



CLUB PAPER
CXLVII

CLUBBING

by

WILLIAM E. BARNHART

THE CHICAGO
LITERARY CLUB
2015

CLUBBING

by

WILLIAM E. BARNHART



THE CHICAGO LITERARY CLUB

28 April 2014

© 2014 WILLIAM E. BARNHART
(All rights reserved)



Clubbing

IN 1867, a member of the Century Association in New York City invited a “red-headed young . . . newspaper man” to attend one of the elite men’s club’s regular meetings.¹ Samuel Clemens, who in the words of a Century Association member was “signing his stuff Mark Twain,” had arrived from San Francisco just as a New York publisher released Clemens’s first book, *The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County and Other Sketches*. Always mindful of his pocketbook, Clemens, at age thirty-one, had dedicated the book to “John Smith,” a composite personage whom, or so Clemens wrote in the book’s inscription, “I have known in divers and sundry places . . . and whose many and manifold virtues did always command my esteem.” He added that “It is said that the man to whom a volume is dedicated, always buys a copy. If this prove true in the present instance, a princely affluence is about to burst upon The Author.”² In addition to promoting his book, Clemens’s attendance at the Century was part of a paid assignment by San Francisco’s *Daily Alta California* newspaper, which made him a “special traveling correspondent.” He filed amusing reports

CLUBBING

of his experiences in the eastern United States and, later that spring, began sending dispatches while on a tour of Europe and the Holy Land aboard the *Quaker City* steamship—a jaunt that is immortalized in his 1869 book *The Innocents Abroad*.

As any good reporter would, dinner-guest Clemens gathered evidence of the purported prominence of the Century Association, the organization that inspired the founders of our Chicago Literary Club in 1874. He noted well-known members he met, including actor Edwin Booth, writer William Cullen Bryant, painter Asher Durant, industrialist Cyrus W. Field, and landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted. To support his assertion that the Century was “the most unspeakably respectable Club in the United States, perhaps,” he “carried away some of the hats with me for specimens.” He found the band widths to be above average—“three sizes larger than the heads I have been accustomed to.”³

Not to suggest any further similarity, I, too, have a reporting assignment—though, alas, unpaid. Last spring, our Club historian, Clark L. Wagner, asked me to investigate, as he put it, “what was in the water” in the second half of nineteenth-century America that gave rise to a surge in the creation of private social clubs in many American cities.” Clark proposed that “our club, and clubs like ours, were part of something larger that was taking place in the country during the period.” In other words, I would probe the “why” of the American club phenomenon, more than the “who,” the “what,” the “where,” and the “when.”

I found two distinct narratives. Since well before the American Revolution, American men of means have retreated from humanity’s “omnium-gatherum,” as one gentleman wrote ungently in 1747,⁴ by huddling inside thickly walled and thickly conservative clubs. Their clubs, which mimicked British class tradition, persisted in the years following the Civil War. But by the end of the 1870s,

CLUBBING

a second narrative emerged in the history of American clubbing. The aftermath of the ruinous Civil War at once threatened the sanctity of private men's clubs and gave them new purpose. The aspirations of a new class of professional men, who helped create the industrial age, turned clubs into social networks instead of bulwarks. At the same time, thousands of middle-class women organized local literary groups to extend their wartime activism on behalf of the sick and wounded to peacetime ambitions for intellectual growth.

In 1711, British poet and essayist Joseph Addison declared, "Man is said to be a Sociable Animal, and, as an instance of it, we may observe that we take all occasions and pretenses of forming ourselves into those little Nocturnal Assemblies, which are commonly known by the name of Clubs."⁵ This instinct, according to scholars, dates back to Cicero and Plutarch. In many cases, Addison wrote, the common denominator of the membership in private men's clubs was simply a love of eating and drinking, which, as Addison put it, "are points wherein most Men agree, and in which the Learned and the Illiterate, the Dull and the Airy, the Philosopher and Buffoon, can all of them bear a part."

Social historian and critic Cleveland Amory observed that "American city clubs were patterned originally on the English idea of a gentlemen's club."

Although they never carried this pattern to the extreme of the English club, where in the old days members wore their hats everywhere except the dining room, the American gentleman found, like the Englishman, that his club, and not his home, was his real castle. Here he had the best of his well-bred friends; the most comfortable of his well-stuffed chairs; the best food, drink and cigars from his well-stocked larders and cellar; the least irritating reading material from a well-censored library; and the best of games from well-mannered losers. Here he could do what

CLUBBING

he pleased when he pleased, where he pleased, and with whom he pleased. . . . From the very beginning, clubs were formed not primarily to get people in but rather to keep people out.⁶

The Union Club of the City of New York, founded in 1836, defined the arch-conservative elite enclave. According to historian and Union Club member Henry Steele Gordon, members of the Union Club included Confederates during the Civil War.⁷ A profile of the club in *Fortune* magazine described its members as "men who are, rather than men who do."⁸ Addison's satire recognized that private clubs frequently imposed selective membership criteria, beyond wealth and social rank, to separate "them" from "us." He tells of a club in London called the Corpulent Club, whose members were required to have trouble fitting through the clubhouse door. Its rival, the Scare-Crows and Skeletons Club, regarded the Corpulent Club as "Men of Dangerous Principles."

After Charles the Second returned from exile in 1658 and reestablished the British monarchy, Addison reports, Londoners with the surname King formed a club to distinguish themselves from the republican rabble surviving the Oliver Cromwell years. The most exclusive group in Addison's essay was the Club of Duelists, in which seating was based on the number of men a member had killed. "This club," Addison wrote, "consisting of Men of Honour, did not continue long, most of its members being put to the Sword, or hanged, a little after its institution."⁹

Satirical depictions of private men's clubs aside, the post-Civil War period in America presented new justifications for upper-class men to hunker down in their wood-paneled domains. America's cities were growing uncontrollably. Three recessions in the period from 1865 to 1879 tarnished the promise of unfettered capitalism, as did intensifying labor unrest. The failures of Reconstruction in the South and a budding national movement

CLUBBING

for women's suffrage were aggravations that America's male elite did not welcome.

Above all, historians tell us it's hard to overestimate the damage on the American psyche left by the Civil War. Many of the country's most prominent thinkers at the time, including Henry James, William Story, Ambrose Bierce and Bret Hart, escaped to Europe to avoid the gloom cast over the country. Historian and critic Lewis Mumford labeled the thirty years from 1865 to 1895 "the Brown Decades" in American culture. "The nation not merely worked differently after the Civil War; the country looked different—darker, sadder, soberer," he wrote. "The younger generation (what was left of it) had aged; and during the decade that followed the war, cynicism and disillusion were uppermost." It was a prosperous time, Mumford notes, for industrial monopolists but a pretty dismal time for ordinary workers. The pace of change created tangible paranoia for both sides.¹⁰

Paranoia might have protected private men's clubs from change. But something else happened. The perspective of new members changed from inward and backward to outward and forward. Wealthy men were not seeking refuge but power and prestige. They saw their clubs as a home base to express their status and rally likeminded forces. Kindred spirits were growing restless. Suddenly optimism was replacing exclusion "in the water" of American club life, to use Clark Wagner's phrase.

Two prestigious men's clubs in Chicago—the Chicago Club and the Standard Club—began operations in 1869. The membership comprised men on the make, not just men whose families had made it. Lisa Holton, in her book profiling Chicago's private clubs, writes, "Not only were Chicago's clubs a sanctuary for the city's rich, but they were a calling card and an enticement to draw more out-of-town money and development to the city. . . . Clubs

CLUBBING

were the networking organization, the industry association, the TV, the movies, the local watering hole for people with money and power.”¹¹ The Chicago Club, for Protestants, and the Standard Club, for Jews, were about “settling the social and business order of the city.” But as Chicago rebuilt itself after the fire of 1871, clubs took on a more activist role as headquarters for civic reform and economic growth. The mid-1870s through the end of the century saw the establishment of the Union League Club of Chicago, perhaps the most activist of the city’s private men’s clubs; the Commercial Club, which counted the city’s business elite as members but never occupied a clubhouse; and the University Club, whose initial membership quickly evolved from Ivy League graduates to include graduates of so-called western schools, like the University of Chicago. Our late member Francis A. Lackner reported that the organizers of the Chicago Literary Club “were actively engaged in operating their own businesses or professions, helping in the gargantuan task of rebuilding the city, establishing and running relief agencies, and finding the money to finance all of it. Yet, busy as they were, they felt the keen need of intellectual stimulation.”¹²

The pessimism of the immediate post-Civil War years was fading. Many middle-class men didn’t want to withdraw and exclude. They wanted to engage and improve. The number of American men who called themselves “professionals”—in fields including law, medicine, science, accounting, and business management—expanded fourfold between 1870 and 1910, to more than a million Americans. These were men who *do*. Historian Burton Bledstein concluded that the Gilded Age was also the “gilded [g-u-i-l-d-e-d] age.” In the 1870s and 1880s, at least two hundred learned societies were formed nationwide. From 1864 through 1888, ten specialized societies were started within the

CLUBBING

medical profession alone.¹³ Status came not from family wealth but by the accreditation of a professional society, with its own journals, meetings, and training programs.

Career building itself became a professional specialty. Membership in a private club had a utilitarian purpose. A high school student applying to college is often advised to join the choir as well as the physics club. It's considered a good idea to list a social service project in the community as well as a winning science fair project. Likewise, membership in a private men's club looked good on the resume of a professional specialist.

Professionalism transformed the English-model men's club. But this change, in hindsight, seems trivial compared to what American women were up to at the same time. Thousands of middle-class women emerged from their homes to organize study groups, often called literary clubs. Education professor Theodora Penny Martin, whose book *The Sound of Our Own Voices* describes the broad scope and impact of women's study clubs in the late 1800s, said the groups appeared independently in scores of cities and towns as woman cast off the emotional depression caused by the Civil War and flexed organizational skills they had learned in their wartime relief efforts. It seemed that women throughout the country spontaneously determined to improve themselves intellectually, even without formal post-high school education.

As Professor Martin put it, "Springing up apparently from nowhere, women's study clubs spread across the American scene in the late 1860s, gathering momentum and increasing in numbers through the 1990s. . . . With the mastery of the 'great minds' as their charge, women had necessarily to look beyond their dooryards, to think beyond the personal, and to express themselves with some scholarly semblance of ordered inquiry."¹⁴

That's not to say that rapid urbanization was of no concern to

CLUBBING

the new clubwomen. A history of the Fortnightly of Chicago, a women's club founded in 1873, noted, "Some reflective citizens, however, wondered if bigger was better." Indeed, the Fortnightly's founders were readers of British thinkers Matthew Arnold, John Ruskin and Thomas Carlyle, who argued that the British aristocracy was promoting growth and wealth at the expense of wisdom and culture.¹⁵ Many of the early clubs among America's wealthy aspired to preserve the refined culture they identified with against the wave of what they viewed as vulgar materialism.

Women's study clubs provided a structured introduction to the classics. But for many women, wrote Patricia Dawn Robinson in her dissertation on the birth of women's clubs, "the principal benefit of the club came not from studying the iambic pentameter of Shakespeare but from learning parliamentary procedures governing organizations."¹⁶

The two forces—professional striving among ambitious career men and an intellectual awakening among women—had two side effects that nurtured a new type of progressive private social club in America. First, self-improvement meant that you not only had to survive the black ball. You had to assert yourself and even lead. Second, little was to be gained by joining a group where everyone agreed. In forming clubs, men and women sought intellectual challenges, not a refuge from modernity and diversity.

In a 2008 paper, our fellow member Charles Ebeling profiled one instigator of such a fellowship in the mid-eighteenth century—British essayist and ardent conversationalist Samuel Johnson. Indeed, the London-based organization most closely associated with Johnson was called "The Literary Club." Founded in 1764, it met in various taverns and was dedicated to the lively and sometimes contentious art of conversation. Samuel Johnson lived from 1709 to 1784. He wrote a dictionary of the English language

CLUBBING

and scores of essays. To quote Mr. Ebeling, "To this day he is not fully appreciated for his genius, in part because, while his wide-ranging body of writing is evidence enough of a great and fluid mind, perhaps his true genius was his voluble and volatile interactions with the 'clubbable' friends."¹⁷ On many occasions Johnson's chief antagonist was fellow club member Edmund Burke. Johnson biographer James Boswell wrote that once when Johnson was ill he exclaimed, "Were I to see Burke now, it would kill me." "So much was [Johnson] accustomed to consider conversation as a contest," Boswell wrote, "and such was his notion of Burke as an opponent."¹⁸

Anne Hutchinson was a decidedly different progenitor of American women's clubs. She was a sternly religious Massachusetts Bay Colony Puritan who is celebrated today by civil libertarians as an early fighter for religious tolerance in New England and by scholars of women's history as America's first club woman. On the ship that brought her to America, Hutchinson gathered women each week to dissect the sermon they had just heard. In Boston, she hosted similar weekly discussions for her women friends. The male Puritan hierarchy denounced Hutchinson. She was accused of "troubling the peace of the commonwealth" and holding meetings in her house that "are not tolerable or comely in the sight of God nor fitting for your sex." She was banished from the colony in 1638 for her dissenting views regarding Puritan orthodoxy.¹⁹

Social institutions that encouraged members to actively engage in intellectual exchanges gained new popularity in post-Civil War America. Congenial argument was a natural extension of a nationally popular self-improvement fad in the mid-1800s that was useful but inhibited—the public lecture. Professional lecturers were nearly as common as traveling drummers by the mid-1800s,

CLUBBING

thanks to the expansion of passenger railroads and the hunger of ordinary Americans everywhere to inform themselves about all things.

Community groups, often called lyceums, invited speakers whose reputations preceded them to address audiences of men and women drawn without exclusion from the community. The lecture season typically ran from October to April. Public halls provided the venues. As historian Donald Scott put it, "Useful to all and offensive to none, the lecture was an oratorical form deliberately and carefully separated from all partisan and sectarian discourse." The public lecture was "a complex form of display," a "public ritual," in Professor Scott's words.²⁰ Speakers sought lyceum dates to hone their rhetorical skills and advertise their expertise. Listeners were, in effect, passive observers of the ritual, expecting no more than to have knowledge imparted to them. It was not a conversation among a small group of compatible people gathered in someone's home or around a pleasant table in a tavern.

By the 1870s, the two cohorts of Americans I've identified—professional men and middle-class women—wanted more. They wanted to study and express themselves among peers on vital topics as an organized part of their life's routine. History shows that while the task was greater for women than for men, women were up to the job. In his 1998 presentation for our Club, titled "The Club's Victorian Roots," Clark Wagner refers to a newspaper clipping found in the Club's archives at the Newberry Library in Chicago. The clipping, from the early years of the Club's existence, includes the following statement regarding Club member Arba Waterman: "Judge Arba N. Waterman reiterated yesterday the expression of his belief, given in his court on Saturday, that women are unreliable in the witness box." Apparently, the good judge was referring specifically to the fact that most women at that time

were not engaged in commercial enterprises and, therefore, lacked experience as witnesses in business litigation.²¹ But the comment still stung. Women were routinely excluded from serving on juries, even after they won the right to vote in 1920.

Still, almost none of the women's clubs organized in the mid-1800s had a political or moral agenda. Women's temperance and suffrage movements are well remembered. But in the second half of the nineteenth century, vastly more women belonged to study clubs and literary clubs.²² Not until the early 1900s did the club movement align itself with the suffrage movement and other progressive causes.

The phrase "literary club," as widely used by private women's groups and a much smaller number of men's organizations in the late 1800s, requires explanation. Using the word "club" was prickly for many women's groups, Professor Martin tells us. The General Federation of Women's Clubs, founded in 1890, said its own name was "an unfortunate one since the word 'club' as applied to a body of individuals has come to mean . . . an organization which exists largely for the purposes of entertainment and amusement."²³

The Fortnightly of Chicago pointedly avoided the word for two reasons, according to the organization's history. First, several prestigious clubs, including the early women's literary group Sorosis, organized in New York City, did not use the term. Second, "In some circles, 'club' may have had a vulgar or sporting connotation." Legend has it that the husband of an early prospective member forbade his wife to join a group "with such a masculine label as 'club.'"²⁴

Men's literary clubs, of course, were not so inhibited. But they sometimes had trouble with the word "literary." The men's organizations were not book clubs. Typically, members neither composed literature nor engaged in literary criticism. The literal

CLUBBING

meaning of the phrase literary club confronted the Men's Literary Club of Sandusky, Ohio, when wives of members crashed a regular meeting in 1914. The speaker's topic that night was "Things I Have Enjoyed in Dickens." The ladies had dressed as characters in Dickens's novels and, according to a club history, "paraded around the room and challenged members to tell which characters they represented." The results were not recorded. The club survived this challenge and met regularly until 1954.²⁵

The consideration of men's literary clubs emerging after the Civil War in light of the history of private men's clubs evokes Mike Myer's comedy sketch, "Coffee Talk with Linda Richman," on Saturday Night Live in the early 1990s: "A literary club is neither literary nor a club. Discuss."

Dr. Marc Cruciger, a member of the Chit Chat Club in San Francisco, argues that a more accurately descriptive name for organizations such as his and ours is "essay club." I agree. In a paper he delivered in 2009,²⁶ Dr. Cruciger makes two important contributions to my thesis about literary clubs in late nineteenth-century America. He notes that papers presented by club members have two complementary goals. First, a paper represents the discovery and expression of ideas by its author. Second, and just as important, each paper is read aloud by the member and thus shared with the club, for better or worse.

Men's literary clubs, either by rule or tradition, typically discouraged members from voicing negative comments after a paper had been read. But at one point in its early history, the Indianapolis Literary Club passed a motion to prohibit *favorable* comments about papers. They reasoned that positive reactions were to be expected and veered toward inane pleasantries. The rule was not enforced. But a history of the club relates the story of one member whose paper

... elicited what he considered to be an unfair comment. He sat there, growing redder and redder in the face by the minute. Finally he could stand it no longer. "It's my paper," he proclaimed, pounding the arm of his chair with his fist. "It's my paper, and I like it, and that's all that matters." Whereupon there naturally ensued apologies, reconciliation and a hasty end to the discussion.²⁷

Dr. Cruciger cites the French word "essai," which means a "trial" or an "attempt." He attributes to a fellow Chit Chat Club member the phrase "crystallized conversation" to convey the rigor of writing a paper and the challenge of reading it aloud to an audience.

In this vein, I will share at length the memories of Anna McMahon, who was a member of Friends in Council, a women's study group in Quincy, Illinois, in the 1870s. Women's literary clubs at that time were more highly structured than men's. McMahon wrote of her "quaking limbs and trembling voice" as she read aloud an assigned paper she had written about the Middle Ages. In 1897, the club's general study theme was "The History of Painting" and the topic assigned to her was "The Venetian School." "Think of it, friends," she wrote years later.

A person who knew nothing of art principles, who had never seen a painting, nor perhaps even an engraving of any work of the Venetian school, with such a theme. Those who had been abroad and knew something about the subject at first-hand were very good not to laugh in my face. But at least I was industrious. Never before I had spent so much labor in the preparation of anything. . . . Everything I heard or saw seemed somehow to bear a relation to Venetian art, and into my paper it went. Neither was fine writing or flight of rhetoric wanting, for the spell of Ruskin was upon me. The reading of this paper took nearly two hours.²⁸

In later years, Anna McMahon said her club became a bit less structured and more open to members' ideas for writing projects.

CLUBBING

She was amused by her struggles over her early assignments, but "they were a necessary step in the evolution of our club," she wrote. "They gave us the habit of experiencing ourselves on paper; they taught us not to fear the sound of our own voices; they made us acquainted with each other's mind and thoughts."²⁹

To be sure, in the 1870s, women's literary clubs were far more rigorous than men's. Women believed they had a lot of ground to make up. They needed to make the best possible use of their limited time away from home. Few had attended college or held any prospect of doing so. Women were building self-confidence, not relishing it. Their clubs were freely mocked by men in their communities. Any hint of entertainment or idle recreation would feed the derision. Professor Martin found that "the meetings themselves were businesslike, disciplined by self-consciousness and parliamentary procedure."³⁰ In this respect, men's and women's literary clubs took sharply different paths in the late 1800s. Victorian standards of the time weighed against integrating the sexes in literary clubs. But, more important, the different goals of men and women in forming the clubs would have clashed significantly.

A theme running through available histories of men's literary clubs from the late nineteenth century is intellectual diversion and an aversion to social pretense. Legend at the Indianapolis Literary Club, founded in 1877, tells of the time in its early years when the proposed membership of the state's governor was rejected. When the story appeared in local newspapers, the governor was elected unanimously and thereupon resigned.³¹ Early in the history of the Chicago Literary Club, one eager member presented a list of fifty of Chicago's wealthiest men and proposed them for membership. "This was tactfully sidetracked," but nonetheless led one of the founding members, Major Henry Alonzo Huntington, to declare,

CLUBBING

"We have always been rich in poor men."³²

It seems the specialization required in men's professional careers created a longing for variety in their lives. Moreover, the career men of nineteenth-century men's literary clubs—unlike their female counterparts—were not looking for organizational conventions. Their day jobs had plenty of rules that must be obeyed. The Century Association and its "foster parent," the Sketch Club, founded in 1829 by twenty-one artists and writers in New York,³³ left us the template for our Club's special institutional bearing—or lack thereof.

At one point, the Sketch Club dissolved itself and reorganized simply to cancel the membership of a wealthy gentleman who had become a member and "tried to corrupt it by serving a 'superb dinner.'"³⁴ The goal of Sketch Club members was to unbend, "at times with the abandon of school boys." The Century Association, founded in 1847, continued the tradition of informality. Perhaps its greatest contribution to late nineteenth-century literary clubs was its membership criteria, which admitted "amateurs of letters and fine arts," a break from the Sketch Club. "Amateurs" were allotted two board seats, along with two authors and two artists.³⁵ As one early club officer put it, "The strain of driving the business and social machinery of this great city unbent at evening here, finding rest in interchange of fresh thoughts. . . . No subject was too high or too small to be attacked in talk."³⁶

The spirit of nonconformity and recreation did not yield, as a rule, to frivolity in the formal work of members, as available minutes and related documents demonstrate. Before it abandoned the debate format in favor of essay presentations, the Literary Club of Cincinnati, founded in 1849, took up weighty questions, some of which are still with us—capital punishment, immigration policy, universal education as a public responsibility, and the tension

CLUBBING

between a nation's wealth and its virtue—and some that aren't, such as women's suffrage and the pros and cons of annexing Canada.

I close with a story from the early years of our Club that, I think, illustrates the self-confidence that comes from the trial and error associated with composing and delivering papers to a literary club. It seems a British missionary doctor named Wilfred Grenfell, who apparently had received favorable press for his work fighting disease in Labrador, Newfoundland, would be in Chicago and would be available to speak to the Club. One of the Club's members wished to invite Grenfell to speak to the Club, and although that member was absent, a lively debate ensued at a Monday-night meeting on whether or not such an invitation should be extended. The debate was recorded by a visiting member of the Literary Club of Cincinnati.³⁷

As it happened, the Club's scheme of exercises for that season contained an upcoming vacancy. But one member thought he recalled—whether it was in the by-laws or not, no one was sure—that nonmembers would not be invited to make presentations. (Indeed, certain Literary Club members years earlier had seceded and formed their own club for the purpose of hearing from distinguished guests. Why not, therefore, send Grenfell to the secessionists?) Other members feared the missionary doctor would use the occasion to proselytize or even solicit money. A member sympathetic to Grenfell (who, by the way, was knighted by King George V a few years later) suggested that Grenfell be allowed to make some informal remarks following another Club member's formal paper presentation. But another member then reminded the group that the after-presentation proposal had been tried unsuccessfully many years earlier, when British poet Matthew Arnold was a guest. Asked to speak after the presentation, Arnold

CLUBBING

had declared openly that the food at the collation was not fit to eat. In response to the implied likelihood of a similar happening, still another member, perhaps knowing of Grenfell's work among the poor on the cold Labrador coast, claimed that the doctor would eat anything as long as it was greased with stockyard butter.

Finally, a member who apparently was a judge ended the debate when he ruled that it was "contrary to the precedents of the club to have persons more distinguished than themselves to address it on any occasion."³⁸

Notes

1. *The Century 1847-1946* (New York: The Century Association, 1947), 27-28.
2. Mark Twain, *The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County and Other Sketches* (New York: C.H. Web Publishers, 1869), Frontispiece.
3. Mark Twain, " 'Mark Twain' in New York: The Overgrown Metropolis," *Daily Alta California*, March 28, 1867, 1.
4. Cleveland Amory, *Who Killed Society?* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1960), 196 (hereafter cited as Amory).
5. Joseph Addison, *The Spectator*, Vol. 1, No. 9, March 10, 1711, available at <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/12030/12030-h/12030-h/SV1/Spectator1.html> (hereafter cited as Addison).
6. Amory, 205.
7. Christopher Gray, "Streetscapes: Inside the Union Club, Jaws Drop," *New York Times*, February 11, 2007.
8. Ibid.
9. Addison.
10. Lewis Mumford, *The Brown Decades* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1931), 6, 10, 17.
11. Lisa Holton, *For Members Only* (Chicago: Lake Claremont Press, 2008), 6.
12. Francis A. Lackner, "What's Past is Prologue: A History of the Cedar Rapids Literary Club" (1991).
13. Burton Bledstein, *The Culture of Professionalism* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1976), 56, 85.
14. Theodora Penny Martin, *The Sound of Our Own Voices* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1987), 1, 3 (hereafter cited as Martin).
15. Muriel Beadle, *The Fortnightly of Chicago* (Chicago: The Fortnightly of Chicago, 1973), 3-4 (hereafter cited as Beadle).
16. Patricia Dawn Robinson, "From Pedestal to Platform: The American Women's Club Movement, 1800-1920," PhD dissertation (University of California at Davis, 1993), 11 (hereafter cited as Robinson).
17. Charles Ebeling, "Samuel Johnson and His 'Clubbable' Friends," (Chicago: The Chicago Literary Club, 2008) available at www.chilit.org.
18. James Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnson* (New York: Penguin Group, 2008), 504.
19. Martin, 5-6.

Notes

20. Donald Scott, "The Popular Lecture and the Creation of a Public in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America," *The Journal of American History*, vol. 66, no. 4, March 1980, 793, 797.

21. Clark L. Wagner, "The Club's Victorian Roots" (Chicago: The Chicago Literary Club, 1998), available at www.chilit.org.

22. Robinson, 27.

23. Martin, 63-64.

24. Beadle, 12.

25. Men's Literary Club (Sandusky, Ohio), Agency History, Center for Archival Collections, Bowling Green State University, available at <http://www2.bgsu.edu/colleges/library/cac/ms/page44496.html>.

26. Marc Petty Cruciger, "Essay Clubs of the United States" (San Francisco: The Chit Chat Club of San Francisco, 2009).

27. Francis Insley, *The Indianapolis Literary Club, a Historical Memoir* (The Indianapolis Literary Club: Summarized Record, 1877-1976), 179 (hereafter cited as Insley).

28. Martin, 91-92.

29. Ibid.

30. Ibid., 111.

31. Insley, 182.

32. Earle A. Shilton, "A Twenty-Minute History of The Chicago Literary Club" (Reprint, Chicago: The Chicago Literary Club, 1998), 5.

33. Allen Nevins, "The Century, 1847-1866," in *The Century*, 4.

34. Ibid., 5.

35. Ibid., 14.

36. John Diehl, "As It Was in the Beginning," *The Literary Club Essays of John Diehl, Club Historian* (Columbus, Ohio: The Literary Club of Cincinnati, 2012), 199.

37. W. C. Cochran, "Visit to the Chicago Literary Club" (Cincinnati: The Literary Club of Cincinnati, 1911).

38. Ibid.

This paper was written for the
Chicago Literary Club
and read before the Club on
Monday evening, the Twenty-eighth of April,
Two Thousand and Fourteen.

This edition of two hundred fifty copies
was printed for the Club in the month of
December, Two Thousand and Fifteen.

Printed in the United States of America