

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
BROOKLINE
HISTORICAL SOCIETY
FOR 1969-1974



PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
BROOKLINE
HISTORICAL SOCIETY
FOR 1969-1974



BROOKLINE, MASSACHUSETTS 02146

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY

1975

Last copy

CONTENTS

1969

	PAGE
HIGH STREET HILL IN THE EIGHTIES, BY CAROLYN H. WETHERBEE	7
THE STORROW FAMILY OF HIGH STREET HILL, BY S. MORTON VOSE	10
A MODERN DWELLING FROM A 19TH CENTURY STABLE, BY ROBERT M. ADAMS	13
DESMOND FITZGERALD'S ART GALLERY, BY S. MORTON VOSE	15
COLLECTORS AND COLLECTIONS IN GREATER BOSTON, SOME PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS, BY CHARLES D. CHILDS	17

1970

OFFICERS	19
REPORT OF THE TREASURER	20
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ROOMS	21

	PAGE
AMY LOWELL OF BROOKLINE: PATTERNS OF A LIFE, BY PETER C. ROLLINS	23
HISTORY OF THE PUTTERHAM SCHOOL, BY NINA F. LITTLE	45

1971

OFFICERS	47
REPORT OF THE TREASURER	48
ADVENTURES IN RESTORATION, BY GUSTAV D. KLIMAN . . .	49
INDIANS OF THE NORTHEAST, BY WENDELL S. HADLOCK . . .	51
A PERMANENT GREEN CORRIDOR FROM THE CHARLES TO THE CHARLES, BY JAMES WHITE	54

1972

OFFICERS	62
REPORT OF THE TREASURER	63
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ROOMS	64
FREDERICK HENRY HEDGE: CONSERVATIVE SCHOLAR IN A LIBERAL FAITH, BY PETER C. ROLLINS IN COLLABORATION WITH OTTO VAN OS	65

	PAGE
THE OLMSTED FIRMS OF BROOKLINE, BY ARTEMAS P. RICHARDSON	74
DR. GEORGE CHEEVER SHATTUCK, BY ELMER O. CAPPERS	82
250 YEARS OF TOWN GOVERNMENT IN BROOKLINE, BY ARTHUR A. O'SHEA	85

1973

OFFICERS	90
REPORT OF THE TREASURER	91
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ROOMS	92
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE PUTTERHAM SCHOOL	93
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH	94
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PAPERS	95
REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT	96
BROOKLINE AND PUBLIC HEALTH: SMALLPOX AND POLIO BY DR. FRANCIS D. MOORE	98
SOME REMARKS CONCERNING THE CABOT ESTATE, BY FRANCIS A. CASWELL	107
THE BROOKLINE HISTORICAL SOCIETY, BY ELMER O. CAPPERS .	112

1974

	PAGE
OFFICERS	119
REPORT OF THE TREASURER	120
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ROOMS	121
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE PUTTERHAM SCHOOL	123
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH	124
REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT	125
PERNICIOUS ANEMIA YIELDS TO NEW ENGLAND CHARACTER, BY DR. WILLIAM B. CASTLE	126
<hr/>	
BY-LAWS	132
LIST OF MEMBERS - 1975	138

1972
OFFICERS

PRESIDENT

ARTHUR A. O'SHEA

VICE-PRESIDENT

ELMER O. CAPPERS

TREASURER

J. FREDERICK NELSON

CLERK

CAROLYN H. WETHERBEE

TRUSTEES

MRS. YVES HENRY BUHLER, MRS. THERESA A. CARROLL,

REV. FRANCIS A. CASWELL, MR. RICHARD T. LEARY,

MISS MAUD OXENHAM, MR. S. MORTON VOSE, II,

MRS. GARDNER WASHBURN, and the officers, ex-officio

The Annual Meeting of the Brookline Historical Society will be held at the Edward Devotion House on Sunday, February 6, 1972, at 3 o'clock.

After the business meeting there will be a talk on "Frederick Henry Hedge, Brookline Transcendentalist" by Mr. Otto Van Os in collaboration with Mr. Peter C. Rollins.

Carolyn H. Wetherbee, *Clerk*

THE BROOKLINE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Treasurer's Annual Report – 1971

Cash on hand January 1, 1971

Brookline Savings Bank		
90 Day Special Account	\$17,175.34	
Regular Account	831.37	
Charles B. Blanchard – Memorial Permanent Fund	517.30	
Charles B. Blanchard – One half Annual Interest accumulated Fund for Special Use	17.29	
Brookline Trust Company Checking Account	541.51	\$19,082.81

Income during 1971

50% Rebate for restoring portraits – Paid by the Mass. Arts and Humanities Council	\$ 845.60	
Membership Dues	964.00	
Interest – Brookline Savings – 90 Day Special Account	915.14	
Regular Account	75.59	
Charles B. Blanchard Memorial Fund	28.78	
Income from the estate of Josephine H. Wilder	67.63	
Book Sales – “Some Old Brookline Houses”	14.75	
Donations	41.00	\$ 2,952.49
		\$22,035.30

Payments during 1971

Secretary's Expenses	\$ 115.62	
Treasurer's Expenses	11.00	
Insurance Premium	353.00	
Collations	26.96	
Chair Rentals	70.00	
Service Charge – Brookline Savings Bank	7.39	
Bay State Historical League Dues	8.00	
New England Council Listing	5.00	
Massachusetts Tax – Secretary of State Filing	5.00	
Attorney General Filing	3.00	
Audit and Tax Services	40.00	
Putterham School – Repairs and Equipment	458.11	
Restoration of Portraits	1,736.84	
Cataloguing Manuscripts	241.90	
Bronze plaque and Installation of boulder to mark original Putterham School site	310.00	\$ 3,391.82

Cash on hand December 31, 1971

Brookline Savings Bank		
90 Day Special Account	\$16,083.09	
Regular Account	1,806.96	
Charles B. Blanchard Memorial Permanent Fund	531.69	
Charles B. Blanchard – One half Annual Interest accumulated Fund for Special Use	31.68	
Brookline Trust Company Checking Account	190.06	\$18,643.48
		\$22,035.30

Respectfully submitted,
J. FREDERICK NELSON
Treasurer

January 20, 1972

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ROOMS

This has been a good year for visitation at the Devotion House with classes from the Lawrence, Devotion and Pierce Schools going through the house. In addition during the summer children of the Learning Disabilities Clinic for Dyslexia of Boston University, and from the summer school in Brookline also visited. There were also two visits from Girl Scout troops under the direction of Mrs. Shea of Brookline; two meetings held in the house by the D.A.R.; and one by the Field and Outlook Club.

Students came from M.I.T., Boston State and Boston College, Boston University, Harvard and Northeastern University. Individual visitors came from Anchorage, Alaska; Israel, Germany and Ireland as well as many states in New England and elsewhere. Total number of visitors including school children was 367.

In 1971 we again sent an entry to the New England Council's guide to "Historic Houses & Museums of New England", and response to this was no doubt partly responsible for some of the visitation.

As usual the April 19th Patriot's Day celebration was a big success with participation of the Brookline Recreation Dept., Ancient and Honorable Soc., Golden Age Club, Selectmen, and Boy Scouts. Mrs. McIntosh and I have consulted with Miss Thayer and Miss Coons on sorting and arranging the historical documents belonging to the Historical Society which they are so kindly cataloging for us.

No repairs have been made to the house during 1971 by the Town, although an out-of-control automobile did damage to the fence and front door during October.

Respectfully submitted,

NINA F. LITTLE

Chairman, Committee on Rooms

**FREDERICK HENRY HEDGE:
Conservative Scholar in a Liberal Faith**

by OTTO VAN OS and PETER C. ROLLINS

I: Frederick Henry Hedge: Transcendentalist

Frederick Henry Hedge has always remained one of the lesser luminaries of the Transcendental Movement. We only remember Hedge (if we think of him at all) because Emerson sometimes referred to the meetings of the Transcendentalists as the "Hedge Club."

Born in 1805, Hedge belonged to that first generation of young Americans who went to Europe in search of education. Under the supervision of his tutor, George Bancroft, Hedge spent five years at German Gymnasias. Thus, when things German became of interest in New England, Hedge was one of the very few who did not have to depend upon translations or interpretations of the new ideas, but could plunge directly into the original sources themselves.

At the Harvard Divinity School, Hedge met Emerson and encouraged him to study German. Emerson characteristically declined — he felt that German could not amount to much if he was not interested in it. Yet Emerson respected Hedge's somewhat different orientation and felt that he could learn from him. In 1833, shortly after Hedge published an article on Coleridge in the *Christian Examiner*, Emerson wrote to his brother Edward: "Henry Hedge is an unfolding man who has just now written the best pieces that have appeared in the Examiner and one especially was a living, leaping Logos and he may help me."

Indeed, it is not difficult to see that Hedge anticipated many radical notions that were to become popular among his peers, for Hedge's articles *did* leap. For example, he defended Coleridge against those critics who charged the literary philosopher with obscurity. Hedge was ready to admit that Coleridge's style was often convoluted, but Hedge added tartly that "we are inclined . . . to suspect that the greater part of this alleged obscurity exists in the mind of the reader, and not in the author." Hedge felt that New Englanders were especially obtuse and wrongheaded in their reading of Coleridge's speculations: "there is no taste for hardy application, no capacity for vigorous and manly thought." In short, Hedge behaved very much as the precocious young man who accused an older generation of allowing its intellectual nerve to go slack: "A hard word scares us, a proposition which does not explain itself at first glance, troubles us; whatever is supersensual, and cannot be made plain by images addressed to the senses, is denounced as obscure, or beckoned away as mystical and extravagant. Whatever lies beyond the limits of ordinary and outward experience is regarded as the ancient geographers regarded the greater portion of the globe — as a land of shadows and chimeras."

German scholars had proved themselves of hardier mettle. The young Hedge was presumptuous enough to claim that one could not understand the ideas of modern Germany unless one was "with it;" "In order to understand Transcendentalism we must raise ourselves at once to a Transcendental point of view, and take one's stand from the interior consciousness, a state of free intuition to be attained by a vigorous effort of the will." If the stodgy readers of the *Christian Examiner* could not comprehend the rebellion of the younger generation, they had only themselves to blame.

Hedge also shared with Emerson an inner uncertainty about the direction of his own life and thought. Margaret Fuller sensed the gravity of this dilemma, the more so after Hedge wrote to her about wanting to found a "society" of like-minded young thinkers. In 1833, she wrote Hedge from Groton: "Could you once be brought into unison with your day and country without sacrificing your individuality all would be well. Let me once more entreat you to write to bring your opinions into collision with those generally received."

Margaret Fuller here articulates the central *motif* underlying the Transcendental movement: the young rebels wanted to join actively with the issues and problems of their society, but they feared that participation would lead to an eclipse of individuality. They had to face the paradox that they could only act on the minds of others by bringing their opinions into collision with those generally received. This indeed was their creative paradox: in order to link themselves to society, they were willing to constantly entertain the necessity of revolt. It may well be that Frederick Henry Hedge has remained a minor figure among them because he was disturbed rather than stimulated by this paradox. Rather than exploiting it as did Margaret Fuller and Emerson, Hedge sought to resolve it.

Emerson sensed this fear of tension in his friend quite early. We mentioned that Emerson described Hedge in 1833 as an "unfolding man." Yet two years later, Emerson confided to his journal that Hedge was not really destined to unfold into a full, transcendental bloom. Instead, he saw that Hedge was seeking a more conservative and modest place, "uniting strangely the old and the new." The mixed reactions to Hedge's *Christian Examiner* article on Coleridge is a good case in point. Emerson may have thought of it as a potential Transcendental bombshell, yet Henry Ware, Jr. found that his fellow Unitarian ministers were equally well pleased with the piece.

If we re-examine the Coleridge article with an understanding that it pleased both Transcendentalists and Unitarians, we can begin to pinpoint Hedge's position. First, no "true believer" would have lingered so long over Coleridge's limitations. Furthermore, Hedge displayed a real fear of the excesses to which a sanguine Transcendentalism might lead, especially if Transcendentalism meant celebrating the liberation of an "absolute self

... incapable of being determined by anything higher than itself." Thus, in spite of his own Transcendental leanings, Hedge drew back from a full-fledged radicalism of the self.

We are not trying to condemn Hedge for being less radical than his Transcendental friends. Rather, we feel that he remained a minor figure because he limited his spectrum of imaginative possibilities: his refusal to admit the validity of the radical posture made him cease to speculate on it, and in doing so to give *form* to it. Here is where Hedge and Emerson definitely parted company, as Emerson clearly understood: "I owe him gratitude for all his manifest kindness to me, though he is quite wrong to say he loves me, for I am sure he does not quite."

Hedge not only missed the opportunity for greatness by dismissing the novel idea of his time too hastily, he shied from accepting the responsibilities of leadership at a moment when leaders were needed most. Hedge's inability to come forward at the opportune moment is best revealed in his dealings with Margaret Fuller and Emerson when the *Dial* was being launched. As early as 1834, Hedge had suggested the idea of a periodical. Nothing had come of his proposal, but in 1840 the time seemed ripe. Margaret Fuller wrote to Hedge that she needed him: "We depend on you for the first number, and for solid bullion, too. Mr. Emerson will write every number and so will you if you are good and politic, for it is the best way to be heard from your sentry-box there in Bangor . . . in the journal you will write to us constantly and of your best life."

The best of one's life. We should be grateful to the Transcendentalists for giving shape to it by publishing it. Yet at this creative moment, Hedge felt spent and prematurely old: "No one can feel a stronger interest in the new journal than myself. I conceived the plan of one and urged its execution in conversation with Ripley and others some five years since. Then, I could have been the editor. I felt equal to any amount of literary labor. But I have grown less enterprising and more diffident . . . I should like now, if possible, to have no other part in it than that of reader and subscriber." Hedge revealed more when he continued that "you frighten me with your sudden announcement."

Hedge was mistrustful of the direction which the *Dial* was likely to take. He might contribute to the *Dial*, but he insisted that he remain anonymous and added significantly, "I wish you would all do so," for he felt that the mystery surrounding anonymity was not worth sacrificing for "the Quakerish downrightness of signatures and first persons singular." The best of one's life, then, could well do without a Transcendental ego.

Emerson confided to Margaret Fuller that the *Dial* might succeed better without Hedge's support. Hedge did not show sufficient sympathy for the fundamental Transcendentalist belief that the center of gravity had shifted from society to the individual. This was an egoistic doctrine which Hedge was unwilling to accept. Emerson was growing increasingly pessimistic about his friend's potential: "Hedge's view of the matter is to

me quite worthless. The poor old public stand just where they always did — garrulous orthodox conservative whilst you say nothing; silent the instant you speak; and perfectly and universally convertible the moment the right word comes. If three or four friends undertake the book, I will answer for the world.”

Hedge was as aware as Emerson of the differences which separated him from his friend. In reviewing Emerson's *Essays: Second Series* for the *Christian Examiner* in 1845, Hedge attempted to clarify these differences, while giving full due to Emerson's merits. Hedge praised Emerson for placing strong emphasis on “the present momentary life.” Hedge quoted with approval from Emerson's “New England Reformers,” for he admired Emerson for keeping his sanity in spite of the “ultraisms” of the day. It was true, Hedge admitted, that Emerson attached “great significance to these movements as an indication of the growing trust in the private, self-supplied powers of the individual,” yet Hedge especially relished Emerson's observation that reformers were “partial, they are not equal to the work they pretend.”

After giving Emerson his deserved praise, Hedge nevertheless felt constrained to scrutinize Emerson as a *Christian Examiner*, and here he found his Transcendental friend seriously wanting. Emerson's relation to the Christian church troubled Hedge. Although it would probably not destroy interest in Emerson as a writer, Hedge felt that Emerson's rejection of “a special and miraculous revelation” would inevitably and essentially qualify the general influence of his writings. Because Emerson regarded Christ as a “mere teacher of moral and religious truths” Hedge as a believer was forced to draw a line beyond which tolerance and imaginative sympathy could not go: “We profess our inability to comprehend how a mind, with any pretensions to philosophic culture, can be satisfied with it; how so acute a thinker as the writer of these essays can overlook the violence it does to that fundamental principle in philosophy, which requires an adequate cause for every effect, or can fail to perceive that, in its anxiety to avoid a miracle, it substitutes a greater wonder for a less.”

Hedge generously allowed that Emerson was a direct follower of Christ in his deep sympathy for humanity and his “genuine regard for individual man.” But Hedge was unwilling to venture beyond this rather unspecific acknowledgement, for Hedge had his own distinctive ideas about the uses of the past, the meaning of Christ, the place of the church, and the function of the scholar.

II: Hedge: Brookline Unitarian

In 1839 Hedge married Lucy Pierce, daughter of John Pierce, minister to the First Parish from 1796 until 1849. In 1857 he returned to Brookline to fill the place that had been left open by the death of his father-in-law. While Hedge had done considerable thinking and writing before his arrival in Brookline in 1857, during his fifteen years in our town

(1857-1872) his pen flowed more freely than at any other period in his career. Indeed, Hedge was quite busy during his Brookline years. From 1857 to 1861 he was editor of (and regular contributor to) the Unitarian quarterly, the *Christian Examiner* in which thirty-five years earlier he had made his *debut* as a young writer. From 1859 until 1862 he served as the President of the American Unitarian Association. Also during his Brookline years, Hedge held a part-time appointment in Church History in the Harvard Divinity School. His book, *Ways of the Spirit* (1877) grew out of his lecture course at the Divinity School. Finally, Hedge wrote his *magnum opus*, *Reason in Religion* while in Brookline. Thus Brookline may well claim the mature Henry Hedge, in his most prolific period, as her own.

Hedge's place in the Transcendental movement is defined by the value which he attached to the preservation of the past. Looking back upon the heyday of the Transcendental club, he mused that at that time he "seemed to discern a power and meaning in the old, which the more impassioned would not allow." Unlike his contemporaries, Hedge was partial to the historical rather than the visionary element of religion.

Above all, he believed that the progress of religion must not be abandoned to the wilful aberrations of individual inspiration: "such a dispensation once initiated in human society, is not left to itself to take what direction chance may impart." The inexorable movement of history had a pattern which it was the scholar's task to explain to his fellow men: "The world's history is not an aimless succession of events — a heap of facts fanned together by the flight of time, as the wind piles sand-drifts in the desert — but a process and a growth. The succession of events is rational; they follow each other by a necessary order." As Hedge grew older, he stressed more and more that this "necessary order" could only be comprehended through imaginative sympathy. Modern rebels would not judge the past so harshly if they could be taught to realize that their own thought, like the thought of the past, was immersed in the flow of history.

In short, to Transcendentalism Hedge owed his conviction that the Spirit was the motor of history, but he differed from the movement in his conviction that the Spirit used the Christian Church rather than the individual, as its vehicle. For this reason Hedge deplored the proliferation of sects within the Christian Church, because they only succeeded in locking valid elements of the universal design into isolated rooms.

Hedge saw it as his task to sift through the past in order to find the components that would achieve an ecumenical reunion among the multitude of alienated sects within the Christian religion. In this search, the incarnation of Christ became increasingly important to Hedge. The incarnation, Hedge believed, was not only historically significant *qua* doctrine. It seemed to him the only correct description of the relationship of Christ to His church. Furthermore, belief in Christ as a divine agent endowed the church with a distinctive, supernatural authority. On this point Hedge was adamant. The church was not merely a platform from which ministers dispensed a code of estimable ethics. It is "much more

than a system of moral philosophy. Christianity means a great deal more than that. It means participation of the Divine nature, through faith, and through the communion of the Spirit, of which the Church is supposed to be the repository and mediator." Without divine authority, which had been imparted to the church by Christ's incarnation, Hedge feared that the church would be unable to "carry weight with the mass of mankind."

In spite of some major flaws, Hedge felt that the Church of Rome had managed to do just that. Catholicism and other "legal" religions had shown their "superiority . . . over liberal Christianity as a method of Church-life." Given Hedge's admiration for churchly traditions, it is not surprising that he was critical of the inability of Unitarians to organize and discipline themselves. In an address of 1851 before a ministerial conference in Boston, Hedge lamented to his Unitarian colleagues:

We want more of the corporate spirit, a stronger sense of our denominational mission and calling, and through that of our relation with the Church Universal. I suppose there is no denomination of Christians in which there is so little of this spirit, so little concentration, so little care for their commonweal and its success. This I consider a fault in our connection, the result sometimes of a daintiness which refuses to mix with the mass in any movement and sometimes the result of an insensibility which ignores the obligation laid on every believer, in some way to cooperate for the maintenance and promotion of Christian truth.

Hedge's criticism of his Unitarian brethren is not dissimilar from George Ripley's strictures of Emerson when the latter decided not to participate in the experiment in cooperative living at Brook Farm. Emerson's journal reflections are famous; "I do wish to remove from my present prison to a prison a little larger, I wish to break all prisons. I have not yet conquered my own house . . . Shall I raise the siege of this hencoop and march baffled away to a pretended siege of Babylon?" But for Hedge, this Babylon was real enough. He felt that the impatience of liberal Christians with rites, forms, and scriptures was not necessarily proof of a larger spirituality. It was "often but a proof of weakness of faith — a want of power to penetrate into the soul of these things, to interpret their deeper import, and discover their latent life."

To many of his nineteenth century contemporaries, the claims of faith and reason seemed to contradict each other. Hedge, however, believed that a proper sense of the past would enable man to place himself in the world, without having to rely on his unpredictable emotions as his only guide. The problem for modern man, Hedge felt, was not so much that he should assert himself, but that he should sustain himself through time by carefully modifying and modestly readjusting his institutions. In Hedge's mind, this was not a case of pouring new wine into old bottles so much as injecting the proper amount of preservative in order that the mellowness of the ages could endure into the future. For Hedge only that "reason" which devoted

itself to dredging the truth out of past and present Christian ideals, could be considered as authentic. All other applications of intellect were destructive to the true ends of faith. They involved "mere curiosity, a thirst for mental excitement amusing itself with mental pictures, as a child turns over the leaves of his picture book, or pulls its playthings to pieces, with a scrutiny in which there is more love of marvel than of wise research."

For Hedge, then, the truths of religion did not exist on a transcendental plane. Religious truths would be understood only after an imaginative projection of the self into the lessons taught by history:

Ecclesiastical continuity means that mankind does not consciously and wilfully foreshape its own future; That history is not the product of human foresight, but divine ordination, education. . . The individual may think he is rid of it, but his fancied emancipation is only the flight of the aeronaut, who seems to detach himself from the earth when he cuts the rope which held his balloon; but all the while an invisible rope — we call it gravitation — has fast hold of him. The length of his tether is the quantity of gas there is in him. The gas escapes, the tether shortens; the gas all gone, ecclesiastical continuity resumes its sway.

An "Anti-Supernaturalism in the Pulpit" (1865) Hedge addressed himself to the increase of arid intellectualism in the Harvard Divinity School. Rather than helping young men to assume their posts as ministers, their training undermined their faith in the divinity of Christ, and hence their ability to speak with real authority.

The authority of a young man just entering the ministry who shall be understood to speak from no warrant but his private opinion, with only his own talent or his own conceit to back him, cannot be exactly measured, but we are safe in placing it somewhere in the neighborhood of zero.

Hedge summarized the impact of this dysfunctional education with a humorous, *reductio ad absurdum*: at the end of his three years of training, the divinity student discovers that his work has "Brought him to accept, as his solution to the great historical and miraculous fact of Christianity, the theory thus stated by a recent critic — that 1800 years ago, in Galilee on the shores of Tiberias and round about Judea — 'nothing happened.'"

Hedge's diatribe against the destructive use of individual reason was not allowed to go unanswered. Daniel Bowen defended the prerogatives of individual judgment in a pamphlet aptly titled "Authority Assumed: A Review of Rev. Dr. Hedge's Address 'Anti-Supernaturalism in the Pulpit.'" Bowen and Hedge obviously disagreed on many points of doctrine, but what most interests us is the contrast of sensibility.

Bowen's pamphlet radiates a shining confidence in the authenticity of religion as a living, inward experience. While Bowen does not reject the record of history, he sees the past as a resource to be consulted rather than an inexorable caravan to be joined. Instead, Bowen encourages us to use history according to our own lights. We should sift through it and control it, rather than submit to it. Bowen's demand for religious experience is too strong, and too personally rooted for him to accept the detached, "historical" perspective which Hedge revered.

Ultimately, of course, each man had his own content for the general term, "faith." Hedge feared that if "faith" was exclusively tied to the individual temper, it was bound to degenerate into an irrational, erratic emotion. To counter this, Hedge felt the need for institutional and traditional boundaries understood through the prism of a reason turned to the past, not to unmask it, but to comprehend it. Bowen saw no need for such timidity: "Faith apprehends divine realities as sense perceives the outward world. The belief in traditions, be they true history or not, is not religious faith. It belongs to the secular and not the sacred part of our nature." Because his idea of faith was pinned to individual inspiration, Bowen saw the source of a minister's authority to flow from personal commitment and public example rather than institutional association:

There is . . . something to be said in behalf of that 'young man' who stands up in the presence of his fellow men, clothed less with priestly sanctions than with the consciousness of sincerity and something to say; who speaks, not because he has been told something as tradition, but because of the inward, irresistible prompting. . . There was once such a thing as men, old and young, speaking as they were moved by the Holy Spirit; and if it is no longer possible to do so, then divine authority no longer exists, and it is worse than vain to parade a show of it.

Bowen's most telling criticism of Hedge grows out of his sense that supernatural authority is a matter of "facts of personal inward experience" rather than what Hedge emphasizes so often, "facts dependent upon outward testimony." Hedge's mistrust of the inward experience, Bowen concludes, has led the Brookline divine to a position which was suicidal to Unitarianism as a liberal faith. Bowen warned that Unitarianism "flourished so long as it . . . contended for . . . our God-given reason," that by tipping its hat to orthodoxy, it will "forget its proper mission." If it lost its confidence in the individual, "Why should it prosper, or even survive?"

The two men also disagreed in their views on Christ. Whereas Hedge held up a meek and modifying Christ who "accepted the conditions of his lot . . . and made his life divine by perfect obedience to those conditions," Bowen presented the ideal of a man who "did not devote himself to reshaping effete creeds and forms," who "supplanted ancient maxims by the insight of a present inspiration." And present inspiration is of course always "new." To Bowen, history proceeded in discontinuous leaps:

“There are crises in all growths, when great and radical changes are demanded, without which the life would become extinct.” On the other hand, according to Hedge, history evolved by a process of slow development. Its main characteristic was continuity rather than crisis.

Reason in Religion was Hedge’s most eloquent plea for religion as a corporate, historically conscious experience, but again his fellow Unitarians balked. In a review of this *magnum opus*, Francis Abbot, like Daniel Bowen before him, reiterated that the pieces of history, of biblical criticism, and the insights of the Bible are all useless and inert by themselves: “private experience and individual consciousness, the scriptures of creation and of literature, the facts of history, and the whole circle of the sciences become data for the soul’s analysis, and *thus alone* have theological worth.”

The soul’s analysis was all that one needed if one wanted to publish the best of one’s life. Both Hedge’s Transcendental and Unitarian friends rejoiced in this discovery. They admonished their friend for falling behind, for had he not been one of the first to point the way? The irony was that Frederick Henry Hedge, the class poet at Harvard in 1825, had given up the adventure of poetry for the stability of history. William H. Lyon, who became pastor to the First Church of Brookline in 1896, has left us a portrait of Hedge at the end of his Brookline period. The year was 1871, just before Hedge moved to Cambridge to become professor of German Literature — and it is here that we take leave of him:

It was a beautiful day in a beautiful town, and I recall a crabapple tree just outside the window that was a wonderful mass of joyous blossoms. Of the conversation, however, I recall nothing. I suspect that I was in such mortal awe before the great scholar that I understood little of what was said. . . He was a man of the study rather than the world, and at ease with thoughts rather than with persons. Mingled with my reverence for his profound scholarship and his lofty thought, there has been ever since the tender memory. . . of a heart, as it were, imprisoned in the habits of a student.

SPRING MEETING – May 14, 1972

The Spring Meeting of the Brookline Historical Society will be held at the workshop of Olmsted Associates, 99 Warren Street, Brookline, on Sunday, May 14, 1972, at three o'clock.

Mr. Artemas P. Richardson will speak on "The Olmsted Firms of Brookline."

Carolyn H. Wetherbee, *Clerk*

THE OLMSTED FIRMS OF BROOKLINE

*Address to the Brookline Historical Society
on 14 May 1972 by Artemas P. Richardson
President – Olmsted Associates, Inc.
at the Olmsted office, 99 Warren Street
Brookline, Massachusetts*

Had his body somehow survived as his spirit has, Frederick Law Olmsted would have observed his 150th birthday on April 26th this year. In New York's *Central Park* he might have been the guest of honor at the celebration of his birth – marked by a turnout of almost 10,000 persons, by a guided bicycle tour, a 19th Century costume contest, sunbathing, ice-cream, balloons, and a 28-foot birthday cake, iced with cream cheese and made to resemble a giant map of the park which he designed with Calvert Vaux in 1858.

He might well have been aghast – as newspaper accounts suggest – at the blaring of transistor radios, the ostentatiousness of the cake, the odd variety of the costuming (some shockingly scanty, even by today's standards)! He would, however, have been tremendously gratified by the continuing broad use of the park, and by the evidences on every side of a universal interest in ecology – even expressed in the crowd's enthusiastic singing of "Happy Birthday – Happy Earthday – to Olmsted".

He might, of course, have attended celebrations of his birthday in Chicago, Cincinnati, San Francisco, at the University of Michigan's Department of Landscape Architecture, or at any of a hundred or more parks or campuses across the country.

So important has been the impact of this man and the firms which he founded that this year is marked as his sesqui-centennial by Olmsted Committees and Associations throughout the United States. In Metropolitan Boston the week of July 24th will spotlight his contributions and invite the involvement of men, women and children in preserving and extending the heritage which he left us by his foresighted planning of an unsurpassed system of parks, playgrounds and open spaces. In October, major exhibitions of his works will open simultaneously at New York's Whitney Museum and at Washington's National Gallery of Art. Later these

will become travelling exhibitions, conveniently available to hundreds of thousands of people throughout the Country. Don't be surprised if F.L.O.'s picture beams at you from the cover of *Life*, *Time*, or another national magazine in the course of the next few months.

My concern today (and yours), stimulated of course by this moment in history, is not with Olmsted alone, but with the firms he founded. It is in particular with the activities, the contributions, and the personalities of the Olmsted firms of Brookline, whose offices, since 1883, have been right here where you are seated, at 99 Warren Street.

We must recognize at the outset, however, the wide scope of the work of the Olmsted firms, encompassing the design of city, State and National parks, of school and college campuses, hospital grounds, industrial sites, residential subdivisions, cemeteries, town and city plans, individual residential properties, arboretums, highways, housing project sites, cathedral and church developments, civic centers and monuments. These developments have been carried out in every corner of the United States, but also in Canada, Bermuda, Central America – even in Europe. Olmsted is acknowledged as the father of Landscape Architecture in the United States, and it has been through the efforts and the talents of his partners and successors in the Olmsted firms that Landscape Architecture got a professional society; that the first schools of Landscape Architecture and of City Planning were established in the United States. I will call your attention, furthermore, to the leadership which the principals of the Olmsted firms have given for 150 years to civic, State and National boards, commissions, committees and associations.

For these reasons Brookline has received – and is now receiving – more National attention than would otherwise have been the case, and we should all share a pride in the fact that for almost a century the name Olmsted has been identified with our town.

Before moving to Brookline, Olmsted had already accomplished more than most men do in a lifetime. He was renowned as an author, traveller, economic and social commentator, and historian, with such significant works published as “Walks and Talks of an American Farmer in England” (1852), “A Journey in the Seaboard Slave States” (1856), “A Journey in Texas” (1857), and “A Journey in the Back Country” (1860). He had worked as publisher of *Putnam's Magazine* and served as Superintendent of Central Park in New York and as Secretary of the United States Sanitary Commission in Washington. With Calvert Vaux he had designed not only Central Park, but Prospect Park in Brooklyn as well. He had designed the *Riverside* subdivision in Chicago, Chicago's South Park, worked on the Buffalo and Montreal parks and on the grounds of the United States Capitol. He had worked for Johns Hopkins University, Vassar College and for Trinity College in Hartford. He is reported to have been a candidate for Vice President of the United States in 1872, running on the Independent Liberal Republican ticket with William S. Groesbeck of Cincinnati.

His planning involvements in the Boston area became greater and greater, including design for the McLean Hospital, for the Boston parks and for various Boston and Albany Railroad stations. In the winter of 1882-83, he lived in the Taylor house on Dudley Street, and in 1883 purchased the Joshua Clark House at 99 Warren Street, establishing both his home and his office here.

John Charles Olmsted was born in Geneva, Switzerland on September 14, 1852. His father, brother of Frederick Law Olmsted, was Dr. John Hull Olmsted — his mother, Mary Cleveland Bryant Olmsted. In 1859, following Dr. John Olmsted's death, Frederick married his brother's widow, becoming step-father to her children. John travelled with his step-father and absorbed his teachings. In 1875 he graduated from Yale University with a Bachelor of Philosophy from the Sheffield Scientific School. Three years later he was given a partial partnership with his step-father, and in 1884, following the move to Brookline, the firm name was made "F.L. and J.C. Olmsted", at which time John received a full partnership.

For more than 40 years, until his death in 1920, John played a major role both in the office and in his profession. He was a founder, and first president, of the American Society of Landscape Architects — holding office as president longer than anyone in succeeding years. He was responsible for a major part of the design and site detail for the Columbian Exposition, for the 1909 Seattle Exposition, the Lewis and Clarke Exposition in Portland (1906) and the Canadian Industrial Exposition at Winnipeg, Manitoba. Though his work was most notable of large scale — universities, parks, institutions and industries — he did work on numerous private residential properties as well.

On August 15, 1889, Frederick Law Olmsted announced a new partnership, "F. L. Olmsted and Co." to succeed "F. L. and J. C. Olmsted". The new firm included as a partner, in addition to Frederick and John, Henry Sargent Codman. In making his announcement, F.L.O. wrote: "Mr. Codman, during the past two years, has been studying under the general direction of one of the foremost European Landscape Architects, and has closely followed the progress of his numerous works both in design and construction."

Unfortunately, Codman's association was of short duration, for he died in 1893. During his partnership, he was deeply involved in the Columbian Exposition design, spending much of his time in Chicago. A month after Codman's death, Charles Eliot was taken into partnership with Frederick and John, and in March the firm name was again changed, this time to "Olmsted, Olmsted and Eliot".

Charles Eliot at that time was 33 years old, having been born in Cambridge in November, 1859. His father, a mathematics Assistant Professor at the time of his birth, had been appointed President of Harvard University in 1869. Like Henry Codman, Charles Eliot's important

contributions to the firm were cut short by his untimely death after only 4 years of partnership. An important autobiographical book, "Charles Eliot, Landscape Architect", has for many years been required reading in Landscape Architectural schools, discussing philosophy of design and presenting specific, down-to-earth examples. Through this work and the writings of other Landscape Architects, we see Charles Eliot as a driving and creative force in the establishment of much of the Boston park system and the park areas surrounding Boston. Franklin Park, Jamaica Pond, the Arborway and the Muddy River development owe much to Eliot's personal involvement. His death in 1897 was quite sudden. On March 17th, he stayed at home, feeling that he had taken cold. The symptoms became rapidly more severe, with pain extending into his head and back. Though at first it was assumed that he had contracted grippe, it became evident that he had cerebrospinal meningitis, and he died within a week.

A little over a year earlier, in September, 1895, Frederick Law Olmsted had retired from professional practice. Now, with only John left as a principal of the firm, his younger step-brother F.L.O., Jr. was taken into partnership, and again the name of the firm became "F. L. and J. C. Olmsted" — this time, of course, with a different F. L.

At this time, Frederick, Jr., was 27 years old. He had graduated first from the Roxbury Latin School and then, magna cum laude, from Harvard in 1894. During the period preceding his partnership, he worked under his father's eye at the Columbian Exposition in Chicago and on other jobs. Much of this work was done during his summer vacations, while still at Harvard. On his graduation he entered the firm, full time, as an assistant, gaining further experience prior to his partnership.

In his early years he was keenly interested in the aesthetic considerations of the profession, and took delight in working out residential developments in beautiful detail. In later years, he turned more and more away from residential developments to devote himself to broader considerations of urban design and conservation. The junior F.L.O. was particularly gifted as an organizer and leader, and it was this ability which not only made it possible for him to organize the office into working departments, to set up advanced filing and bookkeeping systems, and to surround himself with talented staff members, but which caused him to be appointed to a number of extremely important posts. In 1898 he was appointed landscape architect to the M.D.C. of Boston. In 1900, on the initiative of President Charles Eliot, he was appointed to inaugurate the first course of study in Landscape Architecture to be offered in the United States, and headed the department at Harvard until 1915. He was appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt as a member of the Senate Park Commission in 1901, and as a member of the Fine Arts Commission from 1910 to 1918. Later he served on the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and as consultant and advisor to numerous Congressional Committees.

In 1898 the firm name was again changed, but this time with no change in partnership, to "OLMSTED BROTHERS", the name it retained for 63 years and shared with ten more partners, always centered in Brookline, Massachusetts, but at various times having branch offices in such places as Fort Tryon Park, New York; Palos Verdes, California; Baltimore, Maryland; and Mountain Lake, Florida. Designs developed by Olmsted Brothers in Brookline included such names as Rock Creek Park in Washington, D.C.; Duke University in Durham, N.C.; Roland Park, Baltimore; the Cleveland Museum of Art; the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, D.C.; and the American Military Cemetery, Cambridge, England.

Time precludes my devoting to each of the Olmsted Brothers partners the biographical detail that they deserve, for each was himself a giant in the profession, and each chose to submerge his personal identity to that of Olmsted Brothers.

Percival Gallagher, partner from 1906 until his death in 1934, was identified particularly with the development of city and county parks, notably for work in the northern counties of New Jersey — Essex, Union and Passaic; and for design on school and college campuses, such as Phillips Andover, Duke University and Haverford College. He was an artist and a horticulturist.

Henry Hubbard, partner from 1921 until his death in 1947, is particularly remembered as a teacher — both of Landscape Architecture and of City Planning. Both of these functions he pursued at Harvard University, where he instituted the planning department. In the office, his opinions were highly valued, for he was a talented analyst and could pick the grain from the chaff when others could not. An author as well, Henry Hubbard and Theodora Kimball's book, "Landscape Design" has been a basic reference in Landscape Architectural schools since 1917.

Edward Clark Whiting, who came to the office of Olmsted Brothers in 1904, was made an Associate Partner in 1920, and a full partner in 1927. His facility with grading and construction, and his grasp of general design principals made him an invaluable member of the firm until his death in 1962.

James Frederick Dawson, son of the first Superintendent of the Arnold Arboretum, became an Associate of Olmsted Brothers in 1906 and a full partner in 1922. Like Percival Gallagher, he was both an horticulturist and an artist, with a far greater interest in a park development or a private residential site than with a city plan or a subdivision. His facility with design, like that of Ted Whiting, had a strong impact on those who were privileged to work with him. Mr. Dawson died while still actively a partner of the firm in 1941.

Leon H. Zach became a partner of the firm in 1938 and withdrew in 1941 to serve the U.S. Government as chief of the planning branch of

military construction in the Army's office of the Chief of Engineers. He later became President of the American Society of Landscape Architects. An able organizer and designer, Mr. Zach's short association with Olmsted Brothers at the period just preceding World War II had a less lasting impact than that of the other partners.

William Bell Marquis, who is the senior surviving partner of Olmsted Brothers, came to the firm in 1919, serving as a designer and supervisor until he became a partner in 1937. He is a past member and chairman of the Planning Board of the Town of Newton, and a past instructor of Landscape Architectural construction. Mr. Marquis's involvement in the firm was broad, extending from private residences to housing projects and city planning. He withdrew from active practice in 1962, after the firm name had been changed from "Olmsted Brothers" to "Olmsted Associates".

In January, 1950, upon the retirement from practice of F. L. Olmsted, Jr., Carl Rust Parker, Charles Scott Riley, and Artemas P. Richardson became partners in Olmsted Brothers, together with the remaining partners, William B. Marquis and Edward C. Whiting. Together, Parker and Riley handled much of the firm's work in Kentucky, Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee – predominantly campus planning and industrial site development planning. Richardson, together with Whiting and Marquis worked primarily on jobs north of Washington, D.C., with considerable activity in the early '50s on the site development planning for State-aided Veterans' Housing Projects, including one on Egmont and Dummer Streets and one on High Street in Brookline.

Joseph Hudak, whose previous employment had been with a metropolitan Planning Commission and with a commercial nursery, became a partner in 1955, bringing the total number of partners at that time to 6 – the largest number at any time throughout the firm's history.

In 1961, upon the retirement of Parker and Riley, F. L. Olmsted, Jr. having died in 1957, it was decided by the remaining partners (who had been associated in practice with Olmsted) to again change the firm name – this time to "Olmsted Associates". About a year later, upon the death of Whiting, Marquis also retired from active practice, leaving Richardson and Hudak as co-partners, and in 1964 they incorporated the business, making the final change of name to "Olmsted Associates, Inc."

For three years, from 1968 to 1971, Erno J. Fonagy served as a principal of the firm, leaving to join a landscape contracting firm in Lexington.

The Olmsted firms, since their founding in 1858, have, as we have seen, been involved in land planning over a wide geographical area – most of their work being outside of Massachusetts. During this 114-year span, however, their jobs have included some 236 in Brookline alone – private home sites, parks, playgrounds, schools, and housing projects.

The involvements of the early principals in civic, regional and national organizations and in education are carried on still by today's principals. Richardson, currently Chairman of the State Board of Registration of Landscape Architects, has served in Needham as member and Chairman of the Planning Board, as member of the Conservation Commission, and as Town Meeting Member. A Past-President of the Brookline Rotary Club and Past Governor of a Rotary District, he has served as a lecturer at Harvard's Department of Landscape Architecture. He is licensed to practice in nine states.

Hudak, a well-known lecturer on radio and television, before garden clubs and civic groups, has for several years instructed the Landscape Architecture students at Harvard in plant identification. He is an author of numerous magazine articles — mostly dealing with plant materials and planting design — and is a Trustee of the American Society of Landscape Architects, representing the members from northern New England on the National Board.

Much of the office building space is unused and unheated today. You can see, however, its plans storage vault, containing some 150,000 plans, and its division into drafting rooms, clerical and administrative offices, photographic and correspondence files, and reproduction facilities. Most of the files of correspondence, reports and memoranda predating the retirement of F. L. Olmsted, Jr. have been given to the Library of Congress, where they are carefully preserved and kept available for researchers.

It is hoped that within the next few months money may be raised, through foundations, public subscription, and other means to purchase the Warren Street property so that it may be turned over to the National Park Service and be redesignated a National Shrine (it has been a Registered National Historic Landmark since 1965). In this way, not only may the buildings and grounds be properly preserved and maintained, but they may become a center for research — a living memorial to the Olmsteds and their contributions to their profession and their Country. This need not herald an end of the Olmsted firms — but merely a shift in the location of their office to smaller and more workable quarters.

**ACTIVITIES OF F.L. OLMSTED, SR. IN BROOKLINE
FROM
FORTY YEARS OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE**

- 1882-3 Rented Taylor House on Dudley Street.
- 1883 House purchased 99 Warren Street.
- 1883 Boston and Albany RR Stations in Brookline and Chestnut Hill & Reservoir.
- 1884 Brookline Country Club (drainage); Subdivision in Chestnut Hill; Town of Brookline in Aspinwall Avenue area.
- 1886 Brookline Country Club; half-dozen subdivisions in Brookline (including Beacon Street region).
- 1887 Two land subdivisions in Brookline.
- 1888 Land subdivisions at Brookline (Corey Hill) and Chestnut Hill.
- 1889 Muddy River Improvement.
- 1894 Advice given to Town of Brookline "on main roads and public reservations in area bounded by Boylston Street, Chestnut Street, Goddard Avenue and Clyde Street".

FALL MEETING – November 12, 1972

The Fall Meeting of the Brookline Historical Society will be held in the Varieties Theatre at the home of Mrs. George Cheever Shattuck on Sunday, November 12, 1972 at 3:00 o'clock, and will be dedicated to the memory of the late Dr. Shattuck.

Mr. Cappers will review Dr. Shattuck's accomplishments; Mrs. Wetherbee will read a history of the house and grounds, written by Dr. Shattuck; and Mr. O'Shea will speak on the development of Brookline Town Government over a period of two hundred and fifty years.

Carolyn H. Wetherbee, *Clerk*

BROOKLINE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Meeting at the home of the late

Dr. G. C. Shattuck

450 Warren Street

DR. GEORGE CHEEVER SHATTUCK

In asking me to make a few remarks today about Doctor George Cheever Shattuck, our President requested that I present some of the more striking facts about the life of the man in whose charming home we are meeting, and not necessarily to compose a tribute to his memory. However, it is not possible to summarize the record of such a life, even briefly, without at the same time writing a narrative which of itself becomes a tribute.

The vital statistics, as in the case of all of us, are brief enough. He was born in Boston, October 12, 1879 and died in this house on June 12, 1972. His early years were like the early years of many a proper Bostonian: Noble and Greenough School, then Harvard graduation in 1901 and Harvard Medical School graduation in 1905. Harvard was to honor him with an honorary Master of Arts degree in 1919, and Harvard awards few honorary degrees to men who have not reached their fortieth birthdays.

Following his medical school graduation, he took a trip around the world, and in the Philippines had an experience which was to have a major effect on the rest of his life. There, for the first time, he observed people suffering from leprosy and smallpox. Thenceforth, he dedicated his particular efforts to the alleviation and cure of those dreadful diseases and of any diseases which could be classified as "tropical".

Next, he continued his medical studies for two years in Vienna. He traveled to Cuba, Yucatan, the Amazon River basin, and back to the Philippines, his purpose always being to study tropical diseases and to find cures for them. It was while on a mission to the Philippines that an incident occurred of which Dr. Victor Heiser tells in his "American

Doctor's Odyssey", an incident involving Dr. Shattuck that will go on in literature as long as that very interesting book is read. The account was of nothing more or less than Dr. Shattuck's embarrassment because, way out off the coast of Samar, he had forgotten to bring a toothbrush. Even the greatest careers have their trivia.

In World War I, he left his work in the tropics and joined the Royal Army Medicine Corps of the British Expeditionary Forces. The British recognized his great work by bestowing the D.S.O. upon him. In 1916, he was a member of the Red Cross Commission to combat typhus in Serbia, and, for that work, he also was decorated. He was later to be decorated by the governments of Brazil and Cuba (pre-Castro).

At the conclusion of the war, he returned to Boston where he served on the staffs of Massachusetts General Hospital, Peter Bent Brigham Hospital, Boston City Hospital, and the U.S. Marine Hospital. He was also consultant to many hospitals in many parts of the world, and served as Clinical Professor of Tropical Medicines at Harvard.

In 1932, he married Virginia Chandler Peabody who is our hostess today, and to whom we express our thanks for her kindness in inviting us to this house at 450 Warren Street. That number is of interest to Mrs. Cappers and me. We live at 405. Sometimes the Post Office, in a burst of myopia, has delivered to us the mail of the Dr. Sydney Stillmans at 45 Warren or the mail of the Dr. George Shattucks at 450. It dresses up our mail to have letters addressed to such prominent physicians come to our home, but we have not heard just how the Stillmans and Shattucks feel about it.

Enough for that aside, and now back to our main theme. Dr. Shattuck shared with the world his extensive knowledge of tropical diseases. His numerous publications through book form and magazine articles added greatly to his fame. One of his works has run through six editions. A natural result of his studies, his practice, and his writings was to bring the peoples of many lands closer together. Mrs. Shattuck joined him in this, and she, too, received honors for improving international relationships.

The doctor was a member of many associations and presided over a number of them. Here in Brookline, he was head of the Tree Planting Committee and of the Citizens' Committee. His membership in the Tree Planting Committee bespeaks "his great love for the open" mentioned by one of his contemporaries. Like his eminent father, Dr. Frederic Cheever Shattuck, he liked the game of golf, and both of them enjoyed a round together at the Country Club. Along this same line, Charles E. Bolton, in his brief 1897 history of Brookline, mentions George C. Shattuck of Boston as one who has helped him prepare a list of the birds to be found in Brookline. Whether it was the same George C. Shattuck of whom we are speaking today, I am not positive; but it might well have been. He was a member of the Union Boat Club and the Tennis and Racquet Club, again giving evidence of his love for the active life.

Before closing, I should mention, without detailing them, other honors which he earned: medals from medical societies, citations for service in World War II, and recognition by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

His was a full life and a valuable life. Many live because of him. Many enjoy life because of him. His work still benefits mankind.

ELMER OSGOOD CAPPERS

**ADDRESS FOR
BROOKLINE HISTORICAL SOCIETY
250 Years of Town Government in Brookline**

by ARTHUR A. O'SHEA
Sunday, November 12, 1972

Muddy River, or Brookline, as it was to be later designated, was incorporated as a Town in Massachusetts on November 13, 1705. It would, of course, be extremely difficult to portray adequately the entire historical background of this community with its interesting developments in the field of government as well as the notable changes in its physical make-up over this extremely long period of 250 years. I thought, perhaps, that it would be more interesting at this particular time to trace that facet of its history dealing with the functioning of its government as a Town, to determine those factors that made our community unique — yes, that made it great — that made it a pattern of good government down through the years — a mecca for students of government from our leading colleges and universities. Lord Bryce, in his *American Commonwealth*, said, "Of the type or systems of local government, that of the Town, with its popular primary assembly, is admittedly the best. It is the cheapest and the most efficient. It is the most educative to the citizens who bear a part of it. The Town Meeting has been not only the source but the school of democracy." Thomas Jefferson, in referring to the New England Town Meeting, observed, "It is the highest invention ever devised by the wit of man for the perfect exercise of self-government and for its preservation."

That you might better understand the development of the Town government, let me point out that the early settlers in New England were accustomed to transacting all the affairs of the community in their parish houses or churches. The meetings were presided over by a Moderator, the title which was usually given to the President of a Congregational or Presbyterian Synod and which title is used to the present day for the presiding officer of the Town Meeting. It is interesting to note that the Charter of the Town contained an order that the residents be enjoined to build a meeting house and obtain an able orthodox minister, the presumption being that there should be a meeting place to conduct the temporal and spiritual affairs of the community. In these early colonial times all business of the community was transacted in monthly or semi-monthly meetings of the Freemen or Townsfolk and as the Town grew this became impossible and the General Court in 1636 provided for the election in Towns of various officers for certain administrative purposes. These officials, to whom was delegated certain responsibilities, were referred to as Select Men — Selected Townsfolk, "Ye chosen men appointed for managing the prudential affairs," hence the derivative of our present term, Selectmen. The Town government inaugurated in 1705 has been preserved down through the years to this generation. Brookline's present Town Officers were elected to office in the same manner and

perform essentially the same functions as those who were chosen in 1705 to stand as sponsors to the infant Town.

It will be recalled in reading early English history that it was the struggle of the common people with the Crown that secured individual liberty and at that time it was indicated that the price of its retention was — *eternal vigilance*. In England, and among us who inherit English traditions, local liberties are the reward of a long struggle for the conviction that the community itself must safeguard them. Outside interferences, incidentally, arouse opposition. This is the basis and essence of local self-government. This was the keynote of the early history of Brookline whereby its citizens banding together were able to defeat the ominous and persistent threat of annexation which cropped up first in 1870 and occasionally at the turn of the century.

In Brookline no man was too great to serve in some capacity to make his municipality a better place for mankind. This is the occasion to review our municipal career, its desperate struggle for its existence in the decade following the Civil War, its brilliant course following its overthrow of the combined effort more powerful than ever before known in Massachusetts, its swift adaptation to rapid advances and its ease in meeting the highest standard of civic attainment free from fraud or graft.

It might be interesting at this point to explain the derivation of the name Brookline. The first reference to the name appeared in the original grant where it was spelled as at present — Brookline. In 1715 it appears in the record again as Brookline, in 1716 as Brooklyn until 1746 when again the suffix appeared as l-i-n-e. In 1768 it again appears in the record l-y-n till 1777 when it became apparently fixed with the present spelling. Incidentally, during the Revolution, on maps of the fortification of British officers, its name appears both as Brookline and Brooklyn. Its precise origin is not known but it is explained that in the Dutch language there appeared Breuklen. The Irish had a suffix l-i-n-n. In Gaelic it was l-i-n-n-e and in the Welsh language the ending l-y-n, all meaning a pool, or collection of water.

Celebrated for its rural beauty and for its development of the most favorable conditions of home life, the Town has leaped to a position absolutely unique. The trust which the voters of Brookline have so well fulfilled affords the highest exemplification of the merit and the elasticity of the best form of local government known. In contrast to the sorry plight of many of our larger cities, it is refreshing to turn to Brookline, a community embracing slightly over 6 square miles, surrounded on all sides by larger communities comprising the Metropolitan area, a community with its generous portion of comfortable homes, superior schools, public libraries, better roads and other municipal facilities.

Brookline, by some strange wisdom, is still a Town — the largest in the country, if not in the world. Its chief officers are the 5 Selectmen who are described in the By-Law as the prudential officers of the Town, the same

designation that has remained uninterrupted since the Colonial days. In 1904, during the Presidential election, there were 4,240 registered voters. 3,550 of this number voted in a single voting place, namely, the Town Hall Auditorium. These were the horse and buggy days when voters came by carriage, by bicycle and on foot, ever conscious of their unflinching devotion to their civic duty. Those in our present generation, with all its modern conveniences, are quite disturbed if the precinct voting facility is located more than a few blocks from their homes. In 1954 there were over 31,000 registered voters. In 1905 the population of the Town was approximately 24,000 and today it is about 60,000. In 1871 real and personal valuation amounted to \$20,000,000. In 1905 it was approximately \$66,000,000 but today it has advanced to approximately \$450,000,000.

Brookline has been a pioneer in many respects. It was one of the first communities in the Commonwealth to avail itself of the legislation authorizing public libraries. It was the first community to construct a public bath for the residents of the Town. It has nurtured its school system with a lavish hand until its school plant and facilities outrank most other communities.

The uncertainty of a Town Meeting is proverbial; but as the years progressed, in spite of occasional errors, the people constantly sought the best in governmental service which has been difficult to surpass. The city man, accustomed all his life to a paternal City Council and who moves to Brookline, does not always appreciate, nor avail himself, of his Town Meeting privileges and duties and it is this slight indication of indifference or apathy that should be our greatest cause for concern.

It might be of interest to dwell for a moment on some of the citizens who have contributed to the development of our Town. First of all, I might point out the Honorable Samuel Sewall for whom Sewall Avenue was named. He was Chief Justice of the Province of Massachusetts Bay. Born in England, he came to New England in 1661, was a member of the Council under the Provisional Charter, 1692-1725, one of the Assistants under the Colonial Charter and, ex-officio, a Judge of the Supreme Court. He was later appointed Judge of the Superior Court in 1692 and its Chief Justice in 1718. He was a Resident Fellow and one of the Board of Overseers of Harvard College. His home in Brookline embraced over 350 acres extending from Harvard Street to the Charles River, his home being near the present site of the Sears Chapel. He died January 1, 1730.

Let me run down rather quickly some of the outstanding citizens of the Town of a later generation who, although they were so-called captains of industry, bankers, merchants, by and large wealthy men in their own right, nevertheless were most generous in their devotion to the local community and gave unstintingly of their time and interest to public office and committees:

Moses Williams, Legislator; Chairman of Selectmen; President, State Street Trust Company
 Desmond Fitzgerald
 William Whitman, Director, Equitable Life Assurance Company
 James Murray Kay, Publisher, Houghton Mifflin Company
 James R. Dunbar, School Committee; Judge of the Superior Court
 Joseph Walker, Attorney; Legislator; Member of the School Committee
 Prentiss Cummings, Representative; Senator; School Committee; Public Library; Vice-President, West End Railway
 Horace James, Selectman; Vice-President, Brookline Savings Bank
 William Francis Humphrey, Treasurer, Boston Towboat Company; Director of many steamship companies
 Franklin W. Hobbs, Treasurer, Arlington Mills; Chairman of the School Committee
 Dr. George C. Shattuck, Tree Planting Committee
 John Knox Marshall, Director of the Massachusetts Mutual Insurance Company
 George Washington Armstrong, Armstrong Transfer Company
 Charles W. Holtzer, Holtzer, Cabot Electric Company
 Charles H. Utley, President, Quincy Market Cold Storage Company
 Charles Storow, Trustee, Suffolk Savings Bank
 Charles Spencer Sergeant, Vice-President, Boston Elevated Railway
 Rufus George Frederick Candage, Historian, School Committee, Selectman, Librarian, Representative Assessor and Moderator
 Caleb B. Chase, Chase and Sanborn Company
 Ernest B. Dane, President, Brookline Trust Company
 Frederick Law Olmsted, Landscape Architect
 Frederick P. Fish
 Charles Henry Stearns, Assessor
 James Pierce Stearns, President, John Hancock Insurance Co.
 Charles L. Edgar, President, Boston Edison Company
 Benjamin F. Keith
 Theodore Lyman
 and a host of others.

As I pointed out, the population of Brookline in 1905 was approximately 22,000. In 1925 it had increased to 42,000 and in 1945 it had reached the figure of approximately 57,000 which was the approximate figure determined in the 1945 Decennial census, the 1950 Federal census and the 1955 Decennial census, indicating that the population growth had reached a level, although we believe the present population figure would be more accurately described as 60,000. Most of the large estates have been subdivided which has changed the financial rating of the community from the richest town in America to second or third place. This was due to the fact that the large estates paid relatively heavy taxes and required little in return from the community in the way of public service such as school attendance, fire and police protection, ash and paper collection, lighting and the usual governmental services. When we reach the

saturation point of development Brookline can advance only through a well-planned program of reconstruction of those areas which have, due to their age, declined in valuation.

Is it not reasonable to ask ourselves the question, "How long can Brookline hold on to its rich tradition and heritage?" Will the public spirit and self-restraint in Brookline be long upheld under the present system by thousands of new citizens or must Brookline accept the fate of the average American city? Let us, therefore, focus our attention on the development of the last fifty years when the Town government has been tested to a degree unknown before. The elasticity of the Town government, fortified by Brookline's characteristic attention to systems, to supervision and to accounting, has enabled the Town to grasp its unique situation and to advance with unprecedented success. We who are associated with municipal government may feel for a time that the reins are firmly in our grasp only to discover that each year with the advent of the Town Meeting, the scrutiny of the Advisory Committee, that we are called upon to give an account of our stewardship. This is the answer to good government — a generous participation of the citizens, a watchful supervision of the municipal functions by men and women of character and ability.

Perhaps in the years ahead, as was necessary in 1915, when the Town adopted the limited Town Meeting, we might be called upon to make some modification in our governmental administration, to adapt it for more efficient accomplishments.

Let not those who are to follow in our footsteps lose sight for a moment of the traditions which have made Brookline different. Let us hold on to the basic tradition of Town government and hold high the torch indicative of the trust that has been so firmly established over the years.

In conclusion, may I again allude to my opening remarks when I referred to the English admonition that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom. The seed of good government has been planted deeply in the traditions of our Town, and to posterity may we say, "Let history repeat itself."