

between the two front rooms. Today, the third floor is used as two rental apartments, as well as collections storage for the CHS.

Because of the way the third story was raised into the attic space, creating a very low-pitched roof, there is no attic floor today. [See Fig. 4e] Instead, there is a crawl-space attic accessible from a set of stairs in front of the central chimney block on the third floor. By looking into the crawl space, one can view the roof framing system. This contains some fragments of early roof-frame members as well as evidence of the roof's change over time, as described in the Grady/Zimmerman report.<sup>5</sup> The cellar, which is accessible from the cellar stairs in the kitchen, shows evidence of numerous alterations and enlargements at various times, and is also described in detail by Grady and Zimmerman.<sup>6</sup> [See Fig. 4a]

### **III. The First Period of the Hooper-Lee-Nichols House: Circa 1685-1733**

Although the Hooper-Lee-Nichols House site was originally part of Watertown, the likely first private owner of the site was an early settler of Cambridge, Robert Holmes, who bought a house and two acres of land in Cambridge in 1639.<sup>7</sup> Holmes, who probably lived on the south side of what is now Brattle Street near the present Appian Way, was apparently a well-respected member of the Cambridge community. In 1641 he helped John Stedman build the town well near the current intersection of Brattle and Mt. Auburn Streets, and a 1642 town survey showed that he held several parcels of land in

---

<sup>5</sup> Grady and Zimmerman, *Hooper-Lee-Nichols*, 27-29.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 14-17.

<sup>7</sup> RTC, 62.

addition to a house and a barn.<sup>8</sup> After marrying his wife Jane by 1639, Holmes fathered several children, at least three of whom survived to adulthood and were mentioned in his will: John (b. 1639), Joseph (b. 1641), and Elizabeth (b. 1643/4).<sup>9</sup> In 1649 he was named as a Town Commissioner and oversaw repairs to the meeting house, and from 1652 to 1662 he served in a variety of town appointments.<sup>10</sup> By 1658, Holmes was a member in full communion in the Cambridge church, as was his wife Jane, who died in 1653. Their children, John, Joseph, and Elizabeth were baptized in the Church as well.<sup>11</sup> Significantly, in 1652, Robert Holmes was granted 150 acres of land when the church's land holdings were apportioned among the town residents; Holmes' portion was one of the larger lots recorded.<sup>12</sup>

It is unclear what use Holmes made of his land holdings or exactly where they were located. Not all Cambridge residents who received land shares developed homesteads on their land. After Jane Holmes died in 1653 and Robert Holmes died in 1663, his heirs inherited a large estate which was recorded in an inventory several pages long, totaling 276 pounds.<sup>13</sup> It is possible that some of his holdings were in Watertown, because in 1685, his son and heir John Holmes sold property in Watertown to Dr. Richard Hooper. John Holmes may well have inherited this property from his father.

Regardless of exactly where Robert Holmes' land holdings were located, it is clear that

---

<sup>8</sup> Lucius R. Paige, *History of Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1630-1877* (Boston: H. O. Houghton, 1877) 54 and 588, and CPR, 92.

<sup>9</sup> RCC, 7 and 23, and James Savage, *A Genealogical Dictionary of the First Settlers of New England, Showing Three Generations of Those Who Came Before May, 1692, on the Basis of the Farmer's Register* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1860) 2:453.

<sup>10</sup> RTC, 84-85, 109, 121, 132, 139.

<sup>11</sup> RCC, 7.

<sup>12</sup> RTC, 96-97.

<sup>13</sup> MP, 11766. The microfilm copy of Robert Holmes's will and inventory at the Massachusetts State Archives is almost entirely illegible. Examination of the original documents might show whether the land on which the Hooper-Lee-Nichols house was later built was in fact part of Robert Holmes's holdings bequeathed to John Holmes. However, since the property descriptions in the probate documents are very vague, it may be impossible to ascertain this even with a closer reading of the originals.

he was a successful and prominent landowner in the early Cambridge community, and that his eldest son, John, followed in his footsteps.

Robert's son John Holmes, born in 1639, married Hannah Thatcher, daughter of another prominent early settler, Samuel Thatcher, in September 1664, about a year after his father's death. He and his wife most likely continued to live in the Holmes homestead in Cambridge (not the Hooper-Lee-Nichols site). Before Hannah's death in May 1670, she and John had a son John (born October 23, 1665) and a daughter Hannah. On May 31, 1667 the adult Hannah was admitted to full communion in the Cambridge Church, and the Holmes children were baptized in June of that year.<sup>14</sup> Meanwhile, John Holmes was appointed by the town of Cambridge to inspect the town fences in 1663, and was granted timber for building fences in 1664 and 1670, and a lean-to in 1669.<sup>15</sup> Nineteenth-century historians note that John Holmes relocated to Salem by 1673, and indeed on the deed conveying a parcel of land in Watertown to Richard Hooper in 1685, he is named as "John Holmes of Salem, in the County of Essex, husbandman."<sup>16</sup> (A 1689 reference to a John Holmes voting in a Cambridge town meeting may refer to either his son or his nephew, both also named John.<sup>17</sup>)

Even after he moved to Salem, it is clear that John Holmes had maintained some property in the Cambridge and Watertown area, a parcel of which eventually became the site of the Hooper-Lee-Nichols house. On February 14, 1684, Holmes sold for 45 pounds to Dr. Richard Hooper of Cambridge, a physician,

---

<sup>14</sup> Savage, *Genealogical Dictionary*, 2:452; VRC, 1:365; RCC, 23.

<sup>15</sup> RTC, 150, 154, 180, 184.

<sup>16</sup> Paige, *History*, 588; Savage, *Genealogical Dictionary*, 2:452; MD, 9:363. It is possible that the elder John Holmes' probate documents exist in Essex County records. A search of the Middlesex County probate located only the will of his son, John, who died unmarried in 1691 leaving all his property to his uncle Samuel Thatcher. MP, 11758.

<sup>17</sup> RTC, 291, and Paige, *History*, 588.

“two parcels of land, the one containing twelve acres for it more or less lying and going (?) scituate in this bound & \_\_\_\_\_ of Watertown in Watertown \_\_\_ field, being bounded \_\_\_\_\_ John Cooper and Christopher Grant westerly, Richard Eccles (?) northerly, Samuel Andrew & Nicholas Hisson (?) on easterly, and Watertown highway southerly; the other parcel of land being marsh containing about half an acre lying and going scituate in Cambridge in Cambridge north (?) below Mr. Pelham’s Island being bounded toward Hall\_\_\_\_\_ westerly & with a brook northerly & easterly and Thomas Danforth Esqr. Southerly.”<sup>18</sup>

Although Dr. Richard Hooper is described as a resident of Cambridge in this deed, he does not appear in any town records prior to 1684, and he may have come from Hampton (Ma.?) according to a nineteenth-century genealogy.<sup>19</sup> His wife’s name was Elizabeth, and they had two children, Hannah, born 1683, and Henry, born in 1685, before Richard died intestate on December 8, 1690.<sup>20</sup> The probate documents include an inventory completed in 1691 which shows that Dr. Hooper had built a dwelling-house upon the land he purchased from John Holmes, had furnished the house fairly comfortably, and left an estate valued at 335:04:06.<sup>21</sup> But strangely, the documents make it appear that over the next several years, Dr. Hooper’s heirs suffered great financial hardship, and that the house fell into serious disrepair before Dr. Hooper’s son Henry rebuilt it.

The 1691 probate inventory indicates that the Hoopers were well off: it showed “a hous [sic], Barn, and Orchard” worth 200 pounds together. [See Fig. 5 and 6] Since no house, barn, or orchard were mentioned in the 1684 deed of sale, it appears that Hooper had made these significant improvements to the property since purchasing the land five years earlier for 45 pounds. The appraisers also recorded eleven acres of land valued at 44 pounds, “three quarters of an acre of Marsh” valued at 5 pounds, and “a

---

<sup>18</sup> MD 9:363.

<sup>19</sup> Savage, *Genealogical Dictionary*, 2:460.

<sup>20</sup> WR, 1:61-62.

<sup>21</sup> “Inventory of Richard Hooper Estate 1691,” MP, 11812.

swamp lot” worth 2 pounds. Inside the house, Hooper had amassed a more-than-respectable quantity of household goods, including numerous textiles, tables, chests, pewter, cooking implements, tools, and sundry other items. Significantly, he owned a set of “Eight Leather Chairs” valued at 2:08:00 and an additional “Ten Chairs” probably of a plainer sort, but a large quantity nonetheless. Hooper also possessed two guns, many pieces of medical equipment, two Bibles, and other books. The books were worth over 12 pounds, while the medical instruments and drugs were worth another 15 pounds. Along with household goods, Hooper owned cattle, horses, and a pig, and had a servant. No outstanding debts were noted on the inventory.

Besides demonstrating that Hooper improved his property and was a man of some wealth, the inventory gives faint clues to the layout of the house. Only two pairs of andirons are listed, indicating that there were no more than two *heated* rooms. The inventory is not enumerated by room, and the appraisers may have listed objects grouped by type rather than by location. For example, most textiles are listed together, then most of the furniture, then the pewter and other metal cooking equipment. But the listing of Bibles, books, medical supplies, two chests and a table, more books, and more medical equipment (scales and weights, mortars and pestles) suggests that these objects might have been separately grouped or stored within the home, perhaps in an unheated chamber or lean-to. A grouping of saddles and bridles, livestock, a servant, and a “bedd Blankest and Rugg” at the end of the list indicates a separate space, probably the barn.<sup>22</sup>

The plan of Richard Hooper’s house cannot be determined from the known documentary or physical evidence. The house may have had two heated rooms on the first floor, possibly with unheated chambers above, or it may have been a single-cell

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

house with one heated room on each floor. Part of the difficulty in determining the original plan of the house arises because evidence suggests that the house deteriorated significantly in the years following Richard Hooper's death, and was renovated by his son Henry in 1716. Since the house was heavily rebuilt within thirty years of its original construction, the surviving First Period elements of the structure cannot be firmly dated with more precision than to say that they were in place *by 1716*. However, it is possible to speculate that the western half of the building is of earlier construction than the eastern half. Grady and Zimmerman observed that the joists are closely spaced in the west room (17-18" apart), as opposed to the spacing of 19-20" between joists in the east room; Abbot Lowell Cummings has shown that in general, close spacing of joists indicates an earlier construction date.<sup>23</sup> Thus, the western half of the building may contain elements of the house originally constructed by Richard Hooper between 1685-1690.

How did the house fall into such disrepair that it required extensive rebuilding within a relatively short time after its construction? The probate documents suggest that not long after Richard Hooper's death in December 1690, his wife Elizabeth had difficulty supporting herself and her children. On January 25, 1691 she asked for and was granted permission by the town selectmen to "felle out Lickuers by Reetale" as a means of earning income.<sup>24</sup> She apparently operated the house as an inn because town records show that she was given warnings about lodging undesirable people. In November 1692, the town voted to send two men "to giue warning to miftres hopper [sic] to fre her hous of any inmates entertained by her without ye confent of ye felect men vpon ye penalty ye law and order of town." The town warned her to "fre her hous of

---

<sup>23</sup> Grady and Zimmerman, "Hooper-Lee-Nichols," 9 and 12; and Abbot Lowell Cummings, *The Framed Houses of Massachusetts Bay 1625-1725* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979 ) 240-241.

<sup>24</sup> WR, 2:48.

good man Sameull Streter and his wife” and later sent representatives to court to “enter a caution against Samuell Streter and his wife that thay may not be exfeptid as inhabitance on Wattertown.”<sup>25</sup> In a similar incident in July 1694, the town sent men “to Mis. Hooper to warn her not to Entertain Henry Reiner without fufficient bond be given by persons Refponsable to save the Town harmlefse.”<sup>26</sup> These incidents suggest that Elizabeth Hooper occasionally lodged somewhat shady characters because she needed the money.

After Elizabeth Hooper died in 1701, probate documents make it seem that she and her two children had been living in dire circumstances. Francis Foxcroft, a wealthy and prominent Cambridge resident and later a judge in Middlesex County, was appointed administrator of the Hooper estate. Foxcroft reported to the Honorable John Leverett, Esq., Judge of Probate for the County of Middlesex, that he found “the house where he [Richard Hooper] dyed and thirteen acres of land adjoining, four acres part thereof being an orchard.” Along with two neighbors who inspected the property, Foxcroft

“found the house much out of repair & nothing of furniture within, either linen or woollen not so much as to wrap the body of the widow in who at the time was buryed at my cost. She had spent all the moveables for her own and her two childrens reliefe since the death of the sd Richard, her late husband. There is only four or five old broken chaires & two dresser or tables not worth the cost of appraismt which we locked up in a room in the house for such as they may of right belong to.”<sup>27</sup>

It seems remarkable that in the ten years since her husband’s death, Elizabeth Hooper had sold none of the land from his estate, but instead had sold off nearly all the household furnishings – even the blankets and other textiles – to feed herself and her children.

Either her property management skills were extremely poor or there was something not

---

<sup>25</sup> Ibid, 2:54.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid, 2:76.

<sup>27</sup> “Please to be informed...,” Francis Foxcroft to Judge John Leverett, Esq., MP, 11812.

right about Foxcroft's appraisal of the property; there is not enough evidence to give a full explanation.

Francis Foxcroft was a well-respected and wealthy citizen in Cambridge by 1701. Having arrived in Boston by 1665, Foxcroft was said to be the son of Daniel Foxcroft, mayor of Leeds in County York. Although he was once arrested and imprisoned for involvement in a political dispute involving Governor Andros, these events seemed to have caused him no permanent political damage. In Boston, he made an excellent marriage to Elizabeth Danforth, daughter of the Governor, in October 1682.<sup>28</sup> Upon the death of his father-in-law, he inherited the Danforth homestead in Cambridge, where he lived until his death December 31, 1727.<sup>29</sup> He served in Middlesex County as Judge of Common Pleas 1707-1719 and Judge of Probate 1708-1725. Despite the fact that Foxcroft was Episcopalian, he and his family participated in the Puritan church in Cambridge; his son Francis, born 1695, received full communion in the Cambridge Church in April 1713.<sup>30</sup> The younger Francis also became a Judge of Probate for Middlesex County.<sup>31</sup>

It is not clear whether or why the wealthy and respected Foxcroft might have exaggerated the poor condition of the Hooper house and the low value of the estate. As administrator for the estate and guardian for the two Hooper children, he kept the Hooper estate accounts for the probate court over the next several years, and he continued to maintain that the house and property had little value. In a 1709 accounting of the estate,

---

<sup>28</sup> Savage, *Genealogical Dictionary*, 2:197.

<sup>29</sup> Paige, *History*, 548, and Savage, *Genealogical Dictionary*, 2:197.

<sup>30</sup> Paige, *History*, 548, and RCC, 45.

<sup>31</sup> Savage, *Genealogical Dictionary*, 2:197

he wrote that he had had difficulties finding a tenant for either the land or the house.<sup>32</sup>

After stating that he was offered no more than 4:8:10 per year for renting the orchard and farmland, he rented the property to himself for 5 pounds per year from 1702-1709, paying a total of 40 pounds to the estate.<sup>33</sup> He sold off the remaining furnishings, which he described as “5 old chairs, 3 small old tables, chest & two or 3 prs lumber\_\_\_\_\_ with an old Iron pot broken & a broken frying pan” for 1:10:00.<sup>34</sup>

Foxcroft gave another indication of the poor condition of the house when he wrote that “The house being so much out of repaires no body would live in it tho I proffered sundry to live in it rent free,” and noted that he received one pound “of Edwd Marret for old glass I took fro windows to prevent further damage by ye wormes.”<sup>35</sup> We could speculate that this last note might mean that wood-boring insects such as termites were attacking the window frames, causing valuable glass to fall out, and that Foxcroft decided it would be better to sell the glass than to allow it to be broken.

Meanwhile, the house was apparently unoccupied from Elizabeth Hooper’s death in 1701 until Henry Hooper (son of Richard and Elizabeth) returned to the property in 1716. At the time of Elizabeth’s death, Foxcroft was appointed guardian of the Hooper children, Hannah, then age eighteen, and Henry, age sixteen.<sup>36</sup> He placed Henry as an apprentice with one “Doctor Checkly” by 1702, and disbursed small amounts of money

---

<sup>32</sup> “The account of Francis Foxcroft Administrator of the Estate of Richard Hooper...,” MP, 11812.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid, and Grady and Zimmerman, *Hooper-Lee-Nichols*, 128. There is no punctuation between the numbers 4, 8, 1, and 0, in the probate document. Grady and Zimmerman transcribed these numbers as “48 10,” but considering that the farmland had been valued at 44 pounds in the 1691 inventory, it seems that an offer of over 48 pounds for one year’s rent would be disproportionately high. Since Foxcroft wrote that he received no higher bids and that he rented the land to himself for 5 pounds per year, it would make sense that the price of the lower bid should be read as 4:8:10.

<sup>34</sup> “The account of Francis Foxcroft,” MP, 11812.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

<sup>36</sup> MP, 11813 and 11814.

to Hannah from 1702 to 1709.<sup>37</sup> But it does not appear that he ever found a tenant for the house, and it is possible that the house was occupied by a squatter in 1714. In that year, the Watertown selectmen ordered a warrant

“To warn Sarah Hayden to depart out of Watertown, who came into sd Town in February last past, And is Refiding at the houfe formerly Doctr. Hoopers, who hath lately been delivered of an Elegetimate Child (as the Select men are informed) therefore Signifie to her that she carry her Child with her out of our Town.”<sup>38</sup>

The reference to the house simply as “formerly Doctr. Hoopers” might suggest that there was no new resident since Dr. Hooper’s time, and the warning hints that this unwanted newcomer in town had been camping out in the abandoned house.

According to Foxcroft’s description and the vague hints from the town records, the house had been in poor condition in 1701 when Elizabeth Hooper died, and no repairs to the building (other than selling off the window glass) are mentioned in any documents until 1716. By that year, Henry Hooper, now age 31 and a physician like his father, had re-appeared on the scene.<sup>39</sup> After Foxcroft, his guardian, placed him as an apprentice with Dr. Checkley, Henry had been living somewhere outside Watertown, probably completing his apprenticeship in medicine. By 1716, he had returned to Watertown, and repaired (and probably enlarged) his late father’s house. In March 1716 he and his sister Hannah asked Francis Foxcroft to form a committee to appraise the estate “Making abatement for the late repaires of the house & fences done at the proper charge of the sd Doct. Henry.”<sup>40</sup> On April 1, 1717, the appraisers reported that they found the property,

---

<sup>37</sup> “The account of Francis Foxcroft,” MP, 11812.

<sup>38</sup> WR, 2:224.

<sup>39</sup> “At the special nomination of Henry Hooper...,” MP, 11812.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid. This document shows that the repairs were carried out *before* March 1716, not between 1716 and 1717 as Grady and Zimmerman believed. See Grady and Zimmerman, *Hooper-Lee-Nichols*, 5.

including “twelve acres of upland contained in a Deed of Sale from John Holmes, on which the Dwelling house standeth,” as well as other small parcels of land to be worth a total of 270:30:00. The “Dwelling house as it now is” they judged to be worth one hundred and thirty pounds.<sup>41</sup> Apparently, Henry asked to have the estate pay for the repair expenses, because he submitted to the probate court an accounting of the estate’s disbursements paid to various workers and suppliers on April 3, 1717.<sup>42</sup> [See Fig. 7 and 8]

The 1717 appraisal and accounting of the disbursements for repairs provide important, if not precise, evidence of the changes Henry and Hannah Hooper made to the house ca. 1716, which probably greatly enlarged the house. Grady and Zimmerman (with the assistance of Abbott Lowell Cummings) made a detailed analysis of the physical evidence compared to the documents discussed above, and concluded that “the front half of the house achieved its current lateral dimensions by 1717, that the framing of the first two floors of this portion as it now exists, was in place by that date and that the house was then two and one half stories high.”<sup>43</sup> Noting some deviations from typical First Period framing methods, and evidence of major differences in the framing of the east and west portions of the house, they concluded that the “front portion of the house in its current dimensions is the result of the joining of two separate, pre-existing house frames. The western rooms and the current chimney bay are apparently from one entity. They may derive from what was originally a one room plan house (with chamber above)...,” or

---

<sup>41</sup> “In observance of the within written order or commission...,” MP, 11812.

<sup>42</sup> “The Am’t Disbursements on My Late Father’s Estate...,” MP, 11812. Workers and suppliers were paid between May 1716 and March 1717 but the repairs were already done before March 1716.

<sup>43</sup> Grady and Zimmerman, *Hooper-Lee-Nichols*, 6.

a two room plan house in which the eastern half was “damaged, destroyed, or never built.”<sup>44</sup>

Grady and Zimmerman assert that the expansion of the house to its 1716 configuration as a two-room, two and one half story house was “a marriage of ...two house frames” that likely occurred when that Henry Hooper made his extensive repairs to the house. [See Fig. 9] In addition to the evidence of different framing systems and different carpenter markings on members in the east and west halves of the house,<sup>45</sup> they provide evidence that the eastern part of the house has smaller front-to-rear dimensions than the western half of the house, and is somewhat awkwardly joined to the western frame. The eastern half therefore does not seem to have been built to fit with the western half, but seems to have been a pre-existing frame, probably for a single-cell house, which was moved to this site and added to the existing frame which now comprises the western half.<sup>46</sup>

Grady and Zimmerman’s analysis of the physical evidence seems sound, and is in part supported by Henry Hooper’s accounting of disbursements for repairs. He spent significant sums on items such as shingles, “1000 feet of boards,” clapboards, nails, window frames – materials which suggest major rebuilding if not expansion of the house. He also listed a charge for “taking down, Carting and Raising & nailes” which could possibly refer to moving and raising the frame which became the eastern half of the building. Furthermore, his payments “to Mr. Gamage pr mending ye Cellars, Chimneys, &c.” and “to Mr. Jno. Green for pavements for Laying 4 hathes” indicates that the

---

<sup>44</sup> Ibid, 10.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid, 9 and 72.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid, 10-12.

chimneys were probably rebuilt and/or enlarged to create four hearths.<sup>47</sup> These expenditures fit with the physical evidence to suggest that the house by 1716 was two rooms wide, two stories high, and had a pair of fireplaces on each floor.

Henry Hooper's extensive remodeling of the house seems to fit with what is known of his life and career at the time. On December 10, 1716, in the same year he remodeled the house, he also married Remember Parker, with whom he had a son Henry in 1717 and a son Richard in 1718.<sup>48</sup> He would have needed a house for his new family, and he secured ownership of the house when he paid his sister Hannah forty-five pounds for her share of their father's estate on June 3, 1717.<sup>49</sup> From 1717 to 1729, records indicate that Henry Hooper was the grantee in at least eight different land transactions in Middlesex County; he may have been expanding his father's estate into a larger farm.<sup>50</sup> At the same time, Dr. Henry Hooper was evidently a respected local physician, because he attended President Leverett of Harvard from February 1721/2 to July 1722; his bill for services was preserved at the library of the New England Historic Genealogical Society.<sup>51</sup> Dr. Hooper still lived in Watertown as late as March 1726/7 when he was appointed to a town committee investigating a proposed re-routing of a road.<sup>52</sup>

By 1733 Dr. Hooper had apparently moved to Newport, Rhode Island.<sup>53</sup> In that year he sold to Cornelius Waldo of Boston "for 630 pounds and discharge of mortgage,

---

<sup>47</sup> "The Am't Disbursements ...," MP, 11812.

<sup>48</sup> Paige, *History*, 598, and WR, 2:358 and 3:155.

<sup>49</sup> MP, 11812.

<sup>50</sup> MD Grantee Index, 1639-1799, Book 4. Examination of each of these deeds would likely show where these parcels were located in relationship to the original Hooper homestead. I did not look up or copy all of these deeds but I include a copy of the index page with the deeds. See document files.

<sup>51</sup> Paige, *History*, 598.

<sup>52</sup> WR, 2:340.

<sup>53</sup> In the deed dated December 20, 1733, in which Henry Hooper sold his house and land in Watertown to Cornelius Waldo, he is named as "Henry Hooper of Newport." MD, 34:416, as quoted in Grady and

dwelling house and 16 ½ acres of land in Watertown; also 28 acres of land south of Brattle Street to the Charles River.”<sup>54</sup> When he added the acreage located south of the road to Watertown, Hooper may have connected his farm to the Charles river in the same manner as other farms along this road in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Although dense 19<sup>th</sup>-century residential development in the area has obscured the relationship between colonial period houses along the north side of Brattle Street and the river, the Vassal-Longfellow House and the remnant of its estate preserved in Longfellow Park provide a hint of this early pattern of landscape use.

#### **IV. The Georgian Period of the Hooper-Lee-Nichols House: 1733 – 1802.**

When the Boston merchant Cornelius Waldo purchased Dr. Hooper’s house and land in 1733, it marked a new period in the house’s history, in which the property functioned less as a homestead farm and more as a gentleman’s country seat. By the mid-eighteenth century, wealthy Boston merchants were beginning to build country seats in coastal towns which were accessible from Boston by boat, such as Cambridge and Watertown. The Royall family in Medford and Governor Shirley in Roxbury are two early examples of this pattern.<sup>55</sup> From the 1730s to the close of the century, the Hooper-Lee-Nichols House was “Georgianized” through several phases of remodeling and redecoration, in keeping with the fashions of the eighteenth century. During this period,

---

Zimmerman, *Hooper -Lee-Nichols*, 123. I was unable to locate a copy of this deed at the Registry of Deeds.

<sup>54</sup> MD, 34:416, as quoted in Grady and Zimmerman, *Hooper -Lee-Nichols*, 123. This may be a paraphrase rather than a direct quote from the deed. “Brattle Street” was probably still called the “road to Watertown” at this time.

<sup>55</sup> Bunting and Nylander, *Survey*, 19.