Classifying a building by type tells only part of the story of its architecture; more varied and interesting is the matter of architectural style. Although the two are interrelated, it is helpful to separate them when, as in Cambridgeport, there is an otherwise overwhelming mass of material to be digested. The following stylistic discussion refers often to the housing types defined in the preceding pages. Emphasis is on single-family types because they were the ones that received the most architectural embellishment.

The principal residential styles in 19th-century Cambridgeport were Late Georgian or Federal, Greek Revival, Italianate or Bracketed, Mansard, and Queen Anne. This arrangement is roughly chronological, although for the styles even more than for the types, the classifications merge and overlap.

Federal

Except for a few scattered farm houses of which no traces or descriptions survive, the first Cambridgeport buildings were erected after the opening of the West Boston Bridge in 1793. The architectural style of the time, sometimes called “Late Georgian” to denote its position at the end of the English Georgian tradition, is more generally called “Federal” to associate it with the early years of the American Republic. Still bound by Georgian formality and symmetry, the Federal style has a lightness and elegance not found in earlier Georgian; hallmarks of the style are delicate, attenuated detail and such features as oval salons and graceful curving staircases. Although few of these elegant Federal characteristics occur in Cambridgeport, the early vernacular architecture of the district can still be seen to belong to the Federal style.

One characteristic of Cambridgeport’s Federal buildings is uniformity of plan. There was little variety beyond the basic three plan-types discussed earlier in this report (Fig. 33): Plan A, the four-room center-hall plan; Plan B, the two-room center-hall plan; and Plan C, the side-hall plan. Although these plans could be combined in double houses and in rows, and although there was variation in the number of stories and in the placement of service wings and porches, the underlying room arrangements remained remarkably constant.

The grandest type of Federal house followed Plan A, with a center hall and four principal rooms per floor. Generally three stories high with a low hip roof, such houses were built in large numbers by wealthy sea captains and merchants in towns like Salem. Cambridgeport had few three-story Federal dwellings, only one of which – the Bordman house of 1805 – might be called a mansion.

Andrew Bordman had extensive land holdings in Cambridgeport, having inherited the old Phips farm from his mother, Sarah Phips Bordman; his house at the corner of Windsor and Hampshire Streets was the finest in the area, being described by a contemporary as a “spacious dwelling” and “elegant mansion.” The house has since been moved back from the corner, hemmed in by stores and tenements, and converted to flats; nonetheless, its basic mass (35 by 50 feet, three stories high with a low hip roof) and its five-window center-entrance facade (despite replacement sash and artificial siding) hint at its former Federal grandeur (Fig. 63). The interior has suffered even more than the exterior. Partitions have been removed; about all one can see are the corner framing posts and a few sections of thin-wall construction. Nevertheless, the house survives, unlike the comparable mansions of Mid Cambridge (the Inman house, the Dana house, and Shady Hill), all of which have been destroyed.

63. ANDREW BORDMAN HOUSE, 96 HAMPSHIRE ST., 1805
Smaller than the Bordman house, but still a substantial dwelling, is the Fuller house at 71 Cherry Street (Fig. 64). Built about 1807, the house is remembered chiefly as the birthplace in 1810 of Margaret Fuller, later Marchioness Ossoli, a Transcendentalist writer and critic associated with progressive intellectual circles here and abroad. Although the building devolved into tenements later in the 19th century, it acquired its present function as a settlement house in 1902, first under the sponsorship of the Y.W.C.A. and later as an independent organization. Appropriately the building still bears the name Margaret Fuller House.

The house has the tall and graceful proportions characteristic of the Federal style. The sharp clarity of the block-like mass is emphasized by the meager cornice, the low hip roof, and the absence of projecting window enframements or other decoration which might minimize the plane of the wall. The facade follows the almost invariable scheme of two windows on either side of the central door, with the nearly square third-story windows decidedly shorter than those below. The double-hung window sash are divided into medium-sized panes, six per sash.

Although the basic mass of the Fuller house looks as though it is only one room deep, the first two stories follow the full four-room center-hall Plan A (Fig. 33A). Originally there was also a two-story ell to the side, now replaced by a basement-level recreation room for the settlement house. The spacious entrance hall accommodates a wide two-run staircase with simple turned newel posts (Fig. 66). The house preserves much of its original detail, including the interior trim of the left front parlor (Fig. 67) and of one upstairs bedroom. The decoration of mantel and dado is sharp and beautifully scaled, even though accomplished with the simplest means — a series of drilled designs and a molding indented with simple saw cuts.

A 19th-century photograph (Fig. 65) shows the Fuller house with its original ell and with a porch (probably a later addition) across the entire front. The present replacement porch is more appropriate for a Federal house, although its proportions are a bit too massive for the style. The old photograph also shows exterior blinds on the windows and, in front, three large elm trees said to have been planted by Margaret’s father on the day of her birth. These elements did much to alleviate the austerity of the house. One must imagine an extensive garden in back, where the paved playground is now, for the Fullers acquired the land all the way to Pine Street (some 200 feet from Cherry) soon after buying the house on its original 40-by-85-foot lot.
Another three-story Federal house, that of Josiah Mason, an early Cambridgeport merchant, survives at the corner of Moore and Harvard Streets (Fig. 68). Dating probably from 1821 and partially remodeled later in the century, this house, like Margaret Fuller's, subsequently became a settlement house. Purchased in 1887 by Pauline Agassiz Shaw and extended to the rear, the building housed the country’s first child-care center, founded by Mrs. Shaw in 1878 and still existing as the Cambridge Neighborhood House.

Unlike the Bordman and Fuller houses, the Mason house (or Neighborhood House) is built of brick, unusual for Cambridgeport. It follows the two-room center-hall Plan B (Fig. 33B), with an ell to the side but without additional original rooms to the rear. Its three-run stairway towards the front of the hall is the standard Plan B type, allowing a small room, accessible from the two main rooms, behind the stairs. The hall of the Neighborhood House extends beyond the line of the front wall into a wooden bay which contains the door and two side windows; although this extension has been somewhat rebuilt, the feature is known to be original in other Federal houses in Cambridgeport.

The left-hand parlor of the Neighborhood House, with its rear-wall chimney, has the original Federal mantel, dado, doors, and trim; the right-hand parlor, now extended into the 1888 rear wing, has a Greek Revival marble mantel on the side-wall chimney. The third floor on the Harvard Street end of the house has been opened up to provide meeting space. With the ceiling cleared of appendages, one can see the early 19th-century manner of framing a roof with a few widely spaced purlins supported on heavy trusses and (in this case) on the brick end walls (Fig. 69).

The exterior aspect of the Neighborhood House is basically Federal – five-window center-entrance facade with squat third-story windows, the two right-hand ones later elongated. The roof, however, is a gable rather than a hip, showing that the hip roof was not a universal feature of vernacular Federal houses. Many contemporary Cambridgeport houses have simple gable roofs, with the gable treated as a continuation of the end wall, not set off by moldings or projections. The only unusual feature of the Neighborhood House gable is the parapet-like cornice on the end walls.

The bracketed bay window over the entrance and certain details of the entrance porch itself are mid-19th-century additions. In 1851 the property passed from the Mason heirs to Alexander Dickinson, a Cambridgeport soap-manufacturer; presumably it was he who remodeled the porch, added the bay window, and built the fine cast-iron fence around the front yard. Since the brick work of the ell is not bonded into that of the main house, and since the window lintels of the ell are brownstone (a mid-19th-century material), it seems likely that Dickinson replaced an earlier frame ell with the present two-story brick one. Judging from atlases, the ell in Dickinson’s time was connected by a wooden extension to a barn or carriage house further along Moore Street, near the corner of the street which now bears Dickinson’s name.

When Pauline Agassiz Shaw purchased the property from the Dickinson estate in 1887, she added a two-story wooden “kindergarten school” to the rear of the house. Although no architect was listed in the building permit of June, 1888, the design was presumably that of Shaw and Shaw of Boston, Mrs. Shaw’s husband’s firm. The interior woodwork of the addition was designed with such appreciation for the old structure that it takes a practiced eye to distinguish new from old. The remodeling is an early, albeit modest, milestone in the Georgian architectural revival that took place in the last two decades of the 19th century.
Most Federal houses in Cambridgeport were two stories high rather than three. Good examples in brick are the houses at 241 Washington Street, corner of Windsor (1826), 145 Elm Street, corner of Hampshire (1839; Fig. 70), and 15 Salem Street, corner of Watson (1841; Fig. 71). The Washington Street house follows Plan A (the four-room center-hall plan), but the others, like most Cambridgeport Federal houses, follow Plan B (the two-room center-hall plan). All have the predictable five-window center-entrance facade; all, too, have gable roofs.

A typical feature of these brick Federal houses is a cornice created in simple fashion by laying one row of bricks on the diagonal while projecting the upper course slightly beyond it; a variant scheme alternates the amount of projection in a row of header bricks. Either system creates a nimble pattern of shadows cast by the projecting bricks, adding a note of animation to the otherwise flat, reserved facade. This modest decorative detail also accents the line of intersection between facade and roof.

Other noteworthy individual features of these houses are the unusually high basement of the Elm Street house and the over-door decoration on the Washington Street house—wooden louvres laid in the pattern of a fan, unfortunately almost obscured by the later entrance porch.

Wooden houses are much more common in Cambridgeport (and indeed in all of Cambridge) than brick ones. Two wooden Federal houses on Auburn Street, both typical two-story Plan B designs, offer an instructive contrast between the relative merits of preservation and aggressive modernization. 156 Auburn was moved to its present position at the rear of the lot when the three-decker next door was constructed in 1898; more recently it has undergone changes that obliterate all traces of its original character except the pair of chimneys on its long rear wall. By contrast, 158 Auburn (1805; Fig. 72) is one of the most appealing residences in the district. Facing a flower garden it shares with its neighbor, it retains something of the village quality of old Cambridgeport. Over the entrance an arched fan window is filled with simple wood tracery; even the imitation brick composition paper is not too disturbing.

A low hip roof such as the one at 158 Auburn Street is often an indication of an early 19th-century date, but not all houses of the period had hip roofs. There is a gable roof on 172 Harvard Street (Fig. 73), a house built in the same year, 1805, as 158 Auburn. 172 Harvard is similarly sited in having its narrow end toward the street and its center-entrance facade facing the side yard. Its plan (Fig. 74) shows that it has a projecting one-story entrance bay that expands the space of the stair hall. Noted above in connection with the Cambridge Neighborhood House, this characteristic feature of Plan B Federal houses is found also at 14 Worcester Street (1829). Since illumination for the hall is obtained from small windows set in the side walls of the projection, no side lights or top lights are needed about the door. The stairs at 172 Harvard Street follow the rather cramped three-run scheme observed in Plan B houses in East Cambridge and in the Neighborhood House, with an extremely simple balustrade and newel design. Employing angled risers, the stairs are kept as compact as possible in order to conserve space at the rear of the hall for a separate room. Probably this rear room served originally as an auxiliary bedroom, but today it accommodates a bathroom.

In Plan B houses the disposition of rooms on either side of the hallway is the same. The hearth is centered on the rear wall; two windows are placed symmetrically on the front wall and two (sometimes one) on the side wall. The space on either side of the chimney projection is generally filled by shallow closets. In most cases the only places where structural framing posts can be seen are the front outside corners. Four doors per room are standard—two leading to the closets, one to the entrance hall, and one to the small room behind the stairs. A plain wooden dado capped by an ornamented molding is carried around the room at window-sill level. The focal point of the room is the mantelpiece with its drilled and reeded fascia resembling the dado molding. The parlor at 172 Harvard Street (Fig. 75) lacks one of the standard two closets; in its place, a window (now covered) pierced the rear wall. A recent thorough restoration at 172 Harvard revealed the structure of the house; of particular interest is the presence of brick nogging, for stability and insulation, between the exterior wall studs (Fig. 76).
Other examples of two-story Plan B houses include 87 Pine Street (1822), 280 Green Street (1822-1825; converted to a tavern), 59 Brookline Street (1809; Fig. 77), and 14 Soden Street.

Although East Cambridge has numerous single-story Plan B houses (referred to in the East Cambridge report as “worker’s cottages”), Cambridgeport has relatively few. A variation on the scheme is found at 167 and 169 Cherry Street (1850). Each of these one-story houses has its roof extended beyond the front and back facade to form hoods that are almost deep enough to be porches. Sheltered by the front hood, the entrance hall is pushed forward in the manner of other Cambridgeport Federal houses.

Besides being the most common plan-type for single houses, Plan B was frequently used for double houses in Federal Cambridgeport. An early example is the house at 109-111 Pine Street/3-5 Marvin Place (1804), where each facade faces a different street. Although the building retains several good mantels and dados, the original stairs have been altered in the conversion to multi-family use. A comparable back-to-back Plan B arrangement occurs at 212-214 Harvard Street (1808), with entrances in the more usual position along the sides of the building (Fig. 78). Unfortunately, the exterior of this house has been disfigured by twin windows, never found in the Federal period, and by imitation shingles. Double Plan B houses, one story in height, can be seen at 30-32 and 34-36 Market Street (by 1825).
Unlike East Cambridge, Cambridgeport has practically no Plan C single houses of the Federal period. A rare example is hidden behind a phalanx of three-deckers on Green Street at 2 Franklin Place. The fact that the house has been moved at least once makes it impossible to date, but the interior trim and the presence of brick nogging (a non-structural fill of brick and mortar placed between framing members as insulation) attest its age. A more important example built of brick stands at 11 Market Street (Fig. 79). The brick cornice of this 1831 house is a good Federal detail, but the pilaster enframement of the entrance indicates the emerging Greek Revival style.

Plan C units in pairs are more common, though they do not occur with the frequency of double Plan B’s, nor with the regularity found later in the Greek Revival. A well-preserved example is 16-18 William Street (Fig. 80), built in 1828 on Pearl Street and moved in 1847 to its present location. Stephen D. Brown was the housewright. In addition to Federal door trim, mantels, and newel posts, 16-18 William Street has paired front entrances that project in the manner of many single Federal houses in Cambridgeport. A pleasant one-story version of the same scheme, including the projecting halls, was built at 6-8 Salem Street in 1829.

Not all Federal houses follow the standard plans or elevations. For example, Cambridgeport has two one-story center-hall houses with central chimneys – 108 Auburn Street (1822; Fig. 81) and 23 Fairmont Street (1823; Fig. 82). In each of these houses, the large central chimney and the compact massing recall much earlier, even 18th-century, structures. Another variant plan occurs at 86 School Street (1835). Sited with its narrow end to the street, this tiny house, like the East Cambridge worker’s cottage, is entered from the flank, but the entrance is not related to the narrow stairs to the two-room attic. Instead, the stairs are placed against the long side wall of the back room. The late date of this example is attested by the absence of fireplaces; only stove outlets are provided by the central flue.
Several Federal-period houses in Cambridgeport contain irregular elevations. For example, a rear lean-to roof occurs on the double house at 22-24 Fairmont Street (1840). So suggestive of earlier work is the lean-to, a feature not otherwise found in Cambridgeport, that the records were double-checked and the interior inspected, but no evidence was found for earlier construction. The house at 27 Grant Street (Fig. 83) has an unusual four-bay facade, placing the entrance and chimney off center. The interior detailing and the large central chimney suggest a date much earlier than 1865, when the house was moved to its present site. Another asymmetrical facade occurs at 26-28 Fairmont Street (1847). Generally, however, the Federal builder’s acceptance of symmetry was as placid as his compliant repetition of a few standard plans.

The Federal idiom disappeared slowly in the everyday architecture of Cambridgeport. Federal-style houses as late as 1847 or 1850 have been noted, a full stylistic generation after Federal went out of fashion for important buildings. The typical Plan B and the simple exterior fuse imperceptibly into vernacular building of the mid-century, so that it is difficult to say just where the Federal style ends in Cambridgeport. It is also easy to lose the Federal feeling when a house is remodeled, when its large chimneys are removed, or when windows with many small lights are replaced by one with larger panes. Although hallmarks of the style are close-cropped gable roofs and tight juxtaposition of eaves over windows, these points are easy to overlook. For example, the house at 59 Brookline Street (Fig. 77) might well have passed unnoticed, had not its presence on the Hales map of 1830 called for a routine check. Despite its late, large-panel windows and its bracketed entrance hood, the house is proved by tax records to have been built in 1809.

Greek Revival

During the middle third of the 19th century, American architecture underwent a metamorphosis, moving from the thin, precise elegance of the Federal idioms to the heavy, forthright manner that prevailed about the time of the Civil War. If coarser, this late work was more inventive, less stereotyped than what went before. The Greek Revival style represents the first step in this change.

Buildings of the Federal period, whether produced by professional architects or by vernacular carpenters, achieved a uniformly high level of craftsmanship and design. This proficiency seems to have been attained instinctively, the result of a consistent building tradition. Plans, shapes, elements of decoration, whole formulas of design were accepted as a matter of course; one result is an urban harmony that is the envy of modern planners. Greek Revival buildings, by contrast, show signs of becoming self-conscious, ingenious, assertive. Although no new house plans developed beyond those used in the Federal period, the side-hall plan for single dwellings increased in popularity. More significant changes occurred in the massing of structures and in the importance of applied ornament. The calm, geometric abstraction of Federal work gave way to a complex and heavily plastic feeling, a change that accelerated with the years, culminating in the Queen Anne movement in the last quarter of the century.
Cambridgeport is rich in Greek Revival architecture, although it lacks the elaborate examples found in other parts of the city, particularly in Mid Cambridge. Only one house with a two-story portico remains in the survey area, and even that example is a small and naive design (Fig. 84). It seems almost impudent for William Hyde, who built 135 Western Avenue in 1846, to have squeezed so pretentious a feature as a temple front on a house of such ordinary dimensions, yet the resulting inconsistencies provide a large measure of the building’s charm. The door and window openings, with their heavy Greek Revival trim, are not quite centered between the columns. The slope of the pediment is increased to an unclassical angle to secure serviceable headroom in the attic. The stock door frame, with its pilasters and pedimented lintel, is so crowded within the small space of the facade that it competes with the portico. Flush facade boarding and floor-length windows leading to the veranda give way to ordinary clapboards and six-over-six sash on the sides (the siding now obscured by asbestos shingles). Although the house is far from a correct or convincing Greek temple, the attempt is disarming, and the house serves a useful purpose in breaking the monotony of the busy trafficway that Western Avenue has become.

A more substantial and more conservative Greek Revival house survives at 11 Magazine Street (Fig. 85). Built in 1846 by architect William Hovey, Jr., the house began life as a broad-pilastered Greek Revival residence facing Franklin Street. A mansard roof and a new entrance bay were added later—perhaps in 1861, when the property changed hands. In 1889, to make room for the three-decker on the corner, the house was rotated to its present position facing Magazine Street. Further changes have occurred in recent years, with the simplification of the entrance porch and the addition of aluminum siding. Despite these indignities, the house still retains an air of distinction (appropriate to its present function as a funeral home), thanks to the handsome proportions of the four broad pilaster panels that divide the facade. Originally this house must have resembled the Jared Sparks house at 21 Kirkland Street (1838) or the house at 127 Mt. Auburn Street, corner of Story (1847), the latter also having received a later mansard roof.

The largest Greek Revival buildings in Cambridgeport are double houses. The most impressive example, consisting of Plan C (side-hall plan) units with paired entrances, is the double house built by Charles Valentine in 1838 at 27-29 William Street, corner of Magazine (Fig. 86). A spacious Ionic porch extends across the entire 42-foot facade, and a long rear ell accommodates a dining room and kitchen for each half. The ample yard still preserves something of the quiet suburban atmosphere that once pervaded this part of Cambridgeport.
A number of good-sized Greek Revival double houses, interspersed with singles, fronted on Broadway between Elm and Inman Streets, but most of the examples lying within the limits of the present study have been considerably remodeled. Cross streets like Tremont and Elm have a few paired Plan C houses of smaller scale, but most of the doubles in this area follow Plan B because that scheme requires less frontage.

A curious but not unprecedented double house stands at 288 Washington Street (1837; Fig. 87). Seen from the front it appears to be a normal center-hall dwelling, but it also has an entrance on its right flank. The arrangement turns out to be a combination of Plans C and B. The center doorway of the facade leads to a side-hall plan in the left half of the building, while the side entry opens into a small center-hall house on the right. On a more extensive scale (four units instead of two), this scheme occurred in East Cambridge at 45-51 Gore Street (by 1821).

Of considerable architectural interest are two double houses of pressed brick at 55-57 Fairmont Street (1855; Fig. 88) and 72-74 Hampshire Street (1854; Fig. 89). Undeniably Greek Revival are the elegant and rather thin brick moldings that cap the main facades. These moldings differ from earlier Federal designs by representing a complete entablature, not just a cornice. Both houses also employ a subtle raked cornice of corbelled brick to cap the gabled walls.

Brick single houses are few in number. Although 180 Pearl Street was built as an office for the C. L. Jones Soap Company before 1854, it is completely domestic in scale and appearance. Later in date (1873) and really post-Greek Revival in style is 11 Lawrence Street, with its corbelled panels worked into the brick cornice and its segmental arches with drip moldings over the windows.

Cambridgeport has a number of brick row houses with Greek Revival characteristics. At 183-189 Windsor Street (Fig. 90) is a four-house row that was built in two sections, although the design is continuous; the left-hand pair (183-185) dates from 1850, the right-hand pair (187-189) from 1856. A tunnel in the basement between 185 and 187 (Fig. 91) once provided access to the rear yards of the two center houses—an awkward but necessary arrangement for row houses when there are no alleys. The facade of the row is capped by delicate brick bands that suggest a full entablature.

Another row of four houses, 99 Austin Street, dates from the same period (1855). This row was drastically remodeled inside and out in 1965 when the houses were converted into offices for Cambridge Community Services (Fig. 92). Without camouflaging the structure as modern, the remodeling sounds a contemporary note by contrasting the granite, brick, and plate glass surfaces in a straightforward way and by adopting an imaginative spatial composition for the new interior staircases.
Single Greek Revival residences are abundant in Cambridgeport, although there are few four-room center-hall houses. One example of Plan A, built in 1837, exists at 296 Washington Street. This modest house, lacking even the accent of a free-standing porch, was the home of Lucius R. Paige, author of the definitive History of Cambridge (1877). The front door, now changed, had an unusual pointed-arch center panel with anthemion designs in the spandrels. Similar doors can be seen in Mid Cambridge at 1715-1717 Cambridge Street (1845).

A number of corner houses appear to utilize the regular four-room Plan A, but examination shows them to be double Plan B houses. Examples include 315-317 Broadway, corner of Prospect Street, built in 1844 (the corner store was added later), and 261-263 Washington Street, corner of Cherry (1845; Fig. 93). Provided with a common porch on one side and a service wing on the other, this composition looks like a single dwelling. Only the placement of chimneys along the party wall suggests a double house, since the drawing rooms of a Greek Revival mansion would ordinarily be connected by double doors, not separated by fireplaces. The bracketed entrance hood is a later addition.

While Plan B Greek Revival single houses are uncommon in Cambridgeport, Plan C singles are too numerous to catalogue. The popularity of the side-hall plan probably lay in the fact that a narrow facade permitted the designer to suggest the proportions and members of a temple front. In the hands of Greek Revival builders this scheme is used with great flexibility, nearly always on a more modest scale than that of the two-story columned portico. One of the handsomest schemes uses full-length pilasters on a two-story facade. The house at 40 William Street (1838), which has pilasters on the side as well as the front, has been ignobly shorn of capital and window trim and has been covered by shingles, a design as well as fate that it shares with 93 Otis Street (1842) in East Cambridge. An unorthodox design projects a full second-story and gable over a first-story porch; examples are 120 Magazine Street (1844) and 36 Cottage Street. More conventional two-story Greek Revival side-hall houses, with or without front porches, can be found in the Broadway, Washington, and Magazine Street neighborhoods.

Greek Revival houses evocative of temples were fashionable in Cambridgeport from about the mid-1830’s to the mid-1840’s. Although popular, the style received some negative criticism, as in the following passage from an article in the North American Review for October, 1836:

Of late, it has become much the fashion to build country houses in the form of Grecian Temples with a projecting portico in front, resting on very magnificent columns. This style prevails at Cambridge. These classical models, which surround the college, are imitated closely in Cambridgeport. Two or three specimens of this style are to be seen on the road which forms the continuation of the old Concord turnpike through the Port. One of them in particular we have noticed, as it has been in progress. It is a small edifice, the whole length of which, including the portico, may possibly be thirty feet, and the breadth fifteen. The front of this little building is adorned with four massive fluted columns, with elegantly carved Ionic capitals, the cost of which can scarcely have been less than that of all the rest of the house.

Despite such criticism, small Greek Revival houses are among the most interesting in Cambridgeport, as well as the best preserved. Some two-story examples contain only one room and an entrance hall in the main block, plus the service ell. This variation of the side-hall house creates a stumpy cube-like shape, the proportions of which are emphasized by a heavy horizontal entablature and by the strong vertical corner pilasters. Good examples of this type are 267 Broadway (1838; Fig. 94), 128 Cherry Street (1844) and 43 Hancock Street (1844). With Greek Revival adaptability, the entrance can be placed on the gable front or on the side, while the service wing is kept small and subordinate. To avoid competition with the main roof, the upper story of the wing is often reduced in height.
Cambridgeport fortunately has its share of one-story Greek Revival cottages, examples of which are scattered throughout the city. These delightful gable-ended structures occur both singly and in groups. 50 Cottage Street (1844; Fig. 95) is the smallest of a group of five Greek Revival cottages, each slightly different. A minimal five-room house, it lacks a portico but employs corner pilasters and a pedimented gable. Somewhat different is a version of the Greek Revival cottage that combines a Greek portico with a Gothic gable and bargeboard, as at 8 and 17 Worcester Street, both built in 1839.

Unusually charming and well maintained is 79 Norfolk Street (Fig. 96). Built by Zenas Crowell in 1843, it was one of four similar cottages facing Norfolk Street, each constructed by a different carpenter. 79 Norfolk is the only one that has escaped mutilation, giving eloquent witness to what the group could look like if restored with care. The high level of the main floor is the result of later remodeling, at which time the line of the front porch was moved forward in front of the columns. At the same time a hot-air furnace was added, with ducts leading to the two parlor fireplaces; the air came out of vertical registers placed in the fireplace openings, which have the standard white marble mantels of the late 1860's. Details of 79 Norfolk Street are beautiful, although they represent nothing more than the standard trim of the period. Crossed window and door frames are used both outside and in; the main stairs have a scroll newel; and the Ionic columns and capitals were factory-made.

Bracketed

As shown in the East Cambridge and Mid Cambridge reports, the Italianate-Bracketed style is an amorphous classification. Inspiration for the movement came from the Italian Villa style, which had produced in the late 1830's and 1840's a number of impressive American country houses. A more distant source was Sir Charles Barry's series of fashionable London clubs that emulated Italian Renaissance palaces and inspired the design of such American civic structures as the Boston Athenaeum of 1847. The Renaissance in Italy was too remote and unknown to have had much direct influence in the United States.

As the style filtered down to the level of everyday architecture, it lost much of its Italianate quality (or what Americans of the day thought was Italianate). The informal massing and irregular silhouette of a country villa were as beyond the scope of a modest suburban dwelling as was the profuse but disciplined stone ornamentation of buildings like the Athenaeum. Nevertheless, vernacular builders of the 1850's did what they could to emulate such features. To houses with traditional plans, they added an overlay of decoration that was as Renaissance as they knew how to make it. But as Italianate designs were transferred into wood, they became more florid and less Classical. By 1850 the bracket had emerged as the characteristic element of decoration, despite the fact that it had never played a significant role in Italian Villa design.

The bracket lent itself to all sorts of modifications and variations, particularly when ingenious Yankee carpenters turned their jigsaws and lathes to the task. After the Civil War, practical carpenters discovered the economic advantages of producing brackets en masse; stock designs appeared with increasing frequency and elaboration, continuing in use through the 1880's.

So inexpensive yet gaudy was bracket decoration that it was incorporated into other systems of architectural ornament—Greek or Gothic Revival, French Academic, even Queen Anne. It is therefore impossible to establish sharp lines between the Bracketed and other mid-century styles. The engrossing and sometimes exasperating thing about vernacular architecture of the period is the way architectural idioms blend. Nonetheless, a typical Bracketed design of the 1850's has a distinct flavor when compared to one of the Greek Revival.

The most frequently encountered Bracketed design is a two-story house following the side-hall plan (Plan C). With gable ends facing the street, such dwellings fitted narrow lots and could be built in series. A textbook example is 232 Prospect Street (Fig. 97). Built in 1861, it was valued on the tax rolls at $3,000 (a medium price for that day). Its Italianate-Bracketed features are readily identified: two large brackets supporting the entrance hood, smaller brackets in the window heads, a large bay window, quoins blocks instead of pilasters, a round-headed window in the gable, and a main cornice that returns at the corners but does not continue across the facade to form a Classical pediment. In addition, both the slope of the roof and the general proportions of the building are slightly more vertical than in Greek Revival design.
A second Plan C house, 3 William Street (1857; Fig. 98) is somewhat closer to Italian Villa precedents. Noteworthy is the use of flush siding on the facade, recalling the smooth plaster surfaces of contemporary villas and effectively setting off the quoins and window trim. The broad cornice is supported on elegantly detailed, evenly spaced brackets, which in this case should more accurately be called modillions. Although the distinction between brackets and modillions is a fine one, modillions are laid in a horizontal rather than a vertical direction and adhere to Classical precedents. As in the Prospect Street house, window frames are given greater emphasis than in Greek Revival designs. The architrave moldings that frame the windows and the voluted corbels beneath the sills call attention to the openings and enhance the plastic interest of the facade. The front porch, the aluminum blinds, and the stained glass windows on the side elevations are obvious later additions.

Two variants of the side-hall plan should be noted. At 12 Magazine Street (1856; Fig. 99), housewright James H. Sparrow varied the scheme only to the extent of placing a small bay-windowed room next to the entrance hall. The extra window created a pleasant (though asymmetrical) balance with the more usually placed bay of similar proportions; in between was an elaborate, almost capricious bracketed entrance. The house was demolished in 1969. At 102 River Street, corner of Cottage Street, stands a side-hall house with a large side ell and cross gables as big as the facade gable (Fig. 100). More complicated massing and heavy ornamentation about windows and doors indicate a later date—1861. The elaborate entrance brackets (Fig. 101) are particularly impressive. 102 River Street clearly demonstrates that architectural character can be maintained if ornamental trim is not stripped off when artificial siding is added.

A modest version of a Bracketed side-hall dwelling is 13 Cottage Street (Fig. 102), one of a group of three houses built in 1868. Valued then at $4,000, the house is almost without ornament except for a bracket-supported canopy over the main entry. Brackets at the eave line are omitted, and the entrance has a single rather than a double door. (The stock door with twin rounded glass panels is one of the handsome industrial products of the time.) The main eaves are returned, but the eave line has not been continued across the facade to suggest the traditional pediment. Even the window heads are without bracketed cornices, but the gable has a characteristic arched window.
The only further simplification of the Bracketed side-hall house is the complete elimination of cornice returns on the facade. Such a design is found at 28 Union Street (Fig. 103), built in 1867. This house represents the irreducible minimum; a builder desiring anything smaller would have to go back to the old-fashioned Greek Revival cottage like 141 Fifth Street in East Cambridge. In Cambridgeport, however, no such units were constructed.

Plan B houses offered designers somewhat more scope for originality in design than did the side-hall plan. A pleasant but uncommon solution at 48 Pleasant Street (1859; Fig. 104) places the house broad side to the street and incorporates a low gable in the middle of the facade, directly over the entrance. Although lacking brackets, the house can be called Italianate because of its symmetrical massing, broad eave overhang, oculus window in the gable, and absence of specifically Greek details. The first-floor window frames (Fig. 105) are capped by strong cornice moldings and are supported by dentils, while the muntin windows, by this time somewhat old-fashioned, provide a sense of scale.

A recently demolished house at 7 Upton Street (Fig. 106) epitomized vernacular Bracketed design at mid-century. Built in 1866 by Joseph Holmes and sold the following year for $5,000, it had the looser plan and irregular massing that larger houses had been employing for some years. The irregular T-shaped plan of 7 Upton (Fig. 107) was a modification of the familiar Plan B entered from the side yard; the front and back walls were simply pushed out to accommodate two rooms on one side of the center hall. A standard service ell contained the kitchen and back stairs.

The T-shaped plan of 7 Upton resulted in a massing that was considerably more active than the boxlike forms of Greek Revival times. The traditional ridge roof was checked by a cross gable of almost equal height that thrust out to cover the library ell. Opposite that was a minor projection, one story high, containing the dining room; the kitchen wing with lower eaves and ridge line repeated the slope and direction of the main roof, and a one-story porch occupied the front corner of the composition. Seen from the street, the front and side gables of almost equal size competed for dominance.

Not as ornate as they sometimes became at a later date, the paired brackets that supported the overhanging eaves were relieved by small drops at their outer ends. The cornice did not continue across the gable to form a pediment but turned near enough to be carried by a pair of brackets. Below the brackets the corner board was fairly wide but not treated as a pilaster. The corner porch was carried on trellised supports whose thin wooden designs were cut with a jigsaw.

Another indication of Italianate-Bracketed origin was the presence of roundheaded windows in the moderately steep gables. These were actually nothing more than rectangular double-hung windows whose upper sash combined quarter-round panes with wooded spandrels. From the outside, however, they had rounded frames and looked like true arches. As in most buildings constructed after 1850, the window panes were large, with a single vertical division in each sash. These are called two-over-two windows—two panes in both upper and lower sash.
The second floor of 7 Upton had four bedrooms, one of them later remodeled into bath and sewing rooms. The sole original water closet seems to have been located in the basement, and no provision was made for a tub. Such a paucity of plumbing continued even in moderately priced houses like 7 Upton until the mid-1870's. Two finished rooms were in the attic. Room sizes throughout the house were somewhat smaller than one might have expected, and the main hall seemed narrow. None of the rooms had a fireplace. Instead, there were hot-air wall registers set in shallow recesses; above them were marble shelves supported on iron brackets, recalling traditional mantels (Fig. 108). That this arrangement was not an alteration is indicated by the way the baseboard edging returned to the floor on each side on the register recesses. It is probable that there were two furnaces, one for each of the two main chimneys of equal size. Hot-air ducts to the wall registers were carried in the same chimney stacks as the flues.

The straight-run staircase had a pot-bellied newel with a somewhat exaggerated profile (Fig. 109). Doors and windows of the principal rooms were framed with moldings that had a more intricate and robust profile than that used for Greek Revival interiors. Subsequently painted white, the interior trim was probably originally a dark color. The front and kitchen doors retained traces of graining, a painted design that simulates the natural grain of wood.

More common and conventional statements of Plan B are found at 34 Magazine Street and 301 Brookline Street. The Magazine Street house (Fig. 110) is beautifully maintained and demonstrates how attractive and well suited to present-day living residences in the heart of the city can be. The facade has been slightly altered, probably in the early 1920's, by the addition of Georgian Revival porch columns, shutters, and muntin windows. As a result the house appears surprisingly like a 20th-century design. Nevertheless, the bracketed cornice, the side bay window with elliptical arches, and the arched window of the attic are clear indications of the 1855 construction date. Despite a dreary coat of later shingles, 301 Brookline Street (1868) is a good Italianate design often used for corner lots. The pair of rounded windows over the entrance, the bracketed cornice, and the steep roof are typical characteristics.

Cambridgeport had a number of large Bracketed houses that followed the full four-room plan, but most have been demolished or drastically changed. At least three such houses stood at the south end of Magazine Street where the street passes over a low hill. Originally situated on large lots, two of the houses have been moved to side streets to permit subdivision for multiple-family dwellings. The old Reliance Kendall mansion of 1850 was moved in 1927 from 138 Magazine Street to 225 Chestnut Street; the George Sanborn mansion of 1852 was moved in 1906 from 149 Magazine Street to 7 Florence Street. Converted into a two-family house, the Kendall house retains little except a heavy bracketed front gable and entrance porch. The facade of the Sanborn house with its center gable, extraordinary bracketed windows, and later front porch is fortunately better preserved (Fig. 111). The third house, built in 1855, stands on its original site at 127 Magazine Street (Fig. 112). Although it has been remodeled with a Georgian Revival entrance and a Palladian window above (not to mention aluminum siding), these changes have been tasteful.

Another house of large scale, gloomily shrouded in dark asphalt shingles, stands at 39 William Street (1854). A remodeling has moved the entrance doors forward to the edge of what was once the front porch, but the curved struts or braces of the original porch are still visible. Generally, porches with arched struts are less well represented in Cambridgeport than in other sections of the city. A better and earlier example at 210 Harvard Street (1847; Fig. 113) uses bracing of an elliptical shape and leaves the spandrels open, giving the impression of a kind of bold wooden tracery. Often the center of the arch is marked by a key block that may be enhanced with a pendant, while the arches are customarily supported on bracketed imposts. The roofs of such porches may be carried on clusters of light posts connected by jigsaw tracery (as at 7 Upton Street), or the posts are sometimes bulky in cross section with the corners chamfered or beaded.
The only large Bracketed house in Cambridgeport that retains much of its original appearance and almost rural setting is 22 Putnam Avenue (Fig. 114). Although the house is confined to a conventional 100-by-63-foot lot on a busy street, its setting is enhanced by a charming old-fashioned garden seen behind a picket fence and by the fact that the buildings that stood on contiguous property to the north have been removed (portents, perhaps, of larger things to come).

22 Putnam Avenue was built in 1848 for a member of the Sands family, owners of an important North Cambridge brickyard – explaining the building's construction of brick. Not surprisingly for its date, the house retains many Greek Revival aspects – stolid mass, not-so-steep roof, and pedimented lintels on the upper-floor windows. Italianate, however, are the somewhat top-heavy proportions and the widely projecting eaves supported by pairs of complex brackets. Interspersed between these large brackets is a series of stumpy brackets that read almost as a row of dentil blocks.

At a somewhat smaller scale, the design of the large roof brackets is repeated on each face of the square posts and pilasters of the front porch (Fig. 115). The result is a lacy enframement of the entrance that contrasts with the building's otherwise heavy proportions. The facade ornamentation is strongly plastic; window caps and sills project bluntly, and two belt courses corbel out from the wall in two steps of brick. The deep brick fascia under the main cornice is not designed as an entablature; its depth is determined solely by the three-foot-high roof brackets.

An important Italianate feature not evident from the facade is the irregular plan of 22 Putnam Avenue. The L-shaped core allows two rooms on one side of the central hall and just one large room on the other. The gable above the rear ell is of the same size and elaboration as the main gable, while the roof of the long service wing thrusts out at one side at a distinctly lower level. Built on a corner, the house has front and side elevations faced with pressed brick, while common brick is employed on the rear. Similarly, there is no projecting corner pilaster on the left rear corner of the building or on the service wing.
Changes taking place in Cambridgeport architecture during the 1850’s are well chronicled in a series of double houses. The basic differences between the Greek Revival and Bracketed styles can be seen in adjacent houses at 204-206 and 198-200 Norfolk Street (1837 and 1855; Fig. 116). Both follow basically the same plan, but the latter illustrates the new mid-century pomposity. Although the box-like shape and simple ridge roof of the earlier example have been retained, there is now a considerable change in scale and proportions. Reduction in the number of facade windows coupled with an increase in their size shows another Italianate preference for monumental form. The same formula is followed at 43-45 Cottage Street (1855), where the entablature is almost Greek Revival in appearance but where the spreading roof, the wide-spaced windows capped with cornices, and the three ponderous brackets supporting the entrance canopy are unmistakably Italianate. (The triple window of the left house is a 20th-century addition.)

112-114 Prospect Street (1866; Fig. 117) attains a calm dignity because of its broad areas of wall between the windows and its long, sustained cornice line. Supported by a dentil course, the cornice is interrupted only by a central gable that rises almost to the height of the main ridge but does not break the plane of the facade. Triple-arched windows grouped within a single frame and capped by a robust cornice molding illustrate the search for variety in window treatment and give the design a monumental accent (Fig. 118). Paired entrances open on a porch supported by heavy posts into whose faces rounded panels have been countersunk.

The geometric composition of the double house at 39-41 Magazine Street (1856) is more complicated (Fig. 119). A pavilion containing the paired entrance vestibules is carried above the main cornice and crowned by a gable that rises almost to the ridge of the main roof; both front and side elevations are provided with ample bay windows. Unfortunately, much of the building’s original character was lost when it was shorn of its original trim. Examples of comparable massing stand at 30-32 Magazine Street, 150-152 Prospect Street, and 326-328 Broadway.

Pairing of Plan B instead of Plan C forms the basis for the delightful double house at 50-52 Magazine Street, corner of Perry Street (Fig. 120). Built in 1852 by Stephen Brooks and taxed at $2,800 per unit, the house stands midway between Greek Revival and Italianate. Robust pilasters and entablatures emphasize the geometry of the main block, a monumentality that is emphasized by the way in which the long narrow ell projects off to one side. The elliptical arches of the bay windows and the rounded attic window are Italianate, while the cast-iron balconies above the bays offer an unexpected and fanciful note. When the photograph in Fig. 120 was taken, the left house had lost its pilasters and original siding, and the entrance of the right unit had been changed; since then, further remodeling has heightened the difference between the two halves.

Bracketed row houses in Cambridgeport are scarce; 68-72 Norfolk Street (Fig. 121) is the only example. The telling characteristic—indeed, the only Italianate feature of this design—is the enormously projecting roof carried around all four sides of the block. Without such a projecting roof, 68-72 Norfolk Street could be a run-of-the-mill Greek Revival design with its brownstone lintels, recessed entrance vestibules, and pressed-brick exterior walls rising to a small dentil course just under the eaves. Indeed the difference between this Bracketed row of 1859 and a Greek Revival example of 1850-56 (183-189 Windsor Street, Fig. 90) or a Mansard design of 1861 (26-32 River Street, Fig. 134) are so superficial that one must be cautious of overemphasizing the matter of architectural style.
In Cambridge, as in Boston, the architectural novelty of the years just before the Civil War was the Academic French style of Louis Napoleon's Second Empire. Up to this point in the United States, taste in architectural matters had been tied to British fashion and practice, but beginning in the early 1850's, American travelers became aware of Continental achievements. In particular they were impressed by the great boulevards being cut through the old quarters of Paris, and they came home with a taste for new, cosmopolitan elegance. The most notable evidence of this French influence in America is the layout and early buildings of the Back Bay district of Boston.

On the Continent the Academic French manner had placed great emphasis on order and on a correct use of Classical and Renaissance detail. Puttornament at corners, foundations, cornices, and openings in walls—points of special importance to the stability of a building. Termed architectonic, ornaments such as pilasters, cornices, window frames, and the like were used as if they were structural reinforcement, though in fact they were not necessary for support. When this sober French manner was copied in Cambridgeport, surprising changes took place. In translating into wood designs intended for stone, local carpenters developed some fanciful and unprecedented forms—particularly wooden brackets, the like of which France had never seen.

The element most seized upon was the mansard roof. Because of the prominence of this feature and because of the substantial differences between the Second Empire manner as built in France and in the United States, it is convenient to refer to Yankee vernacular work as the “Mansard style,” even though a mansard, properly speaking, is a type of roof rather than a recognizable style of architecture.

Although Boston architects were just beginning to use the Mansard style in 1857, the mansard roof had appeared in Cambridge as early as 1854 in the work of dilettante architect Henry Greenough (Mid Cambridge, pp. 63-65). By 1861 mansards were in general use in all parts of Cambridge and Boston. Speculator builders lost no time in adopting the new roof design, which provided practical head room in the attic as well as a visible symbol of up-to-dateness. In vernacular buildings the Mansard style lingered into the 1880's, when it was finally assimilated into the Queen Anne manner.

Mansard mansions in Cambridgeport are difficult to describe, since only a few much-changed examples remain. Each is essentially a four-square, Plan A dwelling with center hall and subsidiary service wing. The principal difference from previous styles—though an important one in visual terms—is the presence of a mansard roof. Its surfaces on all four sides of the building emphasize rectangularity and form a substantial lid to the box-like mass. An important surviving example is the Henry Houghton mansion at 1000 Massachusetts Avenue, designed in 1856 by architect Calvin Ryder (Fig. 122). There, a mansard gable provides an element of variety without causing a break in the plane of the facade or destroying the roof's compositional unity.
160 Norfolk Street (Fig. 123) has a more complex geometric composition because of side pavilions placed well behind the front plane of the building. Maintaining the level of the principal cornice, these pavilions frame the main body of the building and enhance its centrality and symmetry. Built about 1873 as the rectory adjacent to St. Mary’s Church, the building was moved to its present location in 1924, at which time the front corners were filled in with one-story additions.

The Briggs house, which stood at 872 Massachusetts Avenue from 1865 until 1963, showed a slight relaxation in the traditional center-hall plan, although its bow-fronted facade was entirely symmetrical (Figs. 124-125). In place of the usual straight flight of stairs in a long central hall, the main stairway was situated in a rectangular shaft in the middle of the house and rose in three runs to the second floor. Instead of the traditional four main rooms per floor, one rear corner was given up to allow for the enlarged stair hall and a pantry connecting the front dining room with the kitchen in the rear wing. The second floor had four principal bedrooms (one over the kitchen), a good-sized sitting room above the front entrance, and a bath over the pantry. A large billiard room occupied the entire front half of the third floor.

Another large Mansard dwelling was the Asa P. Morse house at 81 Magazine Street (1861; demolished 1944), of which a set of fine interior photographs exists. A view of the library (Fig. 126) shows the heaviness of the moldings used for the plaster cornice and for the wooden door trim. Characteristic also is the white marble mantel with its arched coal grate.
Not large or elaborate enough to be termed mansions are a number of dwellings that follow the four-room Plan A. Too altered to illustrate here, but undoubtedly good Mansard designs, were 66, 71, and 88 Magazine Street. A better example stands at 197 Harvard Street (1867; Fig. 127). Despite a shroud of modern composition shingles, it retains its original trim, but it is interesting to see how far this design has strayed from the disciplined academic quality of French architecture. The composition fuses the entrance porch (originally not glazed) to the two large bay windows on the first floor to form a continuous projection across the facade. Above the entrance is a second-story oriel window with a capricious roof, concave in profile and ingeniously designed to avoid the eave line of the main roof.

Cambridgeport lacks freestanding Mansard houses that follow Plan B (the one-room-deep, center-hall plan). Only one example, 133 Pine Street, is known, and it is placed with its narrow elevation to the street (Fig. 128). Most Mansard residences following Plan B were paired as double houses. Good examples are 36 Tremont Street (1883) and 108 Chestnut Street/1 Hastings Square (1871).

Much more numerous in Cambridgeport are side-hall plans (Plan C). This basic scheme can be found in all sizes and combinations—in single houses of one or more stories, in pairs, or in rows. Set on narrow single lots or compacted in groups, side-hall houses were well adapted to the urban condition that developed as the population grew. The two-story side-hall single house is Cambridgeport’s most characteristic Mansard design. Augmented by the mansard roof, this type is so upright and vertical that it is best seen in a city environment with dwellings built at fairly close intervals; on larger lots, such a composition seems lonely and ill-proportioned.

Aside from the mansard roof, which is clearly the most important design feature, architectural decoration is restricted to points of structural importance. The entrance is often marked by a small porch supported by posts with beaded edges, though modest dwellings have nothing more than a bracketed hood. At

11 Putnam Avenue (1869; Fig. 129), the porch posts are connected by curved wooden struts or braces that meet at a central key block. This example is quite simple, but sometimes the key block is serrated or reeded, with turned pendants appended to it. As the curved-strut porch is also found on Italianate houses, it cannot be considered a specifically Mansard feature.

Entrance doors are generally double, with a transom above; the glass in the doors’ upper panels often contains an etched design. Window frames are capped by a cornice molding resting on brackets, though in more sophisticated work complete pediments may crown the window. Enframmements for second-story windows are usually simpler, sometimes with nothing more than a heavy wooden drip molding. Such a detail illustrates the hit-or-miss eclecticism that prevailed at the time, since drip moldings essentially are a Medieval rather than Classical feature. They had entered the American carpenter’s repertoire through the Tudor cottage, but this historical association did not keep naive builders from employing so useful a decorative element in other contexts. A satisfactory drip molding could be achieved, as at 11 Putnam Avenue (Fig. 130), by the simple means of carrying a robust molding across the top of the window and part way down each side, with additional short pieces nailed across the bottom to form an inverted T.

The main cornice at 11 Putnam Avenue is supported on simple paired brackets; the windows in the mansard roof have triangular pediments. At the base of several of these windows, traces remain of simple scrolls cut out of two-inch boards to recall the more substantial stone volutes of European prototypes.
The Mansard cottage is a charming variation of the side-hall plan. Largely built during the early 1870’s in areas then on the outskirts of Cambridgeport, good examples are found north of Hampshire Street, along the district’s southwestern boundary on Putnam Avenue, and on Kelly Road, Chalk and Fairmont Streets, and nearby stretches of Pleasant Street.

32 Kelly Road (1870; Fig. 131) looks smaller than it is. Because the second story is under the mansard roof, one thinks of the dwelling as having only one story, though in reality it contains seven comfortable rooms. Taxed at $2,500 when built, the house had no bath, but a water closet was situated in the basement. The exterior is simple but dignified, with a bracketed hood above the entrance, regular windows topped by cornice moldings, and a main cornice without brackets. The facade is dominated by a simple octagonal bay window that is really an oriel, since it is cantilevered beyond the brick foundation. Capped by simple moldings, the dormer windows are slightly recessed and are framed by heavy wooden jams that flare out to follow the contour of the roof.

Typically for a Mansard cottage, the plan of 32 Kelly Road is L-shaped (Fig. 132). Just behind the stair hall a room projects out at one side to provide sufficient width for a kitchen. This arrangement creates a more complicated geometric pattern in the mansard roof than some builders liked. In ordinary two-story houses the rear ell is low enough to avoid conflict with the main roof, with the result that the mansard generally has a clear, rectangular simplicity.

Built singly and in pairs in the mid-1870’s, the groups of Mansard cottages on Windsor and Plymouth Streets illustrate such late Mansard features as the overhanging roof and recessed dormer window. A sequence of four structures on Windsor Street (Fig. 133) also shows how one style can fuse into another in almost imperceptible steps and thus how architectural style in vernacular building can be very illusive. 370-372 Windsor Street (1875) is a regular one-story double Mansard cottage; its Bracketed entrance and cornice can be found on many other streets in Cambridgeport. Built in 1874, the adjacent house at 376-378 is similar in appearance except that the mansard roof is employed only on the facade; side and rear walls are carried straight up for two stories to the low hip roof. This house has been placed on a high basement that contains additional rooms, but the facade reads much the same as its smaller neighbor. The third step, 384-386 Windsor (1875), has a mass very similar to the last, except that all traces of the mansard roof have disappeared. Our principal clue to stylistic classification is therefore gone, even though the pitch of the remaining hip roof is the same as on the upper part of earlier mansards. One would probably term this house Bracketed in style because of the decorative brackets used for the main cornice, but these are identical with the upper bay-window brackets used next door at 376-378. The last stage of the mutation is represented by 390-396 Windsor, a double two-family and a run-of-the-mill Queen Anne design. Its later date (1890) is attested by fan-shaped brackets and four front doors, but its mass and fenestration are basically similar to its neighbors.

Mansard row houses are plentiful in Cambridgeport, as they are in other suburban areas within commuting distance of downtown Boston. Interspersed among single dwellings, comparable rows are found in Roxbury, South Boston, Charlestown, and East Cambridge, but few of these suburban structures have the size or decorative profusion of row houses in Boston itself.
Typical of suburban row housing is the group of four two-story houses at 26-32 River Street (Fig. 134). Valued at $14,000 per unit when built in 1860 and faced with pressed brick trimmed with brownstone, this design is comparable to some contemporary work in the South End of Boston. Unusual, however, is the ingenious manner in which the facades are staggered to fit the irregular lot, permitting windows in the side walls of the front rooms. In scale and detail, though not in siting, the River Street group is similar to a row at 83-95 Third Street in East Cambridge, built 1861.

Exceptional for Cambridgeport is the group of five houses at 942-950 Massachusetts Avenue (1873; Fig. 137). Instead of being lined up in a repeating fashion, these facades are organized around a central design element. Although the interior of the middle house is no different from that of its neighbors, its facade is pushed slightly forward to create an axial pavilion capped with a higher mansard roof. A pavilion treatment also occurs on the two end bays. More sophisticated than a mere repetition or pairing of facades, such groupings were common in houses designed by professional architects in the Back Bay.

The block of Pearl Street between Green and Franklin shows how imposing a street lined with mansard row houses can be. Numbers 30 to 38 Pearl (Fig. 138), built in 1874, make interesting use of brick in their ornamental banding, while the wooden facades of 40-48 Pearl (1875; Fig. 139) are designed to recall ashlar masonry.
Double Mansard houses with entrances facing the street can be quite impressive. When built close together, such houses constitute a more imposing streetscape than do single houses—perhaps because the broad facades with regular fenestration appear more monumental. The paired dwellings at 77-79 and 83-85 Pearl Street (1861) are typical (Fig. 140). There is noticeably less variety in the way Mansard units were combined than was the case in the Greek Revival or Bracketed styles. Entrances are invariably paired at the center of the facade rather than being placed at the outside corners, and the plane of the facade is seldom interrupted. Other representative double Mansards are 56-58 Columbia Street (1858) and 201-203 Harvard Street (1867).

A group of four dwellings between 12 and 24 Watson Street was erected in the years 1865-1869 by speculative builders Robert Carson and Albert Rollins (Fig. 141). Though lacking architectural distinction, these houses are interesting because they demonstrate how a builder could select decorative details from a repertoire of stock forms and impose them upon standard house types to provide variety. The Watson Street group consists of three double houses and one single. One double has a gable roof; the others have mansards. One of the mansarded doubles is two stories high, the other, one story. Although these houses are dissimilar in overall appearance, their detailing is identical; the same brackets support the entrance hoods, and newel posts and stair details within are exactly alike.

Mansard building in Cambridgeport follows a broad chronological development, with changes evident in three areas—roof design, exterior detailing, and geometric composition. Although the mansard is basically a roof of two slopes on all four faces of a building, there are several variations of this form, which differ in date. The first mansard roofs in Cambridge had a relatively low slope, were almost flat on top, and might be described as truncated hip roofs. Sought out in the mid-Cambridge report (page 65) as the work of Henry Greenough between 1854 and 1856, roofs of this kind are absent from Cambridgeport. By the late 1850's, however, many mansards were being built. The pitch of the lower roof section was steeper, and the upper slope usually had enough inclination to be seen from the street. The profile of the lower roof could be concave or straight—a matter of individual preference, though the concave roof tends to be slightly earlier (Fig. 122). Most early mansards begin their rise from a point just above the corner of the building; only the cornice, which contains the gutter, projects beyond the wall surface.

After 1873 the lower slope of the mansard roof was modified to eliminate loss of headroom within the attic. One awkward solution gave the “roof” a completely vertical slope that flared out at the bottom to appear like a mansard; a second solution cantilevered the lower slope well beyond the surface of the wall below. Such unorthodox mansards are found only in cottages and tenements where full-size rooms were at a premium; they were never popular with style-conscious builders. In late roofs, too, the upper slope increases in pitch, becoming in effect a low hip (Fig. 146).

A minor distinction concerns the molding that occurs at the break between the mansard’s upper and lower slopes. In early examples this division is simple and utilitarian—usually nothing more than a cyma molding painted slate color and just large enough to throw the drainage of the upper roof beyond the topmost slope of the lower surface. In the 1870's, however, this dividing molding becomes more important. Forgetting structural purpose and historical precedent, vernacular builders enlarged its decorative importance until it became a kind of second cornice, sometimes even provided with brackets. Also in the 70's, the lower mansard slope is sometimes framed with elaborate moldings and the corner edged with a rope molding, but such ostentatious treatments are lacking in Cambridgeport. Lower slopes of mansard roofs are always covered with slate. Early slate work is simple or is laid in an imbricated pattern (Fig. 134), but later slate can be set in bands or geometric patterns (Fig. 144), often emphasized by contrasting colors.

Dormer window design also changed through the decades. Arched and segmental-arched dormers tend to be somewhat earlier than those capped by pediments, which appear in the 1860's. In the 70's the dormer develops more complex silhouettes (Fig. 139), especially around the jamb. Another tendency of the 70's was to recess the dormer within the slope of the roof (Fig. 144). Shed dormers that continue the slope of the upper roof generally indicate a still later date (Fig. 146).

The detailing of ornamental wood and masonry members also helps to date Mansard designs. Early work between 1855 and 1865 is of two types. The nearer the designer was to the accepted Academic French manner, the greater the
likelihood of an early date. A pure academic design abjures brackets, supporting the cornice by means of modillions, a dentil course, or a simple cyma molding. Although employed by Greenough in Mid-Cambridge and by professional architects in Boston in these years, such restraint was rare among carpenter-builders; they preferred to load their design with ponderous brackets and free-wheeling, easily made decorations similar to those found on pedestrian Italianate-Bracketed buildings. A good example of this second approach is 24 Mt. Auburn Street (1862; Fig. 142), where the huge paired brackets would be proper on an Italianate house. These brackets are animated by knobs and drops that give the design a full-bodied, sculptural feeling.

Smaller brackets like those at 11 Putnam Avenue (Fig. 130) may date any time before 1873. They can be simple in profile or have turned drops, and their center can be solid or open, but their sides will be smooth, without jigsaw work. During the mid-70's, however, bracket design became particularly ornate through the use of jigsaw and lathe. Excellent examples are found at 146 Columbia Street (1874), 46 Pleasant Street (1874), and 48 Magazine Street (1875; Fig 143). All use laminated brackets composed of two outer boards (about an inch thick) and a two- or three-inch core. Before being glued together, the thin outer boards were cut with a jigsaw in fanciful linear designs, and the core was shaped with the same profile or given a reeded texture. Other surfaces of the laminated bracket could be enlivened with prefabricated bosses or drops glued in place. When completed, such a bracket looks sculptural, even though no hand carving is involved. The decoration is composed entirely of elements fabricated by machine, a procedure that costs considerably less than traditional carving and explains both the extreme elaborateness of the designs and their popularity. Other elements of decoration such as key blocks, window frames, or even front doors are also fit subjects for the jigsaw carpenter, who could contrive fantastically elaborate designs from bits and pieces of precut wood.

A comparable change in spirit and technique can be seen in masonry building of the period, a change illustrated by two groups of row houses. The dwellings at 26-32 River Street, built in 1860 and mentioned before (Fig. 134), retain a Bracketed opulence in their detailing, although for economy the hoods and consoles over the entrances (Fig. 135) were made of wood, which was painted brown and dusted with sand to give the appearance of brownstone. The window caps, on the other hand, are made of stone and have a robust, full-bodied quality, with bas-relief decoration that had to be hand cut (Fig. 136). Allston Terrace at 13-21 Magazine Street (Fig. 144-145) was built in 1871, after the wages of stone-cutters had skyrocketed in the wake of the Civil War; thus its decoration is very different. Where stone is used, a linear pattern is grouted into a block already surfaced by a stone plane. This mechanical decoration saved enormously on hand labor cost. Now also, brick is used to achieve ornamental effects—a series of cross-shaped panels sunk into the belt course, bricks set at angles with the plane of the wall to create a flickering play of light and shadow, or a main cornice formed by crenellating rows of brick. This exploitation of brick ornamentation, so popular in the 1870's and so distinctive, is sometimes called the Panel Brick style.
Finally, the geometric clarity of a Mansard house offers a good clue — perhaps the most reliable — for dating. Houses of the late 1850’s and early 1860’s have a compact and regular mass, with the mansard roof forming a heavy lid to the composition. Mansard buildings show less tendency than Italianate designs toward towered or asymmetrical schemes. Service wings are usually kept low enough to avoid conflict with the blocklike mass of the design. At the same time, the exterior surfaces of the building are charged with a heavy component of architectural decoration — window frames, entrance porches, an entablature, perhaps corner quoins. But the compact regularity of the mass — its basic geometry — is never challenged by this applied decoration. Stronger at the beginning, this tendency continues through the 1860’s (Fig. 129).

In the course of time, the rigid geometry of the mass begins to relax. Slowly at first, the building mass is augmented by appendages like bay windows that eventually extend through two stories into the mansard roof (Fig. 143). By the middle 70’s the geometric composition becomes quite active. Not only is the plane of the facade interrupted by projecting porches and bay windows, but the silhouette is broken into active, competing forms.

9 Bow Street (1884; Fig. 146) is an instructive example of later Mansard design. The center entrance of this Plan A house is flanked by bay windows that are octagonal in plan and two stories high. Above the open entrance porch is another bay window. These three projections impinge on each other, leaving little of the front wall of the house exposed to act as the plane of reference on which the appendages are hung. In effect, the facade consists of a series of narrow vertical planes that meet each other at sharp angles. The facade is restless and cramped, as though disrupted from within by some explosive energy. The silhouette of the building also lacks repose. When observed in a foreshortened manner from the street, the traditionally strong horizontal line of the main cornice is fractured by the back-and-forth movement of the facade and by the manner in which the upper slope of the mansard is carried on to the shed dormers. Less drastic, though illustrating the same restlessness, are the wall surfaces and porch members. The spandrels of the bay windows are articulated by slatlike panels that are raised slightly and shaped like inverted pickets. The uprights of the entrance porch, instead of being straight posts, are turned and contorted, and the balustrades contain an irregular openwork pattern.

Thus the spirit of Mansard decoration shifted from the harmonious and dignified work of the late 50’s to dynamic and exhibitionistic work of the 70’s, from simple rectitude to exuberant surfeit. It is as though the academically conceived formula had burst apart, as though the old and staid forms were no longer able to contain the throbbing vitality of American life. The restless, dynamic mood of 9 Bow Street suggests that we are on the verge of a new movement — the Queen Anne. The energy is there, and indeed so are a few elements of the new vocabulary.

**Queen Anne**

The three decades between 1875 and 1905 were dominated by a style of architecture known as Queen Anne. In Cambridgeport the movement came as a fitting climax to 19th-century architectural development. Falling chronologically at the end of the century, the style exceeded earlier movements in the quantity of construction and in the variety and types of buildings erected. Equally important, it marked the culmination of architectural tendencies that had been stirring for half a century.

The Queen Anne brought greater freedom in plan, massing, and fenestration, coupled with a desire for a more active and individualistic architectural statement. There was a marked increase in ornamentation, made possible at no increase in cost by the use of machines. At the same time, the movement is different from earlier ones in that the wages of artisans and laborers had increased sharply, the scarcity of land had become noticeable in some sections of the city, and the architect was faced with an even larger selection of natural or manufactured building products. If the Queen Anne was the culmination of the 19th century, it also anticipated many practices and problems of the 20th.

The Queen Anne was an English architectural concept imported by Americans. It made its first appearance in this country in the mid-1870’s, and by the 1880’s it had entered the mainstream of American building. Here it remained a recognizable and vital force as late as 1905, though during the late 1890’s and early 1900’s it was gradually transformed into the Colonial Revival. In England, Queen Anne design had largely been constructed of masonry, and the first Queen Anne structures in this country were little more than competent reflections of British work. Not until Queen Anne ideas were translated into wood for suburban building did American architects begin to achieve something significantly original. In the course of the first decade, however, the movement proved itself to be the fitting vehicle to express the several tendencies toward which American architecture had been moving for fifty years.
Because there is considerable chronological development in Queen Anne architecture over its thirty-year lifespan and because there is so much variation in appearance, especially between urban and suburban building, it might be preferable to regard the Queen Anne as an attitude toward architecture rather than as a fixed architectural style.

Key to the movement is its freedom of plan and massing. This informality and irregularity resulted from a process of loosening up begun in the 1840's and 1850's, when the rigid rectangular shapes of buildings were broken first by service wings and then by larger projections that expressed variations in room arrangement within. The boxlike mass was further fractured by the addition of bay windows and porches and by gables intersecting with the main axis of the roof. In Queen Anne work, functional variations in plan and geometric composition were intentionally exaggerated to make buildings irregular and picturesque. Designers also attempted to find new and personal solutions, to outdo their rivals in originality and fancy. Such a self-conscious approach to design is quite different from the unconscious adherence to tradition of Federal builders or the self-disciplined attitude of designers who sought to master the Academic French manner.

As an example of this new freedom in design, one can compare changes in window treatment during the half-century following the Greek Revival. In Greek Revival houses, windows were fairly uniform. In principal rooms they were occasionally made long enough to reach the floor, but all windows were divided into panes of about the same size, imparting a consistency of scale and appearance (Fig. 147A). In Italianate-Bracketed work of the 50's, changes in fenestration began to appear. Glass size was increased so that four panes rather than twelve customarily filled a window - two each in upper and lower sash (Fig. 147B). Window frames became heavier and more varied in design, with roundheaded openings in the gable and sometimes elsewhere; occasionally windows were grouped in twos and threes, the frame capped by a cornice supported by brackets. But the proportions of openings remained fairly constant. Variations in window design were used only as an accent, and most windows in a given building were similar in appearance.

In the Queen Anne period, window design became more complex. Proportions, groupings, and window levels in Queen Anne houses are unpredictable, as windows of different size and shape pop out anywhere. Some project as bays or oriel windows, others cover under balconies or porches; tower windows frequently use curved glass to conform to curving wall surfaces. Glass sizes vary from large sheets of plate glass to traditional two-over-two or six-over-six sizes to sash with picturesque compositions of large and small panes. One popular stock window groups a border of small square panes (often filled with colored glass) around a large pane of clear glass (Fig. 147C). Window enframements are varied, and elevations frequently contain several varieties of windows.

Equal possibilities existed for variety and originality in the use of materials. Because transportation had become easier, builders were no longer restricted to local materials, and many combinations became possible - brick and stone (several colors and varieties of each), slate, tile, metal, glass, and timber. Use of fine materials was prodigal. The Queen Anne architect at his best was sensitive to the unique properties of each material and could skillfully adapt his design or detailing to fit shingles or brick or rough stone. This sensitivity contrasts with attitudes of the 1840's and 1850's, when materials were regarded merely as the stuff out of which a predetermined design was created and when wood construction often attempted to look like masonry. On the other hand, Queen Anne designers were sometimes so preoccupied with craftsmanship that they could forget about the material in the process of achieving copious decoration.

Since the fullest expression of American Queen Anne concepts is found in large suburban and country houses of the 1880's, the movement in Cambridge is better studied on Avon Hill or in Hubbard Park than in Cambridgeport. Nevertheless, the buildings discussed in this section provide a catalogue of most aspects of the Queen Anne, and they illustrate how strongly the movement affected vernacular architecture.
Several Cambridgeport houses built in the late 1870's and in the 1880's illustrate the transitional phase of the Queen Anne. Although certain aspects of their plan, massing, and detail look backward to the Bracketed vernacular of the 50's, the tendency to burst out of the rigid, boxlike mass with bays and ells and a more plastic type of ornamentation is purely Queen Anne. Good examples of this transitional stage are 152 Magazine Street (1875; Fig. 148) and 14 Tremont Street (1885; Fig. 150). The rectangular core of both buildings is augmented by side wings - a polygonal bay window on one house and a side service wing on the other. Though these projections carry into the second story, they are not capped by gables that would interrupt the simple ridge roof; instead, the slope of the main roof is covered to continue them. The roof slope in both houses is noticeably steeper than in Bracketed designs, and eave lines are placed higher above the tops of the second-story windows. The proportions of such Queen Anne designs are more vertical than before, and the composition becomes more active as individual parts assume independent interest.

On the Magazine Street house the new aggressive manner is seen in the small gables that rise over the face of the bay window and front porch (Fig. 149), in the hoods that overhang the windows (these hoods have been removed except on the north side), in the division of the exterior wall surfaces into contrasting textures ( clapboards on the first two stories and two types of vertical siding in the gables), and in the curious sawtooth frieze of wood over the entrance porch and bay window and under the main gable. Unique in design, this frieze is the most readily identified Queen Anne detail on the facade. Cut with jigsaw and bore to form a running design, the frieze's outer face ingeniously overhangs the wall surface by an inch, creating a crisp, emphatic shadow that interrupts still more the surface continuity of the facade. The underside of the eaves of the entrance porch has been incised with jigsaw design. Lacelike and delicate, this design is unrelated to the coarse angular ornamentation employed elsewhere in the building.

Although later in date, the Tremont Street house is more conservative in some details. The entrance porch with its heavy keyblock and the bracket-supported cornices over the windows can be duplicated in Mansard houses. Nevertheless, the building's upthrusting proportions and steep roof and especially the fan-shaped brackets are Queen Anne. Two brackets are placed at each corner of the gable to support projecting roof plates, while handsome openwork brackets support the shed roof above the bay window on the side elevation. The window of the main gable adds a picturesque detail, and the bargeboards in the gable are enlivened with a panel design built up with bits of molding.

Similar transitional side-hall houses are found at 52 Chestnut Street (1885), 321 Pearl Street (1887), and 106 Henry Street (1884; Fig. 151). Here the side wings are short enough to be covered by a continuation of the main roof slope, and the front porch is carried around a corner to one side of the house. The porch posts, typically Queen Anne, are turned on a lathe and have intricate profiles. Also typical is the spindle frieze - a series of open panels containing turned spindles.

A different branch of the Queen Anne movement derives, though remotely, from Swiss chalets. A skeletal system of wooden posts and beams recalls the importance of structural members used to frame walls and gables. Reduced to a form of decoration and employed in the vernacular, this system - called the Stick Style - is seen in several Cambridgeport edifices. The articulated facade at 60-62 Prospect Street (1882; Fig. 152), for example, separates the wall surface into framing members (or what appear to be framing members) and a non-bearing sheathing of clapboards and shingles. That this articulation is not really structural is indicated by the fact that the vertical elements of the system are lacking on the side and rear walls. The purpose of the articulation is simply to lend animation and textural contrast to the wall surface.

Another Stick Style feature is elaborate bridging, such as the exposed trusses in the gables of 90-92 Pleasant Street (1881; Fig. 153) or 17 Kelly Road. The roof of the Pleasant Street house is two full stories in height, not for practical reasons (since there are no windows in the fourth-story attic) but as a visual device to provide a background for the openwork of the truss.
Beginning with such trusses, Queen Anne designers added new touches of their own. Spaces between truss members were sometimes filled with sheets of wood pierced with jigsaw designs. This feature is seen in two delightful houses at 105 and 111 Chestnut Street (1875; Fig. 154). Reminiscent of chalets are the broad overhanging roofs and the prominence of the exposed rafters with their notched and chamfered edges. The twin houses are also remarkable for their entrance porches constructed of six-inch members (Fig. 155). A hybrid of tracery and bridging, this timber work is one of the most original details in Cambridgeport. The involved plan of these houses—an asymmetrical cross that requires an intricate intersecting-gable roof—illustrates the Queen Anne penchant for complexity.

Still another type of exposed framing, reminiscent of Medieval half-timber work, exploits the decorative possibilities of timber bracing. At 125 Magazine Street (1881; Fig. 156), one of the few examples in Cambridgeport, a simple hip roof is augmented on each side by a gable in which half-timber work contrasts with a coarse stucco fill. The design and framing of these gables contrast almost unpleasantly with the boxlike mass and plain clapboard surfaces of the lower floors, although the effect must have been more agreeable before the entrance was remodeled. A pedestrian example of a Queen Anne half-timber gable is found at 460 Franklin Street, a house moved to its present location in 1964 from 5 Putnam Avenue.

Three houses in the Hastings Square neighborhood represent fullblown versions of the Queen Anne manner in its middle phase. Built within a few years of each other and each typical in its own way, these houses illustrate the difficulty of defining the Queen Anne style narrowly. The first of the three, 195 Erie Street (Fig. 157), was built in 1884 for Edmund Reardon, whose soap factory was just a few blocks away. Though the mass of this house at first appears complicated, a careful look reveals it as nothing more than a rectangular block capped by a hip roof. The basic form is augmented on each side by a gable—a common Queen Anne solution—but because the gables are of different sizes and are placed off center, the eye does not readily comprehend the shape. One slope of the main hip roof extends down in a gentle curve over the front porch; out of this sweeping roof rises a large gable, the major element of the facade composition. Supporting the gable are two large brackets, fluid in outline and gracefully carved; the gable in turn is filled with half-timber decoration and with panels of heavy spiral designs. Another striking feature is the front porch with its heavy timber arches, their open spandrels filled with curiously shaped clusters that look like skewered cranberries. A cradled wooden balustrade surrounds the porch and front steps. A second Reardon house on Eric Street (number 170, built 1885) has a similar mass, placement of front porch, and disposition of ornamental detail, while nearby at 120 Henry Street is a related design of the same year, more modest in scale.

The second major example, equally deserving of the term Queen Anne yet quite different in appearance, is 82 Henry Street (1886; Fig. 158). Despite asbestos siding that hides the original wood surfaces (probably patterned shingles), it is worthy of note for its corner tower. Although the tower and conical roof
compete with the main mass of the house, they do not obscure it. The designer seems to have done everything possible to disguise the basically simple shape of the house and to keep it from appearing as a rectangular box covered with a hip roof. Each face has a gable, but the gables are dissimilar in size and height and are not even symmetrical in placement. One gable covers a polygonal bay window on the Brookline Street elevation; another — supported by an oriel window — hangs out beyond the face of the building. The soaring clustered chimney stack is another Queen Anne feature, but its position does not clarify the mass or plan of the house. The large front porch pushes out beyond the corner of the composition and contributes still further to a sense of restlessness. Somewhat similar in detailing and equally spoiled by artificial siding is 39 Austin Street (1881).

The third version of Queen Anne stands at 302 Brookline Street (Fig. 159). Representing what is popularly called the Shingle Style, this 1887 house by Rand and Taylor is informal in composition and makes extensive use of shingles laid in a variety of patterns. Its long rectangular shape (determined by the lot) is disguised by a gabled side ell as large as the main block of the house. The face of the ell is three stories high, has four sides, and is punctuated by windows of different sizes. On a front corner a one-story bay is placed at a 45-degree angle and is roofed with two hips. Two decorative bands, created by a slightly flaring projection of the shingle wall above a plain fascia, carry around the house at window-head level and cast a shadow on the wall below. For textural variety, the walls are covered with shingles laid in four different patterns.

Later developments of the Shingle Style are seen at 75 Henry Street (Figs. 160-161) and 65 Chestnut Street (Fig. 162). Houses such as these represent a clearer awareness of the aesthetic possibilities of shingle construction than those just discussed. Hartwell and Richardson were the architects of 75 Henry Street (1892), a complex and not entirely satisfactory design that consists of a number of disparate elements — steep ridge roof, overhanging second story, two facade towers, front porch, and side and rear ells. The facade misses symmetry by just enough to be disconcerting; nothing is quite anchored down. One of the tower roofs is conical, the other octagonal, and the intersection of these shapes with the changing slopes of the main roof is confusing, though ingenious. A broad segmental arch connects the towers and supports the lower slope of the main roof yet fails to establish the plane of the facade, which remains indistinct and undetermined. The design is unified, however, by the way in which this complex assemblage of shapes is bound together by the taut skin of shingles that envelops the exterior walls. This covering stretches around curves, overhangs, setbacks, and bays and accommodates frequent changes in the plane of the facade. A smaller example at 112 Henry Street (1887) contains a round tower and an overhanging gable.

Lacking towered forms but still rambling in appearance is the attractive house at 65 Chestnut Street, designed in 1894 by J. A. Hasty. The composition is so informal and the shingle sheathing so adaptable that the outside walls of the dwelling are able to expand or contract as interior function dictates. The house is generous in size, though it looks unassuming because the full second story is disguised under a gambrel roof. A broad facade gable is supported by acanthus consoles of the sort that Queen Anne designers so much admired, and there is a...
fanciful Palladian window in the attic. Picturesque stair windows on the side elevation have been obscured by later additions to the lower story, and the original entrance has unfortunately been changed.

The arresting structure at 184 Magazine Street (1911; Fig. 163), another example of the late Queen Anne Shingle Style, is one of the most unusual three-deckers in Cambridge. Although the layout of rooms on each floor is substantially the same, the stereotyped three-decker appearance has been avoided. The top story is treated as a gambrel, the fenestration is varied slightly, and a porch is provided for the first level—all contributing to a sense of variety. Despite the multiplicity of openings, the design avoids chaos; architectural trim that would emphasize window differences is suppressed, and the facade is recessed within the protective hollow of the hovering gambrel roof.

Shingled surface walls continued to be used even after the picturesque Queen Anne manner had faded in popularity. This continued use is explained in part by the adaptability and economy of shingles. A group of two-family houses built in 1895 on Chestnut Street below Magazine shows the Queen Anne manner changing into Colonial Revival dress but still using shingles (Fig. 39). Still later, three-deckers often employed shingles in combination with minimum quantities of Classical ornamentation (Fig. 50). On such buildings the relatively large areas of textured dark shingled walls form an effective background against which are placed a few bold architectural forms painted white. The well-scaled entrance of 88 Columbia Street (1915; Fig. 164) consists of Tuscan columns and an enframed arch opening into a recessed vestibule. The only other parts of the facade to receive ornamentation are the main cornice and a string course.

The last phase of the Queen Anne movement unfolded in the middle and late 90's. It combines Colonial Revival details with Queen Anne freedom of plan and design, forming a transitional link to the full Georgian Revival, which dominated American domestic building for the first third of the present century. Although Cambridgeport has no Colonial Revival houses comparable to those on Brattle Street, a few double houses and three-deckers should be mentioned.

A splendid double house was designed at 183-185 Chestnut Street in 1893 by W. E. Clark (Fig. 165). Still Queen Anne is the restless massing—an overhanging second story supported by corner consoles, a projecting entrance porch that repeats the shape of two bay windows, and a center pavilion that rises above the main cornice while overhanging the entrances in a mysterious way. The detailing is full of originality and surprise yet is unmistakably patterned after Classical forms. The inventive Palladian window has a blank center section because this is a double house. The front porch is supported on columns of good Classical detail, but the shape of the porch is most unclassical. Pilasters enframe the middle pavilion, but they in turn are supported by nothing. The major cornice is so elaborate that one almost forgets to notice that the roof is flat.

A simpler but equally characteristic design appears at 141-143 and 145-147 Magazine Street (1897; Figs. 166-167). Designed by Eugene Harrington, these two buildings use Georgian detail with somewhat more restraint than the Chestnut Street dwelling. There is still the same informal composition, with the second story overhanging an elliptical bay, but the ornamentation is more sober. Features such as the porch columns (which were stock manufactured items) and the stuccoed walls were to be used extensively in the early 20th century. Less revivialistic and nearer the rough-and-tumble composition of earlier Queen Anne work is the pleasant two-family house by C. H. McClare at 212 Norfolk Street (1892; Fig. 168), which looks more like a single.

In Cambridgeport as elsewhere in the city, the most common if not the most flamboyant use of late Queen Anne decoration is found on the ubiquitous three-deckers of the 1890's. A characteristic example is 431 Putnam Avenue (Fig. 47), designed in 1900 by the same W. E. Clark who had done 183-185 Chestnut Street a few years earlier.
Postscript: 20th Century

As noted before, Cambridgeport has few single-family houses of the 20th century because most land suitable for residential building had been occupied by 1900. Two exceptions are a brick house of the so-called English style at 89 Magazine Street (1938) and a ranch-type house at 65 Henry Street (1963). Of considerably greater design distinction, but still an exception to the Cambridgeport rule, is a house by architect Victor Cromie at 488 Franklin Street (1965; Fig. 169). Because of its two-story height, pitched roof, and shingled walls, the Cromie house fits compatibly into the streetscape. Not apparent from the street is the open interior plan, oriented toward a garden in the rear.

The contributions of the present century to residential Cambridgeport have been principally in apartment construction and in the remodeling of older dwellings. While it is inevitable that old buildings will be changed from time to time to meet current demands and tastes, it is tragic that so much remodeling is done without regard to original architectural character. In too many instances old houses are emasculated through the elimination of distinctive trim and the addition of artificial siding. In this sense the 20th century is leaving an imprint on Cambridgeport architecture, but the result, unhappily, is negative rather than positive.