

**THE SILENT PARTNER: MARY MEHAGAN HILL  
AND THE GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY**

Christiane Diehl Taylor  
*Eastern Kentucky University*

*At a time when large corporations were just becoming commonplace and the term “corporate wife” was more than a half-century from entering the vernacular, Mary Mehagan Hill, spouse of Great Northern Railway founding partner and president James J. Hill, exemplified what many in modern American business would come to view as the good corporate wife. Her diaries and private correspondence between 1884 and 1920 reveal that she ably performed the business functions company executives expected corporate spouses to perform: the evaluative, the motivational, and the diplomatic. Although her public face never betrayed that she undertook these tasks reluctantly, she fulfilled her corporate duties so well that her obituary called Mary her husband’s “silent partner.”*

The November 22, 1921, *St. Paul Pioneer Press Dispatch* front pages announced the passing of Mary Mehagan Hill:

The wife of the Empire Builder is dead. Eternity has claimed her who exemplified the noblest in American womanhood. She aided her husband, the late James J. Hill, in his struggle to a great place among his fellow men. Hers was the role of the silent partner.<sup>1</sup>

34

Mary Mehagan Hill, wife of Great Northern Railway founding partner and president James J. Hill, was her husband’s silent partner. Large corporations were becoming commonplace, and “corporate wife” was more than half a century from the vernacular, but Mary Hill exemplified what American businesses and society would come to view as a type of silent partner—the corporate wife. Yet Mary took on her role as helpmate to James with little relish; she fulfilled the expected duties of a corporate wife with reluctance and out of a sense of duty and deep-abiding love for her husband.

Throughout the twentieth century, company executives viewed spouses as extensions of their employees, particularly their managers. As Rosabeth

Kanter observed in *Men and Woman of the Corporation*, firms expected corporate spouses, which until the 1970s equated to wives, to fulfill one or more of the following business-related functions: the motivational, the evaluative, and the diplomatic. The motivational function arose from the belief of business leaders that a successful worker was a motivated and satisfied one. Executives often felt that a wife's desire for a larger home or an additional automobile could spur her husband into working harder to get a raise or a promotion. A spouse who did not complain about having to move made an employee happier about a job transfer. Supervisors also argued that the satisfied worker was one who routinely went to a home that was a refuge rather than an extension of the hectic, stressful office environment. Therefore, wives and families played an integral role in workers' motivation and satisfaction.

The evaluative function related to the selection and promotion of managers. While all executives wanted their candidates for managerial positions to be men of good character and to have the demonstrated ability to organize, prioritize, control, and motivate their subordinates, not all relied on job performance as their sole criterion in differentiating among candidates. The difficulty of evaluating the potential of inexperienced men vying for entry and mid-level management positions led executives to look to candidates' families as a surrogate measure. If a candidate could not manage a family, he or she could not manage a department, much less an entire operation. So the appearance and deportment of an executive's family influenced the rate of advancement up the corporate ladder.

The diplomatic function included company outreach. Executives acknowledged that a firm's success required diplomacy: the creation and maintenance of ongoing social relations between company personnel and influential members of the wider business realm, the political world, and the community-at-large. Spouses played an integral role in developing and sustaining those linkages, and since the public often equated executives and their spouses with their respective firms, how they appeared and acted in public reflected upon their companies' images and financial performance.<sup>2</sup>

Mary Mehagan Hill proved a competent corporate wife. Her background and his ambition had her filling an evaluative role even before they married. When the couple talked of marriage in 1862, they realized that Mary would play a part in assuring James's business success. He worked for Borup and Champlin, a St. Paul, Minnesota, wholesale grocer and freight-forwarding and commission agency that represented such key area transport firms as

the Galena Packet Company and the LaCrosse and Milwaukee Railroad. Hill was so successful an employee that despite having no financial interest in the firm, local business leaders thought of him as the company. Yet remaining an employee did not satisfy the ambitious Hill, who was formulating plans to open his own freight-forwarding and commission agency.<sup>3</sup>

Like many other ambitious young businessmen of the latter half of the nineteenth century, James was eager for business success and he knew what success was. It was not enough to amass money; he must be of good character, single-minded, hard-working, honest, a man of integrity who was friendly, loyal, and generous in the workplace and out.<sup>4</sup> After coming to St. Paul in 1856, Hill had risen from the rank of shipping clerk to the verge of owning his own business not merely by putting in long hours, being willing to undertake any task, and building and maintaining outstanding customer relations but also by becoming a valued and loyal friend to area businessmen, participating in social events, and serving in the town militia and volunteer fire brigade.<sup>5</sup>

James and Mary knew that diplomatic activities must continue as he established and expanded his own firm. Upon marriage these duties would no longer be just his responsibility; some, like entertaining and participating in civic affairs, would also become Mary's. More importantly, both recognized that her appearance and deportment, particularly in public, would help shape people's opinions of James and his new firm. Marriage would make her an extension of James and a determinant of his business success.

Born in New York City in 1846 to Irish immigrants, Mary and her family had moved to St. Paul in 1850. Her father, reputedly a man of some formal education and refinement, attempted to establish a business in the growing community, but he quickly failed and died in 1854. Although she and her sisters had attended the local Catholic school operated by the Sisters of St. Joseph, family lore suggests that Mary became a waitress in the Merchant's Hotel while in her mid-teens. There she reputedly met Hill, who took many of his meals at the establishment. As the couple began to talk of marriage, both Mary and James feared that her background inadequately prepared her to assume the role of the wife of an up-and-coming St. Paul businessman. She consulted her longtime family friend and surrogate father, the priest Father Caillet, and agreed to attend St. Mary's, a Milwaukee, Wisconsin, finishing school recently opened by the sisters of Notre Dame for young upper-class Roman Catholic women. James used his money and some borrowed

from close business acquaintances to pay for her schooling. For two years Mary studied subjects suited for an aspiring businessman's spouse: French, music and art appreciation, natural philosophy, etiquette, letter writing, and needlework. Both Mary and James must have viewed St. Mary's as the pivotal step in preparing her for marriage because they did not become officially engaged until after she had come back from the school in 1864 and did not marry until 1867, over a year after James had opened his own business.<sup>6</sup>

Mary's fulfillment of the evaluative role continued into her marriage and extended to her dealings with her children. By 1885, Mary and James had nine living children ranging in age from a few months to seventeen. Their appearance and deportment mattered as much as Mary's, particularly given that James was no longer a freight-forwarding and commission agent. He had parlayed his success in his first venture and in the Red River Transportation Company and the Northwestern Fuel Company to acquire, along with three other associates, the St. Paul and Pacific Railroad in 1878. Four years later, Hill became president of the railroad, now renamed the St. Paul, Minneapolis & Manitoba Railway Company. In 1885, he and his partners began aggressively seeking the investments necessary to expand the railroad into Montana and northern Minnesota.<sup>7</sup>

The Hills became a leading St. Paul family, and the public eye was on them. Yet managing the appearance and deportment of the Hill children was not easy, particularly that of their three sons, James Norman, Louis, and Walter. The nine received their early education from private tutors. By 1887, however, James realized that his sons were inadequately prepared to fulfill his desires for their futures. He wanted them to go to Yale, where the leading national businessmen with whom he associated sent their sons. Since the level of pedagogy provided by their private tutors would not assure their acceptance, Hill sent his two eldest boys, James Norman and Louis, then aged seventeen and fifteen, to Philips Exeter Academy.

From their entrance into Philips Exeter in September 1887 through their years at Yale, a frustrating pattern emerged. At the beginning of each term, the two promised to do well, and throughout each semester, they wrote to their parents about how hard they worked at their studies. Yet their actions contradicted their words. Louis wrote to Mary that study consumed his weekends, while his sisters' letters to him begged him to come once again for the weekend to New York, where they were attending the Spence School, or to accompany them to Boston. In November 1891, Yale officials suspended

James Norman for a month for intoxication and setting a bonfire outside the dorms in the early hours of the morning. Their behavior resulted in the same outcome each semester. Near the end of the term, James and Mary learned from either the boys or the school that their sons were on the verge of failure or had failed one or more of their final examinations. James then arranged for private tutoring so his sons could make up their deficiencies. On at least five occasions, James or Mary made special trips to Philips Exeter and Yale to plead with school presidents and professors for additional chances for their sons.<sup>8</sup>

Both Mary's and James's correspondence with their two eldest sons during these end-of-term crises revealed their awareness that the boys' behavior threatened their family's and the railroad's image. On October 5, 1889, James wrote to Louis: "You will never be called on to make the effort I have had to make; at the same time there would be no satisfaction to you or any one else if all my work should fail from want of spirited enterprise on the part of my sons." Mary's letters echoed the same sentiments. On January 24, 1892, she wrote to Louis: "It is that you have not applied yourself sufficiently...without discipline and regularity, mental facilities will not respond...It would be too bad for you and for us all if you should fail in moral strength." Mary went even further than James in expressing her displeasure. She dispensed guilt as only a mother could. On February 4, 1892, she wrote to James Norman: "Papa's cares and responsibilities are great and numerous but none try so cruelly as when he feels called on to question why either you or Louis are not doing as well as you should." Mary and James's struggles to have their sons live up to their expectations and the public's finally ended when in June 1893, by the narrowest of margins, James Norman and Louis graduated from Yale and joined the Great Northern. James Norman became the head of the Eastern Railway, the railroad's branch serving northern Minnesota, and Louis began as the Assistant to the President.<sup>9</sup>

Now that James and Mary had established their two oldest boys in the business, they had to prepare their third and considerably younger son, Walter, to follow in his brothers' footsteps. James could not oversee this son's education because of the ever-increasing hours he devoted to the railroad. That task fell largely to Mary, and from 1897 to 1901 her diaries relate her ongoing struggles with Walter, who apparently lacked both scholastic aptitude and interest. In January 1897, Mary exchanged letters with both Walter and his headmaster regarding his lack of progress. The letters did not lead

to change, and in October 1899, Mary made final arrangements for Walter to enter the Baldwin School in Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania. As Walter entered Baldwin on October 17, her diary entry for that day reflected her continuing concern with his progress. "Walter seems quite happy at what is expected of him, may he continue so and give satisfaction."

Walter did not live up to his parents' expectations, and so in June 1901, Mary visited the Hotchkiss School in Lakeville, Connecticut, and consulted with its headmaster, Professor Coy. Despite admonishments to the contrary from Coy, Mary and James decided to register their son in the school. Since Walter had to be tutored in German over the summer if he was to enter Hotchkiss in the fall, Mary arranged for a Miss Hartman to provide the lessons, and her entries throughout July and early August noted her hope that Walter would perform as required for admission. "Walter began his German lesson today; Miss Hartman appears decided enough a good thing in a teacher." "I hope that Walter will do well with Miss Hartman now that I have to be off." The tutoring must have sufficed, for in late August, Mary prepared Walter for his trip east. Yet by October, Mary once again had to admonish Walter about his performance and to write to Professor Coy about her son's lack of progress. Her battle to prepare her third and last son to join his brothers and father at the Great Northern continued until, in the end, Mary and James admitted that Walter had no business aptitude or inclination and that his real interest lay in farming and animal husbandry. By allowing him to pursue career opportunities in agriculture they not only ended their academic struggles with him but kept the family's and the railroad's reputation intact.<sup>10</sup>

Mary found carrying out the motivational duties associated with being a corporate wife no less challenging than assuring that her sons lived up to the evaluative expectations placed upon them. James was a micromanager and refused to delegate authority to the very capable individuals who served under him. He second-guessed his subordinates and often bypassed them by intervening personally and unannounced into matters that were clearly their responsibility. Business occupied nearly all of his waking moments. Between 1884 and 1916, he spent an average of 42 percent of each year traveling on railroad business. When not on the road, he worked late into the evening in his office and spent most of his weekends there. When he eventually came home, he often had a subordinate in tow or received employees calling upon him.<sup>11</sup>

Mary apparently never complained to James about his work habits or his driving ambition. While on rare occasions she pointed out that his pace intermittently drove him to physical exhaustion and illness, she never suggested he slow down or delegate more. When James traveled to London or Paris, he sometimes took Mary along but would then leave her alone for hours, even days, with family members who accompanied them or individuals affiliated with the Great Northern. Only to her children and her diary did Mary confide her concern for her husband's emotional and physical well-being and, during the European trips, her loneliness and boredom. On December 7, 1899, she wrote in her diary: "Papa came home directly because he did not feel very well." Two days later her entry indicated: "Louis and papa left for New York this evening." On April 27, 1901, she noted: "Papa went east this evening...Papa seems to have taken some cold, his throat troubles him, possibly he was but tired, I hope so." Her entry for March 27, 1900, read: "Papa is trying to arrange for us to sail in April. I shall not want to leave home, but then I never do and if one ever goes, one must."<sup>12</sup> In 1906, she revealed in a letter to her daughter, Clara, that

I am happy to be going home—you may think that home is the only place I can be happy. I would enjoy very much a trip abroad if there was no hurry and if I could go some other place than London and Paris and plan my own stay—all these conditions are long on the way and may not materialize ever.<sup>13</sup>

40

Since her husband spent approximately half of each year traveling for the Great Northern, it often fell to Mary to fulfill the diplomatic function—namely, creating and maintaining social relations between firm executives and influential members of the wider business realm, the political world, and the community-at-large. In her diaries, Mary recorded not just such mundane items as the weather and the books she read but every individual she visited or who visited her or whom she entertained or who entertained her as well as every social, civic, and philanthropic event she attended. The visiting and entertainment roster of her diaries demonstrates how well Mary fulfilled the diplomatic function.

Her surviving diaries from 1884 and 1921 reveal that she had contact with 578 family units. When these names are coupled with St. Paul city directories and family and railroad biographies, the professional associations of

three-fourths of these family units become apparent. Slightly over half the individuals Mary visited or who visited her were affiliated with either the Great Northern (24 percent) or St. Paul/Minneapolis businesses (28 percent). Railroad associates included investors, senior managers, board members, longtime low-level employees, and suppliers, and even representatives of Great Northern competitors. The majority of area business people with whom Mary had contact used the railroad as a transporter of their goods or supplies. These individuals ranged from hardware retailers and wholesalers to food and clothing purveyors to local livery companies. An additional 10 percent of Mary's visitors were public officials, including Supreme Court justices, the governors and senators of Minnesota and other states through which the Great Northern passed (6 percent), partners in Hill family business ventures other than the railroad (2 percent), national businessmen (1 percent) like Marshall Field, and influential area citizens (1 percent), among them Archbishop John Ireland.<sup>14</sup>

Although Mary and James seldom hosted large, elaborate dinner parties or receptions, they frequently had luncheon and dinner guests, particularly at their summer residence, a farm at North Oaks, Minnesota. Moreover, given the lack of upscale lodging within the St. Paul-Minneapolis area, Mary and James had a number of overnight guests. Individuals associated with the railroad (30 percent) or area businesses (18 percent) made up nearly half of those who attended Hill parties, spent the night, or dined with the Hills. An additional 15 percent were public officials (6 percent), influential citizens (5 percent), business partners (2 percent), and national businessmen (2 percent). The names of those entertained by the Hills ranged from Charles Bunn, railroad counsel, to H. T. Upham, president of the First National Bank of St Paul, to Minnesota Governor Alexander Ramsey, and even President William McKinley.<sup>15</sup>

Mary interacted with both men and women. Only 44 percent of those she visited were women; even fewer, 27 percent, of those entertained by the Hills together were women. Fifty-six percent of her visits and 73 percent of her entertaining included both men and women or solely men. In fact, 65 percent of those entertained by the Hills were men.<sup>16</sup>

Mary was an extension of her husband and a diplomat for the Great Northern Railway. Half (51 percent) of the contacts Mary made through visiting occurred while James served as president of the railroad between 1884 and 1907. This percentage dropped precipitously when James was the chair-



man of the Board from 1908 to 1912 (16 percent) and during his retirement from 1912 to his death in May 1916 (15 percent).

A similar pattern emerged for entertainment. Forty-seven percent of such events occurred while James served as president of the Great Northern. That proportion dropped to 20 percent when James became the chairman of the Board and to 15 percent after he retired. While these drops in frequency may have been, in part, a function of aging and the increasing number of flareups of tuberculosis Mary experienced, the declines were too precipitous merely to be the result of these causes. As James was no longer the head of the railroad, much of the contact with and entertainment of railroad associates, suppliers, competitors, customers, and politicians fell to his successor. Just as James no longer had to represent the railroad on an ongoing basis, neither did Mary. Now both she and James could enjoy interacting with people out of choice rather than obligation.<sup>17</sup>

42 An obligation or duty was how Mary viewed her role as a corporate wife. Her frequency of contact with various individuals reveals that she did not relish serving as an extension of her husband and the Great Northern. She called on or received business and community-related acquaintances as infrequently as social convention would permit, semiannually when possible, annually at minimum. Overall, Mary visited with two-thirds (69 percent) of the family units listed in her diary one to three times a year. Only 10 percent saw her more than twelve times a year. Except for family members, those having the most frequent contact with Mary had befriended her or James early in their lives or his career. They were a diverse group and included the longtime general counsel of the Great Northern, R. Jackson, and his wife; early railroad board members and investors, Mr. and Mrs. D. Willis James and Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Thorne; Mary's childhood priest, Father Caillet; and the couple's neighbors, Judge and Mrs. George B. Young. The most frequent visiting, however, was between James and Mary and H. T. Upham and his wife Grace. The Uphams had become the Hill's closest friends as a result of the two couples beginning their married lives in 1871 as neighbors in Lowertown St. Paul.<sup>18</sup>

Although St. Paul residents expected their area business leaders to be actively involved in civic and charitable affairs, Mary limited her participation to those where her absence would be obvious or those that were affiliated with the Catholic Church. Between 1885 and James's death in 1916, her diary indicates that she attended only forty-eight civic events. Only in

1897 and 1899 did she attend as many as six events. Moreover, she appeared to attend nearly two-thirds (61 percent) of such events because James was the featured speaker or an honoree, or the Hills were major contributors to the institution hosting the event. The roster of events Mary attended during 1908 illustrates this pattern. On May 30, Mary and James attended a citywide memorial service at which James spoke. Mary went to the opening of the Minnesota State Fair on August 31 because James could not attend and William Jennings Bryan was the honored guest. On September 16, Mary joined Great Northern employees as they celebrated her husband's seventieth birthday at the Lafayette Club at Minnetonka Beach. Two days later she accompanied James to his address to the students and faculty of the agricultural college at Crockston, Minnesota.

Mary's limited civic participation extended to charitable events as well. The Hills took a conservative approach to philanthropy because James did not believe in giving to organizations that received public funds. Although James was a Methodist and a rare church attendee, he did direct a significant portion of his contributions to Catholic-based organizations in honor of Mary, a devout lifelong Catholic. Realizing that further regional economic growth required an educated workforce, James directed most of his charitable giving to the Presbyterian-founded Macalester College and the Catholic St. Paul Seminary and College of St. Thomas. To help those he viewed as less fortunate, James allotted a portion of the family's donations to such local groups as the Society for the Relief of the Poor, the Little Sisters of the Poor, and the Visitation Convent and Home of the Friendless. While James was somewhat ecumenical in his giving, Mary focused her patronage almost exclusively on two Catholic charities: St. Mary's Home and the Good Shepherd Convent. At St. Mary's, she participated in a variety of activities from teaching sewing and knitting to overseeing the cleaning of the institution's facilities to donating playground equipment. The Good Shepherd sisters received regular visits and gifts from her. Mary's diary entries also indicate that she routinely participated in the convent's philanthropic programs. With the outbreak of World War I, Mary changed her focus and began using her considerable needlework skills to knit socks, sweaters, and caps for allied soldiers and war refugees. She continued this effort until her death in 1921.<sup>19</sup>

On occasion, Mary's correspondence and diaries reveal her grudging fulfillment of the duties expected of her as the wife of an executive and leading

area businessman. "This afternoon I made some visits of obligation." "Urgent, necessary visits." "I made up all my calls this afternoon." "In the afternoon Ruth (her daughter) and I made several visits of duty." Her infrequent comments about enjoying visits further illustrate that calls were no more than tasks to be completed. On January 30, 1891, she wrote: "Spent the afternoon at Mrs. N. P. Langford's and had a most enjoyable time as there were so many agreeable ladies present." Another entry three days later reads like a roster: "Called at Mrs. Hammond's to Ogden before his going back to New Haven...Then went to Mrs. Fred Driscole Jr. reception and met Miss Seixas." Throughout her life, her entries noted little more than people visited or dined with and social or philanthropic events attended but not enjoyed.<sup>20</sup>

Other more personal actions demonstrate that Mary assumed the role of a business executive's wife because it was expected of her, not because she yearned to play that role or because she enjoyed being the publicly prominent wife. In 1891, she and James took up residence in an imposing 36,000-square-foot mansion on St. Paul's most prestigious street, Summit Avenue. Constructed at a cost of \$930,000, the home was the first electrified house in St. Paul and contained thirteen bathrooms with modern plumbing, a large art gallery complete with pipe organ, and quarters for ten to fourteen servants. Mary took no part in the planning or furnishing of this home. She left it all to James because the family's former large frame house in Lowertown St. Paul and the rambling farmhouse in North Oaks represented home to her. At North Oaks, Mary could make jellies and grape juice, preserve strawberries, and pickle peaches without upsetting her kitchen staff. When her husband bought her emerald and sapphire necklaces for birthdays or wedding anniversaries, Mary told him to put them in the safe at railroad headquarters, and there they remained. By 1900 her family's wealth approached twenty million dollars and thereby surpassed that of many of the social elites in New York and Paris, where the Hills maintained apartments. Yet Mary preferred to spend her time in these cities touring botanical and zoological gardens and art museums, attending the opera, visiting with family members, or just quietly reading a book or doing needlework instead of socializing with the areas' "movers and shakers."<sup>21</sup>

While Mary Mehagan Hill may have yearned for a simpler, quieter, and less public life, she performed her role as corporate wife well enough to earn the sobriquet silent partner. Like her, succeeding generations of corporate wives would motivate their partners and groom themselves and their

families for the public eye in hopes of assuring a rapid rise through the corporate ranks.

#### NOTES

1. *St. Paul [Minnesota] Pioneer Press Dispatch* (November 22, 1921), 1.
2. Rosabeth Kanter, *Men and Woman of the Corporation* (New York: Basic Books, 1977), 104–6, 113–22. While the three functions of corporate wives are set out in numerous business-related pieces published before and after Kanter's, she provides concise descriptions of these functions, and this discussion of the evaluative, diplomatic, and motivational draws on her analysis. Corporate wives became advisers and mentors to their husbands and unpaid employees when they served as administrative assistants or even as direct replacements when their husbands were incapacitated by illness or injury. Supervisors, however, considered the women unsuited to these roles for they lacked adequate knowledge of the firms' affairs.
3. Ralph W. Hidy, Muriel E. Hidy, Roy V. Scott, and Don L. Hofsommer, *The Great Northern Railway: A History* (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1988), 17; Michael P. Malone, *James J. Hill: Empire Builder of the Northwest* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995), 10–17; and Albro Martin, *James J. Hill and the Opening of the Northwest* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976), 45–57.
4. Particularly during the last three decades of the twentieth century, scholars have examined the historical parameters of masculinity and success. For more in-depth and extensive discussions of the characteristics presented above, see Martha Banta, *Failure and Success in America: A Literary Debate* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978); Peter G. Filene, *Him/Her/Self: Gender Identities in Modern America* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998); Judy Arlene Hilkey, *Character is Capital: Success Manuals and Manhood in Gilded Age America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997); Richard M. Huber, *The American Idea of Success* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971); David Leverenz, *Manhood and the American Renaissance* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989); Moses Rischin, ed., *The American Gospel of Success: Individualism and Beyond* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1965); E. Anthony Rotundo, *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1993); and Peter N. Stearns, *Be a Man! Males in Modern Society* (New Haven, CT: Holmes & Meier, 1979).

5. Martin, *James J. Hill and the Opening of the Northwest*, 25–57, 329.
6. Clara Hill Lindley, *James J. and Mary T. Hill: An Unfinished Chronicle by Their Daughter* (New York: North River Press, 1948), 41–55, 80–82; Eileen R. McCormack, “Mary Hill” (Senior History Paper, University of Minnesota, December 6, 1993), 5, copy in possession of James J. Hill Reference Library; and Martin, *James J. Hill and the Opening of the Northwest*, 59–64.
7. Hidy et al., *Great Northern Railway*, 25–148; Malone, *James J. Hill: Empire Builder*, 31–225; and Martin, *James J. Hill and the Opening of the Northwest*, 114–523.
8. Malone, *James J. Hill: Empire Builder*, 104; Martin, *James J. Hill and the Opening of the Northwest*, 258–59, 353–54, 433; Mary Hill’s and James Hill’s letters to James Norman and Louis, Home File Boxes 1 & 2, Louis W. Hill Papers, James J. Hill Reference Library, St. Paul, Minnesota; and Mary Hill Diaries, James J. Hill Reference Library.
9. James Hill’s and Mary Hill’s letters to James Norman and Louis, Home File Boxes 1 & 2, Louis W. Hill Papers, James J. Hill Reference Library.
10. (January 22, 23; April 23, 1897; October 16, 17, 1899; June 7, 20; August 11, 29; October 12, 26; November 16, 1901) Mary Hill Diaries, Louis W. Hill Papers, James J. Hill Reference Library.
11. Malone, *James J. Hill: Empire Builder*, 81, 103, 152.
12. (December 7, 9, 1899, March 27, 1900, April 27, 1901) Mary Hill Diaries, Louis W. Hill Papers, James J. Hill Reference Library.
13. Letter quoted in Eileen McCormack’s unpublished manuscript “On the Sunny Side of the Street: Mary T. Hill’s Life in New York,” Plan B Paper for Masters of Liberal Studies, University of Minnesota, June 1999, 27, copy in possession of James J. Hill Reference Library.
14. Mary Hill Diaries, 1886–87, 1889, 1891–92, 1894–95, 1897, 1900–1914, Louis W. Hill Papers, James J. Hill Reference Library; Mary Hill Diaries, 1884–85, 1888, 1892, 1913–21, Manuscript Collection, P2210, James J. Hill and Family Papers: 1855–1960, Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul, Minnesota.
15. Mary Hill Diaries, Louis W. Hill Papers, James J. Hill Reference Library and Manuscript Collection, P2210, James J. Hill Family Papers: 1855–1960, Minnesota Historical Society.
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Ibid.*
18. *Ibid.*; McCormack, “Mary Hill,” 11–12.

19. Malone, *James J. Hill: Empire Builder*, 109, 192; Martin, *James J. Hill and the Opening of the Northwest*, xx, 315, 356; Mary Hill Diaries, Louis W. Hill Papers, James J. Hill Reference Library and Manuscript Collection, P2210, James J. Hill Family Papers: 1855–1960, Minnesota Historical Society.
20. (January 30 and February 2, 1891; January 11, 1897; January 7, 1899; December 12, 1901) Mary Hill Diaries, Louis W. Hill Papers, James J. Hill Reference Library.
21. Malone, *James J. Hill: Empire Builder*, 106, 154; McCormack, “On the Sunny Side of the Street”; (June 12, 16; September 6, 1907; June 24, 1908; August 31, 1910) Mary Hill Diaries, Louis W. Hill Papers, James J. Hill Reference Library; and (May 21 and July 14, 1918) Mary Hill Diaries, James J. Hill Family Papers, Minnesota Historical Society.