the graduate level. On May 27, 1878, an application was received from a Vassar graduate for admission to such courses during 1878-79. "After consideration the request was refused." Before Mr. Gilman developed his project for "Private Collegiate Instruction for Women" one more experiment was conceived and put into practice to secure the cooperation of Harvard professors in educating women, namely, the establishment of Harvard Examinations for Women.¹⁰

In January, 1872, a small group of women, fifteen in number, called a conference of both ladies and gentlemen at Wesleyan Hall, 36 Bromfield Street, Boston, to discuss ways and

means by which they might further women's education. The moving spirits in the effort were Mrs. Charles S. Pierce and Mrs. B. F. Brooks, the latter having been the lone woman who took the University Course in Philosophy two years earlier. Out of this preliminary meeting evolved the Woman's Education Association founded on January 24, 1872, "to promote the better education of Women."¹¹ They consulted university presidents, teachers, and members of school committees as to methods whereby they might best work towards this goal and were urged "not to disturb the present system of education, which is the result of the wisdom and experience of the past and bears so large a part in the moulding of our republican life." The Association organized itself into committees to develop various projects, a committee on Intellectual Education headed by Mrs. Pierce and another committee to raise scholarships for worthy but needy candidates to enable them to study in normal schools.

The Intellectual Committee found general agreement among educators that there was a real "need for a higher school for girls than we have at present" and then propounded a scheme by which girls should go through a course of study in some degree equivalent to that of Har-

¹⁰ For short article on this, cf. Mary Coes: "History of Harvard Examinations for Women," in *Harvard Graduates Magazine*, September, 1897, pp. 67-68.

¹¹ Cf. *First Annual Report, Woman's Education Association*, pp. 6-9.

vard College.¹² But when they inquired of President Eliot whether the University would confer degrees on women who should pass all the examinations required of men for the said degrees, the Harvard Corporation instructed him to reply that "a certain amount of residence at the University is an essential condition of receiving any degrees from Harvard and that the University does not propose to give its degrees to women."¹³ Mrs. Pierce in her annual report, however, merely stated that "this proved so large an undertaking that the Association was unwilling to incur responsibility for it."¹⁴ The Committee then switched to a suggestion made by Dr. Samuel Eliot that they might emulate the University examinations for women, established by Cambridge University in England,¹⁵ and asked Harvard whether it would follow suit. The Corporation appointed Mr. Putnam and Mr. Bigelow to serve with President Eliot as a committee to confer with the Intellectual Committee of the Woman's Education Association.¹⁶

After considerable negotiations, we find the following vote, "Whereas an association known as the Woman's Education Association, has requested the President and Fellows of Harvard College to establish and conduct stated examinations for young women in Boston, and in such other places as may hereinafter be designated for the purpose, and has undertaken through a responsible committee to meet all the expenses and do all the work connected with such examinations, except the actual preparation of the questions, and the examination of the work done by the persons examined. "Voted, that it is expedient to establish and conduct annual local examinations for young women, provided that the function of the University be limited to the preparation of the questions, the examination of the work of the candidates, and the granting of certificates to those who pass the examinations."¹⁷

Much time was required to work out the details of the project and nearly a year elapsed before the announcement in May, 1873, of the "Harvard Examinations for Women." The committee sent the pamphlet far and wide to all high school teachers in Massachusetts and to the prin-

¹² *This same proposition came up in the negotiations for the founding of Barnard.*

¹³ *Harvard Corporation Records, March 25, 1872.*

¹⁴ *W.E.A., First Annual [sic.] Report, p. 9.*

¹⁵ *Cf. pamphlet on Merton Hall and the Cambridge Lectures for Women, written by Miss Anne J. Clough, principal, October 22, 1873. Found among clippings of Arthur Gilman in the Radcliffe Archives.*

¹⁶ *Corporation Records, April 8, 1872.*

¹⁷ *Corporation Minutes, August 7, 1872. The Board of Overseers concurred in this vote. Oct. 9, 1872.*

cipals of the best-known academies and girls' schools throughout New England. The plan rested on the underlying philosophy that by thus testing the actual instruction given to girls an objective standard could be established by which schools and students might evaluate their work. This is not dissimilar to one function of the College Entrance Examination Board today. The committee realized that a big problem was involved in raising the standard of teachers. They pointed out that of some 120,000 women teachers in the United States fewer than 10,000 had graduated from a normal school. This situation was partly explained by the fact that at that time eighty out of one hundred women married, and consequently the average length of a woman's employment as a teacher in Massachusetts was only four years. This deterred many from spending four years in college at a cost of \$2500 in preparation for so short a professional life, in which the teacher could earn on an average only \$800 per year.¹⁸

Two grades of examination were offered: (1) a preliminary general examination for girls at least seventeen years old in a large choice of subjects — English, French, German, Latin, Greek; in Mathematics, algebra through quadratics and plane geometry; in elementary physics or botany for the sciences; and in history; (2) an advanced examination for girls not less than eighteen years old.¹⁹ None of these examinations were to be identical with those for entrance to Harvard or with any examination for resident students in the University. Although similar in grade to the average college entrance examination, the purpose was to give those girls who had been educated at home or in private schools an opportunity to test their progress by a strict, publicly recognized standard, and for high school graduates to set up a wider range of subjects than the ordinary public school included. The Advanced Examinations were not intended to be taken as a whole but as a test of special culture in one or more of five departments — languages, natural sciences, mathematics, history, philosophy — and were to be adapted for those who would probably have limited leisure for study, such as girls who had left school and were occupied with home cares or teachers engaged in their professional duties. In some cases book lists were drawn up and made available. The examina-

¹⁸ These statistics are given in *W.E.A., Third Annual Report*, p. 11.

¹⁹ A copy of this pamphlet announcing the *Harvard Examinations for Women, 1875*, is appended to *W.E.A., Third Annual Report*.

tions were to be given in Boston in June over a period of six days, 9-12 and 3-5 o'clock each day. The fee for the preliminary examinations was set at \$ 15 and for the advanced at \$ 10. The Woman's Education Association offered to help poor students to meet costs by remission of fees, loans, and free board and lodging. They also undertook to provide board and lodging in Boston at moderate cost for all whose homes were so distant that they could not return to them each evening. If candidates were under twenty-one, the application must be accompanied by written approval of parent or guardian. Certificates would be awarded to successful candidates in the following form:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATIONS FOR WOMEN

A-----B-----has passed [passed with distinction, passed with the highest distinction] the Preliminary Examinations held at -----, on the ----- day of -----, 187—, under the direction of the Faculty of Harvard College, and is entitled to proceed to the Advanced Examination.

President

Cambridge, June 187—

The Preliminary Examination includes English, French, Physical Geography, either Elementary Botany or Elementary Physics, Arithmetic, Algebra through quadratic equations, Plane Geometry, History, or any one of the three languages, German, Latin, and Greek.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

ADVANCED EXAMINATION FOR WOMEN

A-----B-----, having duly passed the Preliminary Examination on the-----of 187—, has been admitted to the Advanced Examination in the section [sections] of-----, and has passed [passed with distinction, passed with the highest distinction] the prescribed examinations in-----, held at-----, under the direction of the Faculty of Harvard College, on the-----of-----, 187—.

President

The five sections of the Advanced Examination were as follows:

- 1. Languages — any two of English, French, German, Italian, Latin, Greek.*
- 2. Natural Science — any two of Chemistry, Physics, Botany, Mineralogy, Geology.*
- 3. Mathematics — required, Solid Geometry, Algebra, Logarithms, and Plane Trigonometry, and any one of Analytic Geometry, Mechanics, Spherical Trigonometry, Astronomy.*
- 4. History (varied from year to year). In 1877, either History of Continental Europe during the Reformation, 1517-1648 or English and American History from 1688 to the end of the 18th Century.*
- 5. Philosophy — any of the following: Mental Philosophy, Moral Philosophy, Logic, Rhetoric, Political Economy.*

The Harvard Archives contain a bluebook in which Professor Charles F. Dunbar, chairman of the Faculty Committee, wrote his report on the results of the first examinations, held at the home of Mrs. Charles G. Loring, i Mt. Vernon Place, Boston. They began on Wednesday, June 17th and were held 9-12 A.M., 3-5 P.M. each day, except Sunday, for six days, ending on the evening of Tuesday before Commencement. Members of the faculty were always in attendance to give out papers, to observe and direct progress, and to collect and remove written work at the end of each session. Seven brave candidates presented themselves for this grueling ordeal, far sniffer than any present college entrance examinations. Only two had prepared under an instructor. One was a teacher in an elementary school; three declared their intentions to teach. Four stated that they hoped to take the advanced examination in a later year. Professor Dunbar gives a detailed and most interesting description of each candidate and her record. Helen Cabot of Boston, eighteen years old, had attended Miss Clapp's school. Two, both nineteen, Elizabeth K. Goss and Evelyn Smalley, came from the Salem High School. Eugenia Homer of Roxbury, twenty years old, had attended both Roxbury High School and Mr. Hooper's School. Susan Mitchell Munroe of Cambridge, also twenty, was a graduate of the Cambridge High School and had prepared for this examination under Mr. Gale. Henrietta Pomeroy of Appleton,

Wisconsin, had studied under Professor Pomeroy of Washington University, St. Louis. Harriet Williams of Somerville, the oldest, twenty-one, taught in a primary school.

Although the schedule was terrific, the grading standards set up by the Committee do not seem too high. Professor Dunbar lists them carefully: (1) a minimum of 40 per cent in every subject, (2) an over-all average of 50 per cent on the entire examination as the minimum passing grade, (3) any candidate falling below the minimum in more than two subjects to

be rejected, (4) action to be suspended on any candidate falling below the minimum in any subject but not rejected under (2) or (3) until she has repeated the examination. These were similar to the rules applied by the faculty to elective studies at Harvard, which allowed two conditions in twelve subjects. The candidates achieved the following results: four passed; two were conditioned with two failures each; one failed three subjects. None won distinction. In notifying the candidates of the results, the Committee gave no exact grades, but stated approximate success or deficiency.

Professor Dunbar then made several suggestions for 1875. He recommended that the closing date for applications be April 1 and that the time and place of examinations be announced by April 15. He urged especially that examinations be held earlier, towards the end of May, and that the place be shifted to Cambridge for the convenience of the faculty. The schedule of 1874 had been too stiff. In one instance the examiner had advised the candidate not to take the examination because she was physically unable. "In order to diminish the pressure of five hours of examination, which it will be observed is more than the faculty have generally thought advisable for young men, and is also continued for several days with only a single break," the Committee recommended that the number of hours be reduced and the examination period extended to cover about two weeks.

The plan grew. In 1877, examinations were held in four centers, New York, Philadelphia, and Cincinnati as well as Cambridge, with twenty-four candidates presenting themselves.²⁰ Four of these were over thirty years of age and had long been teachers, nine were definitely fitting to be teachers, five were studying for their own improvement. The remainder

²⁰ W.E.A., *Sixth Annual Report*, pp. 6-7.

were younger but expected some day to enter the teaching profession. This proves the point that these examinations differed from college entrance tests both in purpose and selection of subjects, but were comparable as to standards. Although fifty-one candidates took the examinations in 1878, public interest in them thereafter rapidly diminished, with twenty-nine presenting themselves in 1879,²¹ and in 1880 only twenty-one. In the peak year, 1878, the results were good.²² For example, of twenty candidates in Philadelphia three received certificates in the advanced examination, one, distinction on the whole preliminary examination, seven, distinction on the first division of the preliminary. The Woman's Education Association felt that the experiment had proved its value.²³ One teacher in Kentucky wrote, "I may never present a candidate, but these Harvard papers shall be the means of elevating the standard in our school and aiding me in my efforts for the higher education of women." It is only fair to state, however, that from the very beginning the more radical protagonists of women's rights eager for coeducation in Harvard were sharply critical of this whole idea, which they called a "singularly unpromising project."²⁴ They sarcastically mocked that "all that Harvard can now do for the higher education of women is to be willing to certify that they have been able to obtain a good education elsewhere."²⁵

Because of the falling number of candidates, the Association felt obliged in 1880-81 to vote to continue the examinations under the original plan only until 1883 so as to give those who had started on the scheme a chance to complete the whole series but then to shift over

to the regular matriculation examinations for Harvard College. In the meantime, beginning in June, 1881, candidates might take whichever set of examinations they preferred, the regular entrance tests for Harvard or the old style Harvard Examinations for Women. Another reason for this change was undoubtedly the founding of the Annex and the necessity of passing on the qualifications of applicants for admission. In April, 1879, Arthur Gilman wrote to the Woman's Education Association requesting permission to use the Harvard Examination papers in examining candidates

²¹ *These included the first candidates for the Annex.*

²² *Seventh Annual Report, p. 7.*

²³ *Eighth Annual Report, p. 9.*

²⁴ *Women's Journal, July 26, 1873, p. 235.*

²⁵ *Ibid., April 10, 1875, p. 115.*

just in special subjects.²⁶ He also asked for "sympathy and cooperation of the Association." They enthusiastically voted to "cooperate in every way possible, as a very inadequate expression of the interest with which we regard the opening of this opportunity, at our own doors, for the best education of women."

Four years later, the Annual Report of the Woman's Education Association speaks of the significance of the Harvard Examinations, which was one of the first measures proposed by them.²⁷ "They proved entirely successful, and they opened the way for the Harvard Annex, which gives girls an opportunity for a full collegiate course." At the same time the Association had to face the fact of fewer and fewer candidates. To help them analyze the situation, the Committee sent questionnaires to one hundred former candidates for the examinations and to seven hundred public and private school teachers throughout the country. Of the 192 teachers who took the trouble to reply only 18 per cent approved. The others were indifferent, opposed, or found themselves unable to prepare candidates. The Committee therefore felt compelled to recommend that after June, 1884, the plan be discontinued. Since more opportunities were becoming available for the higher education of women, parents and teachers preferred to prepare girls for college rather than for a test which opened no new opportunities. The Committee regretfully concluded that this type of examination simply had not taken root and perhaps had been rendered unnecessary by the growth of women's colleges, which in itself was raising the standard of education for girls at the high school level.

Thus we see that in the first decade of Mr. Eliot's presidency Harvard showed no intention of admitting women to any of its professional schools or to candidacy for a Harvard degree. The University, however, recognized the problem of women's education and Harvard's responsibility to it by a readiness to experiment cautiously. Several plans were tried: the University Course, University Lectures, Harvard Examinations for Women, all directed to the underlying objective of preparing women to become better teachers. These were

interesting ventures but proved ineffective answers to the problem of how best to tie women into a Harvard education. They did, however, develop a climate of opinion

²⁶ *Eighth Annual Report, p. 7.*

²⁷ *Twelfth Annual Report, p. 5.*

38

*among the faculty and provide precedents for the final solution. "The idea was in the air." Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Gilman had no formal connection with Harvard, but they were residents of Cambridge with many friends in University circles, and they faced the practical family problem of the best education for their daughter Grace. A plan occurred to them. "Suppose I find a number of ladies wanting to get the same education that men have, and I tell them, 'I will arrange a course exactly the same that Harvard offers men, and get the Harvard professors to give the instruction.' "*²⁸

They discussed this proposal with their friends Professor and Mrs. Greenough. Mr. Greenough proved to be in a receptive frame of mind because he and other professors had recently accepted for informal private instruction a most able student, Abby Leach, who proved so brilliant and so appreciative of this opportunity to study under famous teachers that President Eliot and a goodly number of the Harvard faculty were willing to continue and enlarge the experiment — private collegiate instruction for women at any level which they were capable of maintaining, close to but not in the Harvard Yard, without University responsibility for supervision of the students or for financing or administering the project, or request for a Harvard degree. Here was the "safe, promising, and instructive experiment" which President Eliot sought in his inaugural speech. Here at last was the seed which fell into good ground, already prepared, and grew and brought forth a hundredfold.

²⁸ *Arthur Gilman, Private Records, vol. I, p. I. (In the Radcliffe Archives.)*

39

THE YWCA IN CAMBRIDGE

BY FRANCES COOPER-MARSHAL DONOVAN

Read October 25, 1955

I*T is a great honor to represent the Cambridge YWCA at this meeting and to speak to you about its history. Many people in this room have helped to write this history; many others here tonight have helped to make that history possible by their generous interest and support. There is little, then, that I can add to your knowledge, but I hope that we can*

enjoy recalling the history of the YWCA in Cambridge as one enjoys the retelling of a familiar and well-loved story.

Although the YWCA was established in this city in 1891 and is therefore almost a newcomer in comparison with many other Cambridge organizations, the first YWCA was organized one hundred years ago in England. The development of our own association becomes more vivid when placed against the background of a world movement now entering upon its second century.

We might as well admit at once that the idea of a Christian fellowship was started first among young men. It is uncertain whether credit for the earliest groups should go to Germany, Switzerland, or England, for in all three countries young men came together for Bible study and fellowship at about the same time, during a period of vigorous growth of the evangelical churches. In England, however, the groups were less closely connected with the church or professional church leadership, and more permeated with the interdenominational character which has come to be considered basic to the Christian association idea. The growth of this activity for young men was so striking that it occurred to individuals here and there that young women, too, were in need of opportunities for recreation, instruction, and Christian companionship. This idea became articulate at about the same time in England and in Germany, but in the latter country the work was closely related to the state church. In England, the movement was more independent of church connection and was led more directly by women. There were two separate beginnings of what eventually became the YWCA — first, the Prayer Union, started

by Miss Emma Robarts in 1855 among her own friends "for their mutual benefit and for that of any young women in their respective spheres whom they might be enabled to influence for good," and, second, the General Female Training Institute, originally a home for nurses returning from the Crimean War, founded in the same year by the Honorable Mrs. Arthur Kinnaird. Miss Robarts' group compiled a list of recipients for their prayers in suitable categories, beginning with "Our Princesses and all who are in the glitter of fashionable life," continuing with "Daughters at home of the middle classes," and on down through all those who, by reason of economic or spiritual poverty they deemed to be most in need of help. Here are the two ideas which later became dominant in Christian Association thinking — concern with the needs of a complete cross section of women and an enterprising approach toward meeting those needs.

The influence of both organizations spread rapidly throughout England, and at an informal meeting in 1877 the two leaders decided to merge under the name of the Young Women's Christian Association, feminizing the title already used by young men. It was one of those exciting instances in history when an idea was sparked by dynamic leaders at an ideal moment. The years following the Crimean War, like other postwar periods with which we are all too familiar, were filled with change and unrest. The industrial revolution had transferred from the home to the factory many of the traditional occupations which had kept women firmly in their place at home. Now came strong pressure to work outside the home, not so much because opportunities for glamorous positions were opened to them as that there was not enough work within the home to take all of the time and labor of the large numbers of female relatives living there.

There is no clear line of connection between Christian Association work in England and the beginnings in America, but in February, 1858, a Prayer Union Circle was organized in New York, which met in a church lecture room for some months. Its first work was to hold religious meetings and to "labor for the temporal, moral, and spiritual welfare of self-supporting young women." The Young Ladies' Christian Association, as this Prayer Union came to be known, rented space on the top floor of a warehouse on University Place as a clubhouse for women wage-earners. This was the nucleus of the YWCA of New York. By choosing the more genteel term "lady," the New York group forfeited to Boston the right

42

to be called the oldest Young Women's Christian Association in the United States. On March 3, 1866, at the home of Mrs. Henry F. Durant in Boston, the same Mrs. Durant who with her husband founded Welles-ley College a few years later, a constitution was adopted under the name which has become world renowned. Its stated object was the "temporal, moral, and religious welfare of young women who are dependent upon their own exertions for support."

In the decade following the organization of the Boston Association, twenty-eight new associations were formed in the United States. Such rapid growth in the number of members dramatized the variety of their needs. By the time the Cambridge Association was started, in 1891, the spirit of pioneering to help meet those needs was well established. It took a good deal of pioneer spirit even to start a new organization, for in many places there was strong opposition from church leadership to any Christian work which was not directly a part of the church program. In Boston it took seven years to overcome this opposition. Mrs. Mary S. Sims, from whose official histories I have drawn much of this material, says that the need for helping working girls was not recognized by Boston men, particularly by pastors of the Boston churches. Doubtless they saw a threat in enthusiasm and missionary zeal devoted to a rapidly growing organization outside their own sphere of influence. The Cambridge Association was more fortunate in this regard. I quote from the Report of the Clerk in the Second Annual Report, dated 1893: "We are not unmindful or unappreciative of the active sympathy of the gentlemen friends of the Association. These, with others who have nobly come to our aid, have been timely helpers, but they are not as yet sufficiently numerous to meet our necessities; but their spirit is abroad and we have only to wait as patiently as we can for the manifestation of other sons of God." Constancy of purpose and demonstrated accomplishment did win the confidence of business and professional men in Cambridge. They have been generous in financial support and in counsel. For many years now, the investments of the Association have been in the capable hands of a Board of Trustees of five men, serving with the Association's President and Treasurer.

In 1891, no such help was forthcoming, but on a hot summer day in June, a meeting was held in the Baptist Church in Central Square to organize the Cambridge YWCA.

43

The first quarters were at 639 Main Street, in a room over a drugstore, and during the first year the program consisted of a variety of classes — in music, physical culture, dressmaking, cooking, water-coloring, German, Bible study, and hygiene. The historian

adds firmly, "There were weekly religious services as well." By early November, scarcely five months later, there were 530 members, twenty-six members in the Men's Auxiliary and nine Life Members, some of them men. Four years later, in 1895, a second room was rented, named the Hay ward Parlor, in memory of a good friend of the Association, Miss Almira Hayward.

The records of those beginning years make extraordinary reading. The early workers present an unmistakable challenge to us of a later day as they set about tasks which, even at this distance, seem more difficult than ours. We can sympathize with the Clerk who said, in 1896, "It is a matter of regret that much of time and strength must needs be expended upon plans for increasing the YWCA exchequer, energy which otherwise might be directed immediately to our legitimate work." That the energy was forthcoming, however, is attested to by the round of lectures, birthday parties, souvenir books of Cambridge, and bazaars or "sales" as they were called, to raise money for the expanding organization. Those who worked for a YWCA book sale last spring in a driving rainstorm have the warmest fellow feeling for the Clerk who wrote in 1901: "The sale in December was held on a very stormy day, otherwise the record would have been broken. You may always count on the storm of the season for Sale Day. In spite of this, you will notice from the Treasurer's Report that the receipts came up to the liveliest expectations." The burden of raising the total budget was not lifted until 1938, when the Cambridge YWCA became a part of United Community Services. Although there have been some limitations on the Board of Directors, necessary in any cooperative project on such a scale, the addition of a red feather to the blue triangle has meant wider interpretation of the Association's work to all Cambridge citizens as well as the sharing of the financial burden. Even those stalwart pioneers of the '90's might have blanched at the prospect of raising the \$30,700 provided by the Community Fund last year.

The basic need for young women leaving home for work in the city, in the '90's, as it is today, was for a suitable, inexpensive place to live. The boarding home, or residence, as it was later called, was always the major feature of the Association program. The hopes of the Cambridge

group in this matter are expressed in the First Annual Report in 1892. The high point of the first year had been achieving a charter, and when this important document was placed in the hands of the Clerk she wrote: "We confess to the passing before us of bright visions of houses and lands, of stocks and bonds; and we could well nigh see in the dim distance the White Palace of Delight, rising from its foundations, the attractive home of a thousand girls, wooing them to its restfulness, its interest, and opportunities." In six years they had achieved their goal; not a home for a thousand girls, it is true, but a commodious home at 11 Temple Street, a property known as the Pray Estate. This location was chosen by the Board of Directors after due thought and discussion because of the genteel surroundings in Central Square. It was adjudged far too dangerous for the girls to walk through the Harvard Yard after dark. In 1902, two more houses, at 144 Austin Street and 7 Temple Street, were purchased. In 1905 the Wellington property at 5 Temple Street was purchased, so that a new administration building and a gymnasium could be built, and in that same year the leaders embarked upon the great adventure of raising \$80,000 for a new headquarters. They were especially anxious to add a swimming pool to their facilities, but since they were

not successful in raising the total amount, this had to be given up. However, on November 18, 1911, a housewarming was held in the present building at 7 Temple Street. "So great was the crowd," says a newspaper account, "that only a small part of it was able to attend the exercises in Hannum Hall." By the 1940's, the need for expansion was again acute, and in 1952 a drive was launched for a health education wing, including a swimming pool. Again there were bright visions of houses and lands, and real estate, of stocks and bonds. The sum of \$238,000 was raised for the new wing, \$198,00 from foundations and from the public, \$40,000 from unrestricted funds of the Association. With these funds, the Board of Directors erected a modern unit, merging with the main building in an enlarged and modernized entrance hall, which now provides ample facilities for the gymnasium and a large room which can be divided into several smaller areas for club meetings. A costly item in the building was a new, badly needed heating system now adequate for the entire plant. Again the leaders had to forego a swimming pool, a much-needed facility for women in this area, but as soon as the new wing was dedicated, on September 28, 1954, gifts began to come in for the pool. So far, nearly \$500 has been received in un-

solicited gifts. This is a small beginning, but indicates the historic determination notable in the Association as far back as 1894 when the Clerk wrote, "Acting on the principle that 'every attainment is only a camp for the night,' no sooner is one industry compassed than we feel stirring within us the stimulus to the establishment of another."

The new wing is already proving its value to the community, for twice a week high-school youngsters fill the large room to capacity, dancing to juke-box music, talking, playing games, and, strange to relate, doing their homework. Gay surroundings, music, companionship fill a real need in 1955 as in 1891, but funds for supervision and maintenance permit opening the unit only two afternoons a week for this activity. The Canteen, as it is called, is a project sponsored jointly with the YMCA and includes a Saturday night dance for the older boys and girls. A dance for other groups every Friday evening is another joint project. An elected Council of young people is responsible for directing the activities of the Canteen and represents the finest leadership in high-school age groups in the City. The Council hopes to add interest groups as soon as funds can be found for leadership. The responsibility given to the Council managing Canteen affairs is reflected in the organization of all YWCA Clubs. It is this practice of participation, the sense of confidence which it imparts, which makes the YWCA acceptable to many people who might not otherwise join forces with a social agency.

As well as maintaining facilities for clubs and classes, the present building provides living accommodations for some forty-five girls. This residence is maintained for girls who need help as they begin their working lives or who are strangers in Cambridge. Only those who earn the comparatively modest salaries of beginners are eligible as permanent residents and may stay for two years. By that time a girl is presumed to have adjusted herself to her job, to be familiar with the city, perhaps to have had a raise in salary, and, therefore, except for some personal difficulty or emergency, to be able to establish herself elsewhere, making way for another youngster at her heels. Four rooms are reserved for transients. These may be travelers en route, mothers of college students coming for a visit or for some family emergency, patients coming to a near-by hospital, or, lately, women coming to

Cambridge for two or three weeks for cancer treatment at the Radiation Laboratory at MIT, girls referred from another social agency, or someone brought by a policeman too kindly to

impose the penalty of a night at the station on a girl astray. For sixty years a home for girls has been the heart of the Association's work.

The great concern of the Board of Directors for providing housing facilities involved the raising of large sums of money, but did not interrupt the work for those who needed constructive activities rather than a home. New classes were added each year in response to the needs and wishes of the members. In the '90's and for some years thereafter, these classes reflected in large measure the need for more training for paid work, in contrast to the recreational and avocational groups of later years. Classes in millinery, dress-cutting, attendant nursing, shampooing, and manicuring were very popular. A Woman's Exchange was organized for the sale of handwork. In 1899 an employment office, mainly for domestic help, was opened, a service maintained by the Association for twenty-nine years, when the supply of domestic servants showed signs of disappearing. In 1926 the Cambridge Association became the first association to offer vocational guidance service, work continued until 1939.

Among the first classes offered by the Cambridge YWCA in the early days of 1891 was "physical culture," presumably such setting-up exercises as were possible while wearing the cumbersome clothing of that era, and when the space available measured ten feet by six. The kind of physical culture indulged in by young women has changed markedly in sixty years, along with the volume of clothing worn, but the Health Education Department has remained a vital part of the Association's work. In Cambridge as elsewhere, the Association has seized every opportunity for healthful exercise for its members, both through its own facilities and through social agency camps. Since 1944 a well-equipped, remodelled barn in Marshfield has been loaned to the Cambridge YWCA through the generosity of Mrs. C. H. Thurber. "The Red Barn" has welcomed teenagers, adult members, and mothers with young children for summer vacations, and has been an invaluable and highly prized addition to the facilities of the Association. In addition, day camp activities are carried on each summer at the building in Cambridge.

The current program of the Cambridge YWCA includes activities geared to the interest of juniors, teen-agers, and working girls, as did the first program of 1891. But in 1855, when Miss Roberts placed "young wives and mothers" on her list to be prayed for, she could hardly have imagined a day when labor-saving devices and a new pattern of living

would bring young women in that group to a YWCA building for companionship and recreation. She would be surprised, at least, to know that one Wives Club in the Cambridge Association has a nursery for its Wednesday morning meeting, and that another club meets on Thursday evenings when fathers can be at home to mind the children. There is no place at all on Miss Roberts' list for another group — if there had been, she would probably have called them "aged and infirm." The Senior Citizens are, indeed, over sixty, but not too aged

and infirm to enjoy lectures, movies, craft lessons, to organize and direct bazaars at which they sell their handwork for special gifts for the Association, nor — bless their hearts! — to make regular visits to contemporaries in Cambridge institutions. During the Centennial Celebration, the Temple Players dramatized the history of the YWCA in an original play. In one scene, laid in London in 1855, a newspaper reporter asks Lady Kinnaird the question which may be in your minds too: "Young Women's Christian Association — what do you mean by young women?" "My dear sir, every woman alive is a young woman."

By the turn of the century, it became apparent that there was a further and still unmet need for recreation among girls and women living at home, but in poor and crowded neighborhoods. It was possible to secure a small building in the proper locality, the birthplace of Margaret Fuller, whose life had been dedicated to serving others. Margaret Fuller House was dedicated on the anniversary of her birthday, May 23, 1902. This was the first extension of the work of the Association beyond its own walls. Forty years later the house was given independent status as a Cambridge settlement house, and the legacies and funds contributed for its work were transferred to the new Board of Directors, which continues to maintain it as a service to Cambridge citizens. The practice of extension work is continued today with Cambridge YW leadership for high school girls in Arlington and Lexington, where no YWCA or substitute organization has been established.

The Cambridge Association has existed through two world wars, gearing its workers and its work to extra service in surgical-dressing and first-aid groups and parties for service men. It has cooperated in any way possible with other organizations in war service. The YWCA has always been a forward looking organization and has been willing to take leadership in the social relationships between men and women. Dancing in pub-

lic places was still somewhat questioned during the first World War, and the Cambridge YWCA was the first organization in this vicinity to sponsor dances under suitable supervision. The President of that day was wise enough to see that this great interest among her members could be given the status of acceptable, healthy activity under the right auspices. She herself put it in its proper place of social recreation as she, often on her father's arm, led off the waltz.

The responsibility involved in building a strong, useful local organization did not deter the Board of Directors from taking an active part also in national and international developments in YWCA affairs. By 1906 the steady increase of associations in the United States warranted the establishment of a national organization to state a common purpose and to initiate projects of mutual interest and benefit. The Board of Directors of the Cambridge Association decided not to affiliate with the National Board at that time because it was felt that the statement of the purpose should be broader and more inclusive. When by 1935 changes were made which expressed the nonsectarianism which had been the tradition and philosophy of the Cambridge Association, the affiliation was voted. Everyone is welcome to become a member of the YWCA, and the constituency of the Cambridge Association reflects in fair measure the constituency of the community. Members who wish to become electors, to take responsibility for direction of the Association by serving on the Board, are asked to sign the purpose. The devotions offered by a member of each group at the beginning of every meeting may be selections from the Episcopal Prayer Book, the

works of Thomas a Kempis, or the works of Oliver Wendell Holmes. Each is completely acceptable as an expression of personal faith, of conviction that the work of the Association is deeply religious in its concern for the individual.

The Cambridge Association has taken leadership in other areas of national concern too. It was one of the first associations to develop a partnership of volunteer and staff workers so successful that it has not only been able to increase significantly the work accomplished in Cambridge, but has been a pattern for other associations. An allied area is that of personnel standards and practices. Pioneer work has been done in preparing work analyses, setting and maintaining standards of work, and evaluating performance on the job. The concern of the YWCA historically has been for the woman wage-earner; therefore it is considered

49

especially important that the best thought of the Association should be given to the wage-earners closest at hand.

The activity of local associations in national affairs is evidenced also by keen interest in legislation affecting women. As the associations have become more highly organized, committees on public affairs have taken special responsibility in this area, studying current and proposed legislation, reporting trends, and educating members in their role as citizens. This includes cooperation with other groups in the community, such as leagues of women voters, encouraging new voters to register, and helping to disseminate nonpartisan information. Another extension of interest beyond local boundaries is the cause of world fellowship. The committee responsible for raising funds to be used in the sixty-five countries where associations have been established takes care also to inform the membership of the needs and problems of women in other parts of the world. Direct evidence has been brought to Cambridge by native workers from foreign associations who come here on visits, made possible by such organizations as the Ford Foundation, to learn new techniques and methods. A Community Relations Committee under Cambridge YWCA auspices gives impetus to the analysis of interracial problems which, local in application, are worldwide in implication.

The variety and scope of all these undertakings are made possible by the willingness of YWCA leaders to adapt techniques and activities to meet changing needs. Each local association is related directly to the needs of its community, although the purpose and philosophy remain constant. This enterprising approach to community developments and the constant practice of democratic methods are the special contribution of the YWCA wherever it is established.

To summarize the story of the YWCA in Cambridge, I should like to tell you about one of the sessions of the Centennial Celebration held in New York last April. It was a World Fellowship Meeting, at which delegates from all over the world described the work of the YWCA in their own countries, where much of the work is perforce supported by the National Association of the United States. The YWCA in Korea has been especially concerned with the situation of war widows and their families. What would these women put first of all their needs? Who would know better than other women that it would be a chance for their children? So YWCA funds in Korea have been used in large part for

milk stations and for schools for children made fatherless by the war. The Korean delegate had brought with her a gift for every one of the 3,300 delegates to the convention, an individual gift made by war widows in Korea — the little knot of colored silks which I am weaving tonight. The message with the gift was: "This gay Norigay [decoration] brings affectionate greetings from the YWCA of Korea." Here is the history of the YWCA, in Cambridge and across the world — the response of women to the needs of women; gifts, tangible and intangible, made with understanding, with no hint of patronage, which can therefore be accepted with dignity and with affection. This little Norigay is a fitting symbol of the history of the YWCA's first century of service — our promise for the next.

THE HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL
AS I HAVE KNOWN IT¹
BY HENRY WILDER FOOTE

Read January 24, 1956

FOR the remote origins of theological education at Harvard we must look back to a far earlier period than that in which the Divinity School took on recognizable form about 140 years ago. The Puritans who reached Massachusetts Bay in June, 1630, voted in their General Court only a little more than six years later, on October 28, 1636, the sum of £400 to establish a college. In the famous words of New England's First Fruits their purpose was "to advance Learning and perpetuate it to Posterity, dreading to leave an illiterate Ministry to the Churches, when our present Ministers shall lie in the Dust."

Strictly speaking, therefore, John Harvard was not the founder of the college, for this money from the public funds had been voted some five months before he sailed from England. But, except to order that a site for the college be laid out in New Towne (which was soon renamed Cambridge), no further action had been taken before Harvard died at Charlestown on September 14, 1638, about fifteen months after his arrival here. On his deathbed he bequeathed to the proposed institution all his books, some four hundred in number, and half his estate. The amount of money is supposed to have been about twice the sum voted by the General Court, but the precious nucleus of a well-selected library, in which standard works on theology predominated, was quite as potent an influence in securing the survival of the tender seed which the court had planted. Six months later the Court gratefully voted that the college should be named for him. History provides no parallel instance in which

¹ Most of the material in this sketch has long been common property, but I have drawn upon S. E. Morison's *Three Centuries of Harvard* (cited as *Morison*) and upon *The Harvard Divinity School* (cited as *H.D.S.*), edited by George H. Williams, for accuracy in details and for occasional quotations.

a young man, devoted to learning and generous in spirit but with no recorded achievements to his credit beyond his acquisition of an education, has purchased at so low a price world-wide fame as a benefactor of learning, far beyond anything which he or his contemporaries could have imagined.

But the choice of his name was fitting both because his bequest did make him a co-founder of the college and provided the stimulus to proceed promptly with an enterprise which otherwise might have languished or altogether failed, and because he could well stand as the representative of that remarkable group of university graduates who, between 1630 and 1640, emigrated from England to Massachusetts Bay to serve as ministers of the churches which were gathered as rapidly as new townships were laid out. Of these ministers 83 were Cambridge men and 26 were from Oxford.² All graduated between 1580 and 1638, most of them in the sixteen-twenties. Some of them would have been outstanding persons in any period or place; the average of character and intellectual attainment was high; and few communities anywhere have had ministerial leadership of as fine quality.

*That they were learned men there is no question. When the preparation of a more "close-fitting" version of the Psalms than that of Sternhold and Hopkins was undertaken — which resulted in the publication in 1640 of *The Bay Psalm Book*, the first book to be printed in the British colonies in America — thirty ministers were invited to submit metrical translations direct from the Hebrew. As a matter of fact, few if any of them did so, and the work was done by three men — Richard Mather of Dorchester and Thomas Welde and John Eliot of Roxbury — but I doubt if there are even three parish ministers in all New England today who know enough Hebrew to venture to make their own metrical translations from that language. And two generations later the Reverend Simon Bradstreet of Charlestown is reported to have been humorously presented by Lieutenant Governor Dummer to Governor Burnet as a minister so learned that he could whistle in Greek.*

It was the weighty influence of these university graduates, especially of the Cambridge men, which initiated the movement to found the college and which in some degree determined the character it was to develop.

² Albert Matthews, *Transactions of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, vol. 25, pp. 14-23. Cf. S. E. Morison, *English University Men who emigrated to New England before 1646*.

Cambridge University in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was a far more open-minded and progressive place than was conservative Oxford. In the sixteenth century it had welcomed the Continental scholars who introduced into England the "new learning" of the Renaissance period, including the study of Greek, and in the seventeenth century it was famous for its notable group of broad-minded philosophers and theologians known as the Cambridge Platonists, two of whom had been Harvard's fellow-students at Emmanuel

College. Cambridge was a center of activity for the reforming party in church and state both before and after the accession of Elizabeth, and of the resultant Puritan movement which was strongest in East Anglia. Emmanuel College had been founded in 1584 as an avowedly Puritan institution. Twenty-six ministers educated there, including John Harvard, came to New England.

Of course these Puritans were Calvinists, as all English Protestants then were in varying degree, but, being bold and zealous reformers, they were aware of the necessity of adapting their doctrines to meet the challenge of changing conditions. Consequently, as Dr. Conrad Wright has pointed out, basing his statement on Professor Perry Miller's researches, "Even the doctrine of the first settlers was not strict Calvinism. The Massachusetts Bay Puritans belonged to the 'Covenant' or 'Federal' school of the Reformed theology, which had considerably modified the teachings of Calvin before they were transplanted to the new world."³ I like to believe that it was these Cambridge graduates, nurtured in the traditional disciplines the roots of which ran back to the early Middle Ages, but with subtle and inquiring minds as they encountered new problems and ways of life, who planted in their little college here the seed of that spirit of free inquiry into truth which has generally been its prevailing characteristic.

Although in New England's First Fruits the emphasis is laid on the dread of "an illiterate Ministry," the need for educated leaders in other lines of community life was recognized from the beginning. In the first eighty years a few more than half the graduates from Harvard went into the ministry, but thereafter the percentage steadily declined. By 1800 less than 20 per cent did so, and nowadays the number is only a small fraction of 1 per cent.

³ Conrad Wright, *The Beginnings of Unitarianism in America*, p. 15. Reference to Perry Miller, *The New England Mind*, pp. 365-397.

In the early years the curriculum for all students was that of the English universities of the period except that Hebrew was introduced as a requirement. Besides Hebrew and Greek, the ability to read, write, and speak Latin was essential, since that was the universal language of the educated European world. But students were also drilled in geometry, the astronomy of the period, philosophy, theology, logic, and rhetoric. Thomas Hollis of London early in the eighteenth century gave the college a fine telescope, which was well used in starting astronomical research here. In 1721 the same benefactor endowed the Hollis Professorship of Divinity, stipulating "that none be refused [appointment] on account of his belief and practice of adult baptism," and in 1727 he gave the Hollis Professorship of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, the latter words meaning what we call experimental science. Fortunately John Leverett, a progressive layman and the greatest president of Harvard before Eliot, and his successor, Benjamin Wadsworth, were able to appoint scholarly and enlightened men to these chairs. There was no longer any danger that the college would remain shackled to the reactionary policy of Increase Mather, who would have held it to the out-dated Calvinism of the preceding century."⁴

Throughout the eighteenth century substantially the same course of study was provided for all undergraduates, except that Hebrew was dropped in the middle of the century for all but men looking towards the ministry. At that period there was no professional school in which aspirants for the ministry could pursue their studies. They generally remained for a year after graduation for further reading under the guidance of the Hollis Professor of Divinity and then often went to live for a year or two with some settled minister to serve an apprenticeship in pastoral care and preaching before ordination and settlement in a parish of their own. Some ministers were noted for their skill in such instruction and had two or three, or even more, young graduates living with them at a time, an arrangement which must have added no little to the burdens of the minister's wife. Before the establishment at Harvard of professional schools in medicine, 1782, and law, 1817, a similar system of apprenticeship was followed by college graduates headed for careers in those fields. The youth who wanted to be a physician generally lived in a doctor's

⁴ Morison, pp. 44-75.

house and accompanied him on his rounds, observing his instructor's methods. The would-be lawyer took a job as clerk in the office of the foremost lawyer who would accept him, read the law books he found there, and was instructed how to prepare and present cases.

That this method of theological education was adequate for the time and place is evidenced by the generally good quality of the native-born New England ministers graduated from Harvard in the seventeenth century and from Harvard and Yale in the eighteenth century. They were much more numerous in proportion to the population, and far more influential, than the clergy of the established Anglican Church in Virginia and other Southern colonies. They were prolific authors of books and pamphlets, and some of them were men of outstanding ability who throughout the eighteenth century waged battles of advancing thought against the entrenched theology of the conservatives. These controversies concerned intellectual issues now as dead as those of medieval scholasticism, but they bear witness to the thorough training and dialectical skill of the leaders. By contrast the clergy in the South stood on a far lower level of character and ability. Very few native-born Southerners went into the ministry because of lack of educational opportunity and because in any case they had to go to England for ordination by a bishop. Consequently, almost all the clergy in the South were men sent out from England, as was the case with the youthful John and Charles Wesley, but the Wesley brothers found their missionary zeal arbitrarily hampered and soon returned to England in disgust. Probably most of those who came did so because they were poorly qualified for preferment at home, whereas in the colonies they had an assured, if rather meagre, living, and little disciplinary oversight if they did not too grossly overstep conventional standards of conduct.⁵ I have never heard of any who risked the intellectual hazards of writing a book and the only clergyman of lasting distinction in colonial Virginia was Dr. James Blair, sent to Williamsburg as commissary for the Bishop of London, who established William and Mary College in 1692.

Until the opening decades of the nineteenth century there was little change in the method which I have been describing of training Harvard graduates for the ministry. You may have

noted that I began this paper by saying that the Divinity School took on recognizable form about 140

⁵ William Meade, *Old Churches, Ministers, and Families of Virginia*, pp. 14-19.

years ago. I put it that way because it was not "founded" as a professional school by a specific act on an unquestioned date. Instead it gradually emerged from the practices which had prevailed for nearly two centuries. Let me now trace the steps of that emergence.

Shortly before 1805 both the presidency and the Hollis Professorship of Divinity had been vacated by the death of their occupants. A vociferous struggle over candidates for these posts ensued between the orthodox wing of the Congregational churches and the liberal wing which was verging towards Unitarianism. In 1805 the liberal Reverend Henry Ware, Sr., was appointed Hollis Professor, and in 1806 the Reverend Samuel Webber, who had been Hollis Professor of Mathematics and who was regarded as a moderate liberal, was elected president. Thus the liberal tradition in the college, which had characterized it since the resignation of Increase Mather, was confirmed and perpetuated.

The response of the orthodox party was the establishment at Andover in 1808 of the first professional theological school in New England, if not the first in the country. In their attempt to ensure its fidelity to Calvinist doctrine the founders composed the Andover Creed, one of the most involved and rigid formulations of belief in Christian history, stipulating that "every article of the above-said creed shall remain entirely and identically the same without the least alteration, or any addition, or diminution." Every student on admission had to assent to it, and every professor had not only to subscribe to it publicly on his appointment, but also had to make a public statement every five years thereafter in which he promised to "maintain and inculcate the Christian faith . . . in opposition not only to Atheists and Infidels, but to Jews, Papists, Mohammedans, Arians, Pelagians, Antinomians, Arminians, Socinians, Sabellians, Unitarians, and Universalists." ⁶ It was the duty of the Trustees to watch the professors, presumably to make sure that none of them ever got any new ideas, and by way of further precaution a Board of Visitors was set up with power to hold the Trustees to their duty. The example set in Andover fixed a pattern which was soon followed in modified forms by other denominations which established seminaries where candidates for their ministries could be safely indoctrinated in the beliefs and practices held essential in each denomination.

The founding of Andover Seminary was the catalyst which caused

⁶ H.D.S., p. 194.

the factors which had existed at Harvard from the beginning to crystallize into a planned program of theological education. The first steps in this development are pictured in the letters of Samuel Gilman of the class of 1811, who is now best remembered as the author of "Fair Harvard," written twenty-five years later for the two-hundredth anniversary of the college. In the summer of 1811 he became engaged to Catherine Howard, who sailed from Boston the following October to spend the winter in Savannah. It was more than a month before he heard of the ship's safe arrival and two months before he received her first letter, but each week throughout the winter he wrote her a detailed story of his doings. These letters, now in Widener Library, give an authentic account of the activities of a resident graduate preparing for the ministry.

Until this year, as already noted, the resident graduate had been left pretty much to his own devices for further acquisition of learning, except that he studied the Greek Testament with the Hollis Professor of Divinity. But when Gilman belatedly returned to Cambridge in November, 1811, he discovered that "new regulations of study" had been "adopted by the graduates," which consisted "in having stated exercises, when we all go before some officer of the college." Presumably these "regulations" had been proposed by, and certainly they had the approval of President John Kirkland, a genial and enlightened man who had been a successful minister in Boston before his election in 1810, and who was deeply concerned to improve theological education.

Gilman continues: "Every Sunday evening [we attend] the President. Some topick in theology is given out, the previous Sunday for investigation and reflection. Doddridge's Lectures is made the text-book. The president questions us on this topick, and after he has gone through our circle, he hears our voluntary promiscuous remarks, interspersing in the mean while his own most excellent observations. . . . Our subject at the President's this evening [November 10] was on the Moral Government of God. . . . Every Friday evening, we attend the Prof, of Divinity [Henry Ware, Sr.] in Biblical criticism. Our subject is generally a chapter in the Greek testament, where we comment on the disputed passages; try to resolve ambiguous words; show the force of particles, etc., etc. On Monday, at 3 o'clock, P.M., we recite Hebrew to Mr. Willard."

On November 20 he writes: "Dined at the President's today, in company with professors Hedge, Willard, Farrar, & Ware jur. tutor Sanger,

and Sir Everett. Did you know that all the B.A.'s are called Sir?" "Sir Everett" was his classmate Edward Everett, who reappears a little later in Gilman's amusing account of the introduction of instruction in preaching and conduct of worship. On December 11 he wrote: "Initiated this evening into a theological society, composed of graduates and officers of College. The exercises are, a prayer, sermon, critical dissertation, and concluding prayer. After each performance, the members indulge in the most free and scrutinizing remarks. The discourse this evening was pronounced by brother Everett. It was on heaven; and written in a masterly manner. . . . His design was, to demonstrate that heaven is a place of security. . . . Being young, and rather inclined to bold, paradoxical assertions, he was somewhat imprudent as it respected . . . the doctrine of fallen angels, who it seems did not find absolute security even in heaven. . . . Here he declined into heterodoxy, and almost

*degenerated into heresy. . . . But his positions were afterwards ably refuted by brother English."*⁷

*The "regulations" thus described were the first step towards a systematic program of theological study. In 1813, Andrews Norton was appointed Dexter Lecturer on the Bible in the college and he and the soundly orthodox Reverend Abiel Holmes of the First Church, father of O. W. Holmes, were invited to lecture on the church history of New England. Both men were cautioned to avoid "inculcating a particular System upon the controverted points in Theology."*⁸

Meanwhile the seminary at Andover was attracting flocks of students, and the liberals at Harvard saw the necessity of providing still better facilities for its graduates looking towards the ministry in their churches. President Kirkland issued in December, 1815, a call for money to assist meritorious students, to erect a building to house them, and to support new professorships. Nearly \$30,000 was soon raised, and in July, 1816, the donors organized the Society for Promoting Theological Education in Harvard University. Perhaps to emphasize their disapproval of the Andover Creed, they stipulated that "every encouragement be given to the serious, impartial, and unbiassed investigation of Christian truth, and that no assent to the peculiarities of any denomination of Christians shall

⁷ *H.D.S., pp. 62-63, and S. Gilman's ms. letters.*

⁸ *H.D.S., p. 26.*

be required either of the instructors or students." The School throughout its history has adhered to this basic principle.

The Corporation on October 18, 1816, passed a vote approving a plan of instruction in "the Theological Seminary of the University," and this is the date upon which in 1916 the hundredth anniversary of the Divinity School was observed. But it was not until "March 19, 1819, that the Corporation accepted a report which, for the first time spoke of a 'Faculty of Theology,' composed of the President and four professors."⁹ So you may decide for yourselves whether the emergence of the School to professional status took place in 1811 or 1816 or 1819.

The first faculty included Kirkland, Henry Ware, Sr., and Willard — all of whom divided their time between the college and the Divinity School — and Andrews Norton, who in 1819 was appointed Dexter Professor of Sacred Literature. Though few in number, they formed as able and distinguished a group as could be found in New England, and in due time others, including Charles Follen, the German refugee who taught church history; and Henry Ware, Jr., who taught preaching and pastoral care, were added to their number.

*Norton was a man of letters writing on many subjects, including a number of hymns, but his masterpiece was his monumental work on *The Genuineness of the Gospels*, the earliest scholarly work on the New Testament by an American. Henry Ware, Jr. wrote a little book on *Extemporaneous Preaching*.¹⁰ When in 1914 I was appointed to teach homiletics in the school, I looked up available books on the subject, among them the volume *La Predication*¹¹*

by the French Protestant pulpit orator Coquerel. Coquerel drew most of his illustrations from the classic Greek and Roman orators, some from French preachers, a few from British sources, and had but one reference to an American work, Ware's Extemporaneous Preaching, which he praised highly. I had never heard of Ware's book but promptly drew it out of the library and found its practical advice as admirable as Coquerel had said. Ware, like Norton, was a hymn-writer, one of the earliest in that century-long succession of Harvard poets who have made a great contribution to the devotional life of America, of whom I shall speak presently.

⁹ *H.D.S., p. 27.*

¹⁰ *H. Ware, Jr., Hints on Extemporaneous Preaching, 1824.*

¹¹ *A. L. C. Coquerel, Observations pratiques sur la prédication, 1860.*

Although the Divinity School steadfastly adhered to its claim that it was undenominational and was committed only to an unfettered search for truth in religion, it was, throughout its first half-century, open to the oft-repeated criticism that it was in fact a denominational institution because only Unitarians were appointed to its faculty and all its students were preparing to serve Unitarian churches. This criticism fails to note that in the religious atmosphere of that period no orthodox scholar of repute could have accepted an appointment to a professorship in the School without being accused of disloyalty to his own communion, and that no pulpits in any other denomination were open to the young graduates, though some of them, after serving as ministers in Unitarian churches, did transfer their membership to another fold. The most notable but by no means the only case was that of F. D. Huntington, who graduated in 1842 and after serving in Unitarian pulpits for seventeen years, joined the Episcopal Church and eventually became a bishop. The School's claim to be undenominational was well grounded in the sense that no denominational organization ever attempted to control its curriculum or would have been permitted to do so, but its position was unique and misunderstood in a period when other seminaries everywhere had followed the Andover pattern and regarded theological education as primarily a matter of indoctrination in denominational belief and practice. As late as 1911 the New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia in a list of ninety-two theological seminaries recorded only the Harvard Divinity School as undenominational.¹²

Throughout the nineteenth century the student body was small, sometimes very small. In the earlier years this was because openings to Unitarian pulpits were few, but two other factors have operated to limit the numbers. The first was the high academic standard generally, though not always, set for admission and for graduation, which shut out many applicants who often found acceptance elsewhere. The School's supporters still "dreaded an illiterate ministry," and may well do so today when only 25 per cent of the students in American seminaries are college graduates, and when evangelists totally ignorant of modern Biblical scholarship are acclaimed with rapture. The second factor was the high cost of tuition • and living expenses, as contrasted with that of most other schools, which made the way easy for any respectable youth who could be induced to*

¹² H.D.S., p. 186, note.

enter. The School was, and probably still is, one of the most expensive places in the country, perhaps in the world, in which to obtain a theological education. As a result of these factors the student body has usually been a selected group with a high average of intellectual ability and character. It is recorded that "Of its graduates down through 1842, 22 per cent achieved sufficient distinction in later life to be included in the Dictionary of American Biography. No less than five of the nine members of the Class of 1836 are listed there." ¹³

The period from 1850 to 1875 is usually regarded as that of the School's low water level. Theodore Parker wrote in 1853, with characteristic sarcasm about those who did not go all the way with him, "I was over at Cambridge the other day, and looked in at the Divinity School, and saw several of the bodies which were awaiting their turn. The operators were not in at the time, so I saw nothing of the modus operandi. The Egyptian embalmers took only seventy days, I think, to make a mummy out of a dead man. Unitarian embalmers use three years in making a mummy out of live men."¹⁴ Yet the foundations for Parker's own ministerial career had been laid in the Divinity School twenty years earlier, though even at that early date he had protested against "mummification," when, required to preach and pray for criticism by class and instructor, he began, "O Lord, we pray thee to bless these miserable spiritual gymnastics."

The injustice of Parker's sarcasm is indicated by two trends already manifest at the School, both of which he should have welcomed. The first was its early recognition of the importance of German scholarship in Biblical studies. Acquaintance with the work of leading New Testament scholars in Germany had begun as early as 1811 and, at the time of Parker's visit, G. R. Noyes, appointed Hancock Professor in 1840, and Convers Francis, Parkman Professor after 1842, had long been leaders in promulgating their findings, as was F. H. Hedge at a later date. It would have been hard to find better and more open-minded teachers in the middle of the nineteenth century.

The other trend found expression in the contribution to the religious life of the country made by the long succession of the School's graduates who were hymn-writers and hymn-book editors. This fountain of devo-

¹³ H.D.S., p. 67.

¹⁴ H.D.S., p. 127.

tional poetry began to flow in the first two decades of the century in the hymns of Norton and Ware and a few of their contemporaries, but in the middle period it gushed forth

abundantly. In 1834 E. H. Sears wrote "Calm on the listening ear of night," the first of his two great Christmas hymns, and in 1846 Samuel Longfellow and Samuel Johnson, while still students in the School, compiled their first Book of Hymns, the earliest American collection to include Newman's "Lead, kindly Light," and to draw upon Whittier's poems for hymns. The custom of encouraging students to write hymns for their graduation exercises, then held on Visitation Day, resulted in the production of a surprising number of fine lyrics. To name only a few, in 1864 J. W. Chadwick wrote "Eternal Ruler of the ceaseless round"; in 1866 S. C. Beach wrote "Mysterious Presence, source of all"; in 1867 E. R. Sill wrote "Send down thy truth, O God." Although neither W. C. Gannett of the class of 1868 nor F. L. Hosmer of the class of 1869 wrote any hymns while students, both later made important contributions to American hymnody, Hosmer being now regarded as the greatest American hymn-writer of the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the opening decades of this one.¹⁵

It is not surprising that when the Congregational Pilgrim Press published the first edition of The Pilgrim Hymnal, in which the index of authors noted their church affiliations, it was soon discovered that 115 of the 547 hymns in the book were attributed to Unitarians, and that of 69 American authors 32 were Unitarians, who had contributed considerably more than half the hymns of American authorship. Almost all these Unitarian authors were Harvard graduates, a few — notably O. W. Holmes and S. F. Smith, from the college — but most of them from the Divinity School. A similar discovery had already been made by the English Congregationalist, Dr. W. Garrett Horder, a competent hym-nologist, who had visited America in the last decade of the nineteenth century and had published in 1896 his Treasury of American Sacred Song, the first book to introduce much of his material to British readers. Writing to me at a later date he said, "Harvard, like our Cambridge, has been 'a nest of singing birds.' I was struck with this when editing [my book]. Harvard provided the bulk, and Yale almost nothing, of the verse I included."¹⁶This succession of Harvard hymn-writers and hymn-

¹⁵ H.D.S., pp. 156-77.

¹⁶ H. W. Foote, *Three Centuries of American Hymnody*, p. 354.

book editors has continued over a full century and a quarter, and the high quality of the devotional lyrics with which they have enriched the religious life of America is a sufficient answer to those who suppose that the school from which they graduated was a coldly intellectual institution.

When in March, 1869, Charles W. Eliot was elected president, the need for a renovation of the School was obvious. He was a layman and a scientist, but his family had long been connected with King's Chapel, and though his intellectual outlook was radical, he was deeply religious by temperament. The Divinity faculty had lost Professors Noyes and Francis by death a few years earlier; the academic standards had dropped to a low level; and the student body was very small and unpromising. Similar conditions prevailed in the Law School and the Medical School, which for years had shuffled along with hardly more than nominal control by the President and Fellows, and Eliot promptly took vigorous steps to

rehabilitate all three schools. Referring to the Divinity School, he wrote in his first Report, "there is reason to hope that [last year] the School touched bottom." ¹⁷

The first task was to reinforce the faculty. In the fall of 1869 Charles Carroll Everett was appointed to the new Bussey Professorship of Theology, and he became dean in 1878. James Freeman Clarke, while remaining a parish minister in Boston, had given as early as 1854 what were probably the first lectures on comparative religion ¹⁸ in any theological school, and he returned to give a course on the subject for several years in the eighteen-seventies. In 1872 Ezra Abbot, one of the foremost New Testament scholars of his day, joined the faculty. In 1878 additional endowment was raised, and Eliot proposed "the development of the Harvard Divinity School from a local school, undenominational in principle but in fact supported and used only by Unitarians, into a broad School of Scientific Theology and independent research." ¹⁹

In pursuance of this policy Crawford H. Toy, whose acceptance of the views of German Old Testament scholars had brought about his resignation from the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, was in 1880 appointed Hancock Professor of Hebrew. In 1881 D. G. Lyon, also a Baptist, was appointed Hollis Professor of Divinity; Ephraim Emerton, a

¹⁷ *H.D.S.*, pp. 91-92.

¹⁸ *This field is now called History of Religions.*

¹⁹ *H.D.S.*, p. 168.

layman who had studied in Germany, was appointed to teach church history; and Francis G. Peabody, later dean, came to teach preaching, pastoral theology, and social ethics. Finally in 1883 the Trinitarian Congregationalist, Joseph Henry Thayer, one of the leading New Testament scholars of his time, resigned his professorship at Andover in protest against the creedal requirements and came to Harvard. In fourteen years Eliot had gathered a faculty of distinguished scholars and had made the School as undenominational in fact as it had always been in principle.

This broad-minded policy was continued through the opening decades of this century with the appointment of a Presbyterian (G. F. Moore), a Methodist (R. H. Pfeiffer), a clergyman of the Church of England (K. Lake), a Quaker (H. J. Cadbury), a man bred in the Jewish tradition (H. A. Wolfson), an Italian whose whole training had been in the Roman Catholic Church (G. LaPiana), and a Dutch Reformed citizen of the Netherlands, long resident in this country, who had come to view religion from the Humanist standpoint (J. A. C. Fagginger-Auer). All these men were scholars of the first rank who attracted increasing numbers of students, the enrollment rising to 128 in 1952, the year before Dean Sperry resigned. Perhaps the time may come when a Hindu philosopher like Radhakrishnan and a Buddhist scholar like Anesaki will be invited to lecture at the School.

When I entered the School as a student in the fall of 1899, the faculty included Dean Everett and Professors Toy, Lyon, Thayer, Peabody, Emerton, with Platner, Ropes and Edward Hale as its younger members, all of whom worked harmoniously together. It was

tacitly understood that they were under no obligation in their teaching other than to present their topics impartially, as clearly and fully as their time and our capacities permitted, and to permit any pertinent questions on our part. We students never had the feeling that we were under pressure to conform to the opinions of our instructors, and the only instances which I recall in which questions pointing towards theological beliefs arose were in a New Testament course by Professor Ropes, when some of us Unitarians thought him unduly cautious in his interpretation of the text.

It was fortunate that I took Dean Everett's introductory course in theology in my first year, for he died the following autumn. He was a striking figure, rather short and thick-set, with round face and white side whiskers. It is an interesting commentary on the way in which two dis-

tinguished men may work for years in the same institution without becoming acquainted that C. E. Norton, living at Shady Hill only a quarter-mile distant from the Divinity School, on hearing of Everett's death, remarked with regret that he had never known him. Friends described Everett's looks and said that the two men must often have passed each other, but Norton could not recollect ever having seen him. As a lecturer Everett was lucid and persuasive, with an occasional touch of humor. He was usually accompanied by his little dog, Larry, who would lie down beside the desk on the platform and sleep through the lecture. One day Larry awoke about five minutes before the hour was up, rose on his front legs and yawned prodigiously. Of course the class tittered. Everett looked down affectionately at the dog, said, "Larry knows when it is time for me to stop talking," closed his lecture notes and dismissed us.

In my first year I took Professor Lyon's introductory course in Hebrew, being the only student in my class to do so, if my memory is correct. At the end of the year he quietly advised me not to continue the subject, and I gladly accepted his advice, and soon lost what little skill I had acquired in reading Hebrew. But I have never regretted the time spent, for it gave me a feeling that I could have gained in no other way for the Old Testament literature, especially for Hebrew poetry, so different from that of the Western world. It was Toy, however, who gave me a vivid sense of the reality of the Old Testament in his clear, calm exposition of the origin and meaning of its varied contents. He was one of the best teachers I ever had. Students behind his back referred to him as "the Plaything," but he made us work, and it was worth while.

I had been acquainted with Professor F. G. Peabody since my childhood and in my senior year at college had taken his course in social ethics commonly known as "Peabo's Drainage, Drunkenness and Divorce." In the school he taught pastoral care, preaching, and more advanced social ethics. He was a master in the art of preaching, and few sermons delivered in the college chapel since the days of Phillips Brooks have equaled his for felicity of phrasing and depth of religious insight. His course "Horn. 2" was carried on in the Appleton Chapel of the period, where we ascended the pulpit and delivered practice sermons for the often very free criticisms by the class and himself in the traditional manner. But he became more widely known for his teaching and writing about social ethics, where he exerted a great influence in awakening the churches of

this country to a realization that Christianity should be as concerned for grave social evils as for the salvation of individual souls.

Twenty-three men are recorded in the General Catalogue of the Divinity School as belonging to my class, that of 1902. Six of us took the B.D. degree, while several of the seventeen others who did not remain for the full course took an A.M. All but one of the twenty-three went into some form of ministerial work and were ordained, in most cases soon after leaving the School, in the following denominations: Unitarian 7, Episcopalian 4, Baptist 3, Trinitarian Congregational 2, Methodist 2, and one each in the Disciples, Lutheran, Presbyterian, and Universalist folds. I do not recall any vehement theological disputes among them. We were content to let each man go the way that suited him best. My three best friends in the School were James E. Gregg, a Trinitarian Congregationalist; Frank Touret, who also entered as a Trinitarian Congregationalist but presently joined the Episcopal Church; and Charles F. Shaw, a Presbyterian, who, though registered in the college, had a room next to mine in Divinity Hall, and took some courses in the School. None of them stayed through the whole course; Gregg transferred to Yale, Touret to the Episcopal Theological School, Shaw to Union Seminary. I believe that they did not leave the Divinity School because dissatisfied with the instruction they were receiving, but only because it was advantageous to have their degrees from schools maintained by their respective denominations. All three remained my lifelong friends. Gregg served as a Congregational minister and for a decade as Principal of Hampton Institute. Touret became a bishop. Shaw had a long and creditable ministry in the Presbyterian Church.

I recall two other illustrations of the diversity of outlook in the student body. There was a brilliant but erratic youth, with strong high church leanings, in the Episcopal Theological School, who came over to the Divinity School for a course in the New Testament because, he frankly said, it was better than that in his own school, and who the next year transferred to the General Theological Seminary in New York because he found every sort of heresy rife in the Cambridge school. When, after the mid-year examinations, our New Testament blue-books were returned, I chanced to see that he had got an A, a better mark than mine, and that he had dated the examination as having been taken on "Feast of the B.V.M." Thus for the first time I learned that my own birthday fell

upon the Feast of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The other case was that of a rather raw youth from the West who had revolted against his fundamentalist upbringing and had become an aggressive left-wing Unitarian. Noting my conservative King's Chapel connection, he told me with some vigor that I had no right to call myself a Unitarian, in spite of the fact that most of my forebears for three generations had been recognized as such.

I took my degree in 1902, proud that I had been selected to speak a part at commencement and deeply grateful for having had the privilege of studying in what I still regard as one of the great schools of the period, with standards of scholarly attainment higher than those of any save a very few other theological seminaries in this country. It was nearly a decade

before I returned to live in Cambridge, and in 1914 I was unexpectedly appointed Assistant Professor of Preaching and Pastoral Care, and Secretary of the Divinity Faculty.

In the interval since my graduation a momentous change had taken place in the removal of Andover Seminary to Cambridge and its affiliation with the Divinity School. As the nineteenth century drew towards its close the orthodox and the liberal wings of Congregationalism had come much closer together. With the death of the die-hards Andover's controversial creed had been shelved, but the seminary's isolation from a university center made it increasingly difficult to recruit either professors or students. After long negotiations with the Harvard Corporation the removal was accomplished in 1908, with the reluctant assent of the Andover Board of Visitors. Andover retained its status as an independent institution with, its own trustees, endowment, faculty and building, but the libraries were combined to form the Andover-Harvard Theological Library, one of the greatest in the world. This affiliation, correctly described as "a gentlemen's agreement"²⁰ rather than a contract — which might have raised legal difficulties — doubled the resources for theological education open to students in the two schools and was a fitting climax to President Eliot's great vision of a first-rate theological institution integrated with the University and dedicated to the unfettered search for truth in the field of religion.

When I joined the Divinity Faculty this arrangement had been in successful operation for nearly eight years. The two faculties met sepa-

²⁰ *H.D.S.,p.193.*

rately to discuss their particular affairs, and together, in complete harmony, to plan the program of courses, the maintenance of scholarly standards, and any common problems which arose. W. W. Fenn, who had followed Everett while I was still a student, was dean, but he greatly preferred his study to administrative tasks, so many of which he assigned to me that I might have been described as an assistant dean. G. F. Moore, who also had come to Cambridge from Andover in time for me to take a course under him in my senior year, was an intellectual giant towering above everyone else. Kirsopp Lake, an Anglican, who came to Harvard from Europe in 1914, once remarked to me that the only man he had ever known who was Moore's equal in great learning was F. C. Conybeare of England, but that Moore was his superior in the art of conveying his knowledge to others, and when Conybeare later gave some lectures here I quite agreed with Lake's opinion.

As World War I drew to a close President Horr of Newton Seminary proposed that a conference of representatives of theological seminaries in this country and Canada be held in Cambridge to discuss their common problems. President Lowell took up the suggestion, members of the Divinity Faculty formulated the plans, and invitations were issued by the University for a meeting in August, 1918. No previous gathering of the sort had ever been held, but forty-nine seminaries sent about 120 delegates belonging to fifteen denominations. I was deputed to ask Bishop Lawrence to conclude the meeting with a communion service in Appleton Chapel. He consented to do so, but said that he must act as a Fellow of Harvard College rather than as Bishop and must use the Episcopal form of communion service, though reduced to its simplest elements omitting the creed. At the

service Professor E. C. Moore and I acted as deacons to pass the bread and wine, of which almost every delegate partook except two or three from the General Theological Seminary in New York, who could not bring themselves to witness so gross a violation of canon law by one of their own bishops in his own diocese. As the delegates left Cambridge, the head of an important school in the Middle West remarked to me, "Such a gathering could have been held only at Harvard." The meeting resulted in the organization of what is now known as the American Association of Theological Schools and Colleges in the United States and Canada, which meets biennially. But when the next meeting was held in Princeton, whither I went a day in advance to

70

assist in arrangements, I was promptly taken in hand by a Princeton professor who told me that no such inclusive communion service could possibly be held in Princeton and that I must not raise the question of having one.

Courses in the Divinity School had long been open to students in the Episcopal Theological School who wished to take them. In 1915 more limited arrangements were made with the Methodist Boston University School of Theology and with the Baptist Newton Theological Institution (and in 1930 with the Universalist Tufts School of Religion) to give students in all these schools the opportunity of entering such courses in any of these institutions as they might wish to attend, and many of them came to the Divinity School. This cooperative enterprise in theological education has continued ever since.

A meeting of the Divinity Faculty was held in the spring of 1922. After the transaction of a small amount of routine business President Lowell read a paper outlining a revision of the affiliation with Andover, informing us that it was a matter entirely in the hands of the Corporation but that he wished us to know what was in prospect. The document began by confirming the "corporate independence and autonomy" of Andover Theological Seminary, but ended by absorbing Andover completely in what was to be called "The Theological School in Harvard University formed by the affiliation of the Harvard Divinity School and Andover Theological Seminary." This plan had been worked out by President Lowell and Professor Ropes in consultation with the Andover Trustees.

We were taken completely by surprise, for we had seen no occasion to alter the existing situation. There were a few questions, Dean Fenn asking whether the proposed plan would be held valid if challenged legally, to which Lowell replied that the Corporation's legal advisers had approved it. As soon as we left the building Fenn repeated his doubts to me, remarking that the same legal advisers a few years earlier had approved the plan by which Harvard was to share the Gordon McKay Fund with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a plan which the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court had invalidated as a breach of trust. The new arrangement, however, was speedily accepted by the Corporation and the Andover Trustees as promising a more efficient use of the combined endowments of the two schools; Fenn resigned as dean and Willard

71

Sperry was appointed to that position; and in the fall of 1922 the Divinity School opened as "The Theological School in Harvard University."

But already an ominous portent had arisen. Professor Ropes, who had graduated from Andover in 1893, had been elected a member of the Andover Board of Trustees in 1899. He had, therefore, taken part in formulating the original plan for the removal of Andover to Harvard in 1908, and knew that the consent of the Andover Board of Visitors had to be obtained before it could be put into effect. But when President Lowell and he prepared this revised plan of 1922 for uniting the two schools they failed to consult the long-dormant Board of Visitors, who knew nothing of the proceedings until the plan was announced in the press as having been accepted by the Harvard Corporation and the Andover Trustees. Lowell and Ropes could hardly have forgotten that the Board of Visitors still existed as a part of Andover's legal set-up, with power to hold the Trustees to the requirements of the seminary's charter, but the written record offers no explanation of their oversight. Presumably they believed that the Visitors would raise no objection to the new plan and would accept it as an improvement over the existing affiliation to which they had given assent in 1908. Instead the Visitors were alarmed and, after a few brief conferences, refused their consent and brought suit against the Andover Trustees to have the plan declared a breach of trust. The Harvard Corporation and the Andover Trustees were too deeply committed to withdraw the plan and the Trustees brought countersuit against the Visitors. The Andover Trustees had to draw upon the seminary's funds to pay the heavy legal expenses of both cases. These suits dragged on for more than three years, terminating in a decree of the Court in January, 1926, which upheld the Visitors' contention that, in spite of the lapse of years, the Andover professors were still obligated to conform to the long abandoned creed. That made it impossible to continue the affiliation.

This outcome, which a more prudent procedure could have avoided and which would never have taken place if the original plan of affiliation had been faithfully adhered to, was a misfortune for the Divinity School and a disaster for Andover. Every Andover professor resigned, and the Trustees suspended all instruction at the end of the academic year. But it was clearly impossible to maintain the weakened seminary as an independent institution under the conditions imposed by the Court's decree,

and, after five years of suspended animation, another decree was obtained greatly modifying the creedal requirements and permitting the Trustees to affiliate the seminary with Newton Theological Institution. Harvard purchased Andover Hall, and the combined library remained intact, for the cost of unscrambling the eggs would have been prodigious.

I had left the Divinity Faculty and returned to the parish ministry in 1924, before this disruption took place, and have only an outside view of later events. The Divinity School's endowment of less than \$700,000 had perhaps been adequate down to about 1900, and had been matched during the affiliation by Andover's endowment of about the same size. It was now quite inadequate to maintain its faculty, which had been increased by the inclusion of several of the former Andover professors, and to meet the rising costs of administration. It had to be supplemented by grants from University funds, which was against President Conant's policy, a revival of President Kirkland's, stated in his appeal for funds to establish the school, that "it is our rule here for every tub to stand on its own bottom." But Conant

did not encourage any plans for raising a sufficient endowment, and although it had a more widely inclusive faculty of great distinction and a larger number of students than in any earlier period, the school was in practice treated like an unwanted child of the family, whose existence had to be recognized but who was grudgingly supported.

The movement towards a more adequate recognition of the School's importance began in 1945 when a visiting committee of the Overseers presented a report pointing out that Dean Sperry and several leading members of the faculty would soon become eligible for retirement, and that plans for the School's future should be carefully formulated. An interdenominational commission was appointed and in 1947 recommended that the School be maintained with a faculty increased to twenty-five members and supported by a greatly increased endowment. Though this plan was accepted, action in carrying it out was delayed until Dr. Pusey became president in 1953. The way was then clear for a reorganization of the faculty by the appointment of a number of distinguished scholars, with varied denominational attachments, to replace Dean Sperry and the retiring professors. As we all know, the new endowment of the School is approaching the desired goal of six million dollars.

The School has entered upon a new era in its history. But the abiding value of its principle of free inquiry into the problems of religion; of its

73

high standards of scholarship; and of its unsectarian spirit of interdenominational cooperation cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents, nor in the number of students whom it may attract. Its greatest service to the religious life of America will always come from its steadfast adherence to the motto adopted for Harvard College by the founders, the single word, Veritas, the Truth. As their contemporary John Robinson, pastor of the Pilgrim Fathers at Ley den, said, "Whatsoever truth is in the world, it is from God, by whatsoever hand it reacheth us." And Samuel Gilman was of the same spirit when he sang,

"Let not moss-covered error moor thee by its side

While the world on truth's current glides by."

Long may the Divinity School remain a place consecrated to the unfettered search for truth, in this new age when man's knowledge of the world in which he lives, and of the course of human history, is vastly greater than in the days of old.

74

FIRE IN CAMBRIDGE
BY SOUTHWORTH LANCASTER
Read April 24, 1956

FIRE may roughly be defined as the thing that results when combustible material comes in contact with a heat source in the presence of oxygen. Early Cambridge must have had its

full share of fires for it contained plenty of oxygen, a wealth of combustible material, and an endless supply of heat sources, like open fireplaces and candles. In the kitchens, the fireplaces worked day and night, while those in other rooms had considerable use, for even in our genial climate there come days when extra warmth is not unwelcome.

But sometimes the fire on the hearth went out, and then its rekindling became a problem. Often the solution was to run over to a neighbor and borrow a scuttle of glowing embers. This job demanded a certain amount of care and was best handled by a grown-up, but sometimes it was easier just to send one of the children. Such practice was not always good. A high wind may scatter sparks and start a field fire that burns down the barn. The small boy may stub his toe and fall, or he may discover that a burning chunk of wood makes lovely fiery curves when tossed in the air, forgetting that when the burning chunk lands on a dry roof, trouble swiftly ensues.

There must have been many instances of this kind which were seriously disturbing to the villagers, for on October 3, 1636, the town fathers decreed that in future no child under ten should carry fire from one house to another, nor should any other person unless the fire were covered. To put a bite into this ordinance, they provided that the offender should be fined twelvecence, half to go to the person who saw the offense and half to the constable who made the pinch.

Fire statistics were not accurately compiled in those days, and we do not know how much this ordinance reduced the number of blazes attributable to the transport of fire in the open, but we can fairly assume that early Cambridge was reasonably aware of the fire danger — what we should now call "fire-conscious" — and there is good reason to believe that the people were more fire-conscious than many of us in 1956. Here

is one Richard Withe who wants to build a barn, but he has a narrow piece of land and he doesn't want the barn too near his house because of the "fire danger." On April 4, 1649, the town allows him his margin of safety by permitting the barn to encroach upon the Common "about three or four foote."

On January 26, 1664, Francis Moore, Jr., desiring a piece of land in the "ox pasture" on the west side of his house for the preservation of his house and barn from danger of fire, is sold an acre of the pasture by the town for three pounds.

The germ of the zoning idea, from the safety standpoint, is in these two incidents, for if a building caught fire, the risk to adjoining structures was considerable. When a house did begin to burn in earnest, there was little to stop it, and as we should say today, the principal problem was to confine the fire and prevent its extension. Lightning, of course, was always a menace, and so was the hay in the barns. Hay or green fodder, if stored in a damp state, mildews and turns sour, so that livestock find it indigestible, if not outright repulsive. Therefore the good farmer carefully dried his hay in the fields before moving it to the hayloft against the winter's consumption. And his cattle flourished. But besides the corruption of mildew, wet hay by a chemical reaction generates heat, enough to start a little fire which quickly becomes a big one, and there goes your barn! This situation was not even suspected until about a hundred years ago, and we can't blame early Cambridge for

missing it. Still, it would be interesting to learn whether some long-headed citizen ever noticed that the best farmers had the fewest barn fires.

As to the house itself, there was always danger from the candle or the lamp carelessly used, but a prime cause (and this is true even today) was the fireplace and chimney, especially in early years when hearth fires were constantly kept alive and soot-producing pine wood was a basic fuel. Sparks can leap from a crackling blaze, and that is why fireguards were an early invention. But soot in the chimney has been another matter. Burning soot makes a very hot fire, and its hazard is threefold. First, it damages the chimney and makes a subsequent fire more probable — especially if the chimney is of wood. Wooden chimneys were banned by the "Agreement" of March 28, 1631, and this was ratified by an ordinance a year later, but records do not show how well this was enforced, nor whether existing wooden chimneys had to be rebuilt.

76

Secondly, the sparks from the chimney fire which blow away can land on the roof, or on a neighbor's roof, and ignite dry shingles or thatch. Thatch was prohibited too by the 1631 agreement, but indications are that it remained a common roofing material. As any fireman can tell you, a roof fire is a mean one to handle. Third, a chimney on fire gets extremely hot, hot enough to kindle the beams and the woodwork past which it thrusts itself to reach the outer air, and then there is more trouble.

There were a great many chimney fires from 1630 on, for according to an official statement, dreadful experiences had brought great loss not only to particular persons but to the whole town. Therefore it was voted on October 9, 1650, that because of careless neglect of keeping chimneys clear, all were to be swept clean forthwith. The same ordinance, noting the want of ladders in time of need, decreed that each inhabitant shall keep one or more ladders in readiness at all times to reach up to the top of his house, on penalty of a fine of 6d. John Russell was appointed to take notice of all violations and to summon negligent parties to answer for themselves at Town Meeting. Out of each fine levied, he received fourpence for his vigilance. This must have been a good job, and John Russell may have held it for as long as eighteen years; but times changed, and in 1668 the duty was turned over to the constables. Whether they inherited the fourpenny stipend is not of record.

It is worth while to point out that so far all the emphasis has been on fire prevention and, save only in the requirement of ladders, no great heed is paid to extinguishment. It would not have been unnatural to ordain, in addition to ladders, the keeping of some sort of water container always at hand, but there seems to have been no rule to cover this. Pails and buckets, of course, were standard equipment in all dwellings, and probably enough of these were usually available as "first aid" appliances, but this tied in with the matter of water supply, which except for those near the river was not copious. Thus prevention was the best defense. As we shall see, when means of conveying water were improved, attention became focused on extinguishment, so much so that the importance of prevention was not rediscovered until comparatively recent times.

This doesn't mean that there was no such thing as a fire engine. The concept of a machine that would throw water is as old as antiquity.

The difficulty was in making one which would work. The first American fire engine was merely a wooden tank on four wheels, with a simple pump which blew a stream out of a fixed nozzle something like the modern deck gun, those shiny brass things visible on the red wagons that today dash about our streets. From the shape of the pipe and nozzle, these machines were usually called "goose-necks." The term "hand tub" was generic and was applied to any type of hand engine, for tub was the proper word, and the problem of pump operation lay mostly in keeping the tub or tank full of water to insure a continuous stream. Originally this was done by passing full buckets in a human chain from some cistern or water source, with the last man pouring the bucket into the tank. The notion of a bucket brigade as a line of people passing along buckets to be spilled on the fire itself has foundation in fact, but it was a most ineffectual means of firefighting and could not be long kept up in the face of a real blaze. It was probably most useful in killing incipient fires started by sparks from the main conflagration.

The town probably had one or more engines by 1750, though there was no organized fire force, and certain landed proprietors had private apparatus for protecting their estates. Henry Vassall had one. The present state of the Vassall houses suggests he used it infrequently, and very likely he got tired of being waked in the night to loan it to frantic householders. Anyway, in 1755, he offered the engine to the town, and the town rejected it. Paige, the Cambridge historian, thinks this proves the existence of publicly owned machines, arguing that the town fathers hardly would have spurned the offer had they not already been supplied. Boston, he says, had seven engines in 1733, and surely Cambridge did not lag behind.

The first definite mention of a town engine is at the burning of Harvard Hall in January 1764. The engine seems to have done a good job, but the reference is casual and we are not sure just how it performed nor who manned it. Somewhere, in some forgotten account, lies the full story. All we know is that the town was growing. It had a college, churches, factories — manufactories, of course. Buildings were closer together and fire hazards multiplied. The need for some sort of fire force, as distinct from local ordinances about conduct, became apparent and the need was met in Cambridge in a pattern similar to that which developed throughout New England.

Generally this took the form of a fire society, privately organized for mutual assistance and protection, but these were not wholly indifferent to the misfortunes of nonmembers and often responded to distress calls from those who had no society affiliation. The usual equipment per member was two stout leathern buckets, a canvas sack, and a bed key. The latter two items were salvage appliances; the bag could be filled with movables from the threatened structure, while the bed key, a most important tool, could quickly dismantle the huge standard double bed of the period and permit its safe, if sectional, removal to the outer air. The buckets received the most attention, and that is probably why so many still survive. Their emblazoning with scrollwork, emblems, and the owner's name was more than just decoration. It had the very practical end of identifying the member's property. When the buckets went to work, anybody might be handling them, and the end of the job found

them in a jumbled heap wherein, you may be sure, your own would be at the bottom. The cry would go forth, "Claim your buckets!" and the owners would then wait patiently while those detailed to the task performed the tedious work of sorting out the mess and seeing that each member received his own. Of course, a member might not have answered the alarm himself, for any number of good reasons, but if he could not go, he was supposed to place his buckets at his front door where the appointed persons could grab them up and run to the scene of the incident. Unless destroyed in the process of firefighting the buckets were pretty sure to come back to the rightful owner. Then they would be scrubbed down, rubbed with neatsfoot oil, and replaced on their hooks in the front hall ready for the next call.

Most of these societies sprang up in the twenty-year period whose midpoint is 1800. Two of the more prominent were the American Fire Society and the Franklin Fire Society, but the one set up in 1803 is generally regarded as the first fully organized Cambridge fire company. It was a private, rather than a municipal, undertaking, and it was daring and progressive enough to buy an engine of its own, at a cost of \$500, so that it possessed rolling equipment as well as the usual hand tools. There is some pretty poor reporting in the contemporary accounts, and professional curiosity about the capacity of the engine, the training of the crews, and the method of command at fires must await further research. It is fairly certain, however, that the successful operation

of the 1803 Society led in the course of some thirty short years to the first real Cambridge Fire Department.

In 1832, by Act of the General Court, the Fire Department was legally established. The town charter conferred no power to set up a true fire force, and legislative action was necessary. Governor Levi Lincoln signed the bill in March. Cambridge selectmen, moving with amazing rapidity, formally accepted the act in the following May, and forthwith appointed Luther Brooks as Chief Engineer in command of an outfit comprising four hand engines and a hand ladder truck. Each piece of apparatus had both a name and a number.

Cambridge I was located on Church Street. Under the stucco front of a business establishment in that street there will some day be rediscovered a granite sill, carved with the name and number of this company and representing all that remains of the first Fire Department. Union 2 was on Main Street, near Windsor, and running with it was Franklin Hook and Ladder I. The present Engine 2 will be found not far away, in Lafayette Square; in fact, it is interesting to see how close these early houses came to modern locations. Niagara 3 was on Cambridge Street, near Third. If today you go down Third Street, near Cambridge, you will see the modern Engine 3. And so on. The catalog is too long to recite, but a fifth and sixth engine shortly appeared, together with a seventh, called "Hunneman 7," which was housed on Church Street but privately maintained for the protection of Ward I. Hunneman 7 was subject to call by the city forces, at an agreed price of \$8 per hour. One year it made \$16.

A number of minor changes, which some day should be chronicled, took place in succeeding years. Washington 9, a hand tub, appears briefly in a location near Prison Point. The number eight apparently was never assigned. But Cambridge was growing and John Fiske, coming to the city in 1860, was appalled by the groups of closely-built houses, and felt that

fire, once loosed, would have a free hand. Others must have felt the same. Looking for protection, they took a forward step in the combined introduction of steam and horses. The honor should have gone to Cambridge i, but its house was deemed inadequate, and the first steamer was therefore assigned to Niagara 3 in 1862. Union 2 got its steamer the following year, and, the Church Street house now being altered, Cambridge i received the new contraption in '64. Lam-

80

tations arose over the doom of the hand engines, but the horse-drawn steamers had come to stay.

Cambridge people marveled over their galloping dash through the shady streets, and none marveled more than John Holmes, brother of Wendell. Today he might be called a "spark." Certainly he belonged to the Fire Society, and so we find him writing to James Russell Lowell on June 30, 1869: "Frank Chapman's vehicular was set on fire at about i, Sunday morning, May 30. [Francis Chapman manufactured carriages on Brattle Square, near Palmer Street.] When I got there [from Appian Way] one steamer was playing on a formidable mass of flame; it was some time before another came — there were three in all, I think — and they had the fire under in about an hour. [The steamer already at work was probably Cambridge i, which had only a short dash down Palmer Street. The fire was listed as incendiary, with damage at \$13,000.] There were no hand engines, and in consequence no bellowing and counter-bellowing. It was curious to see the quiet of the whole proceeding. There was the fire serpent doing his best — drawing in a coil under the attack and rolling himself up as if done for, and then shooting out a tongue of flame in some new spot — then the engines going click, click, click, and that was all their noise — then there was the audience or spectance, which in the absence of the usual fire clamor was perfectly quiet — young men and maidens looking on as if at a show, and I think a man of moderate voice might have spoken a discourse so that all would have heard him. Such a scene is rather distant from . . . the 'friendly fire buckets' that you and I remember."

Yes, the good old days have passed, and John Holmes regrets them. But Frank Chapman might have disagreed, for though he was burned, he was not burned out, and he continued in business at the same location for some years more. Hand engines could not have saved him, nor would they have helped Fire Chief Eaton, who did not call upon them, though four were still on the roster and one, Hunneman 7, no farther away than Church Street. The day of the hand engine was really a short one, perhaps forty years as the main firefighting reliance of organized departments, and it passed as all things must pass which do not meet the needs of a growing community. Hand engines could deliver powerful streams, with the pumps worked up and down, up and down, by ten to twenty men according to the size of the machine, but ten

81

minutes at a normal pace was all that any man could stand and relays of crews were necessary for prolonged work. Chiefs had to watch not only the fire but the operation of the pumps, and orders for more water, more hose, anything the Chief wanted, were shouted through speaking trumpets so that all might hear. But the steamer could be left alone in

charge of the engineer. The chiefs were then free to attend to the fire, standing close enough to the nozzle crews to permit the ready transmission of orders.

A direct, if not an immediate, result was an increased understanding of how fires behaved and how they might be controlled. It was a novel field, so novel and fascinating that it pushed aside the equally important matter of fire prevention, which was all but forgotten until well into the present century. But before we give all the credit to the steam fire engine, we might look at the device which made the steamer possible. That was workable hose. The first hose was of leather, made of strips stitched together like the leg of a boot. The stitching, however, was unreliable and apt to give way under pressure, and so it was not trustworthy. In 1808 some genius in Philadelphia found that copper rivets could replace stitching, and from then on hose became more useful. But it still had disadvantages, for leather can act in queer ways when it is wet. To prevent cracking, each length of hose, carefully dried after use, was treated, tediously, with a lubricant prescribed by the best authorities as a mixture of beef tallow and neatsfoot oil, applied warm. A cotton hose, sometimes rubber-lined, was invented, but this too had to be riveted, and its chief merit lay in the fact that it was easier to take care of.

Here Cambridge came into the picture. In 1870 there was displayed a new machine which could sew rubber-lined canvas into hose. It was the invention of Lyman Blake of Cambridge. Colonel Theodore A. Dodge, seeking useful employment after leaving the army, decided that this should be his field, and he forthwith bought the rights to the machine. Two years later James Gillespie found a way to make Blake's invention produce fabric in tubular form. With the colonel's backing he produced a hose that would work under fire conditions. After many disappointing experiments, a factory was set up on Portland Street, called the Boston Woven Hose and Rubber Company, and to help run it Colonel Dodge impressed a young mechanic named Robert Cowen. It

would be pleasant to say that the Cambridge Fire Department was the first customer. Certainly the first working test was given in Boston, but there was much resistance, all around, from old-line fire chiefs who had come up the hard way and who preferred to stick with the equipment they were used to, however defective. The struggles of the young company are a story in themselves, but with Cowen as the directing head, a happy ending can be written. Take a look, today, at any piece of Cambridge apparatus and see whose name is on the hose it carries.

But in whatever form, flexible hose solved the problem of getting water to the engine and from the engine to the fire. Another story lies here. Leather hose could be bent or coiled but it could not be laid flat, and so the first hose carriages were merely drums or reels round which the hose was wrapped. But cotton hose is best stowed flat, and thus the reels vanished and in their places came open-body wagons and that is what you see today. And even cotton hose may be going. With another bow to Portland Street we find nylon appearing — in the face of many crude jests about nylon hose for firemen.

Still another story lies in the water supply. We do not know what the future may bring, but in the present stage of the art and despite all the wonder chemicals you read about, water remains the firefighter's best friend. For our purposes, let's leave it that Cambridge has had, and will have for many years to come, a reserve of water adequate for all possible

fires. Instead, let's go back to John Holmes and his nostalgic feelings about hand engines and friendly fire buckets. Their absence became permanent, for 1869 marked the retirement of all hand pumpers except Hydrant 4. A fourth steamer was added that year, assigned to the Daniel Webster company whose number was shortly changed from 5 to 4, the number still borne by the North Cambridge engine situated near Porter Square. This change in number marked also the end of Hydrant 4, which vanishes from the record after 1871.

In succeeding years a fifth and a sixth steamer were added, and in 1881 came a startling modern device called a chemical engine, donated by Harvard University complete with three horses and harness. This engine, despite its name, discharged plain water, which was forced through a small hose by carbonic acid gas. While these machines are now obsolete, they once were highly useful apparatus, and Harvard's gift remained in busy service until 1919. A seventh steamer appeared

83

in 1894, in the house on Main Street near Kendall Square, and again Harvard took a hand, presenting the new company with its hose wagon, a pair of horses, and the necessary horse equipment. Now there was a real fire department, adequate for the protection of the Cambridge of sixty years ago and possessing many of the technical devices which are still used, in more modern form, today.

One of these is the thing sometimes called "the little red box on the corner." The essential in firefighting is early and prompt notification of an emergency, and the best method is positive notice given directly to the Fire Department. In 1869 an electric fire alarm system was installed, with thirty street alarm boxes and a central office in the Church Street engine house. This was one of the first departments, if not the very first, to use a central office instead of connecting the boxes individually to the various fire houses. It is interesting that Cambridge so soon understood the importance of this method. The alarm system has kept up with the times, and though the bells and whistles which once gave notice throughout the city are no longer heard, swift, silent accurate signals still speed over inconspicuous wires or leap unseen on radio impulses.

A list of all the changes would be a long one. Suppose that we accept the fact that they have happened. Suppose we leave the past and come directly to the present-day department and try to explain how, with modern equipment and modern methods, it operates for your protection. Perhaps its most notable achievement, apart from the use of short-wave radio, is in the employment of water, where the problem is so to apply it to the fire that its application shall not do more harm than the fire itself. Wherever possible, Cambridge uses, first, the "booster" line, not much bigger than a garden hose and supplied by a miniature pump, and second, the device called "water fog," which by a special type of nozzle breaks up the stream into an intense mist and smothers a fire with the minimum of water damage. The skillful use of these appliances is one of the reasons why Cambridge has been remarkably free from serious fires. Another is that, partly by chance and partly by design, Cambridge engine houses are so located that in almost any situation an engine can be on the scene within two and one-half minutes from the time the alarm is received. The saying is that the first minutes will make or break a fire, and thus prompt response is vital. Of course

this may be nullified if there is not prompt discovery of the fire and prompt giving of the alarm. If the fire has a start, if the alarm is delayed while some excited person fumbles with the telephone dial, then there can be real trouble, and that is why experienced firefighters tell you to use the phone if you must but be sure that somebody is sent to pull the nearest street box, for the red box is infallible and corrects the mistakes of a confused or garbled phone call. And confused or garbled calls are more common than your might think.

Here is one James Brown who, walking home at night along Ashley Street, sees an unmistakable fire in a closed store. He looks about him — did he pass a fire box a short distance back? Yes, there it is, corner of Thompson Street. He runs back. He opens the little door in the front of the box and pulls down the black hook he sees protruding. The thing whirs and clicks, whirs and clicks, and subsides. Nothing seems to be happening. The box is silent. The street remains silent except for a muted sound coming from the threatened store. Has he done right? Then, distantly at first but ever louder, ever nearer, the sound of a siren. Something is happening. Help is coming.

The moment James Brown pulled the hook, swift action followed. James may not have known that the box had a number and that this number, click, click, click, was being registered electrically at the Fire Alarm Office. But the Fire Alarm Operators are ready. They check the clicks on the roll of endless tape on which each click is punched out. Quickly, but without hurry, they set up on the transmitter the box number, 3-2-4, press a switch, and ting, ting, ting, the same number taps out on the gongs of every fire house in the city. For some of these houses, the number means little, but for three engines and two ladder trucks it means a great deal, for each box calls out a predetermined response, and each man knows, by long habit become instinct, the numbers which call him into action. Down the long sliding-poles from the bunk-room drop the crews, silently, swiftly, like so many blue-shirted ghosts. The great doors fly open, motors spin, red lights flash on, and with a rush the big engines sweep over the doorsill. James Brown's simple motion has been transformed, within seconds, into red roaring action.

How does a firefighter feel when suddenly called out to dash through

night streets in response to an alarm? One officer has described his sensations in the following paragraphs:

I suppose that people on the streets hear the yowl of sirens and the roar of motors, see the men on the seats and on the footboards looking tense and alert, and grasp a sense of drama from our passage, but for me the drama, if there is any, lies all ahead. Getting the piece through the streets is the job of the driver, and I leave it all to him. I know that ever since I got my white shirt I have never taken much notice of the incidents of a run. A small part of my mind absorbs the turns and the swerves as we round a corner or dodge a bewildered motorist, but the rest of my attention is fixed ahead, on the situation we are hurrying to meet and the split-second decisions I must make when we meet it.

Is anything showing in the sky? Is that red glare the light of our fire or just the reflection of a neon sign against the city haze? Can I pick up any clues from the flow of traffic, from jammed streets or thronging sightseers? I raise and lower my foot on the siren button and I am aware that a sound results in the proper cadence of rise and fall, but I am really thinking of the street we go in on and the hydrants there, and will the fire be where we can reach it with a short lay or will it be tough to get into?

That's the sensation. Now for the action!

The engine swings around from the avenue into Ashley Street, the hose wagon howling and rumbling at its heels. There is James Brown at the box. He points toward the scene of the fire. The engine rolls up a few yards to a hydrant. The captain jumps down and runs to the store. Up comes the hose wagon, a white thread of hose paying out from its rear. Two men swiftly connect the hose to the engine, another jumps down from the wagon, bearing the nozzle of the booster line, and pulls the booster hose from its basket. The store door is deftly forced, with curiously little damage to woodwork. The officer points to a rubbish fire in the rear. "Hit it with the booster." He goes back to the engine, picks up the radio phone.

"Engine 6 calling Fire Alarm."

"Fire Alarm answering Engine 6."

"Just a rubbish fire. We can handle it."

The Deputy Chief's car whirls up. The Deputy takes one look.

"Car 2 to Fire Alarm. Holding Engine 6. All other apparatus return to quarters. Send the all-out on box 324."

"Fire Alarm answering. You want the all-out on box 324. All apparatus except Engine 6 return to quarters. KCB 290 at 10.33 P-M."

86

All this may have taken as much as a minute and a half. No other pieces appear. They have received the radio message and merely turn around and go back to quarters. Engine 6 remains, making sure the fire is out and that no sparks have lodged in sensitive places. Sometimes the Deputy may hold a ladder truck as well, if he thinks walls need to be opened or overhauling done. But now it's all over. The Captain grasps the radio phone.

"Engine 6 to Fire Alarm. Returning to quarters." And that is the routine story of seven out of every ten alarms in Cambridge, and it can be routine because of fast response and because of skill and know-how in doing the work. The other three alarms — well, they sometimes make different stories.

It is to take care of those three other fires that the whole complex organization has been set up in such detail. Nobody can know, when the call is first received, whether the fire is serious, and consequently the department must proceed on the theory that each alarm is a potential conflagration. The initial attacking force — what is called the "first alarm response" — must be powerful enough to strike a heavy, and if possible, a decisive blow at the blaze. Cambridge experience indicates that the minimum force should be three engines,

with their hose wagons, two ladder trucks, and a rescue company. The plan of response — the so-called running card — provides for the nearest companies to move out as soon as the gong taps the box number and without further command.

Take, for example, box 647, at Craigie and Berkeley Streets. When this box number is transmitted, the automatic response calls for the apparatus from Taylor Square, Broadway, and Lexington Avenue; that is, Engine 8 and Ladder 4, Engine i and Ladder i, and Engine 9. If all these pieces are not needed, they are dismissed. As we have seen, they sometimes are intercepted and ordered back to quarters by radio. If they are needed, they are on the spot to go into action at once, and so effectively that for the vast majority of fires no further help is required. In fact, for only about 1¹/₂ per cent of all building fires is extra assistance called for, and this ratio has held remarkably steady over the past years. But if the first alarm detail is not enough, if more apparatus must be brought in — and this is usually evident to the Chief within the first two

or three minutes — then the summoning of additional strength is a simple matter.

The chief officer merely picks up his radio and requests a second alarm. Here again there is a predetermined response which will dash to the scene with no more notice than the gong signal, while other companies shift around, according to a fixed plan, to cover strategically located vacant stations and while Arlington, Belmont, Boston, and Somerville send apparatus, too, to fill other empty houses. Thus even with two thirds of the Cambridge protective force concentrated at the fire there will always be enough apparatus in readiness to deal with other incidents which may occur.

This business of getting help from adjoining cities, known as Mutual Aid, originated in the 1870's between Cambridge and Somerville and has extended through the Greater Boston area and has been extensively copied in other cities. Because it works two ways, Cambridge engines often go to neighboring communities in their time of need, but a posting of debits and credits is futile, for in emergency all boundaries disappear and the entire region becomes a single organism for combatting the Enemy Fire. Two recent episodes dramatize this.

In March of 1954 children playing with matches in Somerville set fire to a wooden fence, which ignited a shed, which in turn ignited a huge wooden structure housing a bottling plant. The first alarm brought the usual response, including Cambridge Engine 5, but this was not enough, and two, three, four alarms went out in quick succession, bringing sorely needed aid from all around. There were crackling flames, towering smoke clouds, panic-stricken residents, and desperately laboring firefighters. But because there were no dramatic rescues and no loss of life, the story of the fire is one of placing and shifting lines and those other tactical incidents interesting only to technicians. Three Cambridge engine companies and a ladder truck worked beside their comrades from Boston, Maiden, and I don't know what other towns, and Cambridge firefighters were on the spot for some eighteen hours. One of the curious sights was a Somerville firehouse occupied under the Mutual Aid plan by a Boston ladder truck and a Cambridge Civil Defense engine. It is doubtful if such a combination could be duplicated elsewhere in the country.

Another incident, on a night some years earlier, caused some grum-

88

bling, afterwards, and one of the grumbles was to the effect that Cambridge could not deal with the fire and had to send all the way to Belmont for an engine. So it is well to see just what occurred. Some time after eleven o'clock that night a serious fire broke out in North Cambridge, so serious that a general alarm was necessary, which is rather unusual in Cambridge. While all this was going on, and in the shuddery hours after midnight, a resident of a quiet neighborhood off Brattle Street happened, just happened, to glance out a window and see the house across the way in the grip of a roaring blaze. How long it had been burning nobody knows, but it could have been as much as ten or fifteen minutes. The wakeful resident reacted promptly. Painfully dialing the seven digits of the telephone number, he called Fire Alarm, and he was sufficiently clear-headed to make his message intelligible.

Fire Alarm followed the standard procedure for such calls, which is to despatch the nearest company by department telephone and at the same time transmit over alarm circuits the number of the nearest box, to call out the other apparatus. The nearest company was the one at Taylor Square, Engine 8. But Engine 8 was working at the North Cambridge fire, along with two-thirds of the Cambridge department, and a Belmont engine, under the Mutual Aid plan, was stationed at Taylor Square. That is why the Belmont engine was the first to arrive, and it arrived speedily and went to work competently. Other companies came rolling in, two of them Boston engines likewise covering Cambridge under Mutual Aid; and two Cambridge engines were detached from the other fire and rushed to the scene. The fire was stopped in its tracks. There was no delay by the firemen, no other houses suffered damage, and had this fire been discovered even ten minutes sooner, the whole outcome might have been different. The point is that even with Cambridge forces fully occupied with a major fire elsewhere, there is still a way to obtain immediate help and to hold losses to the lowest possible limit.

History is defined as a narrative of events, but too often we look at it as the narrative of past events, without regard for the need for recording the present. It is for the purpose of recording the present that I have risked the expenditure of your time in making a general outline of fire organization and procedure, for these things are found today only in technical publications and in the dry skeleton of official reports, so

89

that the later researcher may have trouble in discovering just how things were done.

What would we not give to know how the town engine worked at the Harvard Hall fire, or just how Chief Eaton's men comported themselves at the Chapman blaze! Why should we not now make some sort of record so that the researchers of 2056 might have at least a notion of how Cambridge handled the crude implements of the present century?

There is the matter of terminology. Out of past times we can get a few clues from the stilted language of official communications, but we cannot be quite sure what Chief Brooks' men or

Chief Eaton's men said among themselves. We know, for example, that the term "steamer" is short for "steam fire engine," which was an official term to distinguish these engines from hand fire engines. We are pretty sure that, seventy years back, men used spanners to couple two lengths of hose together, just as they do today, but did they also use plaster hooks, or were these called pike poles? Probably they were just called hooks, for we still hear the obsolete expression "hook and ladder company." Why not, then, set down the modern lingo?

Fire apparatus, or just apparatus, is the collective term for rolling firefighting material. A single unit is a piece of apparatus, or more simply, a piece. You will hear an officer say, "Take the piece around the corner." An engine company, often organized with two units, has a pumper or pump, and a hose wagon, or the wagon. An engine is never a truck. Truck means a piece which carries ladders, that is, a ladder truck. If it has a long ladder, permanently attached, which can be raised in the air, it is an aerial, short for aerial ladder truck.

When James Brown gave that alarm on Ashley Street, he pulled the box. Had he waited to hunt up a telephone, and given the alarm in that way, it would have been a still alarm. When a telephone alarm is received, and it is absolutely clear that the fire is a minor one, Fire Alarm operators will merely despatch the nearest engine and truck companies and the incident remains on record as a still. If there is the least chance that the fire could be dangerous, the operator will also transmit or send the number of the nearest street box.

When the first engine company reaches the scene, it will stretch hose or lay a line. For a small fire, this would be the booster line but a larger line is always placed in readiness, should it be needed. That is,

the booster is backed up by larger hose, or a big line. If the fire is burning rather briskly it will be called a working fire or a worker. Meantime the pump is set in at a hydrant and connected or hooked up with suction hose, to receive water. This may be of rubber-lined cotton, soft suction, or of heavy reinforced rubber, hard suction. The choice is a technical matter. We think Chief Eaton used hard suction at the Chapman fire.

At the same time a ladder company will throw one or more ground ladders against the building and usually will raise an aerial, or big stick. Laddermen will ascend to open up or vent, to let smoke and gases escape and thus provide an up-draft to draw the fire upwards and outwards so that it will not mushroom, and thus extend laterally and downwards, perhaps involving parts of the building still untouched by flame. Hose will not be carried up a ladder, but a line may be taken over a ladder. When all is over, companies are ordered to make up; they collect their hose, ladders, and tools, replace them on the pieces and return to quarters. One or two may be directed to remain for overhauling, a thorough exploration of the premises to make sure that no hidden fire still lurks. This avoids the chance of a rekindle. When he is satisfied that everything is safe, the Chief Officer radios Fire Alarm to send the all-out, and the incident is finished.

We could spend a week on this one.

The final item for the record is one aspect of Civil Defense. C.D., as you know, was set up to provide a ready reserve in case of enemy attack, but it has been so useful in our ordinary domestic calamities that it might possibly become a permanent organization. It provides, among other things, for an Auxiliary Fire Service, which, in Cambridge, has been very carefully planned.

Auxiliary Fire, as it is called, has two 750-gallon pumping engines, complete with hose and tools, which were procured through "matching funds"; that is, Cambridge paid part of the cost and Uncle Sam the remainder. This means a sort of joint ownership, under a measure of federal control. The two pieces are quartered in city property, at Fresh Pond, where there is a fully-equipped fire station with radio, gong, and telephone connected directly with the Fire Alarm office.

The Auxiliary has its own chief officers, who report to the Director of Civil Defense. It is formed into platoons, each of which is responsible

91

for service one day per week and each of which drills once each week. In any emergency there is a force which can be put into action usually within twenty minutes. The Auxiliary, of course, can be alerted at any time by Civil Defense authorities, but it may also be called upon at any time by the Fire Chief for local emergencies. It was on duty at the great fire in Somerville in 1954, and it went also to Worcester when the tornado struck. In 1955 it worked at four major Cambridge fires and was on duty during the three hurricane periods. This year, when the snow fell so heavily and unexpectedly, it logged about one hundred hours of duty and it received special commendation from the Chief of Department himself. All of this is in official records. It might be just as well to file it with the Historical Society too.

Fire protection is something which touches us all intimately. It permits us to rest quietly at night and helps to preserve what peace we may have by day. The highly trained and splendidly equipped Cambridge Fire Department is adequate for all foreseeable emergencies. Unseen, it watches constantly over the city. It's nice to know it's there.

92

SOME ASPECTS OF THE EAST CAMBRIDGE STORY

BY JOHN W. WOOD

Read May 31, 1956

F*OR some reason, the local history of East Cambridge has been almost completely neglected. It is a little hard to understand why this should be. There is so much that is interesting.*

It was here that eight hundred British soldiers landed to begin their march to Lexington and Concord, and made a dismal start to a terrible day by fording the icy flood tide over the causeway. One of their number, left behind because of illness, found his way to the home of

Thomas Graves and thus spread the alarm which sent the Cambridge company speeding toward Concord.¹ Graves' house, incidentally, was the first to be built in Cambridge.

Not only in history, but in other fields, East Cambridge was, if not unique, certainly unusual. Nowhere else in the city was there a "Millionaire Row" — Otis Street — nor so many rapidly changing fortunes. It was the scene of the largest real estate development by one corporation, where Andrew Craigie, reputed to be the shrewdest Yankee in the country, took a flyer and lost his shirt. Further, it saw the glass industry come, grow to international fame, and go, leaving no trace. Sugar refining, too, flourished and died, as did fine furniture making. Yet the town lived on and populationwise harbored such a variety of people from so many foreign lands that few areas could match it.

Also unique were the "Dearos," exiles from East Cambridge by their own will, but with their "hearts still in the hielands." Did anyone ever sigh for dear old Cambridgeport?

These are only a few of the reasons why East Cambridge should have awakened the pride of Cantabrigians.

In speaking of East Cambridge, I have in mind only what is now Ward One, a relatively small area covering perhaps three hundred acres more or less. Until after the Revolution it was an upland surrounded by swamp land to the west and south, and by Miller's River and the

¹ *Historic Guide to Cambridge.*

Charles estuary on the other two sides. At high tide the marshes were covered by water and the point became an island. A causeway, located approximately where Gore Street is now, afforded a dubious passage over the marsh. When East Cambridge became important from a military standpoint, General Washington had the causeway repaired and strengthened to permit the passage of troops and material. The military importance of East Cambridge consisted in the fact of its nearness to Boston. It will surprise you to see how the river narrows at Lechmere Point, and to realize how easy it was to lob cannon balls from old Israel Putnam's fort and a mortar battery at Lechmere Point over into Boston. The fort was a well-designed and well-constructed work, extending for some distance from the top of the hill both north and south. Old Put, its commander, was a salty character, in addition to being a well-trained and able commander. The story goes, that on one occasion, upon the capture in the Bay of a 13-inch brass mortar, Old Put mounted astride it with a bottle of rum in his hand, and "stood parson," while godfather Mifflin gave it the name "Congress."² Notice that history fails to suggest that Old Put smashed the bottle as a part of the christening ceremony. He may have been able to think of other ways to use it.

Settlement in East Cambridge really began with the formation of the Lechmere Corporation in 1810. Andrew Craigie, by quiet negotiations, succeeded in getting control of all of the land at the point, comprising upward of three hundred acres, for a total investment of about \$30,000, and obtained permission from the legislature to form a corporation to develop the area and to build a toll bridge across the river to Boston. By 1813, the toll bridge was

successfully completed, and with access to Boston secured, the undertaking seemed well on its way to success. The corporation, including most of the land and the bridge, was capitalized at \$360,000, and some shares were sold. Also, a road was laid out in a straight line from the bridge to Cambridge Common. This road, now Cambridge Street, is so straight and level that to one standing on the corner of Fourth Street (now Sciarappa), the tower on Memorial Hall is plainly visible.

Now that the stage seemed all set for a real estate boom, a decided

² Samuel Adams Drake, p. 180.

reluctance appeared on the part of prospective buyers. This is easily understandable, as there was very little in the area to attract capital.

However, two events occurred to change this situation. First, Andrew Craigie hit upon a shrewd move. In November, 1813, he offered to give to Middlesex County the land bordered by Otis, Second, Thorndike, and Third Streets as a site for a County Court House, and further to present to the County \$24,000 with which to erect the Court House and Jail. This offer was promptly accepted, much to the displeasure of the people of Old Cambridge.

The second critical event was the purchase of a large tract of land running four hundred feet on East Street, four hundred feet on North Street, three hundred feet on Water Street, and on "land covered with water" four hundred feet, by Jesse Putnam. It was conveyed by him to the Boston Porcelain and Glass Company. This was the site of the important glass industry that was to develop.

From this time on, sales were brisk and settlement of the district went on successfully. Apparently, too, the advent of industry set the pattern of growth in the area. It is an interesting fact that at no time in East Cambridge could you find large estates, such as those in Old Cambridge and in Cambridgeport. The story runs that Spencer Phipps, in the early days, built himself a mansion on what is now Otis Street, but that during the house warming to welcome his friends, the house caught fire and burned to the ground. Perhaps the fates were against it. Whatever the reason, in later years the well-to-do families who built up "millionaires' row" occupied relatively small houses. The Sortwells, the Chaffees, the Lockharts, and others who lived here apparently had no ambition to build on a large scale. Perhaps there just wasn't room. It is remembered in East Cambridge that Mr. Lockhart used to bring a large steam yacht to anchor in the river just below the bridge.

It is interesting to note that many of the East Cambridge families later moved into large houses in the upper part of the city — Judge Mc-Intire, Gustavus Goepper, Otis S. Brown, and Frank Fitzpatrick on North Avenue (Massachusetts Avenue), the Rindge family and Oliver H. Durrell on Dana Hill, the Sortwells on Highland Street, and William E. Doyle on Cambridge Street.

With the establishment of the glass works, a considerable number of English families were brought over to furnish the necessary knowl-

edge and skill, as there were few if any such workers in America. At the same time, there was a considerable influx of Germans, with some Scotch and Irish. Typical representatives of the German element were the Gutheims. One son later became Chief of the Cambridge Fire Department, and another is a prominent attorney in Washington. Another family was the Goeppers, who built up a successful barrel factory as an adjunct to the Revere Sugar Refinery. Gustavus Goepper was a prominent citizen of Cambridge, active as President of the East Cambridge Savings Bank and Vice-President of the Cambridge Electric Light Company and in many other interests. Charles Emmel, an artist in furniture design, and Louis Volpe, an artist in glass decoration, were Germans living here.

The New England Glass Company was the most famous of the early industries. It was originally the Boston Porcelain and Glass Company, organized by Amos Binney and Daniel Hastings of Cambridge and Edmund Munroe of Boston. Demming Jarvis, who later organized the Sandwich Glass Company, was the general manager and sales agent, and to him should go much of the credit for the early financial success of the enterprise. The New England Company made a wide variety of plain and moulded glass. Its greatest pride, however, was rich cut glass. The company was also a large producer of red lead, which was shipped to all parts of the United States.

By 1823, East Cambridge had a population of one thousand people, closely following the growth of the New England Company, which was then reputed to be the largest glass factory in the world. By 1849 the factory had five hundred workmen and a payroll of \$200,000.

The technical efficiency of the glass works was largely due to members of the Leighton family. Thomas Leighton was induced to come over from England to serve as superintendent. It was not easy for him to leave England as there was a law forbidding glass workers to leave for America, but he went first to France, and from there succeeded in reaching Cambridge. He was thoroughly conversant with the art of glass making, and the business flourished under his direction.

The New England Company reached its greatest prosperity near the middle of the century. Oddly enough, no one contributed more to the decline of the company than William Leighton, a genius in glass production, who was a son of Thomas Leighton. It was he who in-

vented lime glass, which could be produced much more cheaply than the flint glass made by the New England Company. The serious competition which resulted, particularly from Ohio, where cheaper fuels were available, finally created a competitive position which was almost impossible to meet.

In 1872, Mr. William L. Libbey was brought in to try to stem the tide, and for a time conditions improved. Mr. Libbey died in 1883 and was succeeded by his son, Edward, who continued the losing battle until labor troubles multiplied the problems to such a point that a shutdown was imperative. In 1888 the Cambridge business was liquidated, and Edward Libbey moved to Toledo, Ohio.

From the beginning to the end, the New England Company produced glass equal to the finest produced anywhere. Sandwich glass, which has become so famous that it has become a collection item, was hardly in the same class. The probability is that many of those treasured pieces purporting to be Sandwich glass were made in East Cambridge. As a matter of fact, some of the more elaborate pieces made by the New England Company have never been surpassed.

Many of the glass workers lived in the area of Winter, Gore, and Bridge Streets. It was an attractive neighborhood with well-shaded streets and attractive little homes, each with its own garden. For the most part, these houses were owned by the glass workers themselves.

The glass house buildings have disappeared leaving no trace. Even the tremendous chimney, higher than Bunker Hill monument, is gone. Part of the land was bought by Squires, but the largest part was acquired by the Boston and Maine Railroad for freight yards, which brought complete desolation to an area which might have been an attractive part of the city.

The decline of the glass industry and the removal of at least one hundred families from a small area like East Cambridge would seem to be a finishing blow to the town, but fortunately the furniture-making shops had been growing rapidly; the large packing plants of Squire and North, and the Revere Sugar Refinery more than made up for the loss of the glass works in the '70's and '80's. The change in population, however, became more and more marked. Irish families came in large numbers until they occupied East Cambridge almost to the exclusion of all other nationalities. In 1930, Mrs. Watkins remarks, some of the old

families were still living in this part of the town, although business had crept in around them, and Leighton Court was called "Yankee Village" because it had resisted the invasion of foreign arrivals. The original population had been mostly English, Scotch, German, and Irish.

It is an interesting fact that both the glass and furniture industries called for a high type of workman. Much of the glass produced was artistic, both in design and execution, and many of the pieces which have survived show this fine taste. The same could be said for much of the fine furniture produced. Hence the population of the town must have contained an exceptionally high average of ability.

Speaking of the furniture industry, it should be noted that there were several large factories. The Geldowsky factory, for example, was an immense structure occupying the square bounded by First, Otis, Second, and Thorndike Streets.

Much of the furniture produced was hand-made and of a very high grade, although there was a considerable amount of machine work. Here again, the competition of machine-made goods from the West, particularly Grand Rapids, brought about a gradual decline in prosperity and the final disappearance of the industry.

These drastic changes in industry have had their effects on the population of the town, as, for example, in the departure of the families of glass workers to Toledo after 1888. But new industries have always appeared to keep East Cambridge busy, and new families have come to fill the vacancies. From the beginning, there were a number of people of Irish ancestry in East Cambridge, and as a result of changes described above, there came a gradual increase in their numbers until they became the dominant factor. Warm-hearted, thrifty, devout, they did much for the life of the town. From these families have come a Justice of the Massachusetts Supreme Court, a leader in the civic and philanthropic life of Boston, and at least one leader in the civic life of Cambridge.

It is important to note that here in East Cambridge occurred the organization of the first Catholic parish in the city. An excellent account of the history of this event is given by Judge McIntire.³

Until the year 1793, the Catholics of Cambridge were obliged to row

³ *The Cambridge of Eighteen Hundred and Ninety-six.*

across the river to go to church, but as their numbers increased, Cambridge was made a part of the parish of St. Mary's in Charlestown. In 1830, a Catholic Sunday School was organized in what had been the Methodist Academy Building at the corner of Fourth and Otis Streets, with Daniel Southwick as Superintendent. The children, after their lesson, were formed in line and marched to the church in Charlestown for the morning Mass. In or about 1842, the number of Catholic families increased to the point that a meeting was held in the Academy Building to consider the erection of a church. \$3,600 was subscribed at this meeting, and Bishop Fenwick was asked to consider assigning a priest to organize the parish. Messrs. Southwick, Loring, and Gleason were appointed to supervise the building project. Their work was so successful that Mass was said by Father Fitzpatrick in the basement October 6, 1842 and the following September the building on Fourth Street was dedicated by the Bishop as St. John's Church. So rapid was the growth of the parish that in 1872 a newer, larger church was planned. Father John O'Brien was appointed to direct the program, and the building was completed and dedicated in 1883. This is the Church of the Sacred Heart at Sixth and Otis Streets, for many years the largest and handsomest Catholic Church in the City.

Another of the interesting churches of East Cambridge was the Trinity Methodist, which for many years occupied a site at the corner of Third and Cambridge Streets. The original church building contained timbers salvaged from old Fort Putnam. This building, however, was replaced by a large brick building seating 1200 people. In its time it was one of the leading Methodist churches in New England. Mr. Wheeler recalls the fact that it was called the "Eel Pot," it was so hard to get into of a Sunday morning. He further recalls that while

he was a student at Harvard, Theodore Roosevelt used to teach a class in the Sunday School. As was true of so much of East Cambridge, the church declined in membership and was finally torn down, the site to be used as a parking lot. However, it is interesting to note that in the closing days of 1955, the Trinity Methodist Society acquired a house on Fourth Street where services are now being held. It is doubtful if this indicates any considerable population shift. Rather, it is a tribute to the loyalty of the congregation.

For some reason, East Cambridge did not produce the sort of nationally known celebrities as was the case in Cambridgeport. How-

ever, it was the home during his college years of the eminent jurist John Henry Wigmore, Dean of Northwestern University Law School, who married an East Cambridge girl. Professor Wigmore was known internationally as the author of books on jurisprudence, and in 1912 he was awarded an honorary degree from Harvard.

Also, there was Edward D. Libbey, who perhaps was not born in East Cambridge, but was closely identified with the town through his work at the New England Glass Company.

Mr. Libbey was a remarkable person. When his struggle to preserve the New England Company ended with a disastrous strike, he decided to move to Toledo, Ohio, in the region of cheap fuel and abundant sand, whence had come the competition which had been his undoing. Judging from his photograph, he was an exceptionally handsome man. He participated in the social life of East Cambridge, but never married. He established a glass factory in Toledo, with the help of many of his old employees. He maintained there the same high standards which had prevailed in Cambridge, and was successful from the very beginning. His business developed into the great Libbey-Owens-Ford Company of today.

At his death, the leading Toledo newspaper said of him: "The story of his life is largely a story of the remarkable machine age. For centuries, glass-making had been an art involving a large amount of highly skilled labor. Through the association of Mr. Libbey with the business and his various enterprises, the industry in all parts of the world has felt the touch of genius which brought mechanical triumph in glass manufacturing. To the Libbey Company, this meant the organization of the great Owen Bottle Company, founded upon the automatic blowing machine invented by Michael J. Owen, a member of the Libbey firm.

"At his death in 1925, Edward Libbey was mourned as Toledo's first citizen. Scarcely a family in Toledo has not been touched in some way by the benefactions of the great multi-millionaire manufacturer, patron of art, city builder, philanthropist and citizen."

Edward Libbey was not the only interesting character connected with the town, although he was perhaps the greatest. James D. Green, the first Mayor of Cambridge, was intimately connected with East Cambridge. He was a graduate of Harvard and of the Harvard Divinity

School. He was only thirty-two when, in 1830, he was ordained minister of the Unitarian Church which still stands at the corner of Third and Thorndike Streets. He continued in the ministry until 1840.

The first city government was formed in 1846 and met for inauguration ceremonies in the town house, at the corner of Harvard and Norfolk Streets where St. Mary's Church now stands. The organization of the town into a city must have presented many problems not faced by mayors of later years, but evidently it proceeded smoothly and to the satisfaction of the voters, as Mayor Green was reelected in '47, '53, '60, and '61. The salary of the Mayor was \$600.00, but fortunately Mr. Green had some private means.

Evidently the police force offered some problems. It is said that Mayor Green once remarked to City Clerk Jacobs, in his usual decisive and abrupt manner: "If I could have my way, the entire police force of the city would be abolished."

"What would you do then?" enquired the City Clerk. "Let every man keep a dog," replied the Mayor. However, he evidently was greatly appreciated by the people of Cambridge. It was said of him that "his entire life was a conscientious and faithful performance of duty."

There are two other rather flamboyant characters who should be mentioned, namely, Frank Fitzpatrick and Thomas W. Lawson, who had perhaps a good many things in common. The former accumulated a fortune by selling tickets in the Louisiana State Lottery, at one time a flourishing enterprise, long since extinct. He used to threaten Mr. Wheeler with withdrawal of his money from Mr. Wheeler's bank if he ever bought any of his "goods." The Fitzpatricks later moved to the corner of Arlington Street and Massachusetts Avenue, and it is recalled that one year he planted his large front lawn to cabbages, much to the edification of the neighbors.

Tom Lawson was never very closely identified with East Cambridge, although he resided there at one time. His career was almost incredible. Starting with nothing, he built up a large fortune through speculation in copper. He built the seven-masted schooner, "The Thomas W. Lawson," the largest ever built; wrote a best seller; he developed a large estate in Scituate, which he called "Dreamwold"; and finally he lost almost everything he had. You may recall that he is one of the villains

under a very thin disguise in Mary Bancroft's somewhat scurrilous book Upside Down in the Magnolia Tree.

To revert to the glass industry for a moment, however, it should be noted that besides the great New England Glass Company, there were six or seven smaller firms which together accounted for a large output. Noticeable among these smaller concerns was the New England Glass Bottle Company, which was located in the area of Third and Spring Streets. Until a few years ago, this neighborhood was known in not too complimentary a term as "The Bottle House."

Another interesting concern was the Bay State Glass Company, at Bridge and Fourth Streets, of which Amory Houghton was a director. In 1851, Amory Houghton established the Union Glass Company in Somerville, a business which persisted until a few years ago.

Thinking that there might be some connection between the Cambridge family of Houghton and the Corning Glass Company, I made enquiry of Mr. Frederick H. Knight, Secretary of Corning Glass Company and received the following information:

"When I received your letter of March 2nd, I asked our Chairman, Mr. Amory Houghton, whose great-grandfather founded the company [Corning Glass] whether he had any information which would answer your question.

"Mr. Houghton tells me that the Massachusetts company, founded by his great-grandfather in 1851, was located in Somerville, Mass., and was called the Union Glass Company. Manufacturing operations were transferred to Brooklyn, New York, and the Houghtons first came to Corning in 1868 and the "Corning Glass Works" was incorporated in New York in 1875."

Thus it is quite evident that the two great American glass companies had their beginnings with men whose experience came from the East Cambridge enterprises.

In the fifties and sixties, there were many flourishing social organizations in East Cambridge. The Germans gathered for their characteristic parties at Harugari Hall, which was a branch of a larger organization represented in many parts of the country. Their meetings may have been nostalgic but they were lightened by good music and good cheer. With the change in the population, due to changes in industry, membership fell off until the affairs of the society had to be liquidated.

It speaks well for the management that the last members shared in a division of funds that amounted to a substantial sum.

Some of the active business men of the town formed the Putnam Lodge of Masons in 1854. Starting with a small group, it soon grew in strength and numbers until it was one of the vital, strong lodges of the city. Putnam Lodge had a remarkable record in the War between the States. A history of Masonry in Cambridge says: "The name of Ezra Ripley, the first master of the lodge, is indelibly inscribed upon the Soldier's Monument on Cambridge Common, as is also that of that true mason and able soldier, Colonel P. Stearns Davis, its fourth master; also, Lieutenant Jared Shepard of the 47th Mass. Volunteers, another active member of the lodge. All of these members died in the service of their country, in the war for the maintenance of the Union."

Putnam Lodge was finally transferred to the Masonic building in North Cambridge.

Another society, the Putnam Club, is a study in contrasts. Its members were recruited exclusively from Millionaire's Row, and their club room was located over a butcher's shop on Cambridge Street. When in the course of events the club was disbanded, its quarters were taken over by the Father Mathews Total Abstinence Society.

By far the largest of these organizations was the St. John's Literary Institute, which was founded in 1854 and continued its activities until 1917. This was the period in America when "culture" was pursued seriously. In those days there were Lyceums, Chatauquas, and lecture courses everywhere. There is an appealing story of Ralph Waldo Emerson making a career of traveling through the country east of the Mississippi, lecturing to audiences furnished by these societies, and realizing for a winter's work perhaps as much as \$800. His real profit lay in bringing his message to these serious people who were looking for a better way of life. Life was hard; to be endured, it had to have a meaning.

In the early days the St. John's Institute sought to bring to its membership, most of whom were members of St. John's Church, lectures, debates, and miscellaneous entertainment. Classes were organized for the benefit of the young men who worked in the glass factory and for some of the older men whose education had been neglected. The society was directed by the older men, who naturally ran the meetings along conservative lines in close touch with the church. As time went on, how-

103

ever, the younger members began to assert themselves. Money was raised for a new building, and while fairs were held for the benefit of the church, culture was less popular, and the emphasis on the social side became greater.

While the dramatic prowess of the members was not of course generated by the Institute, the Institute certainly furnished an opportunity for their development. Harry Mahoney, Editor of the Cambridge Sentinel for many years, and John T. Shea, a prominent citizen, wrote of this side of the life of the town as follows:

"Cambridge Street from Lechmere Square to the railroad crossing and its contributory Streets housed as brilliant a body of would-be Booths, Barretts, Davenportes and Warrens as any community of its size in the country. A keen flair for the dramatic has always characterized the human spirit of old East Cambridge. No matter what the theme or the field, whether religious, political, social or humanitarian, East Cambridge was bound to dramatize it."

With this abundance of natural talent, and with such outstanding men as John T. Shea, John Whoriskey, and James Aylward, the Institute shows attracted crowds from all over the city.

Activities were continued in a diminishing ratio until 1917, when as the population had changed in character, the affairs of the Institute were wound up, and the assets were turned over to the Right Reverend Hugh F. Blunt, then pastor of the Sacred Heart Church.

Among other picturesque organizations was the Apple Island Fishing Club. The club used to row in large boats from Lechmere Point to the Island, a little spot of two or three acres off Winthrop. To one sufficiently fortified, this little outing presented no great difficulty, and while there were very few fish to be caught, it was always possible, with the aid of the fish market, to put together a chowder, and a good time was had by all.

In the early days, St. Patrick's Day was the high point of the year, usually celebrated by a parade. The story runs that as one of these parades was in progress, the Hibernians were proceeding down Cambridge Street and were part way past Fourth Street just as the St.

John's Institute delegation appeared marching down that street. Such a situation offered certain exciting possibilities. But the colonel commanding the Hibernians, a fine figure of a man mounted on a horse, met the situation with the command, "Skither about now, skither about, and let the St. John's

104

Literary Institute pass through yez," and the crisis was safely passed. It is interesting to note that these three societies represented the dominant racial stock of the early days, and that none of them survived the change in population.

At the present time, the dominant racial strains residing in East Cambridge are Italian, Portuguese, and Polish.

What of the future?

This little hillock, sticking up out of the marsh has seen some stirring events. Its marshes have gradually disappeared. The river front has been smoothed off with a granite wall. Craigie's bridge has given place to the Charles River Dam, and the attractive waterfront park has gained in interest and importance by the building of the Science Museum. Apparently, however, there has been no change in East Cambridge housing for at least a hundred years. It remains one of the most overcrowded areas in the city. The Planning Board says that the strong church affiliations and national loyalties are contributing factors to a strong civic pride in East Cambridge, and probably more important, to absence of serious social problems. In two areas, from 85 to 90 per cent of the houses have no central heating. The prevailing rents are from \$18.00 to \$21.00 monthly. The absence of social problems, despite poor physical conditions, may well be attributed to the strong influence exerted on the community by the East End Union Settlement House and the four parishes, Irish, Italian, Polish, and Portuguese, three of which maintain their own schools.

In view of what has happened to East Cambridge in the past, the present tendency toward smaller more diversified industry points to more stable conditions in the future. However, the future looks rather drab in contrast with what the past has shown.

In conclusion, let me say that this paper gives a totally inadequate account of an appealingly picturesque and colorful neighborhood, the area that might have been a slum and isn't, the step-child of the University City. I am greatly indebted to Mr. Wheeler, for many years President of the East Cambridge Savings Bank, for his kind interest and many suggestions from his great store of memories of the people of Old East Cambridge; also, to Mr. Kenneth Goepper, and to Mrs. L. W. Watkins' book, Cambridge Glass.

105

THE FOUNDER AND THREE EDITORS OF THE CAMBRIDGE CHRONICLE

BY ELIOT B. SPALDING
Read October 23, 1956

ON Thursday, May 7, 1846, three days after the first city government of Cambridge was inaugurated, a 32-year-old printer, in dubious health and a comparative stranger, published the first issue of the *Cambridge Chronicle*.

He had chosen a strategic and newsworthy time to establish his weekly newspaper, and his first issue took full advantage of this fortunate timing. It contained a complete account of the city's inaugural exercises, and, for good measure, a story over a column long about the inauguration on the preceding Thursday of the Honorable Edward Everett, LL.D., as President of Harvard College.

The inaugural address of Mayor James D. Green to the city council was printed in full. From it we learn that the population of the city was between 13,000 and 14,000, that the city debt totaled \$22,000 of which \$7,000 was a note to Catherine E. Thomson, and that the tax rate for the past two years had been forty-eight cents on a hundred dollars.

In comparing the relative advantages of the city and town forms of government, the mayor implied that the city form was more likely to provide adequate police protection against "riotous noises at night" and against citizens having their lives endangered by "the furious driving of horses through the streets."

The Chronicle's coverage of the inauguration of the new President of Harvard was enlivened by a paragraph which confided that "pickpockets extracted six pocketbooks at the affair."

Since that first issue, the Chronicle has continued in an unbroken series of issues to do what its name implies — to chronicle the events of Cambridge. It is not, however, the purpose of this article to recite the complete history of the Chronicle. That has already been done elsewhere. In the Semi-Centennial Souvenir of Cambridge issued by the Chronicle in 1896,

107

the first half century of the paper's life was described by one whose qualifications I should be the last to question: my granduncle, Warren F. Spalding. This history was brought up to date in the special Centennial Edition issued by the Chronicle in 1946.

Instead of rehashing this material, this article will concern itself with four personalities who played important and sometimes exciting roles in the Chronicle's history — Andrew Reid, the founder; Linn Boyd Porter, the boy editor who won fortune and contemporary fame as a writer of popular novels; C. Burnside Seagrave, who held the editorship for the longest period (forty-three years); and Lucian Deane (Dan) Fuller who served as the bridge by which the traditions of the Cambridge Chronicle were carried over into the Cambridge Chronicle-Sun.

At the time he published the first issue of the Chronicle, Andrew Reid was thirty-two years old and had lived in Cambridge for less than a year. His training and background had been entirely in the printing business.

He was born in Bathgate, Scotland, served an apprenticeship as a printer in Edinburgh, emigrated to Halifax, Nova Scotia, and in December, 1834, came to Boston, where he worked as a printer until the spring of 1843. At that time, he became senior partner of the Boston firm of Reid and Rand, publishers of the Sabbath School Messenger and Sunday School Teacher. In the fall of 1845 he retired from the firm because of poor health and moved to Cambridge.

As the time drew near when Cambridge was to change from a town to a city form of government, he thought his health was sufficiently restored to resume the business of printing. He decided to establish a weekly newspaper, "hoping by this and the casual work that might offer to be able to provide for the wants of his family." His timing and business judgment were sound, his paper found favor with readers and advertisers, his prospects for success seemed bright, but his health was not equal to the task. On January 4, 1847, less than eight months after he founded the Chronicle, he died.

In its obituary notice, the Chronicle stated that his illness had begun about two years before, that it had been a painful pleasure in recent weeks to witness in him the mastery of a strong will over a wasting frame," and that he was "an example of constancy and perseverance under adverse circumstances."

108

His death certificate confirms what this description of his illness might lead us to suspect. It lists the cause of death as "consumption."

The obituary relates that he was a member of Boston Lodge No. 25, I.O.O.F., and that he left a widow and four young children. It concluded by stating that "his work on earth is ended but he has left behind him a good name, and the kind remembrance of all who knew him."

He also left behind him a newspaper that 109 years later is still a regular and, I trust, a welcome visitor in Cambridge homes. His family, too, continues to be an honored and useful one. In World War II, his great great grandson, Philip Standish Mather, flew thirty-five missions over Japan as a radar man on a B-29 bomber.

After the founder, the next three men to take the helm of the Chronicle were, in chronological order, John Ford, John Baldwin and George Fisher. George Fisher had one unusual claim to fame which perhaps should be noted in passing. George Grier Wright, in a paper written for your Society in 1928, said that Fisher "enjoys the distinction of being, so far as my memory goes, the only Cambridge editor who has been publicly horse-whipped for his editorial utterance."

Warren F. Spalding, writing in 1896, conceded that Fisher was an independent and aggressive editor, but gives a more moderate version of the whipping story. He says, "Fisher was twice visited by angry men, who with cowhide in hand sought to make him retract, but he held his ground, did not retract, and did not get an application of the lash as intended. One of these misunderstandings was caused by Mr. Fisher's position upon the temperance question which gave offence to the saloon crowd and its friends."

But independent as Fisher may have been, his editorship was sedate, indeed, when compared to that of the brash and iconoclastic boy editor who followed. This was Linn Boyd Porter who was only twenty-one years old when, in October, 1873, he purchased the Chronicle from Fisher for \$6,000.

Wiseacres who predicted that the young purchaser wouldn't be able to make a go of it were wrong. Linn Boyd Porter had more experience and more business acumen than his years would indicate. He was born in Westfield, Massachusetts, where his father, Elijah, was proprietor of the Westfield Newsletter. His father named him in

109

honor of Linn Boyd of Kentucky, who served as Speaker of the national House of Representatives.

In his twelfth year, Linn went to Minnesota, where at Lake City his father was postmaster and editor of the Tribune. Adventurous and enterprising from the word go, the lad set out to earn his own living and, amazingly enough, he did so. He worked on farms as a chore boy, in printing offices as a devil, on steamboats as a newsboy, and even as advance man for a traveling show.

At the ripe old age of sixteen, he returned to Massachusetts, spent a year at the Leicester Military Academy, clerked in a dry goods store in Worcester, perfected his typesetting skill in a Southbridge printing office, and at the age of nineteen came to Boston as a typesetter for the Boston Journal. A few months later he became a reporter for that newspaper, a post which he held when he bought the Chronicle while still only twenty-one years old.

As soon as he purchased the Chronicle, its columns began to show a new bounce and gusto. In his very first issue he censured the city council for overriding the mayor's veto and voting to extend Green Street from Pearl Street to Brookline Street. He was equally critical of a prior vote widening Prospect Street. This, he said, with all the blessed assurance of youth, was a project that could just as well have been postponed for twenty-five years. In support of his stand he wrote: "Beyond two horse cars an hour, an occasional vehicle and a drove of cattle several times a week, there is no travel to speak of on this avenue."

He was perhaps on more logical ground in December, 1873, when he opposed a pending council order that would have abolished the position of Superintendent of Schools.

His initial editorial gusto was no flash in the pan. As the years went by he continued to write in the same lively slam-bang style.

March of 1874 found him arguing that the city should advertise for bids when buying materials and stores. If competitive bidding prevailed, he wrote, "friends of members of the city government would not be so anxious for their election in some instances, for their chance at contracts would not be increased in any degree thereby . . ."

For his issue of February 21, 1880, he cooked up one of the strangest sets of statistics ever printed in a newspaper. He wrote that: "A careful estimate of the amount of talking done by members of our Board of

Aldermen in open session . . . gives the following result: — Chamberlain 50%, Corcoran 12, Brine 10, Gilmore 9, Chapman 7, Gooch 5, Howe 3, Davies 2, Sortwell 1 1/2, Nichols 3/4 of one per cent. We submit these facts to an intelligent public."

In the same issue he gently admonished an anonymous letter-writer as follows: "If the totally stupid dunce who writes us a letter signed 'Citizen' this week will call at this office, he will learn something greatly to his advantage, provided he is gifted with understanding."

He also made some sprightly comment in that same issue on the fact that the city council had hemmed and hawed before reluctantly accepting the offer of the President of Harvard to give the city \$3,000 to buy a chemical engine, a pair of horses and a set of harness.

Editor Porter wrote: "Looking a gift horse in the mouth has always been considered a highly improper thing to do. But to look a pair of gift horses, and a set of double harness, and a chemical engine, and the President and Fellows of Harvard College in the mouth certainly surpasses all former feats."

Looking back on his editorship at a later date, Porter recalled:

I attacked through my newspaper and by investigations, the city treasurer, the city engineer, the chief of the fire department, the city messenger, the city clerk, registrar of the water board, chief of police, and I think a few more, and at the end they were all supplanted by new men while living, except one, whose death occurred under circumstances which all will remember.

Some of these officials were accused of frauds, some of incapacity. Nearly all were "whitewashed" by investigating committees. But all had to go ... One of them sued me in the superior court for \$5,000, on the charge of libel. A verdict was rendered in my favor, but some \$200 of the expense of my defense had to be paid out of my own pocket while the "prominent citizens" who had urged me into the fight remarked that I was going it a little stronger than they had anticipated.

In all this editorial and political uproar, Porter declared:

I had no personal axe to grind. Like the fellow at Donnybrook, I hit every head I could find, where I thought the interests of the city demanded. My private business was always made second to these calls. Aspiring politicians used to tell me how much good I was doing, and how gladly they would reciprocate if I ever wanted office for myself. I tried them once, afterwards, and those I had done the hardest work for deserted me almost to a man.

It would be wrong to conclude from this description of Porter's editorship that his talent was confined to a gift for sprightly and outspoken writing. He was also a shrewd and hard-working businessman. The panic of '73 fell on the country in the very month he bought the Chronicle, and he later confessed that "nothing but the hardest work made success possible."

The \$6,000 he paid for the paper bought, he said, little besides the "good will." The plant was in a sorry state; there was some type considerably the worse for wear, and no press at all. He bought new type, increased the size of the Chronicle to eight pages well-filled with advertising, and doubled its circulation in the first year.

At the end of that first year he was proud of his progress, but had worked too hard and his health began to suffer. He reported that

I had been my own editor, publisher, bookkeeper, collector and city hall reporter, besides doing the larger share of my locals and getting most of my advertising. From eight in the morning till eleven at night were my working hours. Suburban papers can not be made profitable to any one who expects to sit in the office and hire his work done for him.

He must have kept everlastingly at it in the years that followed. When he sold the Chronicle in 1886, the paper had a good dress of type, steam engine, printing press, and "all the paraphernalia of a first-class office." He admitted that he had made a little money, although I might have made much more if I had devoted less attention to politics, and I could afford to rest." He was then only thirty-four years old.

Despite his exhausting newspaper labors, he apparently found time to acquire some real estate holdings. In his announcement of the sale of the Chronicle, he reported that the care of the Austin and Norfolk Hotels would, with other business matters, occupy his time for the present, and "future plans must await future developments."

He was, of course, too enterprising and imaginative a person to lead a humdrum, vegetative life for long. He was soon caught up in the whirlwind of a new career, winning fortune and contemporary fame as a writer of popular novels.

Under the pseudonym of Albert Ross, he wrote twenty-three or more books published by G. W. Dillingham Company, New York, under the general title of "The Albatross Novels."

Some idea of the nature of these novels can perhaps be gained from listing their titles: Black Adonis, The Garston Bigamy, Her Husband's Friend, His Foster Sister, His Private Character, In Stella's Shadow, Love at Seventy, Love Gone Astray, Moulding a Maiden, The Naked Truth, A New Sensation, An Original Sinner, Out of Wedlock, Speaking of Ellen, Stranger than Fiction, A Sugar Princess, That Gay Deceiver, Their Marriage Bond, Thou Shalt Not, Thy Neighbor's Wife, Why I'm Single, Young Fawcett's Mabel, and Young Miss Giddy.

A contemporary newspaper account stated that "Mr. Porter has only one superstition. He believes that his novels should have titles of three words each." It also stated that "He has one theory of writing: he believes that the relation of man to woman is the most dramatic and interesting phase of human life, and all his books deal with that relation."

None of his books can today be found in the Cambridge Public Library. Only two of them, The Naked Truth and Stranger than Fiction, are available at Harvard's Widener Library.

While writing his novels, he indulged his desire for travel. The Naked Truth has a preface written in Honolulu in June, 1899, and Stranger than Fiction has a preface written in Shanghai in November of the same year. This makes reference to his travels in the Pacific

isles, Japan, the Adriatic, and the Caribbean. His passion for travel carried him into nearly every American state, and on many journeys to different parts of the globe. His sea voyages alone exceeded 100,000 miles.

A feature article in a Boston newspaper, written at the height of his literary success, gave some interesting sidelights on his career. It stated that:

Albert Ross makes no claim to literary greatness. His name is on the covers of a million books, and with a shrewd business sense he has so husbanded the money earned by writing them that even if the name of Albert Ross is not high on the scroll of literary fame, the name of Linn Boyd Porter is unquestioned when appended to a bank check.

. . . He is the owner of much real estate besides other substantial investments. He has erected five apartment houses in Cambridge, which he still owns, and was also the builder of "Ware Hall," the Harvard dormitory, which he sold at a handsome profit . . . He drives good horses and loves to be surrounded by his friends when at home. He has also a fondness for the stage, and numbers among his associates many people in that profession.

113

His home, by the way, was described as being the "extensive estate bounded by Harvard, Dana and Chatham Streets."

Later he moved to Brookline where on the night of June 29, 1916, he died, leaving his wife and two married daughters. Death was attributed to a heart ailment that had developed during a trip to South Africa several years before. He was buried in Cambridge Cemetery.

The man who purchased the Chronicle from Linn Boyd Porter in 1886 was F. Stanhope Hill. He held its ownership until 1890, when he purchased the Cambridge Tribune and sold the Chronicle to F. H. Buff urn. Mr. Buffum did not hold it long. In December, 1891, he sold the paper to James W. Bean and C. Burnside Seagrave who, as partners, operated the paper successfully for some forty-three years.

Mr. Bean was a good newspaperman and businessman too, but he devoted much of his time to other interests. It is with his partner, C. Burnside Seagrave, editor and manager of the Chronicle for over forty-three years, that we shall be concerned here.

Charlie Seagrave, as his friends called him, was a born newspaperman who would have been miserable in any other line of work. He had a bump of curiosity as high as Mount Everest and dug for facts with the tireless energy of a steam shovel.

The son of Captain Charles Stowe Seagrave and Watie Almeda Scott, he was born in Uxbridge, August 3, 1862, while his father was serving in the Civil War with General Burnside's division. Hence, presumably, the future editor's middle name of Burnside.

The family came to Cambridge when C. Burnside was ten years old and enrolled him as a pupil in the Shepard Grammar School. The first item he ever wrote for any newspaper was a little account for the Cambridge Tribune of a sleigh ride given by his grammar school class. This attracted the attention of the owner of the Tribune, who offered the youngster a

position to write local items for that paper. He accepted and for a year or more gathered local news from North Cambridge.

In 1879 the Tribune offered him three dollars a week to become a full-time employee and learn the business. Young Seagrave did not hesitate; he promptly left his studies at Cambridge High School and, at age seventeen, became a full-fledged newspaperman.

In 1882 he started and took charge of an offshoot of the Tribune in Arlington, known as the Middlesex Townsman. Later, before he and

his partner acquired the Chronicle, he worked for papers in Marlboro and Waltham, and returned to Cambridge as Cambridge-Somerville representative of the Boston Journal. During this last period, he also served as city editor of the Cambridge Tribune.

Besides his newspaper experience, he brought to the editorship of the Chronicle many other assets: a passion for accuracy, a lack of social or economic snobbery, a driving energy, a hatred of sham and soft soap, a fiery independence that made him incapable of kow-towing to anyone, and a love of Cambridge that was not gushing, but deep.

He was always more interested in the news columns of the paper than in either its editorials or its advertising. The race, religion, or social status of a resident was no concern of his. If a person lived in Cambridge and his doings were newsworthy, Editor Seagrave was always eager to print them. At all times his reporter's instinct was predominant. He knew that names make news and build circulation.

At times he would leave advertisements out of the paper to make room for news — a policy almost unthinkable today.

Chronicle editorials, although often written by other members of the staff, were more likely to be based on common sense than on theories, were more often informative than critical, and made a sincere attempt to advocate what was best for Cambridge. They praised more than they blamed. In short, the Chronicle, under Editor Seagrave, was not a common scold.

All these policies helped make the Chronicle a unifying rather than a divisive force in a city that was growing rapidly, both in population and industry. The paper helped to tie together in civic pride the separate sections and varied racial and religious groups of which Cambridge is composed.

The writer of this article worked for nine years under Editor Sea-grave's direction and can testify that it was frequently exasperating but never boring. Mr. Seagrave was described by the late Henry J. Mahoney as having "as slender a store of patience as may be found in Cambridge." This was literally true.

Outside the office, "The Old Man," as his staff called him, was a kindly gentleman who carried a green felt bag under his arm, walked on the streets instead of the sidewalks, and was extravagantly fond of children, wildflowers, and birds. But inside the office, he was a peppery

and impatient editorial genius who suffered a thousand tortures and died a thousands deaths while getting out each issue of the Chronicle. On the morning of publication, he could sometimes be seen, striking his head with his fist and moaning, "God, God, why do I have to do everything myself?"

Every Monday morning he was sure the week ahead would be the most difficult ever, and each week on the night before publication he became so excited that he found it difficult to sleep. He would often get out of bed at midnight, brew himself a cup of coffee at his Bellevue Avenue home, and make his way by foot and trolley car to the Chronicle building at 83 Austin Street. There, all by himself in the cavernous composing room, he would don a turtle-necked sweater and cap, light up a White Owl cigar, and work for hours, moving type from one page to another, or writing personal items which he had gathered from a milkman or trolley car conductor on his way to work.

"Get an item out of everyone you meet," was his motto, and he practiced what he preached. He had a passion for perfection and insisted upon seeing many page proofs and making the most minute corrections before he would allow the paper to go to press. As soon as the first paper was run off, he would scan it swiftly and then — all of a sudden — would smile, light up a cigar, and saunter out to lunch in a state of benign relaxation.

But this didn't necessarily mean that he was through getting out the paper. If he picked up a good personal item while at lunch, he would come dashing back, stop the press, and insist that a place be found on page one for his last-minute scoop. Often it would amount to no more than the fact that a police captain had left for Maine on a hunting trip.

Neither he nor his staff took many holidays. Even when at home, he would sit in his kitchen, clipping Cambridge items out of Boston newspapers, or writing stories in a helter-skelter handwriting that only a few old-timers at the office were able to decode. He once went on a ten-day hunting trip to Maine, but became so fidgety he returned to the paper in less than three days.

He was warm in his friendships and when he admired a man in public life would stand by him through thick and thin. On the other hand, he once ordered that the name of a clergyman to whom he had taken a violent dislike never be allowed to appear in the paper. He held fast to this

rule even when the clergyman was elected Master of his own Masonic Lodge.

Editor Seagrave was a realistic rather than a polished writer. He once wrote that a resident of Upland Road "is sick with sore boils. He is suffering the tortures of the damned." Sometimes his realism was a bit grim as when he wrote that the finding of the decomposed body of a suicide floating in Fresh Pond "once again proves the wisdom of ex-Mayor Quinn's decision to erect a modern filtration plant."

He hated sloppy or careless reporting. Once when a Boston paper carried a story about a wild bull escaping from the Brighton abattoir, he called the abattoir to check up. "Just as I thought," he snorted; "it wasn't a bull at all, just a little heifer."

Occasionally, in a fit of anger, he would discharge a reporter or printer. If they knew the ropes, they would walk out the front door, go for a cup of coffee, return by the side door, and resume their work. Usually he would have cooled off and would be glad to see them back.

He would stand back of his reporters when they were right, even in the face of protests from high city officials. Once a young reporter incurred the ire of the fire chief by writing that firemen, after extinguishing a blaze in a tea room, had eaten up most of the apple pie and ice cream in the tea room's larder.

When the chief stormed into the Chronicle office to complain, Editor Seagrave summoned the reporter and heard both sides of the story. His decision was short and gratifying. "You get the hell out of here, Chief," he said, "the boy is right."

In his later years, Editor Seagrave took little part in Cambridge public or social life except through the columns of the Chronicle. But earlier he had served as a city councillor, as an election commissioner under six mayors, and as a state representative in 1912, 1914, and 1915. He was author of the legislative bill for the construction of the first unit of the Alewife Brook Parkway, and Seagrave Road, bordering the parkway, is named in his honor.

On the death of his partner, James W. Bean, early in 1934, Mr. Seagrave became sole owner of the Chronicle. On November 16, 1934, he sold the paper and plant to Charles M. Cox of Melrose, publisher of the Dedham Transcript. Mr. Seagrave continued to edit the paper until May 9, 1935, when Mr. Cox sold the Chronicle to the Cambridge Sun.

Editor Seagrave then retired to his home at 48 Bellevue Avenue, now owned by Professor John H. Welsh. There, on May 23, 1941, he died. Several months before his death he wrote his own obituary, which he gave to the then editor of the Chronicle. He exacted a promise that, upon his death, his obituary would be printed just as he wrote it, that no picture of him would be printed with the story, and that no memorial resolutions would be adopted in his honor. All these promises were kept. His wife, the former Carrie Choate Hill of Belmont, had died before him. There were no surviving children, their only son having died in infancy.

When the Chronicle was purchased by the Cambridge Sun in 1935, the two papers were merged. The first issue of the combined papers carried a publisher's announcement stating that "the Chronicle is in the hands of its friends who will not hold lightly its reputation or the responsibilities attendant upon its management." Time proved this statement to be correct. The new owners not only placed the name of the Chronicle ahead of the name of the Sun in the title of the combined papers, but also kept their promise to "maintain the high standards of accurate and comprehensive news gathering which characterized the Chronicle . . . under Editor Seagrave."

One reason why the Chronicle-Sun continued to carry on the Chronicle tradition was the fortunate fact that the editor and co-owner of the Sun was himself a former city editor of the Chronicle, thoroughly familiar with its history, prestige and policies.

This was Lucian Deane (Dan) Fuller, who was born in Chatham, January 26, 1884, the son of the Reverend and Mrs. Oliver Payson Fuller, and who was graduated from Brown University in the class of 1906. After his college days, he went to work in the circulation department of the Boston Journal. In 1913 he came to Cambridge as editor of the Cambridge Standard, a daily newspaper. In 1919 he served for one year as secretary of the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce, and then served as secretary of the Chamber of Commerce in Bath, Maine, until 1921. He then returned to Cambridge where he became city editor of the Chronicle under Mr. Seagrave.

Dan Fuller was a short, plump man with sad brown eyes but a delightful sense of humor. He was more of a listener than a talker, often entering a discussion only when he could no longer put up with the non-

118

sense being uttered. Then, a swift thrust of his wit would puncture the absurdity of the theories being advanced. He was strongly idealistic by nature, although he would have denied it; and a truly dedicated newspaperman, although he would have denied that too.

On the first day that the writer of this article became a permanent employee of the Chronicle, Mr. Fuller shook his head sadly and remarked, "Why don't you go out and commit suicide? You'll be happier in the long run. "

A day or two later, he instructed the young reporter to call him Dan. "Don't ever call me Mr. Fuller again," he said, "it makes me feel my age." Dan knew the newspaper business inside out, and was generous in sharing his knowledge. He seemed to know everyone of importance in the city and helped the young reporter to become acquainted with them too. He was an ideal mentor, fatherly yet strict, especially where accuracy of reporting was concerned.

He was the creator of a popular Chronicle feature entitled "A Self-Made Pol Writes to His Son." This gave a humorous but shrewdly analytical picture of Cambridge politics and politicians.

While working for the Chronicle, Dan became convinced that a free-distribution newspaper could be a success in Cambridge. He lived in Melrose and was fond of pointing to the Melrose Free Press as an example of the kind of publication that could succeed here.

The Chronicle then had a paid circulation of some five or six thousand copies. This circulation, although consisting of loyal readers, was not large enough to meet the advertising needs of many of the bigger Cambridge stores. Dan Fuller believed that a free-distribution newspaper with a much larger circulation would attract enough advertising to pay the cost of producing the newspaper and a profit as well.

He discussed these ideas with his friend and fellow Melrose resident, William A. Dole, Jr., who had gained a knowledge of the printing business as a salesman for the Murray Printing

Company, then located in Cambridge. Mr. Dole, a graduate of Harvard in the Class of 1918, was enterprising, intelligent, and gregarious. He was looking for a business opportunity and was receptive to the idea of starting a newspaper in Cambridge.

On September 5, 1930, the two men, as partners, published the first

119

issue of the Cambridge Sun. Although started in the depths of a serious business depression and backed only by the limited life savings of the partners, the new publication showed a steady growth. Each partner had abilities that complemented those of the other. Mr. Fuller handled the news and editorial end of the paper, while Mr. Dole, an energetic salesman, concentrated on the advertising. Less than five years later they were doing so well that they were able to buy the Chronicle and merge it with the Sun.

Although serious about his duties as an editor, Dan Fuller could never keep his sense of humor from breaking through. His headline at the time Al Smith overwhelmingly carried Cambridge in a presidential election read:

HOOVER HURRICANE MISSES CAMBRIDGE

He once printed the picture of a pinched-faced Cambridge city councillor above the caption "Yon Cassius." And the week before a referendum vote on the city manager form of government for Cambridge, his leading headline read:

PLAN E OR NOT TO BE,

THAT IS THE QUESTION

Incidentally, the Chronicle-Sun under his editorship was an original supporter of the Plan E form of government, and a champion of other constructive measures for a better Cambridge.

Because of his wisdom and knowledge of the city, his advice was regularly sought by public officials, social agencies, business and professional men, young people pondering the next step in their careers, and leaders in such public-spirited organizations as the League of Women Voters and the Public School Association. Although his own job was a busy and exacting one, he was always patient and unhurried in listening to other peoples' problems. His advice was both practical and far-sighted and invariably seasoned with his delightful sense of humor.

In his quiet, unassuming way, Dan Fuller was about as independent as they come. He refused to attend parties which one of the Cambridge mayors gave for newspapermen. He argued that it might put him under obligation to the mayor and sway the objectivity of his reporting.

When he was city editor of the Chronicle, he argued for half an hour with two city officials before he agreed to be their guest at a Harvard-

Yale game. He loved football and was eager to see the game, but before he accepted the invitation he warned his hosts that "sometime I may have to criticize you in the paper just the same."

As editor of the Sun he once wrote an editorial that incurred the ire of a mayor and cost the paper hundreds of dollars' worth of city advertising. He never expressed any regret at having written it. In November, 1939, a serious illness forced Dan Fuller to retire as editor of the Chronicle-Sun. A note he left for his successor read in part: "Open any mail which comes addressed to me. I think all the skeletons in my closet have disintegrated. I hope so anyway." He died June 17, 1941, at his home in Melrose, less than a month after the death of Editor C. Burnside Seagrave. Dan was fifty-seven years old. He left his wife, the former Mabelle N. Sargent, and a married daughter, Nancy.

ANNUAL REPORTS

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL AND SECRETARY FOR THE YEAR 1954

THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORICAL SOCIETY holds its fiftieth annual meeting tonight and it seems appropriate that we remind ourselves of the purpose of this Society as outlined in the Charter of 1905, namely, "promoting interest and research in relation to the history of Cambridge." The thirty-four volumes of Proceedings cover aspects of Cambridge life during the past three centuries. These contain many of the papers read at meetings of the Society. We are indebted to our present editor, Mr. John Walden, for the excellence of his work.

During 1954 we have been very fortunate in the diversity and quality of the papers presented, all of them by members of the Society. At the January 1954 annual meeting Mrs. Laura Dudley Saunderson read a paper "Forty Years in the Fogg Museum." The meeting was held in the museum, which provided the only appropriate setting for the reading of this paper. Mrs. Saunderson paid tribute to the devoted and able leadership of the people who have developed this outstanding museum, with special honor paid to Mr. Edward Forbes. Mrs. Saunderson's own part in the life of the museum has been considerable and her carefully drawn picture proved of real interest to her audience.

The spring meeting went back to the Harvard Faculty Club. Mr. John W. Wood read a paper which contrasted pleasantly with the first, a colorful and entertaining picture of "Cambridgeport, A Brief History." He sketched the region and traced the biographies of a number of outstanding men and women born in the neighborhood who have had a respected place in science, business, literature, and a variety of important

professions. We hope that Mr. Wood may soon have ready a similar brief history of East Cambridge.

The June meeting was held at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Philip P. Sharpies. Mr. Cecil Thayer Derry read a paper of unusual interest to a large audience, many of whom had been pupils in the school he described. The paper was called "Pages from the History of the Cambridge High and Latin School," and in it Mr. Derry presented much interesting early history as well as several memorable biographical sketches of teachers well known to members of the Society in their school years.

The autumn meeting was unique and has been described by many present as the most delightful in recent years. Mr. Pottinger presented a paper which he entitled "I, too, in Arcadia." To describe it as reminiscences of his years in Cambridge gives a suggestion of the quality of this paper. Since it covered years in which this Society has grown, it made a perfect closing piece for the first half century of this organization.

We are very grateful to our speakers, to the members who have served on the hospitality committees, and to Mr. and Mrs. Sharpies, who welcomed us to their house for the June garden party. We have received with sorrow announcement of the death of several members during the past year. We have accepted with regret the resignation of a number of members for reasons including illness and removal from Cambridge. Through the careful management of our Vice-President, Mr. Pottinger, new members have been added to keep our membership strong and within the limit decided upon by the Council. The lists are published in the Proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSAMOND COOLIDGE HOWE

Secretary

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL AND THE SECRETARY FOR THE YEAR 1955

THIS YEAR has marked the mid-century point of the Cambridge Historical Society. The Fiftieth Annual Meeting took place a year ago tonight, Tuesday, January 25, 1955, at the Harvard Faculty Club, Mr. John W. Wood, Second Vice-President presiding. The guests were received by Mr. and Mrs. Gage Bailey and Mr. and Mrs. Robert Cushman.

Mr. Ashton Sanborn presented the slate of officers for the year 1955 for the nominating committee, of which the Reverend Henry Washburn was chairman, Mr. Sanborn and Mrs.

Dows Dunham the other members. Judge Walcott had requested that his resignation be accepted, a request which was honored, with deep appreciation expressed for the twenty-seven years of service he gave as President of the Society. By unanimous vote he was elected permanent Honorary President. Mr. David T. Pottinger, the Third Vice-President, was elected to succeed Judge Walcott.

Annual reports were given by the Secretary, Treasurer, Editor, and Curator.

The address of the evening was the "Story of the Episcopal Theological School of Cambridge" given by Dean Charles L. Taylor. It was a notable paper and set a high standard which was successfully met by the other speakers in the series of meetings in this fiftieth birthday year.

The April meeting honored Radcliffe College. Mrs. John M. Maguire, college historian, prepared a paper entitled "The Curtain Raiser to the Founding of Radcliffe College." This was a report of her research into the early efforts of Harvard professors to make available higher education for women even before the work of Mr. Arthur Gilman. Hers was a scholarly paper and worthy of the Radcliffe historian. The college was fittingly represented also by the hospitality committee, President and Mrs. Wilbur K. Jordan, Mr. and Mrs. Henry J. Winslow, and Mr. and Mrs. Hollis G. Gerrish. Radcliffe alumnae, Miss Marion Lansing and Miss Carol Smith, served the refreshments.

The June meeting paid honor to a neighboring institution, the Museum of Science. Mr. Bradford Washburn, the director, gave us a very

125

entertaining talk and demonstration assisted by members of his staff. His title, "The New Science Museum," included an introductory description of the early days of the museum, its physical expansion, and the story of its development to the present time. A delighted audience explored the exhibits and found refreshments served in a gallery surrounded by the scientific material which is displayed to thousands of museum visitors, children and adults. We were welcomed by the Reverend Henry B. Washburn, Miss Mabel Colgate, and Mr. and Mrs. David Pottinger. Mrs. Roger Clapp and Mrs. Arthur Beane poured tea at this our one annual afternoon meeting.

The final meeting of 1955 brought to a high point a series which had been deliberately planned to honor several important institutions. The trustees of Longfellow House made us welcome in October. We were received by Dr. and Mrs. Robert Ganz and Mr. Thomas de Valcourt. The paper was entitled "The Young Women's Christian Association in Cambridge" and was given by a member of the Cambridge board, Mrs. James Donovan. In the one hundredth year of the National Association the Cambridge branch is justly proud of its service to women since 1891, and Mrs. Donovan's paper was a distinguished and charming report. A large audience of members and their guests showed their interest in the Cambridge YWCA, and two members of the Cambridge board poured coffee and chocolate afterward, Mrs. William C. Greene and Mrs. Walter G. O'Neil.

The Council of this Society has held three important meetings this year, during which time a plan for rotation in office of members was under discussion. Mrs. Clifford Holland was the author of the proposed schedule, and with minor changes her plan has been adopted by the

Council as a guide, or line of procedure, to "keep the present stability for its officers but also to open up the Council so that more members may participate."

Each nominating committee will be guided by this plan. This year we shall have three new councillors at large. We are very grateful to the three members whose terms expire tonight for their interest and support of the Society, Miss Katharine Crothers, Mr. Dudley Clapp, and Mr. C. Conrad Wright.

This year we have accepted with regret the resignation of four members. We note with sorrow the death of Miss Lillian Abbot, Miss Mar-

126

ion Abbott, Mrs. Susan Gould Durant, Mrs. Mabel Macleod Hammond, and Miss Alice Thorp. We have added seven new members. Our total membership remains two hundred fifty-four.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSAMOND COOLIDGE HOWE

Secretary

127

REPORT OF THE TREASURER FOR THE YEAR 1954

Cash Balance January 1, 1954		\$2,182.72
Dues	\$1,288.00	
Guest Fees	17.15	
Sale of Proceedings	3.30	
Bowen Fund	87.45	1,395.90
		\$3,578.62
Printing and Stationery	\$ 126.18	
Clerical and Postage	191.61	
Vault Rental	10.00	
Life Membership Fund	125.00	

Cost of Meetings	429.22	
Vol. 33 Proceedings 1949-50	1,260.14	
Bay State Historical League	4.00	
Bank Service charges	1.50	
3/4 shares Second National Bank (Bowen Fund)	87.45	2,235.10
Cash Balance December 31, 1954		\$1,343.52

128

<i>Investments</i>	<i>Book Value 1/1/54</i>	<i>Cash Income Rec'd</i>	<i>Purchases and With- drawals</i>	<i>Book Value 12/31/54</i>	<i>Account to which Income was Credited</i>
<i>Maria Bowen Fund</i>					
95 shs. 1st. Nat'l Bank	\$ 3,730.79	\$ 228.00		\$ 3,730.79	Camb. Savings Bank
50 shs. State St. Tr. Co.	2,920.00	150.00		2,920.00	Camb. Savings Bank
10 shs. Merchants Nat'l Bank	3,290.00	150.00		3,290.00	Camb. Savings Bank
32 shs. 2nd Nat'l Bank*	3,125.00	133.50	\$87.45	3,212.45	Camb. Savings Bank
Camb. Savings Bank	7,862.06	248.07	(87.45)	8,684.18	Camb. Savings Bank
Camb'p't Savings Bank	2,112.66	66.53		2,179.19	Camb'p't Savings Bank
East Camb. Sav. Bank	2,104.09	58.26		2,162.35	East Camb. Sav. Bk.
	<u>\$25,144.60</u>	<u>\$1,034.36</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>\$26,178.96</u>	
<i>Life Membership Fund</i>					
Cambridge Savings Bank	\$ 1,329.74	\$ 42.67	\$125.00	\$ 1,497.41	
<i>Historic Houses</i>					
Cambridge Savings Bank	\$ 3,711.00	\$116.87		\$ 3,827.87	
<i>Elizabeth E. Dana Bequest</i>					
Cambridge Trust Company	\$ 235.35	\$ 2.36		\$ 237.71	
<i>Frank Gaylord Cook Bequest</i>					
Cambridge Savings Bank	\$ 1,133.52	\$ 35.69		\$ 1,169.21	
	<u>\$ 6,409.61</u>	<u>\$197.59</u>	<u>\$125.00</u>	<u>\$ 6,732.20</u>	
				Book Value of Funds December 31, 1954	\$32,911.16
				Total Income, December 31, 1954	\$ 1,231.95
* Stock Dividend of 6 shares Bowen 3/4 share for Bowen Fund Savings Bank account					
JOHN T. G. NICHOLS, <i>Treasurer</i>					

129

REPORT OF THE TREASURER FOR THE YEAR 1955

Cash Balance January 1, 1955	\$ 1,343.52
Dues	\$1,272.00
Guest Fees	42.74

Sale of Proceedings	15.52	
Bowen Fund	8,314.08	
9,644.34		\$10,987.86
Printing and Stationery	100.26	
Clerical and Postage	181.24	
Vault Rental	10.00	
Life Membership Fund	50.00	
Cost of Meetings	527.57	
Vols. 34, 35 Proceedings 1951-54	2,034.37	
Bay State Historical League	4.00	
Bowen Fund	7,814.08	
10,721.52		\$ 266.34
Cash Balance 12/31/55		

	<i>Life Membership Fund</i>			
Cambridge Savings Bank	\$1,497.41	\$ 49.05	\$ 50.00	\$1,596.46
		<i>Historic Houses</i>		
Cambridge Savings Bank	\$3,827.87	\$125.40		\$3,953.27
		<i>Elizabeth E. Dana Bequest</i>		
Cambridge Trust Company	\$ 237.71	\$ 1.19	\$(238.90)	
Cambridge Savings Bank		\$.64	\$ 238.90	\$ 239.54
		<i>Frank Gaylord Cook Bequest</i>		
Cambridge Savings Bank	\$1,169.21	\$ 38.31		\$1,207.52
		<i>Frances Fowler Fund</i>		
Cambridge Savings Bank	\$ 0		\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00
	<u>\$6,732.20</u>	<u>\$214.59</u>	<u>\$ 550.00</u>	<u>\$7,496.79</u>
				Book Value of Funds \$34,470.57
				Total Income \$ 1,509.41
				JOHN T. G. NICHOLS, <i>Treasurer</i>

<i>Maria Bowen Fund</i>					
<i>Investments</i>	<i>Book Value 1/1/55</i>	<i>Cash Income Rec'd</i>	<i>Purchases and With- drawals</i>	<i>Book Value 12/31/55</i>	<i>Account to which Income was Credited</i>
95 shs. 1st Nat'l Bank	\$ 3,730.79	\$ 256.50		\$ 3,730.79	Camb. Sav. Bank
50 shs. State St. Trust Co.	2,920.60	37.50	(\$ 2,920.60)	0	Camb. Sav. Bank
32 shs. 2nd Nat'l Bank	3,212.45	32.00	(3,212.45)	0	Camb. Sav. Bank
125 shs. 2nd Bank St.*		243.75	6,132.45	6,049.05	Camb. Sav. Bank
117 shs. Mer. Nat'l Bank†	3,290.00	172.65	(83.40) 681.10	3,971.10	Camb. Sav. Bank
50 shs. Gulf State Util.		72.50	1,732.63	1,732.63	Camb. Sav. Bank
50 shs. Middle South Util.		56.25	1,745.55	1,745.55	Camb. Sav. Bank
50 shs. Central & South West		50.50	1,776.99	1,776.99	Camb. Sav. Bank
50 shs. Virginia Electric & Power		77.50	1,877.81	1,877.81	Camb. Sav. Bank
Cambridge Savings Bank	8,684.18	164.41	(7,814.08)	1,617.06	Camb. Sav. Bank
Camb'p't Savings Bank	2,179.19	71.39	(500.00)‡	2,250.58	Camb'p't Sav. Bank
E. Camb. Savings Bank	2,162.35	59.87	83.40	2,222.22	E. Camb. Sav. Bank
	<u>\$26,178.96</u>	<u>\$1,294.82</u>	<u>\$—500.00</u>	<u>\$26,973.78</u>	

* Merger of State Street Trust Co.
and 2nd Nat'l Bank Stock dividend of 43 shares.
† 10 for 1 split subscribed to 17 shares.
‡ Advance to general cash

LIST OF MEMBERS, 1955, 1956

*Marion Stanley Abbot	Sylvia Church (Mrs. I.) Bowditch
* Lillian Abbott	Laura Post (Mrs. S. A.) Breed
Margaret Wilder (Mrs. P. F.) Alles	* Jessie Waterman (Mrs. Wm. F.) Brooks
Paul Frost Alles	Martha Thacher Brown
Elizabeth Gardner (Mrs. C.) Almy	Mary MacArthur (Mrs. K.) Bryan
Mary Almy	Eleanor Sheridan (Mrs. D. E.) Burr
Harriet Hastings (Mrs. O. I.) Ames	Douglas Bush
James Barr Ames	Hazel Cleaver (Mrs. D.) Bush
Mary Ogden (Mrs. J. B.) Ames	Bernice Cannon
Oakes Ingalls Ames	Paul DeWitt Caskey
John Bradshaw Atkinson	Ruth Blackman (Mrs. P. D.) Caskey
Louise Marie (Mrs. J. B.) Atkinson	Louise Fletcher (Mrs. C. L.) Chase
Catherine Smith (Mrs. D. W.) Bailey	Dudley Clapp
David Washburn Bailey	*Elizabeth Neill (Mrs. D.) Clapp
Ellen Nealley (Mrs. G.) Bailey	Roger Saunders Clapp
Gage Bailey	Winifred Irvlin (Mrs. R. S.) Clapp
Helen Diman (Mrs. I. W.) Bailey	Arthur Harrison Cole
Alethea Pew (Mrs. E. J.) Barnard	Anna Steckel (Mrs. A. H.) Cole
Edmund Johnson Barnard	(L) Mabel Hall Colgate
(L) Mary Emory Batchelder	Marie Schneider Conant
(L) Ruth Richards (Mrs. A.) Beane	Theresa Reynolds (Mrs. J. L.) Coolidge
Florence Barrett (Mrs. R.) Beatley	Phyllis Byrne (Mrs. G.) Cox
Ralph Beatley	Abby Chandler (Mrs. J. F.) Crocker
Pierre Belliveau	John Franklin Crocker
**Marion Gordon (Mrs. M. B.) Bever	Martha Crocker
** Michael Berliner Bever	Katharine Foster Crothers

<i>Helen Thomas (Mrs. H. L.) Blackwell</i>	<i>Esther Lanman (Mrs. R. A.) Cushman</i>
<i>Howard Lane Blackwell</i>	<i>Robert Adams Cushman</i>
<i>Frank Aloysius Kenney Boland</i>	<i>Sally Adams (Mrs. C. F.) Cushman</i>
<i>Velma Louise Gibson (Mrs. F. A. K.) Boland</i>	<i>Helen Winthrop Daugherty</i>
<i>Charles Stephen Bolster</i>	<i>Gardiner Mumford Day</i>
<i>Elizabeth Winthrop (Mrs. C. S.) Bolster</i>	<i>*Katherine Monroe Day</i>
	<i>Thomas Henri DeValcourt</i>

**Died*

(A) Associate member

*** Resigned*

(L) Life member

<i>Cecil Thayer Derry</i>	<i>Dusser de Barenne (Mrs. J. D.) Greene</i>
<i>Frank Currier Doble</i>	<i>Jerome Davis Greene</i>
<i>Helen Dadmun (Mrs. F. C.) Doble</i>	<i>Margaret Eckfeldt (Mrs. Wm. C.) Greene</i>
<i>James Donovan</i>	<i>William Chase Greene</i>
<i>Frances Cooper-Marshall (Mrs. J.) Donovan</i>	<i>(L) Helen McQuesten (Mrs. P.) Gring</i>
<i>Elizabeth Flagg (Mrs. S.) Dow</i>	<i>Lillian Helen (Mrs. T.) Hadley</i>
<i>George Lincoln Dow</i>	<i>Edward Everett Hale</i>
<i>Arthur Drinkwater</i>	<i>Helen Holmes (Mrs. E. E.) Hale</i>
<i>Dows Dunham</i>	<i>Constance Huntington Hall</i>
<i>Marion Jessie (Mrs. D.) Dunham</i>	<i>Henry Magnus Halvorson</i>
<i>Aldrich Durant</i>	<i>Janet Matthews (Mrs. H. M.) Halvorson</i>
<i>(A) Ethel Harding (Mrs. F. C.) Durant</i>	<i>Catherine Russell (Mrs. F. T., Jr.) Hammond</i>
<i>Faith Lanman Hine (Mrs. A.) Durant</i>	<i>Franklin Tweed Hammond</i>
<i>* Susan Gould (Mrs. A.) Durant</i>	<i>Franklin Tweed Hammond, Jr.</i>
<i>Eleanor Clark (Mrs. O.) Earle</i>	<i>* Mabel MacLeod (Mrs. F. T.) Hammond</i>
<i>Osborne Earle</i>	<i>Charles Lane Hanson</i>
<i>Walter Frank Earle</i>	<i>Mary Caroline Hardy</i>
<i>(A) Alvin Clark Eastman</i>	<i>* Truman Davis Hayes</i>
<i>Charles William Eliot, 2nd</i>	<i>Christina Doyle (Mrs. R. H.) Haynes</i>
<i>Elizabeth Lee (Mrs. F. M.) Eliot</i>	<i>Robert Hammond Haynes</i>
<i>Frederick May Eliot</i>	<i>Florence Wilhelmina (Mrs. N.) Heard</i>
<i>**Marion Eliot</i>	<i>Lucy Gregory (Mrs. R. G.) Henderson</i>
<i>Regina Dodge (Mrs. C. W.) Eliot</i>	<i>Robert Graham Henderson</i>
<i>Frances White (Mrs. Wm.) Emerson</i>	<i>Albert Frederick Hill</i>
<i>Mary Fife (Mrs. L. E.) Emerson</i>	<i>Georgiana Ames (Mrs. T. L.) Hinckley</i>
<i>William Emerson</i>	<i>Eleanor Holmes Hinkley</i>
	<i>Janet Elliott (Mrs. R. B.) Hobart</i>
	<i>Richard Bryant Hobart</i>
	<i>Elizabeth Chandler (Mrs. E. W.) Hockley</i>

<i>Mary Lillian (Mrs. R. C.) Evarts</i>	<i>Anna Coolidge Davenport (Mrs. C. M.)</i>
<i>Richard Conover Evarts</i>	<i>Holland</i>
<i>Pearl Brock Fahrney</i>	<i>George Wright Howe</i>
<i>Claire (Mrs. P.) Faude</i>	<i>Lois Lilley Howe</i>
<i>Eleanor Tyson Cope (Mrs. H. W.) Foote</i>	<i>Rosamond Coolidge (Mrs. G. W.) Howe</i>
<i>Henry Wilder Foote</i>	<i>Eda Woolson (Mrs. B. S.) Hurlbut</i>
<i>Edward Waldo Forbes</i>	<i>Elsie Powell (Mrs. E.) Ingraham</i>
<i>Lois Whitney (Mrs. A. B.) Forbes</i>	<i>Dorothy Judd (Mrs. Wm. A.) Jackson</i>
<i>Alden Simonds Foss</i>	<i>Pauline Fay (Mrs. A. L.) Jackson</i>
<i>Dorothy Tenney (Mrs. A. S.) Foss</i>	<i>William Alexander Jackson</i>
<i>(A) Francis Apthorp Foster</i>	<i>Louis Leventhal Jaffe</i>
<i>Ingeborg Gade Frick</i>	<i>Mildred Miles (Mrs. L. L.) Jaffe</i>
<i>Claire MacIntyre (Mrs. R. N.) Ganz</i>	<i>(L) Constance Bouve (Mrs. H. A.) Jenks</i>
<i>Robert Norton Ganz</i>	
<i>Alice Howland (Mrs. H. G.) Garrett</i>	
<i>Catherine Ruggles (Mrs. H. G.) Gerrish</i>	
<i>Hollis Gupstill Gerrish</i>	
<i>Henry Lathrop Gilbert</i>	
<i>Priscilla Brown (Mrs. H. L.) Gilbert</i>	
<i>Roger Gilman</i>	

(L) Henry Angler Jenks
Ethel Robinson (Mrs. W. S.) Jones
Llewellyn Jones
Susan Wilbur (Mrs. L.) Jones
Wallace St. Clair Jones
Frances Ruml (Mrs. W. K.) Jordan
Wilbur Kitchener Jordan
Albert Guy Keith
(L) Theodora Keith
Louise Higgins Langenberg
Rowena Morse (Mrs. Wm. L.) Langer
William Leonard Langer
Marion Florence Lansing
(A) Susan Taber Low
***John Aleck Lunn*
***Susan Williams (Mrs. J. A.) Lunn*
***Frank Lyman, Jr.*
***Jeanne (Mrs. F., Jr.) Lyman*
Dorothy St. John Manks
Gustavus Howard Maynadier
Elinor Gregory (Mrs. K. D.) Metcalf
Keyes DeWitt Metcalf
Helen Bonney (Mrs. H.) Montgomery
Alva Morrison
Amy Gallagher (Mrs. A.) Morrison
James Buell Munn

(L) Bradford Hendrick Peirce
Marion Hilton Pike
Elizabeth Bridge Piper
Mary Friedlander (Mrs. J. S.) Plaut
(L) Bremer Whidden Pond
Lucy Kingsley (Mrs. A. K.) Porter
Faith Eddy (Mrs. J. M.) Potter
David Thomas Pottinger
Mildred Stone (Mrs. D. T.) Pottinger
Alice Edmands Putnam
Mary Clement Parker (Mrs. H. W.) Read
Fred Norris Robinson
George Irwin Rohrbough
Martha Fraser (Mrs. G.I.) Rohrbough
Alfred Sherwood Romer
Ruth Hibbard (Mrs. A. S.) Romer
Gertrude Swan (Mrs. J. C.) Runkle
Paul Joseph Sachs
Charles Rodney Sage
Marjorie Llewellyn (Mrs. C. R.) Sage
Edward Joseph Samp, Jr.
Agnes Goldman (Mrs. A.) Sanborn
Cyrus Ashton Rollins Sanborn
Henry Hallam Saunderson
Laura Dudley (Mrs. H. H.) Saunderson
Erwin Haskell Schell

<i>Ruth Crosby Hanford (Mrs. J.B.) Munn</i>	<i>Esther Sidelinger (Mrs. E. H.) Schell</i>
<i>Mary Liscomb (Mrs. H. A.) Nealley</i>	<i>(L) Edgar Vigers Seeler, Jr.</i>
<i>Elizabeth Flint (Mrs. F. H.) Nesmith</i>	<i>(L) Katherine PerLee (Mrs. E. V., Jr.) Seeler</i>
<i>Edwin Broomell Newman</i>	<i>Eugenia Jackson (Mrs. P. P.) Sharples</i>
<i>Mary Beaumont (Mrs. E. B.) Newman</i>	<i>Philip Price Sharples</i>
<i>Emily Alan Smith (Mrs. J. T. G.) Nichols</i>	<i>**Helen Davis (Mrs. W.) Shumway</i>
<i>John Taylor Gilman Nichols</i>	<i>Carol Mary Smith</i>
<i>Edward Wentworth Norris</i>	<i>Clement Andrew Smith</i>
<i>Emma Salom (Mrs. E. W.) Norris</i>	<i>Edna Stevenson Smith</i>
<i>Grace Wyeth (Mrs. A. P.) Norris</i>	<i>(L) Margaret Beal Earhart (Mrs. C. A.) Smith</i>
<i>Penelope Barker Noyes</i>	<i>William Stevenson Smith</i>
<i>Joseph A. O'Gorman</i>	<i>Livingston Stebbins</i>
<i>Isabel Marchant (Mrs. W. G.) O'Neil</i>	<i>Arthur Engene Sutherland</i>
<i>Walter George O'Neil</i>	<i>Susanne Adams (Mrs. A. E.) Sutherland</i>
<i>Doris Madelyn (Mrs. F. M.) Palmer</i>	<i>Ellamae McKee (Mrs. W. D.) Swan</i>
<i>Foster McCrum Palmer</i>	<i>William Donnison Swan</i>
<i>Nancy Johnson (Mrs. S. B.) Parker</i>	<i>Charles Lincoln Taylor</i>
<i>Stanley Brampton Parker</i>	<i>Hannah Chamberlin (Mrs. C. L.) Taylor</i>
<i>Frederica Watson (Mrs. Wm. L.) Payson</i>	<i>Helen Ingersoll Tetlow</i>
<i>William Lincoln Payson</i>	
<i>Barbara Welch (Mrs. E.) Peabody</i>	

<p><i>* Alice Allegra Thorp</i></p> <p><i>(L) Eleanor Gray (Mrs. H. D.) Tudor</i></p> <p><i>(L) Mary Wellington (Mrs. K. 5.) Usher</i></p> <p><i>Mabel Henderson (Mrs. W.E.) Vandermark</i></p> <p><i>Elizabeth Perry Stevens (Mrs. F. A.) Vaughan</i></p> <p><i>* Robert Walcott</i></p> <p><i>John Reed Walden</i></p> <p><i>Olive Ely Allen (Mrs. F. D.) Washburn</i></p> <p><i>Henry Bradford Washburn</i></p> <p><i>Harriet Eaton (Mrs. T. N.) Whitehead</i></p> <p><i>Thomas North Whitehead</i></p> <p><i>Jane Revere Coolidge (Mrs. W. M.) Whitehill</i></p> <p><i>Walter Muir Whitehill</i></p>	<p><i>Charles Frederick Whiting</i></p> <p><i>Constance Bigelow Williston</i></p> <p><i>Grace Davenport (Mrs. H. J.) Winslow</i></p> <p><i>Henry Joshua Winslow</i></p> <p><i>Henry Wise</i></p> <p><i>Pearl (Mrs. H.) Wise</i></p> <p><i>Mary Andrews (Mrs. R. L.) Wolff</i></p> <p><i>Robert Lee Wolff</i></p> <p><i>Alice Russell (Mrs. J. W.) Wood</i></p> <p><i>(A) John Russell Wood</i></p> <p><i>John William Wood</i></p> <p><i>Charles Conrad Wright</i></p> <p><i>Charles Henry Conrad Wright</i></p> <p><i>Elizabeth Hilgendorff (Mrs. C. C.) Wright</i></p> <p><i>Elizabeth Woodman (Mrs. C. H. C.) Wright</i></p>
--	---

BY-LAWS

As adopted 17 June 1905, with amendments to 24 April 1956

I. CORPORATE NAME

The name of this corporation shall be "The Cambridge Historical Society."

II. OBJECT

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

III. REGULAR MEMBERSHIP

Any resident of, or person having a usual place of business in, the City of Cambridge, Massachusetts, or any town or city within twenty-five miles of the city limits of said Cambridge, shall be eligible for regular membership in this Society. Nominations for such membership shall be made in writing to any member of the Council, and the persons so nominated may be elected at any meeting of the Council by a vote of two-thirds of the members present and voting. Persons so elected shall become members upon payment of the current fees.

IV. LIMIT OF REGULAR MEMBERSHIP

The regular membership of this Society shall be limited to two hundred and twenty-five.

V. HONORARY MEMBERSHIP

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

137

VI. ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP

An indefinite number of associate members may be elected provided that such candidates are not eligible for Regular Membership as defined in Article III of these By-laws. Nominations for Associate Membership shall be made in writing to any member of the Council and the persons so nominated may be elected at any meeting of the Council by a vote of two-thirds of the members present and voting. Associate Members shall not be eligible for office and shall have no interest in the property of the Society and no right to vote.

VII. SEAL

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

VIII. OFFICERS

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

IX. DUTY OF PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT

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

X. DUTY OF SECRETARY

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

XI. DUTY OF THE TREASURER

The Treasurer shall have charge of the funds and securities, and shall keep in proper books the accounts of the Corporation. He shall receive and collect all fees and other dues owing to it, and all donations and testamentary gifts

138

made to it. He shall make all investments and disbursements of its funds, but only with the approval of the Council. He shall give the Society a bond, in amount and with sureties satisfactory to the Council, conditioned for the proper performance of his duties; but he may be excused from giving such bond, by majority vote of the Council. He shall make a written report at each Annual Meeting. Such report shall be audited prior to the Annual Meeting by one or more auditors appointed by the Council.

XII. DUTY OF EDITOR

The Editor shall have charge, under the direction of the Council, of the preparation for the press of the Society's proceedings and of their printing, publication, and distribution, as well as of the printing and distribution of other pamphlets and books issued by the Society for general circulation.

XIII. DUTY OF CURATOR

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

XIV. DUTY OF COUNCIL

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

XV. MEETINGS

The Annual Meeting shall be held on the fourth Tuesday in January in each year. Other regular meetings shall be held on the fourth Tuesdays of April and October of each year,

unless the President otherwise directs. Special meetings may be called by the President or by the Council.

XVI. QUORUM

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

XVII. FEES

The amount of the annual assessment for regular and associate members shall be fixed from time to time by majority vote of the Council; and this assessment shall be payable in advance at the Annual Meeting. But any regular member shall be exempted from the annual payment if at any time after his admission, he shall pay into the Treasury One Hundred Dollars in addition

139

to his previous payments, and any Associate member shall be similarly exempted on payment of Fifty Dollars. All commutations shall be and remain permanently funded, the interest only to be used for current expenses.

XVIII. RESIGNATION OF MEMBERSHIP

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

XIX. DISSOLUTION

If at any time the active membership falls below ten, this Society may be dissolved at the written request of three members, according to the laws and statutes of this Commonwealth.

XX. DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY UPON DISSOLUTION

Upon dissolution of the Society, the books, manuscripts, collections, the invested and other funds of the Society, and such other property as it may have, shall be transferred to such institution or institutions doing similar work as may seem best to the members of the Society.

XXI. AMENDMENT OF BY-LAWS

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

140
