1. NAME OF PROPERTY

Historic Name: **Gore Place** (Additional Documentation)

Other Name/Site Number: Governor Christopher Gore Mansion

2. LOCATION

Street & Number: 52 Gore Street Not for publication:___

City/Town: Waltham Vicinity:___

State: MA County: Middlesex Code: 017 Zip Code: 02154

3. CLASSIFICATION

Ownership of Property		Category of Property	
Private:	X	Building(s):	X
Public-Local:	___	District:	___
Public-State:	___	Site:	___
Public-Federal:	___	Structure:	___
		Object:	___

Number of Resources within Property

Contributing	Noncontributing
2	2 buildings
___	___ sites
___	5 structures
___	___ objects
2	7 Total

Number of Contributing Resources Previously Listed in the National Register: 1

Name of Related Multiple Property Listing: N/A

Designated a
NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK on

FEB 18 1997

by the Secretary of the Interior

4. STATE/FEDERAL AGENCY CERTIFICATION

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this ____ nomination ____ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property ____ meets ____ does not meet the National Register Criteria.

_____ _____
Signature of Certifying Official Date

_____
State or Federal Agency and Bureau

In my opinion, the property ____ meets ____ does not meet the National Register criteria.

_____ _____
Signature of Commenting or Other Official Date

_____
State or Federal Agency and Bureau

5. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that this property is:

____ Entered in the National Register
____ Determined eligible for the National Register
____ Determined not eligible for the National Register
____ Removed from the National Register
____ Other (explain): _____

_____ _____
Signature of Keeper Date of Action

Designated a
NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK on
[illegible] 1997
by the Secretary of the Interior

6. FUNCTION OR USE

Historic:	Domestic	Sub: Single dwelling
Current:	Recreation and culture	Sub: Museum

7. DESCRIPTION

ARCHITECTURAL CLASSIFICATION: Early Republic sub: Federal

MATERIALS:

Foundation:	Granite
Walls:	Brick, Wood
Roof:	Shingle
Other:	Sandstone terrace

Describe Present and Historic Physical Appearance.

Gore Place consists of approximately seventy-six acres of grounds surrounding the Federal-style mansion built by Massachusetts Governor Christopher Gore in 1805. Governor Gore purchased the first forty acres, on which stood a small frame homestead, in 1786 to use as a summer residence. The original wooden mansion burned in 1799, so the Gores planned a new home while they were traveling in Europe. While the Gores collaborated with French architect Jacques Guillame LeGrand on the plans for the house, they laid out the grounds themselves. Gore was influenced in his planting plans for the original forty acres by Humphrey Repton, the famous eighteenth-century English landscape gardener who was an exponent of the "naturalist" style of landscape design. The plantings consisted of "every variety of forest trees," apple trees, wildflowers, grape vines, spacious lawns, and an herb garden. The Gore Place Society, which was incorporated in 1935 to preserve and restore Gore Place, has recreated much of the landscape design from Gore's original plans.

In 1786 Aaron Dexter, a Boston physician, sold a 50 acre lot "Situated and being partly in Waltham and partly in Watertown" to C. Gore, "partly mowing and partly plowing land & partly Pasture land with Mansion House, Barn, and other buildings."

However, by 1793 Christopher and Rebecca Gore evidently wanted a more elaborate "mansion house" and constructed a house said to have been "McIntyre" style along with a carriage house. From 1796 to 1804 the Gores lived in London. During this time the house burned.

> Tuesday morning early, the seat at Waltham of Christopher Gore, Esq., Commissioner of the United States at the Court of London, was discovered to be on fire: which entirely consumed the frame, except the western wing. It began in the green house. The principal part of the furniture was saved, although much damaged in the removal.
> (J. Russell's Gazette, Boston, March 21, 1799 p2 c4).

The present building, which is on the site of the house destroyed by the fire, incorporates many design and technological innovations which the Gores were exposed to in their travels and were not yet found in the United States. The mansion is thus unusual because it is the reflection of many amenities as expressed by Americans recently returned from England. It was completed in 1806. The twenty-two room house cost $23,000.

Letters written between the close friends, Christopher Gore and Rufus King, indicate that the design of Gore Place is the result of a collaboration between Christopher and Rebecca Gore and Jacques Guillame LeGrand, a Paris architect. In July of 1801, Gore wrote to King "Mrs. G. is now with Monsieur LeGrand in the adjoining parlour building houses. ..." Again in 1802 "Mrs. G. has sent the plan of our intended house, with a wish that you should explain it to LeGrand, & request him to make a compleat & perfect plan according to our sketch..." Unfortunately, the plans are not extant, but it does indicate that Rebecca Gore played an active role in the designing of the mansion.

The mansion is a symmetrical five part composition with a two and one half story main block, one and one half story hyphens to either side, and two story end pavilions built at right angles to the main axis. The overall length is approximately 190 feet; the main block is approximately 68 feet wide and 40 feet deep; the hyphens are each 40 feet wide and 21 feet deep; and the end pavilions 20 feet wide and 32 feet deep. It is constructed of brick made in Charlestown, MA laid in Flemish bond. Very little of the mortar has been repointed.

The main block has a hip roof capped with an octagonal ventilator/skylight. There are two dormers facing north. The hyphens have gable roofs on an east/west axis, while the end pavilions' gable roofs run on a north/south axis. The roofing is Vermont slate installed in 1956. The original roofing material was wood shingle.

The north facade of the main block is five bays wide with a brownstone terrace. The terrace, with its central steps, originally was used as a mounting block. The eastern and western bays serve as the two entrances. The two entries each have an elliptical fanlight and flanking side lights. The fanlight to the west entry lights a room above it placed entresol. Between the two doorways are three triple sash windows capped by dentilled cornices and framed by elongated narrow pilasters meeting the jamb directly. The second story windows are six-over-six lights with winged lintels.

The south facade has an oval bow with three triple hung windows. The windows in the flanking rooms now become French doors with fans to light an entresol room to the west and a blank box to the east.

The mezzanines (hyphens) are four bays wide and are characterized by a rectangular window on the first floor and a lunette window on the second enclosed by arched brickwork. The second floor windows on the east wing are low to the floor because the ceiling was raised in the billiard room below sometime during the Gore tenancy.

The gable ends are one bay wide and have the same window arrangement with the roof line serving as a pediment and brickwork as pilasters on the corners. The eaves trough serves as a capital for the pilaster.

The mansion was the summer home of a well-to-do lawyer and sometime politician. The main block of the house is two rooms deep, while the mezzanines and gable ends are one room deep. Very much in the style of an English country house, the main block of the first floor along with the east wing is designed for large formal entertainment. The west wing was given over to service areas, and the second floor was living space.

The great hall, where formal dining was held, has a floor of "King of Prussia" marble which extends to both entrance halls. The room is semi-circular with fireplaces to the east and west sides, three doors to the south, and three windows facing north. These windows are floor to ceiling and open to allow guests to walk out to the terrace expanding the space to the outside. The ceiling is approximately 17 feet high. The high ceilings, large windows, and marble flooring were means of cooling a summer home.

Across from the great hall is the oval withdrawing room separated by two sets of doors, one curved to the shape of the room, the other a curved bifold. The fireplace is located at the end of the ellipse and curves to the shape of the room. The three triple hung windows allow for egress to the lawn and are part of the cross ventilation with the windows in the great hall.

To the east of the oval room is a reception room/parlor. French doors along the south wall lead outside in this room. These three rooms together allow circulation of guests from one to the other. The wallpapers in both the oval room and parlor are reproductions of the French papers hung by the Gores. Fragments of the paper for the great hall are known and are being researched but have not yet been reproduced.

To the east of the great hall is the formal entry with a circular staircase obviously intended to impress the Gores' guests. This leads to the second floor living quarters as well as to the mezzanine rooms through a door curved to the shape of the wall in the middle of the stairs. The entry was conserved in 1986. "Stone colored paper with matching borders" were hung on the walls in accordance with a letter

Gore wrote to King. The stair treads were returned to the faux mabre of the Gores' times and Brussels carpeting laid on the stair treads and upper hall.

The east mezzanine (or hyphen) area is occupied by a 19" x 30" billiard room thought to have been extant at the time of the Gores' residence. In it is Governor Gore's oversize billiard table. The small room just before the library is thought to have been a bathing chamber. Gore's account book from the time of the construction of the house mentions a copper tub and water closet. Many dressing rooms have been found next to the library in English country houses.

The second floor of the mezzanine has three rooms of unknown usage with curved ceilings. They are now used to exhibit the museum's collection of children's toys and accouterments.

The east gable end is the library where Gore wrote of the straight walk which can be seen from the east window.

> "Shady walks radiated from the house to the east and west... one of which formed a vista opposite the east window of the Library."

In this room the lunette windows sit high in the walls to the north and south allowing a great deal of light to shine in the room. The mantle piece surrounding the fireplace was salvaged from the 1793 house as was the mantle piece in the great hall. The one in the library has a gesso gryphon, said to be one of the earliest examples in this country, and the great hall mantle depicts the Caladonian Boars Hunt. Both of these mantle pieces have the typical Federal decorative elements of swags, bell drops, medallions.

The north side of the second floor main block is composed of two bedchambers and a dressing room. The south side has a bedchamber on the southeast corner along with a dressing room with original built-in shelving and drawers. An oval family parlor with three windows facing south overlooks the lawn. This room is now being restored with French block print paper and sisal carpeting to cover the soft pine subflooring installed by the Gores. The original cream color woodwork has been restored with an 1800-era formula paint. The southwest chamber is interpreted as Rebecca Gore's office or workroom. It has built-in bookcases with adjustable shelves plus an alcove with built-in drawers and shelves for linen storage.

Dividing the north and south chambers is a service hall with the ventilator/skylight. The lights in the cupola originally opened and closed on a pulley system. The windows have since been replaced and nailed shut. The light emitted from these windows lights the hallway even on a dark day. This hall provides individual access to all rooms allowing service without disruption. Original louvre doors opening to the hall from the parlor allows cross ventilation from the north center chamber to the parlor while providing privacy.

The west wing was devoted entirely to service. Originally, the main kitchen was in the cellar of the west wing with a complete Rumford kitchen. A second kitchen hearth is located directly above in the gable end in what is now the gift shop.

The first floor of the west mezzanine area holds the servants' hall. The rooms above were servant's bedchambers and are now offices for the staff. The entresol room above the breakfast room is now interpreted as a servant's chamber although the original usage is unclear. Visitors can view the bed, desk, chair, and side table that were typical of servants' rooms in the Gores' household. Curators of Gore Place also have recreated the servants' kitchen as it would have looked in the nineteenth century,

and are in the process of obtaining information on arrangements of utensils, pots, and other tools for meal preparation.

The exterior brickwork was painted white and the roof balustraded in the 1830s or 1840s. These alterations have been removed. The interior colors of the Mansion were mostly grays. The floors of the two entrance halls and of the State Reception Hall were of American marble. The entrance doors were traditional six-paned doors with louvered windows beside them. Gore Place Society has conducted extensive research on the original materials, colors, and furnishings of the Gore Mansion, and has recreated many of the nineteenth-century features of the home. Among the original Gore belongings are the sideboard in the Oval Dining Room, the books in the library, family portraits on the walls, and Governor Gore's inaugural suit.

Carriage House
Architectural Description
The carriage house is a rectangular shaped building, approximately 70' x 40', two windows wide. The Federal style architecture features a hip roof, a pediment with an oculi over the central arched portal, and keystones over the doors. The two stories are divided on the exterior by a belt course. The building is sided with clapboards and still retains its original skived clapboards on the north and part of the west facades. The walls are painted white, with the doors and windows a deep mauve.

The building is composed of three segments. The largest one, located on the west end of the building, was used to store carriages. The central section, with two large hinged doors allowing tall carriages to enter, was the area used to harness the horse to the carriage and to clean the carriages. The floor is pitched to carry off the water to the basement. The interior of the east segment has seven stalls, with unique iron work hay cribs, which could be filled from the attic. The edges of the stalls are lined with iron to prevent the horses from cribbing or gnawing on the wood. The grooves on the flooring of the stalls are sloped to allow the urine to flow out and into the hatches where the manure was also shoveled.

The tack room located between the stall area and the harnessing area served to separate the smell of the horses from the carriages.

The upper story was used to store hay, grain, and may have been used as quarters for the stable hands. Two original grain storage bins can still be seen in the attic as can the original hay cribs. Despite several devastating fires the original beams are still in place.

The interior today is plastered in the west and central segments and kitchen area with exposed beams. Much of the original flooring is still in place.

In 1968, to save the building, it was moved from the entrance to the property to its present location at the end of the parking lot. This allowed for the widening of Gore Street and the evacuation of the parking lots from Raytheon Corporation. See plot plan for the land taken by eminent domain.

Historical Narrative
Built in 1793, the same time as the original house on the property which burned in 1799, the carriage house at Gore Place continued to be used even after the 1805 mansion was completed. It held the carriages, coach horses and a few riding horses, which were a necessary part of the life of the wealthy Boston patricians of the era. It also would have been used to house the carriages of the many visiting politicians and luminaries such as the Marquis de Lafayette, President James Monroe and Daniel Webster.

The son of a Boston paint merchant who was known for decorating coaches, Christopher Gore apparently enjoyed brightly colored carriages. Henry Lee wrote of him "I dimly remember seeing through a cloud of dust the Governor's orange-colored coach with its crimson harness cloth, coachman and footman and two preceding outriders all in livery, as he went to take an airing with a stateliness quite in keeping with his fine place, ..." (Letter from Colonel Henry Lee to Justin Winsor in 1881).

His delight in stylish carriages impacted the landscape of his "farm in the country." The mile walk surrounding the property could also be used as a carriage path to circumnavigate his estate.

The carriage house was a common component of large 18th and early 19th century houses. Similar structures with a tripartite facade and high central arched doorway may be found at the house designed by Charles Bulfinch for Stephen Higginson at the rear of 85 Mount Vernon Street, Boston, at the Harrison Gray Otis house as well as at the Theodore Lyman house in Waltham. Bulfinch designed a similar stable for the Swan house in Dorchester, but this has been demolished as has the coach house from the Lindens in Danvers, MA. The Gore carriage house is the only one in the vicinity to retain much of its original fabric. The carriage house at the Vale is now used to house the conservation laboratories for SPNEA.

It is probable that the tack room and stalls were remodeled during the Lyman occupancy (1835-1838). The dark staining of the stalls and the patented feeders were typical of this period.

In 1935 Gore Place Society was formed to save the site from becoming a housing project. At this time the carriage house was located at the entrance to the property, closer to the Gore Street entrance. This, of course, would be the logical location when used by the Gores and subsequent tenants of the property. In 1968, the city of Waltham took some property by emminent domain and the carriage house was moved 200 feet to the northwest of the property and a parking lot was built to accommodate visitors to the site.

In 1977, the interior of the building was modified to be used for educational programs, lectures, concerts, and rental space to augment the funding of the site. The tack room is now a kitchen available to caterers. Two rest rooms were added, one of which is handicap accessible, and a ramp was built on the northwest exterior side of the building.

Farmhouse
Architectural Description
The footprint of the farmhouse is rectangular with a one story one room L-shaped ell extending to the north. A second ell extends to the east with the kitchen and a four bay garage. While these ells were replaced in 1963 when the house was moved, it appears materials from the original were utilized when the replacement was made. Some of the sash is old as is the back door and the tongue and groove paneling on the lower third of the walls. This paneling continues into the north facing ell.

The house consists of two stories plus an attic and a full cellar. The cellar is fully replaced with poured concrete and granite facing on the exterior. The original beams are still in place in the cellar except in the north ell which was wholly replaced.

The house has two chimneys at the peak of the roof symmetrically spaced in a north/south direction to align with the dormers. These chimneys each contain four flues servicing four fireplaces on the first floor and four fireplaces on the second floor. All the fireplaces are shallow and of the Rumford design except for the fireplace in the central room which obviously was the original kitchen (now used as a dining room). The fireplace in the central room is large with space for a boiler (now covered with

painted soapstone), a closed up bake oven, and a low, but deep fireplace (now also closed and used with a stove.) The second floor fireplaces are low and shallow. All eight fireplaces are back to back.

There are four dormers--two front and two back. The roof is side gabled with a distinctive slope which curves out over a colonaded front porch and a small back entry with the rest of the area enclosed as the laundry and bathroom. It appears that the ells were a later addition and the back of the house originally had a full colonaded porch. The roof is covered with cedar shingles on the front roof and the ells with asphalt shingles on the rear roof.

The front facade is composed of a center door with side lights and two symmetrically placed windows under the overhanging roof supported by four columns to form a porch. One column appears original, but could be a later replacement. The front door appears original or least very early with two large lights at the top. The north side has three asymmetrically placed windows, while the south facade has two symmetrically placed windows. The windows are 12-over-12 lights in wood sashes.

The house is sided with clapboards which are overlapped or skived, except for the front facade within the porch area where it is sided with tongue and groove horizontally laid boards. In 1992 paint analysis was done and the cottage returned to its original colors of khaki green with white trim and black door.

No other farmhouses of this particular style of architecture with the distinctive sloping roofline are known to exist in the area. Morgan Phillips, the noted architectural historian, when asked how he would describe the architectural style said, if he were going by on a fast train he would call it a "cape."

Historical Narrative

The farmhouse at Gore Place was built in 1835 by the second owner of the site, Theodore Lyman Jr. It originally was situated across Waltham Street on land that was then farmed by the owner. It is believed that the farmhouse has always been used in the same capacity it is today - as the home of the head farmer of the property. Several of the farmers show up in museum records. The *Waltham Sentinel* reported on May 15, 1856 that "Mr. Robert Murray, the well known horticulturist, and scientific and practical farmer, has had the charge of this estate for now more than twenty years, and seems almost as much a fixture upon the place as the venerable elm which screened the Governor from the burning rays of the sun..." Board records also show the names of some of the farmers, such as Matthew Curren, who lived there when the house was moved. The only time there are no records is when the site was a country club.

In 1964, the farmhouse was moved to the "home plot" when the Town of Waltham was widening Waltham/Grove Street. It is actively used by Gore Place for museum purposes. The land where it was previously sited is now leased to the Raytheon Corporation by Gore Place Society. However, it is still possible to see the location of the original foundation. It is considered a noncontributing building because it post-dates the period of significance.

Approximately thirty acres of the Gore Place property is separated from the main parcel by a road, constructed in 1967, which bisects the property. This portion of the land, while still owned by the Gore Place Society, has been leased by the Raytheon Corporation since the 1940s. The parcel contains three radar towers, constructed prior to 1947; a brick building, constructed in 1958 and enlarged in 1959; and a parking lot. These buildings and structures were on the property at the time of its designation as a National Historic Landmark in 1970, and are counted as non-contributing for the purposes of this nomination, as is the road (Grove Street/Waltham Street) bisecting the property. Gore

Place is in excellent condition and has been carefully restored. The mansion and grounds are open to visitors, both for guided tours and soon for self-guided walks.[1]

[1] This physical description was adapted from the Charles Snell, "National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form for Gore Place" (1970). See also Philip Dana Orcutt, A.I.A., "Gore Place: Waltham, Massachusetts: The Beginnings of a Restoration," Gore Place Society files; Orcutt, "Gore Place," Gore Place Society, Waltham, Massachusetts; and Phyllis Polson, "Gore Place: A Restoration in Progress," Gore Place Society files.

8. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Certifying official has considered the significance of this property in relation to other properties: Nationally: X
Statewide:___ Locally:___

Applicable National Register Criteria: A _X_ B _X_ C _X_ D ___

Criteria Considerations (Exceptions): A___ B___ C___ D___ E___ F___ G___

NHL Criteria: 2, 4

NHL Theme(s): III. Expressing Cultural Values
5. Architecture
V. Developing the American Economy
4. Workers and Work Culture

National Register Areas of Significance: architecture; social history

Period(s) of Significance: 1805-1806; 1825-1827

Significant Dates: 1806; 1827

Significant Person(s): Roberts, Robert

Cultural Affiliation: N/A

Architect/Builder: LeGrand, Jacques Guillame

State Significance of Property, and Justify Criteria, Criteria Considerations, and Areas and Periods of Significance Noted Above.

Statement of Significance

Gore Place is nationally significant as representative of the central role of domestic labor in American labor history. The physical structure of the house reflects changes in household labor, ideals of domesticity, working and living conditions of servants, and women's role in the family during the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. In addition, the home is "one of the finest examples of a large-scale Adamesque Federal count[r]y house in the Unites States."[2] Gore Place was recognized for architectural significance by being designated a National Historic Landmark in 1970.

The site was the country home of Christopher Gore, a prominent New England lawyer, veteran of the American Revolution, signer of the Constitution, Governor of Massachusetts (1809-1810), and United States Senator (1813-1816). He and his wife Rebecca (Payne) purchased the first forty acres of farm land in rural Waltham in 1786, and soon acquired 400 acres of land that Gore would refer to as his "farm at Waltham." One of the distinguishing features of the mansion was the devotion of the entire West Gable to quarters for domestic servants. The first floor contained a large servants hall, consisting of the kitchen and the butlers' entry, while the second floor contained sleeping quarters for servants. The allowance of so much space for servants attests to the increased presence of live-in domestics in the early to mid-nineteenth century. Wealthy and even middle-class women relied more heavily on the help of domestics partly as a result of the redefinition of women's role in the household economy. Rather than hiring non-live-in "help" for particular tasks like childbirth, sewing, spinning, laundry, or spring cleaning, as women had done during the colonial period, women now relied on live-in "domestics" to do more of the daily work of the household, thereby freeing the mistress to concentrate on the duties of child care, charity work, and visiting, elements of womanhood promoted by advocates of the "cult of true womanhood." The physical design of the household reflected these changes in the roles of family members, and the new reliance on a large staff of live-in domestic servants.

Gore Place has preserved the living and working quarters of domestic servants, and currently interprets living and working conditions among the Gores' servant staff. Any well-preserved historic house museum could interpret the changes in family roles and domestic economy, as the significance of these changes lies in their pervasiveness across a broad spectrum of middle- and upper-class American households. By illustrating the lives of the domestic servants and slaves who worked there, Gore Place provides a deeper understanding of the living conditions in the households of the nation's leaders. Ideal sites for interpreting domestic service also include such preeminent American homes as Monticello and Mt. Vernon. Other appropriate sites include the Christian Heurich Mansion (Washington, D.C.), the James J. Hill House (St. Paul, Minn.), Pomona Hall (Camden, NJ), Glessner House (Chicago, IL), and the McFaddin-Ward House (Beaumont, TX). All of these sites have preserved some aspect of servants' lives and interpret them on house tours.[3]

Gore Place also stands as a nationally significant property for interpreting domestic service because of the role of African-American butler Robert Roberts in codifying rules and guidelines for domestic service. While under the employ of the Gores, Roberts published The House Servant's Directory, one

---

[2] "Gore Place," National Register Nomination Form (1970).

[3] See National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP), "List of Historic Sites Interpreting the Lives of Domestic Workers," compiled from "The View from the Kitchen Workshop" at the NTHP Conference, Oct. 25, 1994. See also Jane Brown Gillette, "Breaking the Silence," Historic Preservation 47 (March/April 1995), 38-43.

of the few guidebooks written by a domestic for other domestics. This publication was the first book written by an African American to be published by a commercial publisher, Monroe and Francis of Boston, in 1827, in the United States. In it, he catalogues how domestics should behave toward their employers and other servants, how they should perform their duties, and how best to accomplish a variety of household tasks. A sampling of guidebooks dealing with domestic servants in the Newberry Library collections reveals that most of them were written by middle-class women for the purpose of explaining proper household roles and social etiquette. There are two books written specifically for servants, one by a college student who worked as a domestic (1903) and one whose author is unknown (1855). Paul Gehl, Newberry Library expert on nineteenth-century etiquette books, believes that there were very few (maybe a handful) of guidebooks written by servants for other servants. There is no catalogue or bibliography of these books available, according to nineteenth-century printing scholar Meredith McGill, so exact figures cannot be supplied. Circulation figures are not available, but the guidebook was popular enough to have merited a second edition in 1828.[4]

Narrative History

Housework has been the most pervasive form of labor in American history. Whether it was wives and mothers engaging in household duties, or domestic servants and part-time help performing particular tasks, housework has occupied long hours of often arduous labor. Yet this aspect of American labor history has until recently gone unexplored, largely as a result of the often unpaid nature of the work. Changes in the way housework is understood and performed, though, reflect larger transformations in American culture and the American economy. Gore Mansion is an ideal site for understanding these changes.

In colonial households, the family economy included the work of women as well as men. Male craftsmen and artisans made their products in their home, and produced items both for self-sufficiency and for trade or sale in a local market. Women did the same. Work of colonial women in the household depended largely upon location (rural or urban), age, class position, and season. Yet most women at some point were responsible for milking cows, churning butter, feeding pigs and chickens, collecting eggs, making preserves, spinning, weaving, mending, laundry, and ironing. Women often contributed to the family economy not only through their household labor but also by producing goods to be bartered, traded, and sold at market. According to historian Jeanne Boydston, colonial women's work was "positioned in the patterns of daily community interaction." Women's household labor, then, was a visible aspect of women's role in the family economy and in broader aspects of village life.[5]

Contrary to myth, however, the colonial household was not self-sufficient. Rather, many families, whether rural or urban, paid hired (most often non-live-in) help to work with the mistress on a temporary basis with specific chores. Farm women often hired help to work with them on outdoor

---

[4] Information based on interviews conducted with Paul Gehl, Curator of Manuscripts and Rare Books, The Newberry Library, and Professor Meredith McGill, Assistant Professor, Rutgers University. See also "Notes on Robert Roberts," Gore Place Society.

[5] Jeanne Boydston, Home and Work: Housework, Wages, and the Ideology of Labor in the Early Republic (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 3. For further discussion of colonial women's roles in the household economy, see especially Ruth Schwartz Cowan, "Household Labor: Huswifs, Housewives and Domestic Workers," Essay submitted for the National Park Service Theme Study in American Labor History (1994); Cowan, More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave (New York: Basic Books, 1983); and Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, Good Wives: Image and Reality in the Lives of Women in Northern New England, 1650-1750 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982).

tasks, including dairying chores, keeping chickens, and gathering eggs.[6] Women in towns and villages, usually in the upper-class, but often in professional and artisan families as well, hired servants for other kinds of chores. The mistress of the household was actively involved in domestic labor, and used the assistance of the "help" to produce more goods and accomplish more tasks.[7]

In the South, African slaves largely replaced indentured servants as household workers by the eighteenth century. Most of the slaves, particularly in the Chesapeake, worked in the fields of large plantations. Yet some spent at least part of their time as "houseslaves," with the largest plantations able to assign some workers to domestic chores on a full-time basis. The women worked as cooks, housemaids, nursemaids, and general helps. Men who worked in the house provided personal services to the male head of household, as well as helping with tasks such as butchering and chopping wood.[8]

The nature of women's role in the household was transformed following the American Revolution. Ideals about domesticity stressed women's roles as republican wives and mothers, whose main duties were to raise good citizens and provide harmonious homes for their families. This transformation was, in part, a result of the rise of industry and the capitalist market, which helped shape changing ideologies of domesticity. Production moved from the farm to the factory, creating a sharper delineation between homespace and workspace than existed previously. As a result, women's role in the economy was devalued, as they were not producing goods outside the home that would enter the economy of the marketplace.[9]

Women's new role in the household was integrally linked to the emerging ideology of civic republicanism. The ideology of republican motherhood focused on the role of women as caretakers of children and emotional supporters of husbands. New notions of domesticity stressed women's separate sphere as a counter to the crass world of the marketplace. As historian Ruth Cowan explains, "Women's work was the work that was done for love (of God and of family); men's work was done for cash."[10] By the end of the War of 1812, this republican gender system that tied men's work with rising industrialization and wage labor, and women's work with unpaid labor in the household, was firmly entrenched.[11]

In order for women to fulfill these wifely and motherly duties, they had to be spared some of the household drudgery for which they previously were responsible. Increased use of domestic servants

---

[6] Faye E. Dudden, Serving Women: Household Service in Nineteenth-Century America (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1983), pp. 12-13.

[7] Boydston, Home and Work, pp. 77-79, and Nancy Cott, The Bonds of Womanhood: "Woman's Sphere" in New England, 1780-1835 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), pp. 28-29.

[8] See Cowan, "Household Labor," pp. 10-11; Eugene Genovese, Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made (New York: Random House, 1974); and Jacqueline Jones, Labor of Love, Labor of Sorrow: Black Women, Work, and the Family from Slavery to the Present (New York: Basic Books, 1985).

[9] Boydston, Home and Work, p. 24.

[10] Cowan, "Household Labor," p. 18.

[11] For further discussion of republican ideals of domesticity, see Boydston, Home and Work, pp. 47-49; Linda K. Kerber, Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980); and Mary Beth Norton, Liberty's Daughters: The Revolutionary Experience of American Women, 1750-1800 (Boston: Little, Brown, 1980).

allowed the woman of the household to spend more time with child rearing, which was the focus of the ideology of republican motherhood. During this period, wealthy and middle-class households started hiring live-in domestic servants (commonly referred to as domestics) instead of part-time help. "Help" implied helping the mistress with chores, whereas "servants" were responsible for chores on their own, thereby creating a clearer class distinction between the family and the hired help.

The creation of the role of formal, live-in domestics reflected new notions of circumscribed spheres of female domain within the household, rather than more fluid interchange between public market and household economy that existed previously. Catherine Beecher (author and arbiter of middle-class taste in the nineteenth century), for example, stressed the importance of the household as a sanctuary, and pointed to the undisturbed family table, where all could come together to relax and enjoy each other, as a model for Christian domesticity. This space of family togetherness necessitated the availability of a servant staff to prepare and serve the family meals in a separate space, which would not disturb family harmony.[12]

Gore Place illustrates how this notion of circumscribed roles within the household was translated into physical space. When Christopher and Rebecca Gore made plans for their new home on their country estate in Waltham in 1801 (the former house on the land burned down), they incorporated new ideas about how home space should be laid out. Homes in the early nineteenth century added public spaces like parlors, where members of the household could entertain guests, and display bric-a-brac and other art items which were becoming more widely available. Builders also constructed homes with separate spaces for live-in servants, based on the dominant opinion of the day that proper, respectable households needed domestics whose living and work space would be separate from those of the family. Changing architecture allowed domestics to inhabit only areas of the house where work was performed, while the family would occupy areas of comfort and display. New homes in the mid-nineteenth century included basement kitchens and separate flights of back stairs for servants.[13]

The Gore Mansion consisted of a central structure flanked by two outstretched wings. The first floor of the central structure included a large reception area, bordered on the west side by the butler's entrance and on the east by the main hall. Separate rooms included a sewing room, a billiards room, a library, a reception room, and separate bedrooms. The kitchen for food preparation was at the far end of the west gable, next to the servants' hall, where servants prepared food for the family and had their own meals. Servants quarters were located directly above the servants' hall, connected by a back stairwell. The back stairwell was completely out of the way of the formal, public areas of the house, thereby physically separating the servants from family and social functions as they carried out their chores. [14]

---

[12] Catherine Beecher, Letter to Persons Who Are Engaged in Domestic Service, New York: Leavitt & Trow, 1842), pp. 87-89; and Dudden, Serving Women, pp. 5, 35, 44. For further discussions of class and domesticity, see Cott, The Bonds of Womanhood; Mary Ryan, Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), chapter 4; and Paul E. Johnson, A Shopkeeper's Millennium: Society and Revivals in Rochester, New York, 1815-1837 (Hill & Wang, 1978).

[13] Dudden, Serving Women, p. 119; and Gwendolyn Wright, Moralism and the Modern Home: Domestic Architecture and Cultural Conflict in Chicago, 1873-1913 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), p. 19.

[14] See Philip Dana Orcutt, "Gore Place," and "Gore Place, Waltham, Massachusetts: The Beginnings of a Restoration," articles on file with The Gore Place Society. See also Helen R. Pinkney, Christopher Gore: Federalist of Massachusetts, 1758-1827 (Waltham, Mass.: The Gore Place Society, 1969), pp. 85-89.

Prominent Americans in the early nineteenth century hired large servant staffs, each with specific titles and duties, including a butler, valet, coachman, footman, housekeeper, lady's maid, cook, waitress, nurse, parlor maid, chambermaid, and laundress. Jobs of the servant staff at Gore Mansion reflected the new types of duties servants performed, as well as the new relationship between employer and employee. The Gores maintained a servant staff of fourteen at the mansion (though not all lived in), each with a different job title and set of responsibilities. Gore's domestic staff, like others of the day, copied the patterns of European servant arrangements. The butler, Robert Roberts, was in charge of all of the other servants, as well as his own tasks. These often included seeing that everything in the household was in order, greeting visitors, tending to the wine and sherry cellars, laying the breakfast table, cleaning the breakfast and dinner tables, and tending to the fires. The butler could also hire the other male staff, including footmen and coachmen. The housekeeper hired and maintained the female staff, often including the cooks and the nursemaid. She was in charge of ordering goods from the market, preparing the house linens, making tea and coffee, and attending to the needs of the mistress. Cooks helped select menus, helped the mistress with preserving and canning, and prepared all meals. Waitresses served the meals to the family and also prepared the table for dinner parties. There were explicit instructions for how a table should be laid for a variety of occasions, so that proper etiquette was always observed.[15]

The staff helped the master and mistress with chores that their eighteenth century counterparts had performed themselves, but also with new tasks created by the advent of new technology. While technology could make household chores easier in some cases, in others it created new demands and tasks for the servants to perform. For example, the refrigerator, which was patented in 1803 but did not come into common use until the 1820s, cut down on much of the work of mistresses and helpers in the area of food preparation, including canning, drying, churning butter and cheese, butchering, and cooking meals. But while the introduction of coal in the 1820s made home heating a bit easier, it also meant that servants had to diligently tend the furnace, an arduous and messy job. Similarly, the advent of lamps in late 1820s improved lighting, and lamps required less physical labor than candlemaking, but oil or gas lamps still required close attention to avoid mishaps.[16] Roberts highlighted the potential danger of lamps in his instructions for "shutting up the house:"

> Your lamps must be turned down, not blown out. Then push up the keys of your lamps, that the oil may not flow over, to spoil the carpets, for this would be a sad disaster; and it oftentimes happens through the neglect of servants not attending properly to the lamps. When all your lights are extinguished, see that your fireguards are put to your fires, and that everything is safe in the rooms before you go out; then fasten your front door; then go round to all the doors and windows on the back part of the house, to ascertain whether they are all safe fastened. This is the most important part of your duty, to see that the house, and all the fires are safe.[17]

In addition to serving the practical needs of wealthy families, servants also attested to the family's social position. The importance of the class status that came with keeping a large staff of servants was exhibited in the Gores' encounter with an acquaintance in a nearby town. Ellen Derby Peabody recounted her thoughts on seeing Gore's chariot during her travels in October, 1815. "Here we found

---

[15] Robert Roberts, The House Servant's Directory, facsimile of the 1827 edition (Waltham, Mass.: The Gore Place Society, 1977), p. 44.

[16] Dudden, Serving Women, pp. 128-145.

[17] Roberts, House Servant's Directory, p. 67.

Governor Gore. He traveled in a chariot, a most foolish thing, not half as comfortable or genteel as our wagon; fourteen servants, including housekeeper, handmaid, butler, and two pages."[18] This portrait illustrates the important role servants played in making visible the elite status of their employers. It also highlights the degree to which the division of labor within the household was firmly established in the homes of the wealthy by the early nineteenth century.

Guidebooks during the nineteenth century laid out the specifics of how a variety of domestic chores should be performed. Most often these guidebooks were written by middle-class reformers and arbiters of moralism in American culture. Many were written for the woman of the household, so that she could properly train her servants. Yet some were directed at the domestics themselves and gave advice not only about how best to accomplish tasks but also about proper relationships with employers and other employees.[19] Robert Roberts was one of the few servants to write his own guidebook to be used by other servants. Roberts claimed experience "as a house servant in some of the first families in England, France, and America."[20] He became butler for the Gores in October of 1825, after having worked for some of the most prominent families in Massachusetts, including Nathan Appelton and Kirk Boot, both large investors in Lowell Mills, one of the first textile manufacturing companies in the nation.

In his guidebook, Roberts gave detailed descriptions of domestics' duties, including how to set out tables and sideboards; how to wait large and small parties; how to polish boots; how to clean plate, brass, steel, glass, and mahogany; and "100 useful and various receipts [recipes and instructions]," including items such as "to render old pictures as fine as new," "a great secret to mix mustard," "to recover a person from intoxication," and "to preserve milk for sea that will keep for six months."[21] He also advised servants how to avoid waste in the household:

> Many well-meaning servants are ignorant of the best means of managing, and thereby waste as much as would maintain a small family, besides causing the mistress of the house much chagrin by their irregularity. . . .[22]

He went on to explain how to store vegetables, meats, candles, and breads. Roberts argued that by training servants in the proper protocol of domestic duties, conflicts with employers could be avoided.

Throughout the guide book, Roberts framed all his advice in terms of preserving propriety and decorum in the household. His discussion of setting out sideboards reflects this concern with proper protocol. "In setting out your sideboard, you must study neatness, convenience, and taste; as you must

---

[18] Some Chronicles of the Day Family Compiled by E.D.P. [Ellen Derby Peabody] (Cambridge, Mass.: Riverside Press, 1893).

[19] Titles that are representative of the nineteenth-century literature on domestic service include The Complete Servant, Being a Practical Guide to the Peculiar Duties and Business of All Descriptions of Servants (London: Knight and Lacey, 1825); Rose Mary Crawshay, Domestic Service for Gentlewomen: A Record of Experience and Success (London: Rose Mary Crawshay, 1876); The Duties of Servants: A Practical Guide to the Routine of Domestic Service (London: Frederick Warne &Co., n.d.); Every Servant's Book, Being a Complete Guide to All Duties (London: TY. Griffiths, 1833); and Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestics (Boston: Philips, Sampson, & Co., 1855).

[20] Roberts, Directory, p. iii.

[21] Ibid, pp. v-viii.

[22] Ibid, p. 173.

think that ladies and gentlemen that have splendid and costly articles, wish to have them seen and set out to best advantage."[23] At the same time, though, he pointed out that the only way for the servant to best serve the family is by the family providing proper working spaces:

> A good dinner is one of the greatest enjoyments of human life; and as the practice of cookery is attended with so many discouraging difficulties, so many disgusting and disagreeable circumstances, and even dangers, we ought to have some regard for those who encounter them, to procure us pleasure, and to reward their attention, by rendering their situation every way as comfortable and agreeable as we can. Mere money is a very inadequate compensation to a complete cook; he who had preached integrity to those in the kitchen may be permitted to recommend liberality to those in the parlour; they are indeed the sources of each other.[24]

Here Roberts lays out his belief in the mutual dependence of the employer and employee, and argues for a recognition of this relationship in order to assure the servant dignity in his or her station.[25]

Employers and guidebook-writers focused on the proper relationship between family members and domestics now that servants were living in. Middle-class reformers encouraged household mistresses to look upon their relationship with their domestics as a missionary one. Employers needed their servants to exhibit propriety so that they would be a proper reflection on the moral, Christian nature of the home. According to Catherine Beecher and her sister, Harriet Beecher Stowe (author of Uncle Tom's Cabin), respect had to be the guide for relationships with servants.[26] Roberts reiterated this point. "'The laborer is worthy of his hire,'" Roberts argued,"and should be treated in health or in sickness with pity and feeling; if it is necessary to place servants under strict surveillance, let them at least be treated as fellow beings and candidates for a future world."[27]

At the same time, though, Roberts illustrated that he, as butler, was a strict supervisor of the rest of the staff. He admonished the servants under his employ to be diligent workers in order to establish their professionalism:

> In order to get through your work in proper time, you should make it your chief study to rise early in the morning; for an hour before the family rises is worth more to you than two after they are up; for in this time you can get through the dirtiest part of the work, which you cannot do when the family rises. . . .

---

[23] Ibid, p. 49.

[24] Roberts, House Servant's Directory, p. 155.

[25] For further discussion of relationships between servants and masters in New England, see Charles A. Hammond, "The Dilemmas of Domestic Service in New England, 1750-1850," Folklife (1988), 58-67; and Daniel E. Sutherland, Americans and Their Servants: Domestic Service in the United States from 1800-1920 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981).

[26] Catherine Beecher and Harriet Beecher Stowe, The American Woman's Home, or, Principles of Domestic Science: Being A Guide to the Formation and Maintenance of Economical, Healthful, Beautiful, and Christian Homes (New York: J.B. Ford and Company, 1869), p. 324.

[27] Roberts, House Servant's Directory, pp. 154-55.

> In the next place, you must have a proper dress for doing your dirty work in; for you should never attempt to wait on the family in the clothes that you clean your boots, shoes, knives, and lamps in; for the dress that you wear is to the do this part of your work is not fit to wait in, on ladies and gentleman. . . .
>
> There is no class of people that should dress more neat and clean than a house servant, because he is generally exposed to the eyes often public; but his dress, though neat and tidy, should never be foppish or extravagant.[28]

Mistresses were even more clear about controlling the behavior and appearance of their servants, so that they would be a dignified reflection of their employers. Servants must not be too showy, but also could not be slovenly. According to employer Helen Munson Williams, her domestic "must keep herself always neat and tidy in her person and never go to the door, or wait on the table with disarranged hair or in any but a clean and smooth white apron."[29]

The large acreage of the landscaped grounds and farming areas at Gore necessitated the hiring of a separate farm staff. Jacob Farwell was the overseer of the farm laborers and lived on site along with his immediate family, his brother Isaac, Maynard Moore, and the gardener, all of whom worked year round. He worked for Gore from 1810 until Gore's death in 1827. Most of the farm laborers were hired on a monthly basis, usually with the agreement that they would work seven or eight months, though few stayed that long. These monthly workers earned an average of ten dollars per month. Typically there were five workers employed on the farm in addition to Farwell from late March through June, approximately three workers from July to October, and one from November through March. Often Farwell would hire day workers to help with particular tasks. In 1825, Farwell hired two female workers, Polly Warren and Lydia Butlers, at a piece rate for the months of April and May; they made as little as two dollars per week. While some workers were hired yearly, including Maynard Moore and Polly Warren, most workers were hired for less than one season. Since Christopher Gore took great pride in his "farm," he was actively involved in its oversight.[30]

The jobs performed by the farm hands included taking produce to market, making mats from corn husks, preparing fertilizer, digging "hot beds" in the yard for planting lettuce, and "helping." Many of the seasonal workers hired by Gore helped the main gardener, David Haggerton, with his planting and reaping chores. Other chores for helpers included fixing the pump and well, building a fence, slaughtering sheep, and helping masons and carpenters. During the off-season, helpers might help Farwell cut down trees or cart leaves, sled ice, and bale hay, both for Gore and for some of his neighbors.[31]

The popularity of domestic guidebooks by the mid-nineteenth century was partly a result of the rise of more permanent live-in servants who needed more formal training than did the hired help of earlier decades. In American cities during the nineteenth century, at any given time 15 to 30 percent of households included live-in domestic servants. Indeed, by the mid-nineteenth century, domestic service

---

[28] Ibid, pp. 15, 76.

[29] Quoted in Dudden, Serving Women, p. 120.

[30] See Jacob Farwell, "Farm Workers at Gore, June 1820-June 1826," in Farm Journal, manuscript in possession of The Gore Place Society.

[31] "Notes from Farwell's Diary," compiled by Sara Cormeny, Gore Place Society, 1991.

was the most common occupation for women. The formal arrangements involved in hiring and training staffs also changed how employers located perspective servants. Christopher Gore's search for female domestics and a footman reveals the changes taking place in securing staff. For hiring domestics, the Gores most likely went through one of the new employment agencies arising during this time. He writes to friend Rufus King (former embassador to England and a college friend of Gore's from Harvard), "Hitherto we have done much better on the score of Domestics than we feared." For a footman, though, Gore relies on the advice of King and tries to secure his former employee. "I have written you two or three letters praying you to permit McIntire [King's servant in New York] to hire and send me a Footman from New York. We are waiting for a reply as we are without necessary servant."[32]

Women entered service in great numbers in the mid-nineteenth century. Ironically, this was the same time when elite families often complained about the lack of availability of good, responsible domestics. The familiar adage "you can't get good help anymore" was partially a response to the increasingly impersonal and intensely hierarchical relationship between employer and employee, and also among servants themselves. Domestics were encouraged to address employers respectfully and obediently at all times. Roberts advised servants, "In the first place all domestics should be submissive and polite to their employers, and to all visitants that may come to the house. [Domestics] should never be pert, or strive to enter into conversation with their employers or any visitant that may come to the house, unless they speak to you or ask you a question, and then you should answer them in a polite manner, in as few words as possible."[33] Also, the entire servant staff had to answer to the butler. Roberts' guidebook, unlike the etiquette books written by middle-class social arbiters, spoke about the interpersonal relationships between servants. He advised, "Take care and never do an injury to any servant's character, for how easy they may be thrown out of bread through it, and perhaps led to greater evils. Always guard against being influenced to do any kind of injustice to your comrade servants, either by lying, or any other revengeful spirit."[34]

Many employers believed that domestic service offered a number of opportunities for young workers, especially women, and they should be grateful for finding such employment. The Beechers claimed, "One would think, on the face of it, that a calling which gives a settled home, a comfortable room, rent-free, with fire and lights, good board and lodging, and steady, well-paid wages, would certainly offer more attractions than the making of shirts for tenpence, with all the risks of providing one's own sustenance and shelter."[35] Living conditions for domestic servants depended largely upon the wealth and sympathies of the employer. In some households, female domestics slept on a cot in the kitchen, or slept on a straw bed in the nursery. Servants at Gore Mansion were fortunate to have separate sleeping quarters, which contained a single bed, a desk, a side table, and a chair. Clearly this living arrangement gave servants more private space and time than those with more austere conditions (though the Gore servants' quarters still were rather austere).[36]

---

[32] Christopher Gore to Rufus King, November 25, 1804; Gore to King, June 9, 1808, Rufus King Papers, New York Historical Society, copies at The Gore Place Society, Waltham, Mass.

[33] Roberts, Directory, p. 69.

[34] Ibid, p, 73.

[35] Beecher and Stowe, The American Woman's Home, p. 322.

[36] Curators at Gore Place have refurnished one of the servants' rooms in the West Gable according to their understanding of how furnishings were arranged in the nineteenth century.

The Beechers pointed out that if employers treated their servants with more respect, then women from more upstanding backgrounds would enter into service. Indeed, the complaints of many servants highlight how the lack of respect exhibited by their employers led them to leave service. In Lucy Maynard Salmon's 1901 survey of domestics, she asked them to name the main reason why more women do not enter service. The overwhelming response was "pride, social condition, and unwillingness to be called servants."[37] Domestics also often had to work evenings and Sundays, with very little time they could call their own. Nearly all domestics worked at least ten hours per day in the nineteenth century, and many worked twelve to fifteen hours per day. Servants complained about being constantly at the beck and call of the mistress. For example, one woman describing the life of a live-in explained, "When you live in, you must do everything but chew [your employer's] food. Do this, do that, run here, run there, and when you get through--do this!"[38]

Women especially experienced great isolation, both from their families and from their peers. Many of the women entering domestic service before 1840 were native-born Americans whose families had fallen on hard times. Their daughters would be sent out to service to earn added income for the family, and also to relieve the family of the expense of their care. The majority of women in service were unmarried, as most employers assumed domestics would leave service upon marriage. Many domestics complained about the isolation they experienced, as many employers frowned on too much social interaction among servants.[39] As a result, women often left service when other job opportunities arose.

Wages for female domestics were much lower than in other trades. By the 1850s, in North Eastern cities, women received room and board, plus about three dollars per week. Male domestics, especially butlers, made more money than women, and often were able to save enough to leave service and purchase their own home. During this period, a butler made approximately $6.50 per week, and had much more freedom during their free time than did females.[40] Robert Roberts owned a house in the Old West Side of Boston on Second Street from 1816 to 1860, the year of his death. He married Ellen Rosina, had five children (four sons and one daughter), and bought another home at 8 Napier Street in Boston, where his children grew up. He left the employ of the Gores shortly after Christopher Gore's death in 1827, and became an active member of the African American Meeting House of Beacon Hill, where he supported the Garrisonian Anti-slavery movement. He evidently purchased the houses next to his home, at 9 Napier Street, as an investment property. Upon his death in 1860, his estate was valued at $7,868.81, including approximately $4,500 for the two houses, $3,042 in personal wealth.[41]

Turnover rates were high for female domestics as a result of the low wages and feelings of isolation and disrespect. Women often sought factory work over service once it became available because of the increased flexibility and control over time and wages. In Cohoes, New York in 1881, the local

---

[37] Salmon, Domestic Service, p. 140.

[38] Elizabeth Clark-Lewis, Living In, Living Out: African American Domestics in Washington, D.C., 1910-1940 (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1994), p. 106. See also David M. Katzman, Seven Days a Week: Women and Domestic Service in Industrializing America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), p. 7, and Salmon, Domestic Service, pp. 140-165.

[39] Cowan, "Household Labor," p. 32; and Dudden, Serving Women, pp. 194-199.

[40] Salmon, Domestic Service, pp. 90-100; and Boydston, Home and Work, p. 132.

[41] See Suffolk County Docket 43224, Probate Records, 1860, Suffolk County Courthouse; U.S. Census, Manuscript Census, 1830, Reel 65, page 188; 1840, Reel 197, page 328; 1860, Reel 521, page 553.

newspaper declared it was "next to impossible" to obtain good servants because of the opening of the cotton mills. Women also left service for marriage, so the length of time a family could employ one servant was relatively limited. The post-1840 influx of Irish immigrants enhanced the availability of domestics at a time when many native-born women were choosing other occupations. Many Irish families sent their daughters to America rather than their sons, knowing that there was demand for domestic labor. German immigrants also took jobs as domestics during this time.[42] The servant staff at Gore Place during the antebellum period reflects these changes. After the death of Mrs. Gore in 1833, the house was purchased by Boston Mayor Theodore Lyman, who then sold the estate to John S. Copley Greene in 1838. The servant staff in the Greene household, according to the 1850 census, included six live-in servants: a coachman born in Maine, a male servant born in Ireland, two female servants born in Germany, one in Ireland, and another in Nova Scotia. Employers began complaining about the habits of the immigrant domestics, and the stereotype of the "Irish" biddy became pervasive in popular literature.[43]

Efforts to challenge the difficult living and working conditions often associated with domestic service took a variety of forms. As early as 1827, a group of Boston women formed the Society for the Mutual Benefit of Female Domestics and Their Employers. The purpose of the society was to establish guidelines for the proper relationship between mistresses and servants. "It is an undoubted fact," the preamble states, "that the situation of female domestics in this city, especially when they are strangers, is attended with great difficulties and dangers--their employers also are often subjected to perplexity and disappointment." In order to overcome this situation, the Society would become "the protectors of the innocent and friendless, and the encourager of virtue and industry." Members contributed a dollar per year, and in return had the opportunity to obtain a domestic registered with the Society who had produced "satisfactory evidence of good character, and of their respective qualifications." Domestics, in turn, received funds of between five and ten dollars per year of satisfactory service (after two years) deposited into a savings account. Domestics received this money, which could rise to as much as fifty dollars, upon leaving their employ (though not before ten years of service, except in cases of marriage or misfortune).[44] While this service functioned primarily as a hiring agency, it did provide some guidelines for the responsibilities employers had toward their servants.

Traditional craft unions paid little attention to domestic servants as workers worthy of organizing. This primarily was a result of the fact that most domestics were women, and their work was considered "unskilled" labor by the organizers of the craft-based American Federation of Labor. The nature of the work also made it difficult to organize servants, since there was no common workplace where all workers came together. As a result, domestics protested their working conditions either by leaving one employer for another, or by leaving service altogether and seeking work elsewhere. There were some working women's protective unions formed in the late nineteenth century to help women find work and to provide free legal service for working women. These organizations, though, run mostly by middle-class reformers, focused on women working in factories and had little success aiding domestic servants.[45]

---

[42] Cowan, "Household Labor," p. 33; Dudden, Serving Women, pp. 65-69; Salmon, Domestic Service, pp. 62-72.

[43] U.S. Census, Manuscript Census, 1850, House #503.

[44] "Constitution of the Society for the Mutual Benefit of Female Domestics and their Employers" (Boston: Munroe and Francis, 1827), pp. 2; 5; 6-7.

[45] See Barbara Mayer Wertheimer, We Were There: The Story of Working Women in America (New York: Pantheon Books, 1977), p. 155.

By the postbellum period, the number of domestic servants rose dramatically, primarily as a result of Emancipation. From 1870 to 1910, the number of female domestic servants rose from 960,000 to 1,830,000. Between 1910 and 1920, this number declined to 1,400,000. After 1900, the number of native-born white women entering service declined sharply, while the number of foreign-born and African-American women in service rose. The Irish still made up the largest segment of foreign-born servants in 1900, with forty-one percent being Irish. In the South after 1900, the number of servants in households declined, as it did in the North. Yet the ratio of servants to households was more than forty percent higher in the South, a result of the large percentage of African-American women entering service jobs there. In 1890, thirty percent of all domestic workers nationwide were black women, and forty percent of all black women who were employed were either domestics or laundresses. The number of African-American servants would continue to rise throughout the twentieth century.[46]

By the turn of the century, many institutions of higher education had launched efforts to professionalize domestic labor. Large research institutions like the University of Chicago instituted departments of Domestic Science which trained women about proper standards of cleanliness, nutrition, household economy, and public health. These departments injected scientific language and problem-solving models to many of the issues formerly addressed by etiquette books. While most of these university programs were geared towards middle-class female students, there also were programs aimed at domestic servants. The most famous was the Nannie Helen Burroughs National Training School for Women and Girls (NHL 1991). Burroughs was an African-American educator and religious leader. She founded the training school in 1909 in Washington, D.C. to provide practical skills for Black women. The school offered academic instruction in liberal arts, religion, and training in domestic arts and vocations, and was the first school to offer all of these opportunities within a single institution. The school was supported by reformers and political leaders such as Mary McLeod Bethune, Oscar De Priest, and Herbert Hoover. By the 1920s, the school was training women not only in domestic science but also in occupations such as shoe repair and dry cleaning.[47]

Changes in the characteristics of domestic workers also brought changes in the nature of the work. By 1920, domestic service moved from being primarily a live-in occupation to mostly live-out work. This was due in part to African American women replacing immigrant and native-born white women in service jobs. African-American women were more likely to be married and have families of their own while they were employed as domestics. As a result, they were employed as "dayworkers," often going to employers' homes every day of the week, and returning home in the evening. Others took work home with them, such as laundry or mending, and their employers paid them by the piece. This pattern continued through World War II, after which service figures declined. Most families who employed domestics during the post-war era had workers come in one or two days a week, or hired them for particular tasks, such as laundering or helping with child care. Often these women were African-American, but in recent decades new immigrants, especially Mexicans, Central Americans, and Asians, have taken over service jobs and even taken live-in positions for the growing number of

---

[46] Katzman, Seven Days A Week, pp. 46-87; W.E.B. DuBois, The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1899); Cowan, "Household Labor," p. 34.

[47] See Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, Righteous Discontent: The Woman's Movement in the Black Baptist Church, 1880-1920 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993); and "National Training School for Women and Girls," National Historic Landmark Nomination Form, National Park Service, 1990.

dual-career middle-class households with children. Domestic service, then, has been a pervasive feature of American labor history, and continues to reflect changes in American culture, demographics, and the economy. [48]

[48] Clark-Lewis, Living In, Living Out, Chapters 1 and 2; Cowan, "Household Labor," pp. 36-38; Katzman, Seven Days a Week, p. 87.

9. MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Beecher, Catherine. *Letter to Persons Who Are Engaged in Domestic Service*. New York: Leavitt & Trow, 1842.

Beecher, Catherine and Harriet Beecher Stowe, *The American Woman's Home, or, Principles of Domestic Science; Being A Guide to the Formation and Maintenance of Economical, Healthful, Beautiful, and Christian Homes*. New York: J.B. Ford and Company, 1869.

The Complete Servant, Being a Practical Guide to the Peculiar Duties and Business of All Descriptions of Servants. London: Knight and Lacey, 1825.

"Constitution of the Society for the Mutual Benefit of Female Domestics and their Employers." Boston: Munroe and Francis, 1827. pp. 2; 5; 6-7.

Crawshay, Rose Mary. *Domestic Service for Gentlewomen: A Record of Experience and Success*. London: Rose Mary Crawshay, 1876.

Downing, Andrew Jackson, Treatice on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening. New York: 1849 fourth ed. page 28.

DuBois, W.E.B. *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1899.

The Duties of Servants: A Practical Guide to the Routine of Domestic Service. London: Frederick Warne & Co., n.d..

Every Servant's Book, Being a Complete Guide to All Duties. London: TY. Griffiths, 1833.

Farwell, Jacob. "Farm Workers at Gore, June 1820-June 1826." In Farm Journal. Manuscript in possession of The Gore Place Society. Waltham, Mass.

Gore, Christopher. Account Book of Christopher Gore 1804 - 1807. Harvard University Baker Library.

Gore, Christopher to Rufus King. November 25, 1804; June 9, 1808. *Rufus King Papers*. New York Historical Society. Copies at The Gore Place Society.

Kendell, Edward Augustus. *Travels through the northern parts of the United States, 1807 and 1808*. 1809 vol 3 p 10.

Orcutt, Philip Dana. "Gore Place." And "Gore Place, Waltham, Massachusetts: The Beginnings of a Restoration." Articles on file with The Gore Place Society.

Peabody, Ellen Derby [E.D.P.], compiler. *Some Chronicles of the Day Family*. Cambridge, Mass.: Riverside Press, 1893.

Plain Talk and Friendly Advice to Domestics. Boston: Philips, Sampson, & Co., 1855.

Ripley, Samuel, "A Topographical & Historical Description of Waltham, in the County of Middlesex" Jan. 1, 1815 in Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, series 2, vol III, p. 272.

Roberts, Robert. *The House Servant's Directory*. Facsimile of the 1827 edition. Waltham, Mass.: The Gore Place Society, 1977.

Salmon, Lucy Maynard. *Domestic Service*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1901.

Small, Edwin W. "Report of Biennial Visit to Gore Place." Registry of National Historic and Natural Landmarks. January 5, 1973.

Snell, Charles. National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form for Gore Place. 1970.

Winsor, Justin. *The Memorial History of Boston*. Boston: 1881 Vol 4 p 634.

Secondary Sources

Boydston, Jeanne. *Home and Work: Housework, Wages, and the Ideology of Labor in the Early Republic*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Clark-Lewis, Elizabeth. *Living In, Living Out: African American Domestics in Washington, D.C., 1910-1940*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1994.

Cott, Nancy. *The Bonds of Womanhood: "Woman's Sphere" in New England, 1780-1835*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

Cowan, Ruth Schwartz. "Household Labor: Huswifs, Housewives and Domestic Workers." Essay submitted for the National Park Service Theme Study in American Labor History, 1994.

_____. *More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Dudden, Faye E. *Serving Women: Household Service in Nineteenth-Century America*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1983.

Garrett, Wendell. *Classical America: The Federal Style and Beyond*. New York: Rizzoli International Publications 1992, pp. 33-35.

Genovese, Eugene. *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made*. New York: Random House, 1974.

Gillette, Jane Brown. "Breaking the Silence." *Historic Preservation* 47 (March/April 1995), pp. 38-43.

Gowans, Alan. *Images of American Living*. Philadelphia & New York: 1964. p 209

Hammond, Charles A. "Carriages at Gore Place" *The Carriage Journal*, vol. 27, no.1. Summer 1989 pages 13-15.

_____. "The Dilemmas of Domestic Service in New England, 1750-1850." *Folklife* 1988, pp. 58-67.

Hammond, Charles and Stephen A. Wilbur. "Gay and Graceful Style": A Catalogue of Objects Associated with Christopher and Rebecca Gore. Waltham, MA: The Gore Place Society, 1982.

Higginbotham, Evelyn Brooks. *Righteous Discontent: The Woman's Movement in the Black Baptist Church, 1880-1920*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Johnson, Paul E. *A Shopkeeper's Millennium: Society and Revivals in Rochester, New York, 1815-1837*. Hill & Wang, 1978.

Jones, Jacqueline. *Labor of Love, Labor of Sorrow: Black Women, Work, and the Family from Slavery to the Present*. New York: Basic Books, 1985.

Katzman, David M. *Seven Days a Week: Women and Domestic Service in Industrializing America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Kerber, Linda K. *Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.

Norton, Mary Beth. *Liberty's Daughters: The Revolutionary Experience of American Women, 1750-1800*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1980.

Pinkney, Helen R. *Christopher Gore: Federalist of Massachusetts, 1758-1827*. Waltham, Mass.: The Gore Place Society, 1969.

Polson, Phyllis. "Gore Place, A Restoration in Progress" 1969.

Pratt, Richard and Dorothy. *The Second Guide to Early American Homes*. New York: Hawthorne Press, 1959. p. 27.

Ryan, Mary. *Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Sadler, Jr., Julius Troysdale, Jacquelin D.J. Sadler. *American Stables: An Architectural Tour*. Boston: New York Graphic Society. 1981. pages 54, 55.

Sutherland, Daniel E. *Americans and Their Servants: Domestic Service in the United States from 1800-1920*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981.

Treese, Lorett. "The Gores of Gore Place" Early American Life 1991.

Ulrich, Laurel Thatcher. *Good Wives: Image and Reality in the Lives of Women in Northern New England, 1650-1750*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982.

Wertheimer, Barbara Mayer. *We Were There: The Story of Working Women in America*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1977.

Wick, Peter A. "Gore Place, Federal Mansion in Waltham, Massachusetts" *The Magazine Antiques* December 1976, p 1250-1261.

Wright, Gwendolyn. *Moralism and the Modern Home: Domestic Architecture and Cultural Conflict in Chicago, 1873-1913*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

__ Preliminary Determination of Individual Listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested.
X Previously Listed in the National Register.
__ Previously Determined Eligible by the National Register.
X Designated a National Historic Landmark.
X Recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey: #MA-210, 210A, 834
__ Recorded by Historic American Engineering Record: #_____

Primary Location of Additional Data:

X State Historic Preservation Office
__ Other State Agency
__ Federal Agency
__ Local Government
__ University
__ Other (Specify Repository): Gore Place Society

10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

Acreage of Property: Approximately 76 acres

UTM References:

	Zone	Easting	Northing
A	19	317890	4693550
B	19	318400	4693330
C	19	318200	4692940
D	19	318050	4692740
E	19	317560	4693000

Verbal Boundary Description:

The boundary of Gore Place is the property in Waltham, Massachusetts bounded as follows: Beginning at the southeast corner of the intersection of Main Street and Gore Street, proceeding south 1247.9 feet to the east side of Gore Street to the northeast intersection of Gore Street and Grove Street, then east along the north edge of Grove Street 271.93 feet, crossing to the south side of Grove Street, proceed due southwest to a point 812.24 feet from the South side of Grove Street, then due southwest 356.26 feet to a point, then east-southeast 1,186.93 feet to a point on the west side of Stanley Avenue, then northeast 769.36 feet on the west side of Stanley Avenue to the southwest corner of the intersection of Stanley Avenue and Waltham Street, crossing Waltham Street to the northeast corner of the intersection, then due north 1,521.56 feet to a point on the south edge of Main Street, then along the south edge of Main Street 1,522.03 feet to the point of origin.

Boundary Justification:

The boundary includes approximately 76 acres of property purchased by the Gore Place Society in 1935. All land within the boundary was historically associated with the estate.

11. FORM PREPARED BY

Name/Title: Robin F. Bachin
Assistant Director
The Dr. William M. Scholl Center
for Family & Community History
The Newberry Library
60 West Walton Street
Chicago, IL 606109

Telephone: (312) 255-3642

Date: 06/03/96

National Park Service
National Historic Landmarks Survey
January 7, 1997