

---

Suburban Men and Masculine Domesticity, 1870-1915

Author(s): Margaret Marsh

Source: *American Quarterly*, Vol. 40, No. 2 (Jun., 1988), pp. 165-186

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2713066>

Accessed: 09/12/2008 08:01

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=jhup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Quarterly*.

# Suburban Men and Masculine Domesticity, 1870–1915

MARGARET MARSH  
*Stockton State College*

---

“The home is man’s affair as much as woman’s.”

—Martha and Robert Bruère, 1909

“There is no reason at all why men should not sweep and dust, make beds, clean windows, fix the fire, clean the grate, arrange the furniture. . . .”

—*American Homes and Gardens*, 1905

WHEN HISTORIANS THINK ABOUT AMERICAN MEN AT THE TURN OF THE TWENTIETH century, among the images they usually conjure up are these: a bored clerk or middle-manager in some impersonal office of a faceless corporation, pushing papers or counting the company’s money, longing nostalgically for a time when a man could find adventure and get rich at the same time—by becoming a robber baron, or conquering new frontiers; or Theodore Roosevelt, the delicate child who grew up to relish big-game hunting and war, and whose open disdain for softness and “effeminacy” made him the symbol of rugged masculinity in his own time.

We owe the association of the corporate drone with the flamboyant Rough Rider to an influential essay by John Higham, who argued that one of the most significant American cultural constructs at the turn of the century was a growing cult of masculinity, attended by the insecurities of middle-class men about their own virility and “manliness.” Beginning in the 1890s, Higham argued, the country witnessed a national “urge to be young, masculine, and adventurous,” when Americans rebelled against “the frustrations, the routine, and the sheer dullness of an urban-industrial culture.”<sup>1</sup> He cited the growing popularity of boxing and football, a disaffection from genteel fiction, and not least, the rise in the level of national bellicosity, as important indicators of a new public mood.

Higham's article, published in 1970, triggered an interest in the historical meaning of masculinity. His insights, and those of others who have followed his interpretive lead, have been of undeniable value.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, his work defined an entire generation of middle-class men—young and middle-aged, married and single, urban, suburban, and rural—in terms of anxieties about manliness. Those anxieties, and the men who faced them, undoubtedly existed, but in the course of my research on suburban families, I have discovered a different manner of middle-class man. The evidence to date is scattered, but there is enough to suggest that historians supplement the image of the dissatisfied clerk with an additional picture of a contented suburban father, who enjoyed the security of a regular salary, a predictable rise through the company hierarchy, and greater leisure. This last prerequisite was facilitated by shorter commuting times—often thirty minutes or less—to and from the suburbs of most cities. (With the exception of some New York lines, men could expect to spend less time going to and from work than had their fathers who had to rely on horse-drawn streetcars and omnibuses.)<sup>3</sup>

Alongside the idea of the cult of masculinity, which offered an explanation for some elements of middle-class male culture, we should consider the model of masculine domesticity.<sup>4</sup> Masculine domesticity is difficult to define; in some ways, it is easier to say what it was *not* than what it was. It was not equivalent to feminism. It was not an equal sharing of all household duties. Nor did it extend to the belief that men and women ought to have identical opportunities in the larger society.<sup>5</sup> It was, however, a model of behavior in which fathers would agree to take on increased responsibility for some of the day-to-day tasks of bringing up children and spending their time away from work in playing with their sons and daughters, teaching them, taking them on trips. A domestic man would also make his wife, rather than his male cronies, his regular companion on evenings out. And while he might not dust the mantel or make the bed except in special circumstances, he would take a significantly greater interest in the details of running the household and caring for the children that his father was expected to do.<sup>6</sup>

The evidence for the growth of masculine domesticity comes from a variety of places. Prescriptive literature is one important source. Tantalizing clues from domestic architecture, records of community groups in the suburbs themselves, letters, and diaries provide others. Among the former are the later writings of the influential literary domestic Harriet Beecher Stowe;<sup>7</sup> the essays of Boston feminist and popular author of juvenile fiction Abby Morton Diaz; widely read child-rearing manuals; and the advice of successful men to their aspiring juniors in the Progressive Era, in this case from such disparate figures as the reformist senator Albert Beveridge and the sensationalist publisher and “physical culture” hero Bernarr Macfadden. If the image of domestic man came only from this prescriptive literature, it would still be important as a

sign of changing cultural models. Yet suggestions of changing male roles also appeared in the reconfiguration of interior space in suburban houses, in the rise of suburban institutions which included both husbands and wives, and in the daily lives of suburban families.

\* \* \*

Masculine domesticity required three conditions for its emergence: an ideal of marriage that emphasized companionship instead of either patriarchal rule or the ideology of domesticity, both of which encouraged gender separation; an economic system that provided sufficient job security for middle-class men so that husbands could devote more attention to their families; and a physical location in which the new attitudes toward family could find their appropriate spatial expressions. It was not until the power relations within middle-class marriage underwent subtle shifts, until the rise of the corporation provided relatively secure jobs with predictable patterns of mobility, and until suburbs began to be viewed as the appropriate space within which to create the companionate family, that the development of masculine domesticity was possible. By the early twentieth century, all three of the conditions had been met.

During the second third of the nineteenth century the patriarchal family, softened by love and mutual obligation, had served as the principal model for middle-class families. This ideal of family life had depended on what twentieth-century historians have come to call the ideology of domesticity, a social theory articulated most persuasively by Catharine Beecher in the 1840s. Building in part on the ideas of Sarah Josepha Hale and Horace Bushnell, Beecher attempted to unify the contradictions of a society that was both democratic and in many ways inegalitarian by minimizing class, racial, and ethnic differences while maximizing those of gender. The success of the ideology of domesticity required, in the words of Beecher's biographer, "the isolation of women in the home away from full participation in the society." To compensate them for their voluntary abdication of the right to a position in the world of men, women held sway within the home, thereby (at least theoretically) stabilizing society as a whole.<sup>8</sup>

The belief in separate spheres was not universal, but during the middle years of the century it dominated ideas about gender. And as Mary Ryan has argued, "Any cultural construct that achieved such popularity bore some semblance to social reality." Ryan's study of Utica and Suzanne Lebsack's of Petersburg demonstrate the "social reality" of gender separation at mid-century for white, middle-class women.<sup>9</sup> The doctrine of separate spheres began to break down after the Civil War. During the past two decades, historians have extensively chronicled the incursions of women into the

masculine sphere. But changing roles for women also meant changes in male roles. As women entered the masculine world, men began to enter the sphere assigned to women.<sup>10</sup>

We can begin to understand this phenomenon—which ended in the masculine domesticity of the Progressive Era—by looking first at changes in the kinds of advice given to young men about the organization of their lives. In the middle of the nineteenth century, male advice-writers (excluding the medical advice-givers who wrote marriage manuals) rarely concerned themselves with the role of husband or father.<sup>11</sup> Instead, they emphasized economic and social mobility, urging young men to develop the qualities of sobriety, honesty, and a capacity for hard work because these qualities were essential to economic success, not because they would help a man become a better husband or father. Neither did these male writers offer suggestions on choosing a suitable wife, or on appropriate behavior toward one's children. Although the moral young man understood from these advice manuals what to avoid—prostitutes, gambling dens, and the questionable pleasures of urban life—they offered him no positive assistance in settling his personal life.<sup>12</sup>

A British writer, William Rathbone Grey, who expressed anxieties about the future of marriage, suggested that prostitution made many men “lo[a]th to resign the easy independence, the exceptional luxuries, the habitual indulgences of a bachelor's career, for the fetters of a wife, the burden and responsibility of children, and the decent monotony of the domestic hearth.” Grey's portrait of urban decadence was not unusual for the period, but his explicit expression of a fear that it would deter young men from marrying was. American writers of advice for young men generally contented themselves with painting lurid pictures of urban corruption, without correspondingly urging their readers to embrace “the decent monotony” of domesticity.<sup>13</sup> Most male advice writers did not exhibit misgivings about their readers' future domestic lives in the 1840s and 1850s; books by women did, but they addressed a different audience. Catharine Sedgwick's *Home*, for example, portrayed the moral home as the only sure preventative against the dissipation that worried the male writers, but her book's readers were largely women.<sup>14</sup>

One of the few men who dealt with the domestic duties of husbands at mid-century, temperance author T. S. Arthur, did so for *Godey's Lady's Book*. Arthur's series on “Model Husbands” explored the impact of a husband's temperament on domestic life. His “bad model” husband possessed a foul temper, was selfish and inconsiderate of his wife, left her alone every evening while he went out with his male cronies, and paid no attention to his children.<sup>15</sup> A “better specimen,” although he began his married life impatient with his bride's inability to manage the home to his satisfaction, learned to subdue his selfishness and thereby bring about an improvement in his wife's domestic abilities.<sup>16</sup> If a “better specimen” was one who could learn to subdue his

anger, a “good model” had none to subdue. The ideal husband took great delight in his family, spending his evenings at home reading with his wife and children. Arthur insisted that men had domestic obligations that included helping around the house in emergencies, as well as showing attentiveness to their wives and children, and taking their pleasures in the home with the family rather than in the city with their friends.<sup>17</sup> T. S. Arthur’s determined effort to combine male superiority with conjugal generosity was atypical; significantly, he published these articles in a magazine read primarily by women, not by men.

In fact, it was women writers who began first to refuse to pay even lip service to the patriarchal ideal. Harriet Beecher Stowe, one of the nineteenth century’s most popular writers, ridiculed patriarchal pretensions and praised domestic men in her last two novels.<sup>18</sup> For example, one of her respected male characters in *My Wife and I* insisted that the opinions of his wife and sister were far more valuable to him than the views “of all the doctors of divinity.” In the same novel Stowe asserted confidently that “sooner or later the true wife becomes a mother to her husband; she guides him, cares for him, teaches him, and catechizes him in the nicest way possible.”<sup>19</sup>

Stowe’s novels found an echo in the advice literature of Abby Morton Diaz, a widely read author of juvenile fiction as well as a prominent Boston feminist, who tried in the mid-1870s to persuade men that egalitarian marriages were in their best interests.<sup>20</sup> Long before the term “togetherness” was coined to describe an ideal marriage, Diaz insisted that “a sympathetic couple are to such a degree one that a pleasure which comes to either singly can only be half enjoyed, and even this half-joy is lessened by the consciousness of what the other is losing.” Such a matrimonial state was possible only when the wife was “at least the equal of her husband” in intelligence, taste, and education. Women would have to be granted the rights of education and citizenship before there could be truly happy marriages.<sup>21</sup>

By the 1890s, women advice-givers were arguing that men should help out around the house and stop expecting their wives to wait on them. As one of Margaret Sangster’s friends complained, she was tired of picking up after her husband, who every day “manages to give my drawing room, sitting room, and library an appearance of having been swept by a cyclone. One traces him all over the house by the things he has heedlessly dropped. . . .” Sangster urged her friend to tell her husband to pick up after himself, since a good husband would surely make an effort to reform, at least “to some extent.”<sup>22</sup> Such advice, and the relationship that it implied, was far removed from a world in which a father’s convenience was of principal importance.

These changes in attitude toward marriage, combined with the significant and growing public activity of middle-class women, contributed to women’s greater self-consciousness that they had significant roles to play in the shaping

of society. Even if she did not aspire to vote or to work at a career, a wife could justify having greater expectations of her husband. Whereas mid-century domestic writers had begged husbands not to “sear and palsy” their wives’ hearts by a “tyrannical and overbearing manner,” their counterparts at the turn of the twentieth century sharply informed men that husbands too “should rise above the petty . . . irritations of the day and speak with agreeable consideration for others. . . .” Furthermore, they insisted, the work of a housewife was “just as important” as the husband’s breadwinning job, and therefore his wife was entitled to his income: “She earns it just as truly, and has just as much a right to it as he. . . .”<sup>23</sup>

By the early twentieth century, male writers had begun to concur with many of these sentiments, particularly those having to do with the importance of family togetherness. As an anonymous father, writing in *The Independent* in 1906, argued, not only the family but the larger society, benefitted when “father and son . . . take their social enjoyments *en famille*.”<sup>24</sup> James Canfield expressed similar views in *Cosmopolitan*. Enumerating “the three controlling desires of every normal man,” he gave first priority to male domestic needs: “His home must be more than a mere shelter. . . . He must be able to make his house a home by adding a hearth—and there is no hearth for a man but the heart of a woman.”<sup>25</sup>

The domestic lives of middle-class families reflected the changes in the attitudes toward marriage. On the surface, the majority of men’s and women’s lives did not appear to change much; for example, women did not hold down paid jobs outside the home to any appreciable extent. But as the twentieth century drew nearer, women increasingly spent more time beyond the confines of the home, whether in mothers’ groups or women’s clubs, in reform activities, or simply shopping in the downtown department stores. Husbands changed their behavior patterns as well. The golden age of male fraternal organizations had passed by the turn of the century, according to historian Mark Carnes. Male clubdom would rise again later in the century, but for the moment suburban men sought their leisure closer to home, in tennis and country clubs that welcomed the whole family, and in social groups that included their wives. In one New Jersey suburb, for example, during the first decade of the twentieth century, the Men’s Civic Club had difficulty in attracting members, and the Women’s Sewing Society was forced to disband completely in 1903; but the Penn Literary Society, the Debating group, and the Natural Science Club, all of which included both men and women and numbered many married couples in their ranks, flourished. So, too, did the new family-oriented tennis club, founded in the same period.<sup>26</sup>

Women advice-givers at mid-century had urged women to spend time socializing with other women for their *own* well-being.<sup>27</sup> By the the 1890s the justification for the maintenance of women’s outside interests was different,

and emphasized the importance of the husband-wife bond. Absorption in one's domestic duties, argued the advice-givers, would damage a woman's relationship with her husband. Women who confined themselves to the household and to the unremitting care of children were in danger of becoming inadequate wives.<sup>28</sup> In the early twentieth century even moderate reformers urged women to get out of the house, to stop "fluttering about inside four walls under the delusion that these mark their proper sphere of activity," to cease thinking of the house as a "fortified citadel."<sup>29</sup>

Advice to men had also changed. While male advice-givers rarely insisted that men take on the administrative or physical duties of running a household, they did urge them to trade the burdens of patriarchal authority and work-induced separation from family life for emotional closeness to their wives and the pleasures of spending time with their children as companions. Of course, not all men were in agreement with such advice. However, even criticism could inadvertently highlight the new domesticity of suburban men. Richard Harding Davis, writing for *Harper's* in 1894, found his married suburban friends boring because they had no interests beyond each other, their house, and their suburban pleasures. Davis found their contentment incomprehensible.<sup>30</sup>

\* \* \*

Companionate marriages need not have been entirely egalitarian to require new roles for both men and women.<sup>31</sup> Martha Bruère, an influential Progressive Era home economist, and her economist husband Robert, investigated the households of early twentieth-century middle-class America, using actual case studies of urban, suburban, and farm families. Reformers who discouraged parsimony and encouraged consumption in the pursuit of cultivation and comfort, the Bruères believed that "the home is man's affair as much as woman's. . . . When God made homemakers, male and female created He them!"<sup>32</sup>

There is a considerable cultural chasm between the middle-class society of the mid-nineteenth century, in which women took responsibility for the home and for the emotional tasks of parenthood while men took on the role of firm patriarch or detached observer, and that of the early twentieth, in which men could be referred to as "homemakers." The generational contrast between the father and husband of Harriet Beecher Stowe's heroine Eva in *My Wife and I* may serve to point up the beginnings of this change in the nature of masculine domestic involvement. The father, Mr. Van Arsdell, a well-to-do businessman who supported his family in a Fifth Avenue townhouse, "considered the household and all its works and ways as an insoluble mystery which he was well-pleased to leave to his wife." His role in the family was quite simply

“yearly to enlarge his means of satisfying the desires and aspirations of his family,” the domestic appurtenances of which “he knew little and cared less.”<sup>33</sup>

But if Mr. Van Arsdell was a shadow in his house, fleeing to his library and leaving everything else to his wife, his son-in-law, Harry Henderson, was a very different kind of man. Harry and Eva eschewed Fifth Avenue and urban fashion for a detached single family house; its yard had “trees, and English sparrows, and bird houses,” not to mention flowers and grape vines, those necessary adjuncts to the late Victorian suburban house. Revelling in his domesticity, Harry spent his evenings with his wife planning new decorations and home improvements (to be carried out by the servants). He said of his house: During the day “I think of it . . . when I’m at work in my office, and am always wanting to come home and see it again.”<sup>34</sup> Harry was completely comfortable with domesticity, proclaiming, “There is no earthly reason which requires a man, in order to be manly, to be unhandy and clumsy in regard to the minutiae of domestic life.”<sup>35</sup>

Although Stowe’s work suggests an incipient change in the ways in which men should make their presence known in the family, it is doubtful that the typical middle-class suburban husband in the 1870s could have emulated the fictional Harry Henderson. Maintaining a condition of affluence or stable respectability for a family without a hereditary income involved considerable risk. The salaried middle-class man with a secure corporate or bureaucratic position was still a rarity. William Robinson was a case in point. Robinson was a Massachusetts journalist of no more than local repute, about whose life historians would know little were it not for the papers left by his wife, Harriet Hanson Robinson, who after his death became a suffragist of state-wide importance. Of significance here is his struggle to provide moderate prosperity for his growing family in the third quarter of the nineteenth century. At one point, seemingly headed for upward mobility as a member of the Massachusetts State Legislature, he rose at 6:30 to take the train from his house in Lowell to Boston, returning home after eight in the evening. Then, since he was editing a weekly paper, he and his wife spent two to three hours each evening working on it. Later, he moved his family to Malden, a Boston suburb, which shortened his commuting time but not his workday. Wherever he worked he put in long hours, and there was at least one period when he remained without full-time employment for several years, supporting his family by freelance work and part-time odd jobs.<sup>36</sup>

William Robinson accepted the breadwinner role and its responsibilities, although the economic realities of the age meant that his work required his whole attention. Other men opted out altogether. David Lee Child, husband of abolitionist and domestic writer Lydia Maria Child, was perhaps an extreme example of an ineffectual provider, since he failed at every occupation he

tried. Nevertheless, the reaction of his wife, a prominent public figure, indicates the great importance of masculine economic success in the mid-nineteenth century, even to a woman capable of providing for herself. Lydia Maria Child complained bitterly to David Child's sister after David died: "For the last forty-five years I have paid from my own funds, all the expenses . . . ; food, clothing, washing, fuel, taxes, etc. . . . [David] had no promptitude, no system in his affairs; hence everything went into confusion. After many years of struggling with ever recurring pecuniary difficulties, I reluctantly became convinced that there was *no help* for these difficulties."<sup>37</sup> Lydia Maria Child, with a husband so absolutely unfit for the demands of the marketplace economy, took over and retained, with some considerable resentment, the role of breadwinner.

Child's resentment exemplifies the contradictions of this age for middle-class men and women. She was a talented (and reasonably well-paid) writer and first-rate editor, but having to support her husband because of his fecklessness angered her. Child was not alone. When Hattie Robinson, William Robinson's daughter, married Sydney Shattuck in 1878, she quit her job so that he could be the sole breadwinner. After a period of living with the bride's mother, the young couple bought a suburban house, and Shattuck, in business for himself, prospered. But his business failed, and although he spent years trying to recapture his early success, it always eluded him; at the time of his death the couple lived in a shabbily genteel boardinghouse, his wife having become a bitter, querulous, and nearly friendless woman. After his death, she was forced to throw herself on the charity of her niece.<sup>38</sup>

These few examples, while they do not indicate that middle-class men were abandoning the breadwinner role in any numbers, nevertheless suggest the precarious nature of middle-class status in the middle years of the century. Statistical portraits have made a similar point. As Michael Katz has said of the male citizenry of Buffalo (a reasonably prosperous city which nevertheless witnessed a downward mobility rate of 27 percent in the 1850s and 43 percent in the 1860s), "Neither staying wealthy nor falling, many men struggled from year to year, their economic state marginal and fluctuating."<sup>39</sup> Both men and women might be unable to live up to their assigned (or hoped-for) roles. When they failed to do so, men were likely to become dispirited and women resentful.

Yet Stowe's Harry Henderson did have some real-life counterparts. One was Charles Cumings, an insurance company executive whose family moved from Boston's South End to suburban Jamaica Plain in 1877. Charles Cumings was a precursor of the early twentieth-century domestic man. We know of him primarily because he made entries in his wife's daybook, entries that showed him to be intensely interested in the doings of his children and revealed his delight in their new suburban house. His joyful notes about the children's

first steps, anxious ones about their illnesses, and proud little comments on the progress of the house and lawn are complemented by Augusta Cumings's remarks, including one written during one of his infrequent absences from home, when she noted that everyone, but especially three-year-old Gertrude, missed him very much.<sup>40</sup> By the early twentieth century there would be more men like Charles Cumings. In the 1870s he was a rarity—an organization man during the heyday of entrepreneurialism; a private man during the great age of public male socializing; and a father involved in the details of his children's lives at a time when most men still believed that children were a mother's responsibility.

The connection between Cumings' occupation and his domesticity is significant. As the century came to a close, and the American upper middle class shifted away from its mid-nineteenth-century base of entrepreneurs, independent professionals, and clergy, other men could be like Charles Cumings. By then, particularly in the suburbs, the typical early twentieth-century, middle-class father was salaried and had some security in his position, more or less regular hours, and relatively predictable patterns of occupational mobility.<sup>41</sup>

\* \* \*

As middle-class men gained respite from the economic pressures that had plagued the previous generation, they had the time to give their families greater attention. This change, along with the prodding of feminists, triggered the recognition of the importance of male domestic responsibility. Abby Diaz had remarked in the 1870s that people were always asking her why, if women needed education for motherhood, men did not need similar training for fatherhood. Men, she responded, did indeed need such training, but she was too busy to provide it. She added derisively: "If men feel this need, there is nothing to prevent them from assembling . . . to inquire how they shall best qualify themselves to fulfill the duties of fatherhood. [I am] . . . under the impression that men's clubs do not meet especially with a view to such discussion."<sup>42</sup> And Harriet Beecher Stowe, although less of a feminist than Diaz, remarked during the same period, "We have heard much said of the importance of training women to be wives." She would have liked "something to be said on the importance of training men to be husbands."<sup>43</sup>

By the 1890s acerbic tones had diminished, to be replaced by sympathetic anecdotes about families in which the men shared domestic duties. Margaret Sangster approved of a family of her acquaintance in which "everyone shared the housework, even the boys . . .," while in another household the son, "a manly young fellow," did the ironing.<sup>44</sup> Martha and Robert Bruère took the idea of masculine domesticity at least as seriously as did Sangster, insisting

that "a knowledge of housekeeping is not a matter of sex, but science," so "all ought to know [it], men and women alike." High schools, they argued, ought to require boys to take home economics courses, because men should also become "homemakers."<sup>45</sup> But even the (male) editor of the suburban-oriented magazine *American Homes and Gardens* announced in 1905, "There is no reason at all why men should not sweep and dust, make beds, clean windows, fix the fire, clean the grate, arrange the furniture" and cook. The editor refers to domestic servants, not husbands. Still, he intended to make a point about male involvement in the home, and not merely about servants; he continued the same theme in his editorial for the following month: "The responsibility for the home is not [the woman's] alone," he insisted, "but is equally the husband's."<sup>46</sup>

It is not clear that the average middle-class man, young or old, was induced to do the ironing because of examples like those cited by Margaret Sangster, or to take home economics courses on the advice of the Bruères. Men were, however, becoming more involved in the internal workings of the household, as Joan Seidl discovered. She has examined the personal papers of Minnesotans at the turn of the twentieth century, many living in suburban St. Paul, and found that husbands of the early twentieth century took a far greater interest in the home than did those of the 1880s. Her focus is on house decoration; in the earlier period men cared little about it, but by the first decade of the century they were active participants. The recently married Helen Sommers, for example, wrote her sister in 1909 about decorating the house which she and her husband had chosen: "Harry & I are working every thing out together. . . ."<sup>47</sup> Household decoration, according to Seidl, was a symbol of the growing involvement of men in the home. "Most remarkable," she argues, "given the standard interpretations of the period, is the degree to which husbands took an active role in domestic arrangements. . . . Fixed hours of work allowed leisure for Walter Post to dry the dishes and for James Andrews to paste up the wallpaper."<sup>48</sup>

Women, however, wanted men to do more than share in the process of making decisions about household furnishings. They also wanted them to be nurturing fathers. Some of them pinned their hopes on the next generation. Kate Wiggin, who before she wrote *Rebecca of Sunnybrook Farm* had been a kindergarten teacher, attempted to develop "the father spirit" in little boys. At school, her charges played a bird game, in which "we had always had a mother bird in the nest with the birdlings. . . ." Wiggin then introduced a "father bird" and similarly reorganized other games. Finally, she incorporated the boys into "doll's day," previously a girls' game only. Wiggin asked one of the boys to play "father" and rock a doll to sleep. To her delight, all the other little boys then wanted to play.<sup>49</sup>

Wiggin published her kindergarten techniques and they enjoyed wide

circulation. Perhaps it was the imagined sight of thousands of little boys rocking dolls to sleep that encouraged men to start getting involved in rearing their children, in order to save their sons from such influences. In fact, some of the motivation for greater fatherly involvement with their children was surely to balance the preponderant female presence in the lives of young children. But the word is *balance*, not *overshadow*. Masculine domesticity, as it had evolved by the early twentieth century, was incorporated into the concept of manliness, as men became convinced that in order to have their sons grow up to be “manly” they should involve themselves more substantially in their children’s upbringing.<sup>50</sup>

Senator Albert Beveridge was one of a growing number of men who applauded masculine domesticity in the early twentieth century.<sup>51</sup> These men encouraged fathers to form direct and immediate bonds with their children, by playing games with them, taking them on camping trips, and simply spending time with them. Of course, before the entrenchment of the ideology of domesticity in the second third of the nineteenth century, fathers had maintained a large role in family government, but in the earlier period the emphasis was on obedience, discipline, and the importance of the father’s role as head of the household. In the early twentieth century the stress was on friendship: fathers were encouraged to be “chums” with their children, especially, but by no means exclusively, with their sons. Male writers on parenthood differed from their female counterparts in that they placed greater importance on independence, approving of boys having, from about the age of seven on, a sort of freewheeling companionship with other boys—a “gang” or “bunch,” to use the terms of the period. They argued that fathers could encourage such freedom because the new closeness of father and son would prevent the boy from falling into evil ways. His father would play baseball with him, take him and his friends camping and swimming, and in general play the role of a caring older companion rather than a stern patriarch.<sup>52</sup>

Within this new definition of fatherhood, aggressiveness was channeled into safe outlets. Indeed, the concepts of masculine domesticity and “manliness” seem more complementary than antipathetic: One might hypothesize that men, as their behavior within the family became less aloof (or patriarchal), and more nurturing and companionable, would develop a fantasy life that was more aggressive. The rage for football and boxing, and the reading of adventure novels, might have provided that vigorous fantasy life, masking but not contradicting masculine domesticity. That subject remains to be investigated. What is clear, however, is that some of the advocates of masculine domesticity did think about its implications for manliness, but stood their ground nonetheless. Senator Beveridge, in his advice book for young men, told the story of a “resourceful Oriental” who had suggested that “the influence of women on the Occidental man is effeminizing our civilization.” Beveridge countered

with his own view: "Even if what this Oriental assailant of our customs terms the overcharge of femininity in Occidental society does mellow us," he said, "it does not follow that it weakens us."<sup>53</sup>

Bernarr Macfadden epitomized the connections between the cult of masculinity and masculine domesticity. Macfadden was a major figure in the mass culture of the early to mid-twentieth century, amassing a publishing empire based on his ownership of *The New York Daily News* and the magazines *True Story* and *True Romance*. In the second decade of the twentieth century he published *Physical Culture* and books on health and what we now call "fitness." A self-proclaimed savior, Macfadden addressed his gospel of "physical culture" to women as much as to men. And just as women ought to develop physical strength, so too men ought to develop their nurturant capacities, since both had emotional and nurturing functions within the family.

Macfadden insisted that husbands should even be present at childbirth, and he warned, "Whenever you find a man who is without an innate love for children, you may rest assured that there is something wrong with his character."<sup>54</sup> An early authorized biographer of Macfadden claimed that his subject regularly devoted his evenings to his family, always leaving work "between five and seven. . . . He is a home-loving soul. . . . Sane, happy American family life is one of his ideals . . . , and his own [seven] children are a constant source of pleasure to him."<sup>55</sup> Whether Macfadden's biographer accurately described his subject's habits is less significant than that it mattered deeply to Macfadden that readers believe in the overarching importance of his family life. In the mid-nineteenth century, a self-made man like Macfadden would have stressed the tenacity and arduousness of his economic struggle, rather than his willingness to set it all aside at a specific time each day in order to be with his family.

\* \* \*

The final condition for the development of masculine domesticity was spatial. The suburbs were assumed to be the natural habitat of domestic man. Macfadden claimed that the purchase of a "modest little home" would give the young married man a sense of stability, as well as the necessary physical distance from urban temptations. Having come to New York City from the midwest to make his fortune, Macfadden himself moved to the suburbs at the first opportunity, and held resolutely anti-urban sentiments.<sup>56</sup> Albert Beveridge had expressed similar views. Devoting an entire chapter of his advice book for young men to "The New Home," he informed his readers that " 'Apartments' cannot by any magic be converted into a home. . . . Better a separate dwelling with [a] dry goods box for a table and camp-stools for chairs than tapestried walls, mosaic floors, and all luxuriousness. . . ." Furthermore,

once the young man had got himself a wife, a nice suburban house, and some children (because "a purposely childless marriage is no marriage at all"), he "will spend all of [his] extra time at home," listening to his wife play the piano, reading, and not least, playing with the children.<sup>57</sup>

Two things are important about the domestic advice of Macfadden and Beveridge. First, successful men advised their juniors to cultivate domestic habits. Second, they advised them to do so in the suburbs. Macfadden and Beveridge were among a growing number of Americans in the early twentieth century who viewed urban life as a direct threat to family happiness. As late as the 1880s, the city had still seemed redeemable to urban residents and social critics alike. When people moved to the urban fringe they were often waiting for the city to catch up to them, not trying to escape it. But by the turn of the century the suburban flow had an escapist quality to it; one symbol of that escapism, as Kenneth Jackson points out, was the decline of annexation as a means of holding suburbs and city together.<sup>58</sup> And a number of sociologists who specialized in the study of the city during the first decade of the twentieth century contended that urban life and stable family life seemed incompatible. In 1909 the American Sociological Society devoted its annual meeting to questions about the family. While the scholars in attendance were not entirely agreed about the nature of the changes that were affecting the family, a number of the participants warned explicitly that city life and family togetherness had become contradictory.<sup>59</sup>

The advice-givers and academics hoped that middle-class fathers, with more secure careers and houses in the suburbs, would spend their time with their wives and children rather than male friends. The great popularity of family-oriented recreational activities around the turn of the century and afterward suggests that suburban families wanted to play together. According to the most comprehensive study of American leisure, in this period croquet and roller skating were more popular than baseball (and many families, including the girls, apparently tried to play baseball on the lawn.) Bicycling did not become a craze until it became a sport for women and girls as well as boys and men. Suburbs institutionalized the relationships that marked the companionate family by creating various kinds of clubs, such as "wheel clubs," athletic fields used by both sexes, and tennis and golf clubs. (If early twentieth-century photographs and real estate advertisements are reliable, men played golf with their wives, not business associates.)<sup>60</sup>

Cordelia Biddle, from a wealthy and prominent Philadelphia family, was obviously not a typical child of the years immediately before World War I, but it was not solely because of her money: she spent much of her childhood in the boxing ring, because boxing was a favorite sport of her father, who taught her. "The center of activity at our house," she recalled, "was the boxing ring, . . . where I was initiated into the mysteries of the solar-plexus

punch, the left jab, and the right cross. Instead of dolls, I played with barbells; instead of hopscotch and ring-o-levio, I was learning to patch up cuts under the eye." But if she remembered that boxing was an unusual sport for girls, she also remembered "that women of that period were so athletic." Biddle's parents belonged to a bicycling club called the "Century Club" because it "specialized in hundred-mile trips," during which her mother "easily kept up" with her father.<sup>61</sup>

Togetherness meant more than sports and outdoor recreation. In suburban Haddonfield, New Jersey, where commuters to Camden and Philadelphia swelled the population from about 2700 in 1900 to more than 4000 by 1910, husbands and wives joined cultural and social clubs together to study nature, to talk about their family trips, even to debate each other on public issues. Such clubs were popular in the community—the debating group had over a hundred active members, and the literary society (which was mostly a social club) sometimes drew as many as forty people to its monthly gatherings. Men and women did not do everything jointly; they did not enjoy (or endure) absolute togetherness. What is at issue is the degree of change that occurred over the course of the last quarter of the nineteenth century or so. And if we compare these husbands and wives of the early twentieth century to the generation that preceded them, the change is apparent. In Haddonfield, even the Mothers and Teachers Club, which normally met in the afternoon, scheduled two of its eight meetings in the evenings for the convenience of the fathers.<sup>62</sup>

In the light of all this, we must be skeptical of assertions like those of Peter Stearns, who has remarked that while it was true that suburbanization weakened patriarchy, it also, in "increas[ing] the physical separation of the man from his home . . . left the woman in greater effective control."<sup>63</sup> The decline of patriarchy did not lead to a decline of masculine interest in the home in the early twentieth century. Elaine Tyler May offers a contrasting view. In her comparative study of marriage and divorce in Victorian and Progressive Era America, she illustrates the ways in which Los Angeles, a suburbanized city composed principally of residential subdivisions, dealt with the early twentieth-century fears about the collapse of the family. In Los Angeles, middle-class Americans created an intense family life in a suburban environment that they hoped would both protect the family from the dangers of urban life and allow its members to enjoy its material blessings.<sup>64</sup>

Architectural evidence supports May's arguments. The most striking thing about the middle-class domestic architecture produced in the second and third quarters of the nineteenth century, as Gwendolyn Wright has pointed out, was its design for separation.<sup>65</sup> The most striking thing about suburban houses in the early twentieth century was their design for family togetherness. In middle- to upper-middle-class homes, the living room replaced the separate

parlor, study (commonly considered a male refuge), and sitting room that had characterized Victorian upper-middle-class houses. Both modest and fairly expensive new houses had more open floor plans.<sup>66</sup> Architects in the early twentieth century, ranging from the iconoclastic Frank Lloyd Wright to the very conservative Joy Wheeler Dow, explicitly designed houses for family togetherness. And architectural writers made the same statement in home magazines.<sup>67</sup> Families no longer maintained segregated social space, but the rage for marking off children's areas with special wallcoverings and accessories announced, perhaps obliquely, that women and children would no longer automatically share the same space. Such a change, one might speculate, might have made it more possible for men and women to share private space.<sup>68</sup>

\* \* \*

The evidence described above may not convince historians to abandon entirely the notion of an early twentieth-century cult of masculinity, and there is no reason that they should; nevertheless, during the last years of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth-century masculine domesticity cropped up in advice literature by men and women, in architectural design, in recreational patterns, in Progressive Era analyses of middle-class households, and in the personal papers of eastern and midwestern suburbanites. Taken as a whole this data does suggest that we need to seek more historical information about the domestic role of American men.

This study does not pretend to be comprehensive; questions about the pervasiveness of masculine domesticity, and especially about the exact ways in which it connected to, or existed in tension with, the cult of masculinity, still await answers. For example, the popularity during the early twentieth century of boxing, football, and adventure novels is seen by historians as indicators of a heightened male aggressiveness, an aggressiveness that also manifested itself in national belligerence. But they may have served more a symbolic function for middle-class American men during this period, overlaying the intensified male participation in what had been defined as women's sphere.

The redefinition of manliness to include some traditional female functions, one suspects, represented a collective masculine response to feminists like Charlotte Perkins Gilman, who insisted that the traditional family was anachronistic in an urban society, and who demanded that women seek for themselves the sense of individual achievement and separate identity that had been reserved for men.<sup>69</sup> Urban feminists endorsed Gilman's ideas. Her writings and lectures received considerable attention in the periodical press of the day, although it is unlikely that all middle-class men knew her by name. Whether they could identify her, however, is not the point; no one who read the

newspapers could have been ignorant of the views she espoused. On the whole, men responded to those views by moving their families to the suburbs. There, fathers would draw themselves into the domestic circle, where individual needs could take second place to the needs of the family.

Masculine domesticity, in that sense, served as a male reply to the feminists' insistence that women had as much right to seek individual achievement as did men. It offered an alternative to feminism: men would acknowledge the importance of the domestic sphere, not only rhetorically, but also by assuming specific responsibilities within it. Women, however, shared only partially in the world of men. Reform activities, mothers' clubs, even voting became acceptable, but taking on roles in the larger society identical to those of men did not. Men who espoused masculine domesticity, it seems logical to speculate, deflected feminist objectives.<sup>70</sup> Suburbanism was neither incidental nor accidental to this process. Suburban advocates in the early twentieth century preached that removal from the city would both encourage family unity and discourage excessive attention to one's individual wants. The suburb served as the spatial context for what its advocates hoped would be a new form of marriage. Husbands and wives would be companions, not rivals, and the specter of individualist demands would retreat in the face of family togetherness.

### NOTES

1. John Higham, "The Reorientation of American Culture in the 1890s," in John Higham, ed., *Writing American History* (Bloomington, Ind., 1970), 79.

2. For example, E. Anthony Rotundo, "Body and Soul: Changing Ideals of Middle-Class Manhood, 1770-1920," *Journal of Social History* 16 (Summer 1983): 32; Peter Gabriel Filene, *Him/Her/Self: Sex Roles in Modern America* (New York, 1974), esp. 105-06.

3. Kenneth Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States* (New York, 1985), 97-99, has a good discussion of suburban leisure; see 41-44 for a discussion of mid-nineteenth-century commuting by horsecar and omnibus. Jon Teaford, *The Twentieth Century American City* (Baltimore, 1986), 21, gives commuting times for the early twentieth century: 18 minutes from suburban Queens to midtown Manhattan; 23 minutes from Riverside to Chicago. Suburban Philadelphians, unless they chose the true countryside, could expect to be downtown in thirty minutes or less: *Thirty Miles Around Philadelphia on the Lines of the Pennsylvania Railroad* (Philadelphia, 1913). Since the deterioration of the railroad and mass transit, and the advent of large-scale traffic jams caused by automobile commuting, Americans have forgotten the convenience of early-twentieth-century rail commuting. See also John R. Stilgoe, *Metropolitan Corridor* (New Haven, 1983), 267-82.

4. The term "masculine domesticity" is my own. Contemporaries would have used words like "manly" and (by 1910 or so) "virile" rather than "masculine." They also would not have used the word "domesticity" in the context in which historians use it. Progressive-Era Americans would have spoken of the role of the "manly" man in the home.

5. The question of what is, or is not, feminist, has become quite complicated in the last few years; for example, Karen Blair, in *The Clubwoman as Feminist: True Womanhood Redefined*,

1868–1914 (New York, 1980) argues that women's club members who upheld many aspects of conventional domesticity were nevertheless feminists. In that sense, there are feminist aspects to masculine domesticity: men's and women's spheres merged in perceptible ways. Nevertheless, I would argue for a somewhat less encompassing view of feminism, defining it as an ideology that begins with a recognition that women are denied full participation in the society, and demands equal rights and opportunities for women within the larger society. Within those boundaries, masculine domesticity was not so much feminist as it was an alternative to, or substitution for, feminism.

6. Carl Degler has argued that middle-class families had become "companionate" by the mid-nineteenth century, but I think he dates this too early. Most of his data is drawn from letters between husbands and wives who spent long periods of time (months, occasionally years) apart. What the letters indicate to me is that husbands and wives *loved* each other, not that men were involved in the details of the household. Carl Degler, *At Odds: Women and the Family in America from the Revolution to the Present* (New York, 1980), 33–42; William Alcott, a very widely read writer of marital advice in the mid-nineteenth century who was considered an advocate of greater family intimacy, told his readers that if a husband spent the dinner hour with his family that was quite enough. Alcott, *The Young Husband* (Boston, 1839), 136. On Alcott's influence, see Degler, *At Odds*, 269. Joan Seidl, "Consumers' Choices: A Study of Household Furnishings, 1880–1920," *Minnesota History* 48 (Spring 1983): 183–97, demonstrates how the pattern of male domestic involvement in the house itself developed in Minnesota.

7. The term "literary domestic" is Mary Kelley's. See *Private Woman, Public Stage: Literary Domesticity in Nineteenth Century America* (New York, 1984), vi–xiii.

8. Kathryn Kish Sklar, *Catharine Beecher: A Study in Domesticity* (New Haven, Conn., 1973), 163. Sklar's biography of Beecher remains perhaps the best analysis of the ideology of domesticity.

9. Some historians have become skeptical of the reality of the doctrine of separate spheres, because of their belief that the affectional marriage had triumphed by the mid-nineteenth century, and that marriages of affection were necessarily companionate. In particular, Carl Degler (for United States), in *At Odds* and Laurence Stone (for England), in *The Family, Sex, and Marriage* (London, 1977), make this claim. But so far the weight of the evidence, it seems to me, is on the side of those who maintain that gender separation was a reality at midcentury. Historians are well aware of Carroll Smith-Rosenberg's work on women's relationships; her older essays, with her new work, recently appeared as *Disorderly Conduct: Visions of Gender in Victorian America* (New York, 1985). Suzanne Lebsock, in *The Free Women of Petersburg* (New York, 1984), argues that "the evidence from Petersburg suggests that marriage was fundamentally asymmetrical." 18. See also, 19–29. Mary Ryan makes much the same argument in *Cradle of the Middle-Class* (New York, 1981), 189–97; quotation on 191.

10. Listing all of the works about the changing roles of women would require a bibliographic essay in itself. For an overview, see Sheila Rothman, *Woman's Proper Place* (New York, 1978). Work on the history of men continues to follow the Higham interpretation. The best of these analyses is Peter Filene, *Him/Her/Self*. See also Elizabeth and Joseph Pleck, *The American Man* (New York, 1980).

11. William Alcott's *The Young Husband* is a typical example of a marital advice tract. But books that offered *general* advice rarely concerned themselves with such topics.

12. Henry Ward Beecher, *Lectures to Young Men* (New York, 1849), 41, 152, 120–27; John Angell James, *The Young Man's Friend* (New York, 1860), esp. 50. Karen Haltunen, *Confidence Men and Painted Women* (New Haven and London, 1982), esp. 25–26 and 47–48.

13. Quoted in J.A. Banks, *Victorian Values* (London, 1981), 81.

14. Catharine Sedgwick, *Home* (1835; reprint, New York, 1890).

15. *Godey's Lady's Book* (January 1855): 37–40.

16. *Ibid.* (February 1855): 110–12.

17. *Ibid.* (March 1855): 206–08. Arthur argued that domestic happiness (or misery) was in the hands of the husband. The belief in the power of men to wreck the happiness of women is an important theme of the domestic novels of mid-nineteenth century as well. Susan Warner's *Wide, Wide, World* (New York, 1852), makes this point explicitly: see esp. 12, 23.

18. Harriet Beecher Stowe, *My Wife and I* (1870; reprint, New York, 1967), esp. 478.

19. *Ibid.*, 98.

20. A good brief introduction to Diaz and her work is Jane Benardete, "Abby Morton Diaz," in *American Women Writers*, Vol. 1 [abridged], ed. Langdon Lynne Faust (New York, 1983), 161–63.

21. Abby M. Diaz, *A Domestic Problem* (1875; reprint, New York, 1974), 36–37.

22. Margaret Sangster, *The Art of Being Agreeable* (New York, 1897), 22. Sangster was a popular domestic writer, whose works appeared in many of the women's magazines of the period.

23. The "sear and palsy" quote is from L. H. G. Abell, *Woman in her Various Relations* (New York, 1851), 214; the "just as important" quote from Sangster, *Art of Being Agreeable*, 272–73. See also Sangster, *Art of Being Agreeable*, 49.

24. "A Father's View of the Home," *The Independent* 61 (1906): 912.

25. James Canfield, "The Philosophy of Staying in Harness," *Cosmopolitan* 39 (May 1905): 10–11.

26. I am indebted to Mark Carnes, an historian at Barnard College working on a book on masculinity in the nineteenth century, for informing me that the heyday of male fraternal associations was in the nineteenth century; there was a relative decline in the early part of the twentieth. The community data is from Haddonfield, New Jersey, which became an important railroad suburb of Philadelphia in the last years of the nineteenth century and continued so into the twentieth. *Minutes of the Haddonfield Sewing Society* (handwritten, 1896–1903); *Minutes of the Penn Literary Society* (handwritten, 1897–1918); *Papers of the Haddonfield Natural Science Club* (miscellaneous materials, 1901–1914). Materials on the Debating Society are mixed in with the Natural Science Club's papers. All are in the possession of the Haddonfield Historical Society. The Society's librarian, Kathy Tassini, shared with me the information on the early vicissitudes of the (male) Civic Club. Interestingly, later in the century Haddonfield men did organize a club quite successfully, which may be a clue that masculine domesticity perhaps did not long outlive this period.

27. It may seem surprising that in what we have come to see as the golden age of female domesticity, advice-givers themselves urged women not to "build a wall around" the "sphere of domestic duties," because that would render them "narrow," and incapable of "having . . . prospects, interests, hopes or enjoyment beyond it." These are L. H. G. Abell's words, in *Woman in her Various Relations*, 22. Abell, although a conservative advocate of domesticity, believed that women needed "society" for their own emotional well-being; husbands did not come into the matter.

28. See Sangster's *Art of Being Agreeable*, 39. My point about the new significance of the husband-wife bond can be illustrated by two stories that focus on the same theme—whether a woman should put her husband or child first—which appeared some sixty years apart. The first, in *Godey's Lady's Book* (August 1843) ended with a child maimed because of her mother's decision to leave her with a nurse for *one evening* to go out with her husband. After the child's injury, the father's business failed, and the author concluded that there was "little prognostic of a brighter day" (69). Contrast that attitude with a *Ladies' Home Journal* story (April 1908) in which a young mother becomes so attached to her first baby that she neglects her husband. The young woman's mother advises her: "You should go out more and try to forget the baby for a time" (16). Although shocked by her mother's advice, she follows it, and is rewarded by a better relationship with her husband and a happier child. The difference between the stories, which have nearly exactly the same subject, is very important for understanding the changes in attitudes toward marriage and parenthood that occurred during this period.

29. Martha and Robert Bruère, *Increasing Home Efficiency* (New York, 1912), 291–92; Anne Morgan, *The American Girl* (New York, 1916), 24.

30. The male advice-givers will be discussed later in the essay. The Richard Harding Davis piece is "Our Suburban Friends," *Harper's* 89 (January 1894): 55–57.

31. When historians use the term "companionate" to describe marriages in the twentieth century, they run the danger of confusion, since in the twenties the term "companionate marriage" came to mean a specific type of marriage urged especially by Judge Ben Lindsay of Colorado, who argued for trial marriages that could easily be dissolved, and in which people would agree not to have children. It should be clear that in this essay companionate refers to a marriage in which the partners are, quite literally, companions.

32. Bruère and Bruère, *Increasing Home Efficiency*, 292; see also 173–74, and 177–78. For

a first-rate analysis of the implications of the Bruères' work for our understanding of middle-class patterns of consumption, see Daniel Horowitz, "Frugality or Comfort: Middle Class Styles of Life in the Early Twentieth Century," *American Quarterly* 37 (Summer 1985): 239-59. He discusses the blending of "comfort with cultivation" on 259.

33. Stowe, *My Wife and I*, 229.

34. *Ibid.*, 478.

35. *Ibid.*, 38. On 447, Eva "propose[s] to introduce the country sitting room into our New York house." Stowe described the Hendersons' house, which was physically within the city limits, in unmistakably suburban terms. See 468-69.

36. Claudia Bushman is the author of a study of the Robinson family which focuses on Harriet Hanson Robinson. It is a carefully researched work, rich in both material and understanding. See *A Good Poor Man's Wife* (Hanover, Conn., 1981). For the specific information cited here, see 86-87.

37. Lydia Maria Child to her sister-in-law Lydia B. Child, 11 Feb. 1875, in *Lydia Maria Child: Selected Letters*, eds. Milton Meltzer and Patricia Hollan (Amherst, Mass., 1982), 530.

38. Bushman, *A Good Poor Man's Wife*, 146, 200. I should note that my interpretation of Hattie Shattuck's growing resentment toward her husband's business failures differs from that of the family's biographer. Claudia Bushman argues that "Sid provided neither a living or a home. Hattie had no children and cleaved to her mother rather than her husband. Yet the family functioned well as a unit. All three pooled their resources and did not blame the others for their lacks" (200). Hattie Shattuck's own behavior implied quite different feelings; she grew bitter and angry, and she refused to live with her husband during the long years of his reversals. I would guess she was dissatisfied with her marriage.

39. Michael Katz, Michael Doucet, and Mark Stern, *The Social Organization of Early Industrial Capitalism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), 29. Carroll Smith-Rosenberg makes much the same point in *Disorderly Conduct*, 167-70.

40. Mary Augusta Carr Cumings Diaries, the Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College. Entries for the following dates: 4 January 1869; 28 January 1872; 7, 11 February 1876; 1877; 3 May 1878, and dated notes in the memoranda section, 1876. The daybooks are sketchy, but revealing.

41. For example, we can look at one suburb at the turn of the century. Overbrook Farms, an upper-middle-class Philadelphia suburb, was built in 1893. In 1900, of its male heads of households (154 out of 173), fifty-one percent worked as corporate officers, business executives, and bankers; another ten percent were managers, or other nonexecutive level corporate employees; and twenty-four percent were physicians, lawyers and other professionals. The majority of the men in this community belonged to the "new" middle class, albeit in the upper reaches of it, Manuscript Census Records, Enumeration District 904, 1900. See also Elaine Tyler May, *Great Expectations: Marriage and Divorce in Post Victorian America* (Chicago, 1980), 49; and Peter Filene *Him/Her/Self*, 80-83.

42. Diaz, *A Domestic Problem*, 115-16. See also 99.

43. Stowe, *My Wife and I*, 40.

44. Sangster, *Art of Being Agreeable*, 137.

45. Bruère and Bruère, *Increasing Home Efficiency*, 291-92.

46. *American Homes and Gardens* (November 1905) and (December 1905), editorials.

47. Seidl, "Consumers' Choices," 186.

48. *Ibid.*, 189.

49. Kate Wiggin, *Children's Rights* (Boston, 1890), 63-67.

50. See Filene, *Him/Her/Self*, 86-88. Also, Allen Davis has an interesting analysis of manliness in relation to war in *American Heroine* (New York, 1973), 228-31, 240-41.

51. Albert J. Beveridge, *The Young Man and the World* (Buffalo, New York, 1907).

52. Ennis Richmond, *Boyhood: A Plea for Continuity in Education* (London and New York, 1898), 71-72; Carl Werner, *Bringing up the Boy* (New York, 1913), 69-83; Kate Upson Clark, *Bringing Up Boys* (New York, 1899), 35; Sangster, *Art of Being Agreeable*, 55. The issue of the impact of boy scouting on father/son relations is problematic. David Macleod, *Building Character in the American Boy* (Madison, Wis., 1983), has no information on the number of fathers who were troop leaders; he says that the organization made "ritual gestures" toward closer father-son relations, suggesting a rivalry between the boy scouts and fathers (268). Boy

Scouting was popular in the suburbs, and we need to know more about the participation of fathers.

53. Beveridge, *The Young Man and the World*, 64–66.

54. Bernarr Macfadden, *Manhood and Marriage* (New York, 1916), 81.

55. Clement Wood, *Bernarr Macfadden: A Study in Success* (New York, 1929), 14.

56. Macfadden, *Manhood and Marriage*, 25–26. Wood, *Bernarr Macfadden*, 14.

57. Beveridge, *The Young Man and the World*, 164–66.

58. David P. Handlin, *The American Home: Architecture and Society, 1815–1915* (Boston, 1979), 116–20; Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 152.

59. Papers and Proceedings, *Third Annual Meeting, American Sociological Society*, esp. 167–68, and 181–90.

60. See Foster Rhea Dulles, *America Learns to Play: A History of Popular Recreation, 1607–1940* (New York, 1940), Chap. 11, esp. 194–201. Dulles' book remains the most comprehensive national study of recreation. His study shows that in the last years of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth the most popular forms of recreation were those that families could enjoy together. He says of football, which along with baseball and boxing was an important spectator sport, that "few adults found themselves able or willing to play football. . . . The game was primarily for boys" (198). For the institutionalization of family togetherness in one suburb, see Tello J. d'Apéry, *Overbrook Farms* (Philadelphia, 1936), 76–80, and Wendell and Smith, *Overbrook Farms: A Suburb Deluxe* (Philadelphia, 1905). *Bylaws of the Haddon Field Club* (Haddonfield, [c. 1910]). For baseball on the suburban lawn, see Handlin, *American Home*, 181.

61. Cordelia Drexel Biddle, *My Philadelphia Father* (New York, 1955), 1, 40.

62. There were, of course, some single sex societies, including the Colonial Dames, Daughters of the American Revolution and the prestigious Fortnightly, a women's club modelled on the New Century Club of Philadelphia, (but tailored for suburban women with a special "section" for "mothers.") Men had a few fraternal organizations, including the Masons, and a "gun club" that held target shoots. (One of the most amusing things about the gun club was that its target shoot program reminds one of nothing so much as a women's club printed program.) *Haddonfield Gun Club: Second Annual Shoot at Targets* (Haddonfield, 1908); the *Haddon Monthly* (March 1901) and (April 1901), has information on the Haddon Fortnightly and other clubs; for the Mothers and Teachers Club, see *Programme, the Haddonfield Mothers and Teachers Club* (Haddonfield, 1906).

63. Peter Stearns, *Be a Man! Males in Modern Society* (New York and London, 1979), 107.

64. Elaine Tyler May, *Great Expectations*, 54; Robert Fogelson, *The Fragmented Metropolis: Los Angeles, 1850–1930* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), 104–05.

65. Gwendolyn Wright, *Building the Dream* (New York, 1981), 109–11, and *Moralism and the Model Home* (Chicago, 1980), 9–46.

66. In order to determine the changes and continuities in house design between the 1860s and 70s, on the one hand, and the first decade of the twentieth century, on the other, I examined 151 interior and exterior designs from these sources: Calvert Vaux, *Villas and Cottages* 1864; reprint New York, 1907); E. C. Hussey, *Home Building: A Reliable Book of Facts* (1875; reprint Watkins Glen, N.Y., 1976); Palliser, Palliser, & Co., *Palliser's Model Homes* (1878; reprint Fenton, Calif., 1972); *American Homes and Gardens*, 1906–1912; and *The Craftsman*, 1901–1906. I deliberately stayed away from "bungalow books" in order to make sure that I included large numbers of designs that appealed to the upper middle class. The question might be raised: Did builders use pattern books and house designs? The answer appears to be that they did. See Catherine Bisher, "Jacob W. Holt: An American Builder," originally published in the *Winterthur Portfolio* (Spring 1981), and reprinted in Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach, *Common Places* (Athens, Ga., 1986), 447–81.

67. David Handlin, *The American Home*, 306–10, analyzes the shift in Frank Lloyd Wright's architectural emphasis from the family to the individual as the century progressed. In the early twentieth century, when Wright was designing houses for the *Ladies' Home Journal*, he emphasized family. Wright, *Moralism and the Model Home*, 139, and 24–253. Jan Cohn, *The Palace or the Poorhouse* (East Lansing, Mich., 1979), 106–07. Joy Wheeler Dow, "The Fascination of an English Cottage," *American Homes and Gardens* (Feb. 1911): 50. See also

*American Homes and Gardens* (March 1906): 161–62. Frank Lloyd Wright, “The Cardboard House,” in *The Future of Architecture* (New York, 1953), 152–53.

68. This whole area is problematic. On the one hand, the popularity of children’s designs (they pervade *The Craftsman* as well as *American Homes and Gardens* in the first decade of the twentieth century) suggests recognition of children as individuals. On the other, it shows that they are being set off from their parents, and seems to indicate that they are no longer automatically part of women’s space. Questions of child and parental space need more attention from historians.

69. Rothman, *Woman’s Proper Place*, 68–69. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, *The Home* (New York, 1903).

70. For example, Beveridge, *Young Man and the World*, 175–77, makes it explicit that he does not expect women and men to take on identical socio-economic roles.

---

A Fellowship from the National Endowment for the Humanities funded the research for this article. The University of Pennsylvania also provided support. I read an earlier version at Columbia University’s Seminar on the City in November 1985. I would like to thank seminar members for their comments.