



A Branch of the

Woodruff Stock

A BRANCH

OF THE

WOODRUFF STOCK

PART II.

From July 31, 1903, Part II will be on sale at the New Jersey Historical Society's Library, West Park St., Newark, N. J.; for the benefit of the Society's book-fund. The price of Parts I and II, together, is One Dollar. Holders of part I, on applying at the Library, can obtain a copy of Part II without charge until the edition is exhausted.

MORRISTOWN, N. J.
PRINTED AT "THE JERSEYMAN" OFFICE
1903

A BRANCH
OF THE
WOODRUFF STOCK

PART II.

COMPILED BY

FRANCIS E. WOODRUFF, B. A. (Yale, 1864)

Life Member of the New Jersey Historical Society; New York
Historical Society; and Washington Association of New Jersey

MORRISTOWN, N. J.
PRINTED AT "THE JERSEYMAN" OFFICE
1903

1992

X

4.2³

YIARU BIT
200000 70

SKETCHES

PART I.

- I. Mr. John Gosmer.
- II. John Woodruff, The Immigrant.
- III. The Two Sons John.

PART II.

- IV. Westfield Woodruffs.

PART III.

- V. (To follow).

NOTES

Notes are numbered consecutively, and are referred to by their number instead of being repeated, throughout the three papers.

ABBREVIATIONS

Howell. The Early History of Southampton, L. I.

By George Rogers Howell, M. A. (Yale), *2d Ed*

S. T. R. Records of the Town of Southampton (printed..)

S. T. R. W. S. P. *Same*, Mr. William S. Pelletreau,
Introduction.

S. T. R. Orig. *Same*, Original records at Southampton.

E. L. I. W. Early Long Island Wills of Suffolk County:
1691-1703, with notes by Wm. S. Pellet-
reau, A. M.

Hatfield. History of Elizabeth, New Jersey.

By Rev. Edwin F. Hatfield, D.D.

T. Trenton.

Inscriptions. Inscriptions on Tombstones and Monu-
ments in the Burying Grounds of The
First Presbyterian Church and St. John's
Church at Elizabeth, New Jersey, 1664-
1892.

Map drawn by Mr. O. L. P. Meyer (Elizabeth, N. J.) from Sheet No. 6 of the Topographic Atlas of New Jersey, and an unpublished chart of the 1699-1700 Division prepared by the late Mr. Ernest L. Meyer.

Roselle (on the Map) is just west of Elizabeth, Westfield just east of Plainfield.

IV. WESTFIELD WOODRUFFS



WESTFIELD WOODRUFFS

A Joseph Woodruff (1676-1742) lies buried at Westfield, New Jersey, whose existence in his own right has not been recognized by modern historians. These have merged the scanty records of his life in that of his Elizabeth Town cousin Joseph (1674-1746), or sometimes in that cousin's son Joseph; but their error has been the more excusable because the cousins were only two years apart in date of birth, and because not only they but their fathers bore the same given names as well as surname. The Etown father, John Woodruff (1637-91), was the elder son of the Immigrant, John Woodruff (1604-70), while the Westfield Joseph's father was the younger son and brother, John Woodruff (1650-1703), of Southampton, Long Island; from which town our Joseph emigrated to New Jersey.⁸⁸

His Westfield tombstone tells us that he departed this life February the 2nd, Anno Domini 1741-2, in the 65th year of his age; so he was born in 1676 or 1677. While living at Southampton, and some seventeen or eighteen years old, he was quite possibly one of the two "schollers" for whom in 1694 his father subscribed "att twelve shillings In cash per scholler for the Terme of Six Months," they to be taught "In the hours following viz, from Eight to Eleven a Clocke In the forenoone, and from one to five of the clocke In ye afternoone";⁸⁹ but nothing is cer-

⁸⁸ See end.

⁸⁹ S T R II p. 360.

tainly known excepting that he was included as the second son of John Woodruff in the 1698 list of the inhabitants of Southampton, and that his father's will, signed on the "14 day of January Anno Dom 1700 alias 1701", treated him as one who had already gone from home. There were good reasons why the second son should have sought a career elsewhere. His father although a wealthy land-owner was because of extortionate taxation land-poor, and there were five brothers and four sisters to be provided for: while there were influential relatives in New Jersey, where in 1699 there was to be a distribution of rich lands; and his cousin Robert Woolley of Southampton was also to become an Etown Associate and draw a Westfield lot.⁹⁰ So Joseph transferred the history of our line from Long Island to New Jersey.

Because in 1664 the shifty Duke of York conveyed the territory now known as New Jersey to Lord Berkeley and Sir George Carteret while his oversea agent, Gov. Nicholls, was under the Duke's authority confirming the Indian deeds of the Etown Associates, there came the century of contest between the "Proprietors" of East Jersey (as successors of Carteret) and the "Associates"; in which all on both sides could feel they had been wronged. For many years neither side thrust home, but in 1693 the Proprietors, in the name of James Fullerton, brought an action of Trespass and Ejectment against one Jeffry Jones because of his refusal to take out a patent from them for his lands (his, under Nicholl's grant) and to pay them "Quit Rents", Judgment (on a "special" verdict) by the Court having been rendered against him (and against the "general" verdict of the jury) he appealed to King William in Coun-

⁹⁰ Part I, p. 24: Howell, p. 408: Hatfield, p. 277.

cil; by whom on Feb'y 25, 1696-97, the judgment was set aside and so Gov. Nicholl's grant confirmed.⁹¹

Encouraged in this and other ways the Associates decided to distribute hitherto undivided lands and by March 1700, the task had been completed. The pioneers found their way (see Map) by blazed trails across Crane's ford (now Cranford) to Westfield,⁹² which was long the extreme border of civilization. For the region that now in many parts has almost the "finish" of the old countries was then a wilderness, that in 1665 had sold ten acres for a penny, with a soil generally of stiff clay or gravelly loam for the wooden plows and harrows to grapple with, and with much heavy timber to clear away. Wolves compelled a bounty of thirty shillings: and there were many battles to be fought with the Indians, who only ceased to trouble when in the middle of the century the French war drew them away never to return in considerable numbers. So like other colonists the settlers long took their muskets to church with them.⁹³ The "homestead plantation", ————— the 100 acre lot No. 148,⁹⁴ ————— of which Joseph Woodruff took possession in 1700, lay "a Cros Raway River" at a great bend a mile down-stream from Cranford, and some three miles south-east of the modern town of Westfield. To-day, looking at the amphitheatre from the old Raritan Road that leads through the bend south-westerly, or from the new north-and-south Walnut Avenue that crosses the old road, one sees broad, almost level fields of green — with here and there hedgerows, and

⁹¹ Hatfield, pp. 80, 241, 242.

⁹² "Westfields," the rich fields west of Etown, (County Histories of Clayton and Ricord.)

⁹³ See end.

⁹⁴ See end.

orchards, and farmhouses half hidden in their shade trees — sloping gently towards the dark background of woods that fringes and marks the semi-circular course of the river. At the south-west the tall smokestacks of the American Felt Mills show over the woods against the sky. Even now a pastoral scene very pleasant to the eye, in its wilder beauty it must have been a home to love that by 1714 Joseph had wrested from the wilderness for his wife Hannah and their growing family.

In Joseph's will the eldest son named (John) was not born until 1704, but as the daughter Abigail (Gold) was among the five children already provided for she may have been the first born, or in the beginning of the settlement deaths may have left no record. Certainly, because in 1699 Joseph would have been some twenty-three years of age and his wife Hannah perhaps sixteen, it would be expected that they came together to New Jersey: and there was an abundant choice at Southampton of maidens of her given name.⁹⁵ Practically, however, nothing is known about the wife and mother excepting that there were ten sons and three daughters to mourn when but a few months after her comrade's death she followed to a grave beside him.

Hannah ye Wife of
Joseph Woodruff
Died August the 14th
Anno Domini 1742
In ye 58th Year of her
Age.

Their married life had been one long anxiety. Barely

⁹⁵ In the 1698 List (Howell p. 34) there were some 34 unmarried (besides married) of the variously spelled name of "Hannah" in a total number of 350 women.

had they safely passed the hardships and dangers of the first days of the new settlement when they were plunged into the forefront of the battle between the Proprietors and the Associates, defending their home in the historic Vaughan Ejectment Suit.

In 1686 James Emott received from the Proprietors a patent for 100 acres each of arable, pasture and woodland. It was claimed that at the time he had work done on the land, but no record has been found that between the 1690-1700 division and his death in April, 1713, he ever disputed Joseph's undisturbed possession of the home his labor was carving out of the wilderness. James Emott left his claim to his widow, a step-daughter of Gov. Carteret and later of Col. Townley. The widow on July 1, 1714, was married to the Rev. Edward Vaughan; and in that year's November term of the Supreme Court the husband brought the action of ejectment. Extracts from the Etown Bill in Chancery (page 46) of 1745 and the Answer (page 122) of the Associates state the two sides of the question with sufficient clearness.

THE PROPRIETORS. " And your Orators do further
 " show unto your Excellency (the Governor) That in
 " the Supreme Court of New Jersey in the Term of
 " November in the first Year of King George the First
 " (1714) an Action of Ejectment was brought on the
 " demise of Edward Vaughan, as Assignee of James
 " Emott, for recovery of the possession of that 300 acres
 " of land which had been granted by the Proprietors to
 " James Emott, by Patent, dated the 6th day of April,
 " 1686, * * *; and of which tract (elsewhere, of a
 " part of which tract) one Joseph Woodruff had pos-
 " sessed himself under colour of the Clinker Lot Right

“ (1699–1700 division) aforesaid; which came to trial in
 “ the Terme of May, in the second year of King George
 “ the First (1715) and therein a special verdict was
 “ found setting forth the Title of the Proprietors of East
 “ Jersey on the part of the Plaintiff, and the said Indian
 “ purchase by (the Associates) Bailey and others, and
 “ Nicholl’s Grant, on the part of the Defendant; which
 “ special verdict was for sundry terms argued by Coun-
 “ cil learned in the law on both sides, and afterwards
 “ upon mature deliberation thereon had, the said Su-
 “ preme Court gave judgment for the Plaintiff, to wit,
 “ in the term of May in the fourth year of King George
 “ the First (1718); which judgement still remains in
 “ Force unreversed, tho’ a Writ of Error was brought
 “ thereon before the Governor and Council.”

THE ASSOCIATES. “ In particular that when Joseph
 “ Woodruff, one of Your Majesty’s petitioners’ ancestors,
 “ ‘96 by Writ of Error, brought his Cause before the
 “ Governor and Council of this Province in the fourth
 “ year of Your Majesty’s late Royal Father (1718), in
 “ order to obtain a Judgment thence and from thence,
 “ if Judgment were given against him, he intended to
 “ have appealed to his said Majesty then King of Great
 “ Britain * * * in Council, the said Governor and
 “ Council would never be prevailed upon to give a Judg-
 “ ment in the said Cause, but after ten or twelve years
 “ delay and a vast Expense in the Cause, the said Cause
 “ dropt without being decided.”

⁹⁶ The Woodruffs who signed the “Answer” were Samuel; Samuel, Jr.; Thomas; Thomas, Jr.; Cooper; Abner; Robert; Nathaniel; Jacob; Daniel; Abraham; John; John 5th; Joseph; Hezekiah; Jonathan; David; Isaac; Ezekiel; Tim. Jr.; Isaac Jr.; Jeremiah. Of these Thomas and Hezekiah certainly, and several of the others probably, were children and descendants of Joseph of Westfield.

It is evident that in face of King William's adverse decision in 1697 (page 49), and of Joseph's stern determination to appeal to England rather than submit to injustice, there was a grave dilemma confronting the Governor and Council. Should they decide for Joseph it would be a fatal blow to the entire claim of the Proprietors; if they decided against him it could only stave off that evil a little time and then bring from England both the fatal blow and the humiliation for themselves of a second adverse decision. So they naturally welcomed delay.

In 1719, they ordered a transcript of the Supreme Court record, and the filing of errors by the defendant. Two years later more time was granted to the defendant. After another two years, on the motion of the defendant, the transcript was returned to the Supreme Court "to be examined and amended." Still another twelvemonth and the amended record was "brought up" by Chief Justice Trent;⁹⁷ but the defendant consented to one more year's postponement. At last, in 1725, a "re-hearing in this Cause" was ordered, and on August 19th the "Cause" made its final appearance before the Governor and Council; but after all the long delay with only this meagre and inconclusive outcome :—

"Councill was re-heard on both sides in this Cause."

"Curia advisare vult."

And the Court kept on deliberating to the end; if it could be called an end that was never finished.⁹⁸ Already, in 1720, to guard against renewed attacks by the Proprietors the associates had appointed a Committee of

⁹⁷ In October, 1902, this record had apparently not yet been returned to the Supreme Court.

⁹⁸ N. J. Archives, Vol. XIV : pp. 93, 112, 194, 199, 243, 273, 275, 288, 299.

Seven.⁹⁹ After 1725 there was further litigation by the Proprietors. The Associates sold lands to provide funds for defense. They petitioned the King. The above-quoted Bill in Chancery and its Answer followed. Then came the Revolution, and the issue dropped out of sight. "Such "was the end of this famous struggle, continued for a "whole century, and resulting in the vindication of the "original purchasers of the soil, and the defeat of their "opponents."¹⁰⁰

For Joseph and Hannah, however, the sword of uncertainty hung suspended until their deaths. It was on January 15th, 1742, that "Joseph Woodruff, Jr., of the Bur- "rough of Elizabeth",¹⁰¹ "Being sickly and weakly "in Body," made his will;¹⁰² and on Feb'y 2d he died. His executors were his wife Hannah, friend William Miller¹⁰³ and son Thomas. To his "Dearly Be- "loved Wife" he bequeathed the "Best Room in my now " (or 'new,' text obscure) Dwelling House"; one-third of the "Improvement" (apparently, income, usufruct) of all his lands; one-third of his "Moveable Estate" (personal property) and any overplus of the latter after all charges had been met. To the heirs who had already received their portions, viz: John, Jonathan, William, Samuel and Abigail (Gold), he gave five shillings each, to be paid out of his "Moveable Estate." Between Thomas and Hezekiah he divided "all my Homestead plantation which I "now live on Situate, Lying and Being adjoining to the

⁹⁹ The Joseph Woodruff placed on it in 1729 (Hatfield, p. 311) was probably, from his connections with the still unfinished Vaughan Ejectment Suit, the Joseph of Westfield, and not the cousin of Etown.

¹⁰⁰ Hatfield : pp. 307, 318, 364, 372.

¹⁰¹ Westfield was not set off from Etown as a township until 1794.

¹⁰² Trenton : C. : 475.

¹⁰³ Hatfield : p. 206.

“ west side of the Rahaway River,” and “ Two pieices or
“ parcels of Salt Marsh or Meadow Lying and being at
“ the Bottom of Tremby’s Neck ”.¹⁰⁴ To Joseph he
gave the “ House and Land ” bought from Daniel Tal-
mage, December 11th, 1741. To Nathaniel he gave the
“ House and Plantation bought of Joseph Bird, lately de-
“ ceased.” To Isaac he gave “ my piece of Salt Meadow
“ Lying and Being by Murthes Creek ”;¹⁰⁵ and
Nathaniel was to pay him thirty pounds. To Benjamin
he gave “ my Negro Boy named Lewey ”; and forty
pounds to be paid him (by Thomas and Hezekiah) when
“ he shall arrive at the age of 16 years old.” To each of
his daughters Sarah and Joanna Woodruff he gave sixteen
pounds. Surely, he had well provided for his goodly fam-
ily! Forced from his boyhood’s home by extortionate tax-
ation, into a struggle with the hardships and dangers of a
wilderness, then to be harassed by the long, anxious con-
test in defence of his home, that he so overcame the ob-
stacles to success and died more than ordinarily prosperous
for his day plainly shows that Jonathan’s¹⁰⁶ “ honored
“ father Joseph ” was a brave, strong man.¹⁰⁷

Hezekiah Woodruff was worse off in the matter of rec-
ords even than his father Joseph. At the time of his birth
in 1724 Westfield had begun to have a community life of
its own apart from Elizabeth, yet has left no annals of
that period. A good authority has stated that a young

104 Near the mouth of Rahway River. The modern spelling is per-
haps Tremley; and see Tremby in Hatfield pp. 267, 509. Until quite
recently the inland farmers made annual pilgrimages to the salt mead-
ows by the sea to increase their store of hay.

105 Said to be the modern Morse’s Creek, emptying into the Kills
near Bayway and Elizabeth.

106 Will, Trenton, Liber 18, Folio 645.

107 See the end.

man who had sinned burned the earlier church records to destroy the minutes of his trial and conviction; and, at least, although the church was organized in 1727 its records date back only to 1759, while the town records do not begin until 1794 when Westfield was set off as a township. Up to 1759, therefore, our chief sources of local information are wills and tombstones.

From the latter we learn that Hezekiah died October 22nd, 1776, in his 52d year; and Mary, his wife, on July 21st, 1772, in the 44th year of her age. In his will (T.—20: 37), dated October 25, 1776,¹⁰⁸ Hezekiah named as an executor his "Loving Father John "Stites" (1706-1782); whose will (T. 23: 436, dated Feb. 13th, 1781) named as daughter "Mary Woodruff, "deceased"; while the will (T. 35: 512, dated June 28th, 1796) of John's Son, Dr. Hezekiah Stites, named as nephew, Dr. Hezekiah Stites Woodruff (1754-1842), who was one of the sons of Hezekiah and Mary Woodruff. As Hezekiah Woodruff's own father was unquestionably Joseph Woodruff; as his mother died too soon after his father's death to have given him a step-father; and as in early records "father" often stood for "father-in-law" ², there can be no doubt that, in accordance with our family traditions, Hezekiah's wife Mary was a daughter of John Stites.

The Hon. John Stites, ancestor of many honored citizens of New Jersey, was born at Hempstead, L. I., in 1706, and died at Springfield, New Jersey, April 21st, 1782. He was a Chosen Freeholder and Justice of Etown, and a Deputy in the Provincial Congress of New Jersey in

¹⁰⁸ The will is dated October 25th, three days later than the date of death on the tombstone, presumably through some error of carelessness.

1775. As his tombstone at Springfield tells us, he "lived "beloved and died lamented by Church and State".¹⁰⁹

No other trace of Hezekiah's life has been found up to the date of his will. Disabled by the death of his wife in July, 1772; at least at the end, "Sick and weak of body"; and dying at the very beginning of the Revolutionary War, he may not have been able to do more than sympathize with the known ardent patriotism of his brothers and his sons; but it is quite as likely that our ignorance of his share is due to lack of records. From what is known of his circumstances it is certain that he was well-born, well-married, well-off, and a respected citizen; to judge from his sons, he may have been very much more.

In his will, after a special gift of a team of horses, a yoke of oxen, &c., &c., to his son Richard, he bequeathed his property in trust to his executors, John Stites and Abner Corey, for the support until sold of his family; the net proceeds to then be "put at intrust" for five years for the same purpose. At the end of the period Hezekiah Stites Woodruff was to receive 50 pounds; Hannah (Winants) 5 pounds; the two children of Abigail (Pack, Paiks or Parks—records obscure) 5 pounds equally divided; Margaret, Mary and Sarah 30 pounds each. The "Remaining part" of his estate was to be equally divided between his "five sons," Hezekiah Stites, Richard, Hiram, Benjamin and John.¹¹⁰ This provision of a

¹⁰⁹ Hatfield; Littell's Passaic Valley; Clayton's Hist of Union County.

¹¹⁰ Of our ancestor, DR. HEZEKIAH STITES WOODRUFF, a sketch is to be given in Part III. For RICHARD, letters of administration (24: 22) were granted August 1st, 1780. In her will (T. 33: 361) of 1793, MARY names her nieces Mary Woodruff Winans, daughter of her brother-in-law Samuel Winans, and Mary Allwood, daughter of Thomas Allwood, dec'd. For all the children, search would doubtless be rewarded with much information.

“trust,” not being common in that day, was possibly made necessary by the Revolution’s disturbance of existing conditions. As will be shown in Part III, it was apparently from the same cause that our great-grandfather sold his share of the Westfield lands, and so severed us from our first New Jersey home; near which, however, many cousins still well maintain the family name.

In the later deeds conveying our ancestors’ lands a boundary mark quite often named is “Tooker’s (Tucker’s) “lane” which (now closed) used to be the way from the Raritan Road, near where it is crossed by the modern Walnut Avenue, to the late John Tucker’s attractive old residence (occupied in 1902 by Mr. Joseph Holland) on the bank of the Rahway. This is said to have been built as a home, and school, by Jean Gabriel and Marie de Vermont Touchembert, formerly of the island of Guadaloupe, who in 1794 bought the land from Jacob Winans, who had in 1884 bought it from Dr. Hezekiah Stites Woodruff ⁹⁴. A short distance to the eastward of this house (see mark in No. 148 on Map), on the land of Mr. and Mrs. Marx Riefel ⁶⁴, there are still traces of the foundations (and well) of a good-sized dwelling-house, that from a knoll looked over the high bank with its fringe of trees across the river to the wooded shore beyond. After John Tucker bought the property from the Touchemberts in 1802 this older building was no longer used as a dwelling, but it was still standing in the lifetime of the present neighbors; a house built of stone for the ground story, and above of oak. From the situation and the circumstances there need be no doubt that it was the home of our ancestor Hezekiah (died 1776), even if not the “now dwelling” of his father Joseph (died 1742); so is an ad-

ditional inducement to their descendants to visit the old
“homestead plantation.”



NOTES.

N. B. Notes are numbered consecutively, and are referred to by their number instead of being repeated, throughout the papers.

88. See Part I.; and Proceedings, Vol. II, No. 2, (May 1900), page 115. In his will John Woodruff (1637-1691), first of Etown, named only one son Joseph. There is abundant evidence (See Hartfield, Index: e. g. page 336) that this son was the Joseph (1674-1746) buried in the Presbyterian graveyard at Etown (Inscriptions, No. 1894); so he of 1676-1742-i. e. born only two years later,—could not have also been that John's son. Nor could a Joseph born 1676 have been his grandson, because his eldest son (John, of course) was not born until 1665-66. In West Jersey there was a contemporary,—a Thomas Woodruff of Fenwick's Colony, who also had a son named Joseph of apparently much the same age as the two East Jersey namesakes: but that Joseph is on record (N. J. Archives Vol. XXI, pp. 617, 629, 632) as a resident of Salem Town, not Westfield. In brief, no New Jersey Woodruff of the period has been found who could have been either the father or the grandfather of our Joseph Woodruff, Jr.; as he was called, doubtless to distinguish him from his only slightly senior Etown cousin. Who then was Joseph Woodruff of Westfield?

In the "List of ye Inhabitants of Southampton, old and young, Christians and Hethen freemen and servants, white and black, Anno 1698" (Howell, p. 34) the family of Etown John Woodruff's younger brother John includes a "Joseph" as the second son. The father in his will (E. L. I., p. 261), signed January 14th, 1701, bequeathed unto his son "Joseph Woodruffe ye sum of twenty pounds current money of sd Province," and also willed that if either of his sons Nathaniel or Isaac "shall depart this life before they come to ye age of twenty-one years then my will is that my son Jonathan Woodruffe shall have his part deceased to him and his heirs forever and if all my sd three sons namely Nathaniel, Isaac and Jonathan shall depart this life without heirs then my will is yt ye aforesd three parcels of land given to them as above be equally divided between my two sons before mentioned namely Joseph and Benjamin and their heirs forever."

Jonathan, who as above was to receive (besides twenty pounds when he came of age) only a reversionary interest in his father's lands, was the youngest son, perhaps sixteen years old. As no later mention of him has been found on record he may have been in ill health, or there may have been some other reason why he too was made an exception; but, when every one of the other brothers was left a portion of the father's only too abundant lands, that the second son (Joseph) then over 21, should have been left (besides twenty pounds) only a reversion of the reversionary interests of younger brothers is strong evidence that he had already received his portion and gone to a far country. That after diligent search

no trace of Joseph later than the date of the will has been found in Southampton or Suffolk County further strengthens the probability.

In addition it should be noted that the final "e" of our surname Woodreeve (14) was retained in Kent down to our emigration in 1639-40. John (1650-1703) of Southampton so retained it in the will above for both himself and his children, including Joseph; and the Westfield defendant was "Joseph Woodruffe" (N. J. Archives, Vol. XIV., p. 93). Whereas John (1637-91) of Etown signed his original will (Trenton: Old Essex Wills) "John Woodruff," and his son Joseph also signed without the "e" (Hatfield; pp. 247; 284. On p. 312 where both cousins sign there is a "Joseph Woodroff" and a "Joseph Woodruffe"). This later retention (at least until 1719 though afterwards dropped) of the "e" by the Westfield Joseph points to New Jersey as the "far country." We know that in the 1699 (for some unknown reason called "Clinker Lot") division many of the settlers of Westfield came from Southampton (Hatfield, p. 251); that a "Joseph Woodruffe" drew a lot (Etown Book B; Hatfield, p. 307): that the Joseph who drew the Westfield lot was beyond question the one (1676-1742) buried at Westfield; and that, without reasonable doubt, he was neither son nor grandson of any Woodruff on record as living at that time in New Jersey, but is needed to account for the Long Island son. Taking it by-and-large, therefore, it is evidently safe to believe that the Joseph Woodruffe of Westfield was the Joseph Woodruffe of Southampton.

93 See County Histories. The "church" was at Etown or Woodbridge until in 1727 Westfield organized one of its own; the first building, however, a log house, not being erected until 1730 (Clayton). While there are no church records extant for the period concerned that might give evidence there is reason to believe that our Joseph Woodruff was an Elder at both Woodbridge and Westfield (where his eldest son John was a Deacon). Dr. Hatfield, p. 358, explicitly referring to the Joseph Woodruff who was the defendant in the Vaughan Ejectment Suit (unquestionably the Joseph of Westfield) states that he was an Elder, but confuses him with his cousin Joseph of Etown who was also an Elder (of the Etown church); just as on p. 582 he made the Joseph of "ten sons" (unmistakably our Joseph, Jr.) a son of that cousin. Similarly in his Historical Discourse, the Rev. James Hunting (on whom Dr. Hatfield doubtless relied), evidently not aware that there ever was a Westfield Joseph, names as first of their surname at Westfield Joseph's sons John (1704-68) and Jonathan (1707-77), both buried near their father.

One now visiting the well-kept graveyard at Westfield cannot but feel surprised that Mr. Hunting could have failed to see the tombstone of Joseph quite near the front gate; but the surprise vanishes on reading Ricord's statement that by 1865 the old cemetery had become choked by young trees, weeds, vines and berry bushes, so that in Mr. Hunting's time it was doubtless practically impossible to obtain information from the tombstones.

94 Map. Etown Book B. Dr. Hatfield, p. 307, states that Lot No. 148 was drawn by Joseph Woodruff; and some 40 acres of the Lot No. 148

on the late Mr. Meyer's very valuable chart (not yet published) have been traced to Joseph (as doubtless if time were taken all could be) from the present (1902) occupants, Mr. and Mrs. Marx Riefel, through deeds and wills as follows:—

1864. Riefel from Stoddard; Etown; 15; 269.

1859. Stoddard from Miller; Etown; 5; 205.

1859. Miller from Clark et als; Etown; 4; 237.

(Clark et als, heirs of Joseph Tooker (Tucker) heir of John Tooker, who died intestate in 1834; see Supreme Court Report of Oct. 29, 1834. Trenton, Book of Partitions, p. 281).

1802. Tooker from Touchembert, Newark F: 409.

1794. Touchembert from Winans, Newark BB: 125.

1784. Winans from Woodruff, Newark F: 339.

The wills (both at Trenton) are:—

1776. Hezekiah Stites Woodruff through Hezekiah Woodruff's will, 20: 37.

1742. Hezekiah Woodruff through Joseph Woodruff's will, C: 475.

Etown Book B. (soon to be published it may be hoped), however, gives Joseph's lot as No. 149 instead of No. 148; but as its No. 148 mentions Joseph Woodruff's No. 149 as next northeast, and does not mention the Rahway river, the unique descriptive item in its No. 149 "East 40 chane a Cros Raway River", in substantial agreement with Joseph's will, shows conclusively that the lot named as 149 in Book B is the lot marked 148 on Mr. Meyer's chart. Very likely as in other cases the Nos. of the lots were changed.

Further, James Emmott's Lot No. 25, "300 on Raway River," in the proprietors' sketch map attached to the Etown Bill, roughly corresponds to the above.

107 Most of the information here given about the children has been come upon incidentally, but may help in their researches those more closely interested. An asterisk denotes burial in the Westfield graveyard. All wills referred to without special mention are on record at Trenton.

The eldest son (by his tombstone a Deacon) JOHN WOODRUFF* was born in 1704 and died in Sept. 1768. He lived where Mr. Sylvanus Pierson was living in 1839 (Hunting). His will, I: 341, names wife, Elinor, and children John, Moses, and Cornelius. JONATHAN,* (1707-July, 1777), married first Jennet,* (1707-50); and second Prudence* (1709-81). His will, 18-645, names wife Prudence*; children Noah, Aaron, Daniel, Mary (Scudder), Anne (Badgeley). In 1750 he was living a mile north of the Westfield church at the four corners on the mountain road. (County History). Of WILLIAM, no record has been found. SAMUEL* (1710-54) in his will F, 208, names wife Elizabeth and daughters (both under 20) Abigail and Rachel. He may have had a first wife Abigail, 1712-48. ISAAC, married first Mary* (1716-Dec. 16. 1760). By the Westfield church records (see end of note) an Isaac Woodruff, on Nov. 19, 1761, married Mary Little; and on No. 12, 1766, an Isaac Woodruff married Abigail Stites. Littell in his "Passaic Valley," p. 407, &c., states that Abigail daughter of John Stites (1706-82) married

Isaac Woodruff, Esquire, of Etown; while the will (23 : 436-40) of John Stites names daughters Mary Woodruff (wife of Isaac's brother Hezekiah) and Abigail Woodruff. The only land bequeathed Isaac by his father Joseph was a piece of salt meadow near Etown, and the name "Isaac" has not been chanced on in this generation of his Etown cousins. An Isaac Woodruff, of suitable dates (1721-Oct. 17, 1803) and a wife Sarah (1727-1799) are buried (Inscriptions, Nos. 1892, 1893) in the Etown Presbyterian Church yard; and there is a will, proved December, 1803. There is thus a possibility that the Isaac of Westfield became the Isaac of Etown mentioned in Hatfield (see Index) as a prominent citizen and patriot. He was a member of the Essex County Revolutionary Committee of Correspondence, and one of the Commissioners for the purchase of arms and camp equipage. Of BENJAMIN nothing certain has been ascertained. There is a will (29 : 533), proved Nov. 27th, 1756, of a Benjamin Woodruff of Franklin in Bergen; whose wife was Jane, and children Benjamin, Joseph, Joshua, Daniel, Elizabeth and Moses. THOMAS* (1722-April 2, 1804) married first Mary* (1714-53,) and second, on January 31, 1763, Rebekah* (1733-1813), by the church records Rebecca Merry. He was a Judge of Common Pleas (Newark Deeds, F. : 339). On December 6, 1774, he was appointed a member of the Essex County Committee of Correspondence, or Observation (Clayton, p. 64; Hatfield, p. 412), and he was otherwise prominent as a patriot.

By the evidence of his father's will, Thomas, Hezekiah, Nathaniel and Joseph were without "Lawfull Issue" on Jan. 15, 1742. Of HEZEKIAH*, our ancestor, what little is known is told in the text. Of the two others, and of their sisters, nothing has been learned. Of them and of all doubtless much could be gleaned from the Trenton, County seats, and Westfield records, including tombstones.

N. B. The references to the Westfield church records have been made through the courtesy of Mrs. Henry C. Cooke (H. R. C.) of Westfield; who will it is hoped consent to the publication of her copy of the Woodruff marriages (1759-1803) in the Appendix to the coming Part III.

