



UNIVERSITY
OF PITTSBURGH



LIBRARY

PAPERS

OF THE

NEW HAVEN COLONY

HISTORICAL SOCIETY

VOL. VIII



NEW HAVEN:
PRINTED FOR THE SOCIETY

1914

Contents

	PAGE
Prefatory Note	iv
List of Officers	v
Committees	vi
List of Members	vii
PAPERS:	
I. Connecticut in Pennsylvania; by SIMEON E. BALDWIN	1
II. An Almost-Forgotten New Haven Institution; by CHARLES RAY PALMER	20
III. Eli Whitney Blake: Scientist and Inventor; by HENRY T. BLAKE	36
IV. Rev. William Hooke, 1601-1678; by CHARLES RAY PALMER	56
V. The Seal of Connecticut; by SIMEON E. BALDWIN	82
VI. The Battle of Lake George (Sept. 8, 1755), and the Men who Won it; by HENRY T. BLAKE	109
VII. An Old New Haven Engraver and his Work: Amos Doolittle; by WILLIAM A. BEARDSLEY	132
VIII. The Congregationalist Separates of the Eighteenth Century in Connecticut; by EDWIN P. PARKER	151
IX. Robert Treat: Founder, Farmer, Soldier and Statesman; by GEORGE H. FORD	162
X. Early Silver of Connecticut and its Makers; by GEORGE M. CURTIS	181
XI. "The Microscope" and James Gates Percival; by JAMES KINGSLEY BLAKE	215
XII. The Fundamental Orders and the Charter; by SAMUEL HART	238
XIII. British Prisoners-of-War in Hartford during the Revolution; by HERBERT H. WHITE	255
XIV. The Fenians of the Long-ago Sixties; by LAURENCE O'BRIEN	277
XV. Thomas Green; by ALBERT C. BATES	289
XVI. The Old New Haven Bank; by THEODORE S. WOOLSEY	310
XVII. The New Haven of Two Hundred Years Ago; by FRANKLIN B. DEXTER	329
Inscriptions on Tombstones in New Haven prior to 1800; edited by FRANKLIN B. DEXTER	351
Index	357

8/26/48

Prefatory Note

The New Haven Colony Historical Society has published eight volumes of its papers; Vol. I, in 1865; Vol. II, in 1877; Vol. III, in 1882; Vol. IV, in 1888; Vol. V, in 1894; Vol. VI, in 1900; Vol. VII, in 1908; and Vol. VIII, in 1914.

The Society does not consider itself committed to the support of the positions taken in any of the papers thus published. For the statements or conclusions of each, the author is alone responsible.

WILLIAM A. BEARDSLEY,
HENRY T. BLAKE,
SIMEON E. BALDWIN,
WILLISTON WALKER,
THEODORE S. WOOLSEY,

} *Publication*
Committee.

Officers of the New Haven Colony Historical Society

1913=1914

President:

WILLIAM A. BEARDSLEY.

First Vice President:

ELI WHITNEY.

Second Vice President:

BURTON MANSFIELD.

Secretary:

HENRY T. BLAKE.

Assistant Secretary:

THOMAS M. PRENTICE.

Treasurer:

GEORGE A. ROOT.

Advisory Committee

(Constituting with the above named a Board of Directors):

ARTHUR T. HADLEY, President of Yale University, *ex-officio*.

FRANK J. RICE, Mayor of the City of New Haven, *ex-officio*.

FREDERICK E. WHITTAKER, Town Clerk of New Haven, *ex-officio*.

Honorary Directors in Permanency

(With power of voting in Board of Directors)

ARTHUR M. WHEELER,

GEORGE B. ADAMS,

HENRY F. ENGLISH,

HENRY L. HOTCHKISS,

WILLISTON WALKER.

Directors for One Year:

THEODORE S. WOOLSEY,

RUTHERFORD TROWBRIDGE,

CHARLES R. PALMER,

HENRY H. TOWNSEND,

F. WELLS WILLIAMS.

Directors for Two Years:

EDWARD E. BRADLEY,

BENJAMIN R. ENGLISH,

EDWARD A. BOWERS,

GEORGE D. WATROUS,

FRANCIS B. TROWBRIDGE.

Directors for Three Years:

SIMEON E. BALDWIN,

WILLIAM S. PARDEE,

LIVINGSTON W. CLEAVELAND,

LEONARD M. DAGGETT,

TALCOTT H. RUSSELL.

Librarian and Curator:

FREDERICK BOSTWICK.

Colonial Hall, the building of the Society, is open to the public daily, except holidays, from 9.30 A. M. to 12.30 P. M., and from 2 P. M. to 5 P. M.; in the winter months closed at 4 P. M.

Telephone: 1700.

Standing Committees for 1913=1914

Executive Committee:

THE PRESIDENT,
THE SECRETARY,
EDWARD E. BRADLEY,
HENRY F. ENGLISH,
BURTON MANSFIELD.

Finance Committee:

BENJAMIN R. ENGLISH,
RUTHERFORD TROWBRIDGE,
ELI WHITNEY.

House Committee:

EDWARD A. BOWERS,
ARTHUR M. WHEELER,
SIMEON E. BALDWIN,
HENRY F. ENGLISH,
LEONARD M. DAGGETT.

Publication Committee:

THE PRESIDENT,
THE SECRETARY,
SIMEON E. BALDWIN,
WILLISTON WALKER,
THEODORE S. WOOLSEY.

Committee on Papers to be Read:

THE PRESIDENT,
THE SECRETARY,
GEORGE D. WATROUS,
ARTHUR M. WHEELER,
F. WELLS WILLIAMS.

Committee on New Members:

HENRY H. TOWNSHEND,
THOMAS M. PRENTICE,
WILSON H. LEE.

Library Committee:

THE PRESIDENT,
FREDERICK BOSTWICK,
EDWARD A. BOWERS,
FRANCIS B. TROWBRIDGE,
WILLIAM S. PARDEE.

Committee on Placing Memorial Tablets:

HENRY T. BLAKE,
SIMEON E. BALDWIN,
TALCOTT H. RUSSELL.

Committee on Relics:

THOMAS M. PRENTICE,
GEORGE B. ADAMS,
LIVINGSTON W. CLEAVELAND,
RUTHERFORD TROWBRIDGE,
FRANCIS B. TROWBRIDGE.

Ladies' Auxiliary Committee:

MISS GERALDINE CARMALT,
MRS. ARNON A. ALLING,
MRS. WILLIAM A. BEARDSLEY,
MISS FANNIE A. BOWERS,
MRS. FREDERICK F. BREWSTER,
MISS MARY B. BRISTOL,
MRS. HENRY CHAMPION,
MRS. HENRY F. ENGLISH,
MRS. JOSEPH M. FLINT,
MRS. H. STUART HOTCHKISS,
MRS. GEORGE HARRISON GRAY,
MRS. BURTON MANSFIELD,
MRS. TALCOTT H. RUSSELL,
MRS. J. B. SARGENT,
MISS MARY E. SCRANTON,
MISS EDITH WALKER,
MRS. ARTHUR M. WHEELER,
MRS. ELI WHITNEY.

Members of the Society

Honorary Members

EPHER WHITAKER, *Southold, N. Y.* SAMUEL HART, *Middletown, Conn.*
WILLIAM C. WINSLOW, *Boston, Mass.* EDWIN S. LINES, *Newark, N. J.*

Corresponding Members

L. VERNON BRIGGS, *Hanover, Mass.*

Life Members

Roger S. Baldwin,	Henry L. Hotchkiss,
Simeon E. Baldwin,	Henry Stuart Hotchkiss,
L. Wheeler Beecher,	Miss Susan V. Hotchkiss,
Hiram Bingham,	Miss Mary S. Johnstone,
Frederick Bostwick,	William S. Pardee,
Miss Fannie A. Bowers,	Edwin Rowe,
Edward E. Bradley,	Charles B. Rowland, <i>Greenwich,</i>
Ericsson F. Bushnell, <i>N. Y. City,</i>	Mrs. Charles B. Rowland, <i>Greenwich,</i>
William H. Carmalt,	Mrs. Joseph B. Sargent,
Franklin B. Dexter,	Joel A. Sperry,
Henry F. English,	Mrs. Elizabeth Pratt Stevens,
Mrs. Henry F. English,	Henry K. Townshend,
Henry W. Farnam,	Rutherford Trowbridge,
Frederick B. Farnsworth,	William R. H. Trowbridge,
Franklin Farrel, Jr., <i>Ansonia,</i>	Mrs. Robert B. Wade,
George H. Ford,	Eli Whitney,
Edwin S. Greeley,	Arthur W. Wright.
Edward A. Harriman,	

Annual Members

Wilbur C. Abbott,	George L. Armstrong,
George B. Adams,	Henry B. Armstrong,
Nelson Adams, <i>Springfield, Mass.,</i>	Ricardo F. Armstrong.
Frederick M. Adler,	Frank G. Atwood,
Max Adler,	Samuel R. Avis,
Mrs. W. F. Alcorn,	Harry L. Babcock,
Arnon A. Alling,	Leonard W. Bacon,
Arthur N. Alling,	Mrs. Henry Baldwin,
David R. Alling,	Amos F. Barnes,
John W. Alling,	Thomas R. Barnum,
Joseph Anderson, <i>Woodmont,</i>	George J. Bassett,
Charles M. Andrews,	Mrs. Samuel A. Bassett.

Vernal W. Bates,
 John K. Beach,
 Miss Elisabeth M. Beardsley,
 William A. Beardsley,
 William Beebe,
 William S. Beecher,
 Mrs. Philo S. Bennett,
 Thomas G. Bennett,
 Miss Emily Betts,
 Frank L. Bigelow,
 Louis B. Bishop,
 Mrs. Timothy H. Bishop,
 Henry T. Blake,
 Charles W. Blakeslee, Jr.,
 Burton L. Blatchley,
 Clarence B. Bolmer,
 Edward A. Bowers,
 Andrew R. Bradley,
 Edward M. Bradley,
 Frederick T. Bradley,
 Mrs. Frederick T. Bradley,
 Miss S. L. Bradley,
 Frederick F. Brewster,
 John W. Bristol,
 Miss Mary B. Bristol,
 Samuel L. Bronson,
 Isaac W. Brooks, *Torrington*,
 Mrs. Robert A. Brown,
 Fred B. Bunnell,
 George F. Burgess,
 Charles E. Burton,
 George R. Burton,
 Winthrop G. Bushnell,
 Timothy E. Byrnes, *Boston, Mass.*,
 Eugene A. Callahan,
 Walter Camp,
 John H. Cannon,
 LeGrand Cannon,
 Lester Card, *Ansonia*,
 Mrs. Henry Champion,
 John N. Champion,
 Edwin L. Chapman,
 Horace F. Chase,
 Minotte E. Chatfield,
 F. Joseph Chatterton,
 Herman D. Clark,
 Livingston W. Cleaveland,

George R. Coan,
 Ward Coe,
 Miss Augusta J. Cooper,
 Miss Harriett J. Cooper,
 Frank Addison Corbin,
 Louis C. Cowles,
 John D. Coyle,
 George M. Curtis, *Meriden*,
 Mrs. T. W. T. Curtis,
 Franklin A. Curtiss,
 David Daggett,
 Leonard M. Daggett,
 Mrs. Leonard M. Daggett,
 Edward S. Dana,
 Clarence B. Dann,
 Harry G. Day,
 Miss Mary E. Day,
 Osborne A. Day,
 Charles S. DeForest,
 Eugene DeForest,
 Samuel C. Deming,
 Robert C. Denison,
 Fred W. Dietter,
 John H. Dillon,
 William H. Douglass,
 Miss Eliza deForest Downer,
 John I. H. Downes,
 Timothy Dwight,
 Mrs. Daniel C. Eaton,
 Benjamin R. English,
 James English,
 Lewis H. English,
 Miss Olivia H. English,
 Alexander W. Evans,
 Henry W. Farnam, Jr.,
 Miss Katherine K. Farnam,
 Miss Louise W. Farnam,
 Thomas W. Farnam,
 William W. Farnam,
 Mrs. William W. Farnam,
 Max Farrand,
 Bruce Fenn,
 Wallace B. Fenn,
 Harry B. Ferris,
 William T. Fields,
 Irving Fisher,
 Samuel H. Fisher,

John B. Fitch,
 Charles J. Foote,
 Ellsworth I. Foote,
 Pierrepont B. Foster,
 John S. Fowler,
 Henry Fresenius,
 Nathaniel L. Garfield,
 George W. F. Gillette,
 Charles E. Graham,
 *Mrs. George M. Grant,
 Frederick D. Grave,
 Arthur C. Graves,
 Mrs. George Harrison Gray,
 Mrs. Mary F. Woods Greist,
 Mrs. Mary T. Gridley,
 Frank W. Guion,
 George M. Gunn, *Milford*,
 William H. Hackett,
 Arthur T. Hadley,
 Miss Elizabeth M. Hall,
 Henry A. L. Hall,
 Edwin Hallock, *Derby*,
 James A. Hamilton,
 Charles S. Hamilton,
 Alfred E. Hammer,
 Adoniram J. Harmount,
 Mrs. Lynde Harrison,
 William F. Hasselbach,
 William T. Hayes,
 James S. Hemingway,
 Samuel Hemingway,
 Nathan W. Hendryx,
 John Henney,
 James Hillhouse,
 Mrs. James Hillhouse,
 Carleton E. Hoadley,
 Mrs. Horace P. Hoadley,
 Clarence R. Hooker,
 Thomas Hooker,
 Hobart L. Hotchkiss,
 Justus S. Hotchkiss,
 Philip Hugo,
 William H. Hull,
 F. Thornton Hunt,
 Samuel W. Hurlburt,
 Mrs. Charles L. Ives,
 Hobart B. Ives,

L. Erwin Jacobs,
 Allen Johnson,
 Joseph C. Johnson,
 Moses Joy,
 John B. Judson,
 John C. Kebabian,
 Andrew Keogh,
 Frederick J. Kingsbury,
 Mrs. William L. Kingsley,
 Cornelius L. Kitchel,
 Isaac L. Kleiner,
 H. M. Kochersperger,
 George T. Ladd,
 Lyman M. Law,
 Wilson H. Lee,
 George W. Lewis,
 C. Purdy Lindsley,
 H. Wales Lines, *Meriden*,
 Harry K. Lines,
 Samuel Lloyd,
 Edwin H. Lockwood,
 Seymour C. Loomis,
 Walter E. Malley,
 Burton Mansfield,
 Mrs. Burton Mansfield,
 Edward F. Mansfield,
 Louis A. Mansfield,
 Stanley Mansfield,
 John T. Manson,
 Mrs. John T. Manson,
 Mrs. George A. Mathews,
 A. McClellan Mathewson,
 Charles B. Matthewman,
 Charles M. Matthews,
 Oscar E. Maurer,
 John P. McCusker,
 James E. McGann,
 Virgil F. McNeil,
 Thomas F. Meagher,
 Adolph Mendel,
 Charles S. Mellen,
 Eli Mix,
 Phelps Montgomery,
 James T. Moran,
 Samuel C. Morehouse,
 Elliott H. Morse,
 James A. Munro,

Charles H. Nettleton,
 *Henry G. Newton,
 Laurence O'Brien,
 Norris G. Osborn,
 Arthur D. Osborne,
 Lewis Osterweis,
 Samuel K. Page,
 George L. Paine,
 A. Oswald Pallman,
 Theodore D. Pallman,
 Charles Ray Palmer,
 Frank W. Pardee,
 Henry F. Parmelee,
 George Leete Peck,
 George W. Peck.
 Henry H. Peck, *Waterbury*,
 Milo L. Peck,
 Cyrus Berry Peets,
 William Lyon Phelps,
 Andrew W. Phillips,
 Miss Lina M. Phipps,
 Edwin S. Pickett,
 James P. Pigott,
 Mrs. Amy B. Porter,
 I. Napoleon Porter,
 Miss Martha Day Porter,
 Thomas M. Prentice,
 Miss Lillian E. Prudden,
 Horatio G. Redfield,
 Mrs. Edward M. Reed,
 Horatio M. Reynolds,
 Edward D. Robbins,
 Charles L. Rockwell, *Meriden*,
 Edward H. Rogers,
 Henry Wade Rogers,
 Edwin P. Root,
 George A. Root,
 Henry B. Rowe,
 Henry C. Rowe,
 F. Howard Russell,
 Talcott H. Russell,
 Thomas H. Russell,
 Mrs. Edward Elbridge Salisbury,
 Charles E. P. Sanford,
 Mrs. Henry B. Sargent,
 Zeigler Sargent,
 Emmett A. Saunders, *Mishawaka, Ind.*,

John C. Schwab,
 Miss Ethel Lord Scofield,
 Charles O. Scoville,
 Miss Mary E. Seranton,
 Morris W. Seymour, *Bridgeport*,
 Mrs. Sarah H. Seymour,
 John O. Shares,
 Harrison T. Sheldon,
 Simon B. Shoninger,
 Mrs. F. W. J. Sizer,
 Walter C. Skiff,
 Clarence E. Skinner,
 John T. Sloan,
 Charles H. Smith,
 Henry H. Smith,
 James B. Smith,
 E. Hershey Sneath,
 Levi T. Snow,
 H. Merriman Steele,
 James E. Stetson,
 Willis K. Stetson,
 Ezekiel G. Stoddard,
 William B. Stoddard, *Milford*,
 Anson Phelps Stokes,
 Mrs. Frederick B. Street,
 S. Fred Strong,
 Thomas H. Sullivan,
 Edward Taylor,
 John H. Taylor,
 Ezra C. Terry,
 Edwin S. Thomas,
 Clarence E. Thompson,
 Paul S. Thompson,
 Mrs. Sherwood S. Thompson,
 John Q. Tilson,
 John A. Timm,
 George H. Townsend,
 Joseph H. Townsend,
 Raynham Townshend,
 Charles F. Treadway,
 Courtlandt H. Trowbridge,
 Elford P. Trowbridge,
 Francis B. Trowbridge,
 Frederick L. Trowbridge,
 Hayes Quincy Trowbridge,
 Mrs. Thomas R. Trowbridge,
 Winston J. Trowbridge,

Charles A. Tuttle,
George Henry Tuttle,
Roger W. Tuttle,
Julius Twiss,
Victor Morris Tyler,
Mrs. William R. Tyler,
Richard H. Tyner,
Isaac M. Ullman,
Louis M. Ullman,
Mrs. John Ulrich,
Addison VanName,
William F. Verdi,
Charles M. Walker,
Williston Walker,
Mrs. Williston Walker,
Thomas Wallace, Jr.,
Frederick S. Ward,
Mrs. Henry A. Warner,
William A. Warner,
Herbert C. Warren,
George D. Watrous,
George D. Watrous, Jr.,
Mrs. George H. Watrous,

William A. Watts,
Mrs. Francis Wayland,
Smith G. Weed,
Jesse D. Welch,
Pierce N. Welch,
Mrs. Pierce N. Welch,
William S. Wells,
Alfred N. Wheeler,
Arthur M. Wheeler,
Edwin S. Wheeler,
John Davenport Wheeler,
Oliver S. White,
Roger S. White,
Mrs. Eli Whitney,
James M. Whittlemore,
Charles W. Whittlesey,
Frederick Wells Williams,
J. Rice Winchell,
Arthur B. Woodford,
Mrs. E. C. Woodruff,
Rollin S. Woodruff,
Theodore S. Woolsey,
Albert Zunder.

CONNECTICUT IN PENNSYLVANIA.

By SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL.D.

[Read September 23, 1907.]

Connecticut has had controversies with each of the neighboring States in regard to the extent of her territorial limits. Quite a sizable book has been written about them.* They began almost with the birth of the colony. Two years before the adoption of her first Constitution—the Fundamental Orders of 1639—she was wrangling with Massachusetts over the title to what is now Springfield. But the only boundary dispute which led to serious consequences, and whose history was written in blood, was that with Pennsylvania, a century or more later.

The original charter from the Earl of Warwick to the first proprietors of Connecticut who could show a paper title, bounded their grant from Narragansett river for a breadth of forty leagues “as the coast lieth towards Virginia” . . . “from the Western ocean to the South sea.” Among those who obtained this patent were John Pym, the leader of the Long Parliament, and John Hampden, whose resistance to the ship-money exactions of the Crown did more, perhaps, than any other one thing to bring Charles I to the block. Another who came later into association with them, and thought seriously, as they did, of settling in New England, was Oliver Cromwell. Had he made the venture, under the Warwick Patent, it is safe to say that he would not have overlooked the fact that the Western boundary it named was the Pacific ocean.

The charter from Charles II, granted to Connecticut in 1662, after her purchase from Governor Fenwick of the title

* Clarence W. Bowen, *Boundary Disputes of Connecticut*.

under the Warwick Patent, while less generous than was the latter in describing her northern boundary, made no change in the western. The charter phrase fixing this described the limits of the grant as "in longitude as the lyne of the Massachusetts Colony, runinge from East to West (that is to say) from the said Narrogancett Bay on the East to the South Sea on the West parte, with the Islands therevnto adioyninge."

Two years later the same King issued a patent to the Duke of York, under which he claimed title to all lands between the west side of the Connecticut River and a line running from its head to the source of the Hudson River, thence to the head of the Mohawk branch of the Hudson, and thence to the east side of Delaware Bay.

It will be perceived that while this carved out a large piece of the lands previously granted to Connecticut, it took away from her nothing lying west of a line running southerly from the head waters of the Mohawk. Under a royal commission appointed to settle the bounds between this grant (under which New York was settled by the English) and Connecticut, a judgment was rendered on November 30, 1664, with the written consent of authorized representatives of Connecticut, "that the creek or river, called Momoronock, which is reputed to be about twelve miles to the East of West-Chester, and a line drawn from the East point, or side, where the fresh water falls into the salt, at high-water mark, North, Northwest, to the line of the Massachusetts, be the Western bounds of the said colony of Connecticut, and the plantations lying Westward of that creek and line so drawn to be under his royal highness's government, and all plantations lying East of that creek and line to be under the government of Connecticut."^{*}

In the official returns by the authorities of Connecticut to the Lords of Trade and Plantations, during the first half of the eighteenth century, the colony is described as bounding westerly on New York.†

* Trumbull, *Hist. of Conn.*, I, 558.

† Hinman, *Letters*, 351, 362. In 1680 they referred, with more caution, to their patent as giving the western boundary.

At the beginning of the second half, however, a different tone was assumed. It had by that time become generally known that there was good farming land in the valley of the Susquehanna, occupied only by Indians, which fell within the limits of both the patents named. In 1753, a sort of syndicate, mainly of Connecticut people, was formed to buy up the Indian title to this territory and plant a new colony there. The next summer the purchase was effected from the Five Nations for £2,000.* The other colonies, Pennsylvania included, seem to have viewed it with a friendly eye, as setting up a new barrier against Indian attack; and at a congress of seven colonies, including Connecticut and Pennsylvania, then sitting at Albany, where the treaty of cession was negotiated,† a resolution was passed that Connecticut and Massachusetts each by charter right extended to the South sea, although it was recommended that their bounds should "be contracted and limited by the Allegheny or Apalachian mountains."‡

In 1755, the General Assembly of Connecticut, on the petition of the syndicate, then consisting of about 850 persons, and styling themselves the Susquehanna Company, voted to assent to their intended application to the Crown for a colony charter. The French and Indian War of the next few years made any movements of this sort inadvisable, but seven years later, as it neared its close, a number of people left Connecticut for the Wyoming Valley, to effect a settlement under the Connecticut charter. The Indians, who had, no doubt, by this time spent the money which they received from the syndicate, showed an unfriendly spirit. The Pennsylvania proprietaries, whose charter of 1681 covered in terms this territory, exerted their influence at court to check the immigration, and in January, 1763, orders to stop it were sent from England to the colonial authorities of Connecticut. A delegation of Mohawks,

* Some of the Indians afterwards asserted that the tribes never consented to the sale, the treaty being merely with a few individuals having no authority from them. Documents relating to the Colonial History of N. Y., VIII, 624.

† On July 11, 1754. *The Susquehannah Title*, 44.

‡ Documents relating to the Colonial History of N. Y., VI, 885, 888.

led, at their request,* by Guy Johnson of New York, appeared at Hartford to protest against any such attempt at colonization, and were informed that these commands had been received.†

The attention of Connecticut and of the Susquehanna Company was now given to endeavoring to secure a change in the policy of England. The company sent one of the leading men in the colony, Col. Eliphalet Dyer, to London, to ask for a charter; but he found the opposition too serious to conquer.

By order of the King in Council, a line was settled in the fall of 1768‡ between the English and the Indian lands in the Wyoming Valley. The Pennsylvania proprietaries then bought up the Indian title to part of the lands which the Five Nations had ceded to the Susquehanna Company fourteen years before. Early in 1769 a new immigration from Connecticut set in, to find their grants from that company disputed by claimants under the Pennsylvania authorities. The Connecticut settlers were thickest on what was then called the East Branch of the Susquehanna: the Pennsylvania settlers on the West Branch.§

A petition, somewhat of the kind reproduced in the modern "initiative," was now presented to the General Assembly of Connecticut from more than four thousand freemen of the colony, praying that its title to the lands in dispute should be asserted and maintained. There were then but about ten thousand freemen in all. None of the signers were members of the Susquehanna Company, and while no doubt many of them were secured by its influence, it is evident that there must have been a solid public opinion back of it.

The claim to the old boundaries of the colony patent was one worth contending for. The swath across the continent which they cut out for Connecticut comprehended, west of the Hudson, the sites of what are now Wilkesbarre, Cleveland, Chicago and Omaha, and east of the Hudson, New York City fell within it. New York, Connecticut acknowledged that she

* Documents relating to the Colonial History of N. Y., VII, 522.

† Winsor, Narrative and Critical History, VI, 605.

‡ Boutell, Life of Roger Sherman, 71. § *Ibid.*

had lost. She could not contend against a royal duke. To Northern Pennsylvania her people were disposed to cling, and before the petition had been presented, the General Assembly had appointed a committee to make diligent search, both in America and England, for all grants affecting the title of Connecticut to her charter limits, and file authenticated copies of such as they might find with the Secretary of the Colony.* Subsequently, after the coming in of the petition, this committee was directed to take the advice of counsel, and in 1771 they submitted the whole question of the merits of the Connecticut title to four of the ablest counsel in England, Thurlow, then Attorney General, afterwards Lord Chancellor; Wedderburn, then Solicitor General, afterwards Lord Chief Justice and Lord Chancellor; Richard Jackson, long the agent of the colony, and Dunning, afterwards Lord Ashburton. They agreed unanimously in a favorable opinion.† Commissioners were then (1773) sent to Governor Penn, to endeavor to obtain an amicable adjustment of differences, or else a reference to the Crown for a settlement of the boundary line.‡ Nothing was accomplished in either direction, and thereupon, in 1774, came the law of Connecticut erecting Wyoming into a new town by the name of Westmoreland, and annexing it to her westernmost county (Litchfield).

It is no easy task to trace the bounds, at any particular period, of the counties of Connecticut. They first were created in 1666.§ Hartford County was to include "the Towns on the River" and ran from the north bounds of Windsor and Farmington to the south end of "Thirty Miles Island"; New London County from "Paukatuck River with Norridge" to the west bounds of "Homonoscet Plantation"; New Haven County from the east bounds of Guilford to the west bounds of Milford; and Fairfield County from the east bounds of Stratford to the west bounds of Rye.

* Colonial Records of Conn., XIII, 304, 366, 427, 518.

† Col. Rec. of Conn., XIV, 445-460.

‡ *Ibid.*, 16, 461-482.

§ Col. Rec., II, 34.

Under this arrangement, Hartford County included what is now Tolland County, most of what is now Middlesex County, and part of what is now Litchfield, Windham, and New London counties. Windham County was incorporated sixty years later, taking in part of New London County. A quarter of a century afterwards Litchfield County was incorporated, largely out of New Haven County. In 1774 it received the addition already mentioned of part of what is now Pennsylvania, and in October, 1776, by one of our first acts of independent statehood, this accession was made a county by itself, under the name of Westmoreland County. Middlesex County was erected in 1785, and Tolland, a year later, was carved out of Hartford and Windham counties.

In the fall of 1773 the selectmen of each town in the colony had been directed by the Assembly to take a census of its inhabitants.* The returns were tabulated and printed in 1774, and showed that of the ten towns then constituting Litchfield County, Westmoreland ranked sixth in population. It numbered 1,922 inhabitants. Woodbury, then the largest town, had 5,224, and Winchester, then the smallest, had but 327.

Westmoreland proved, from the first, strongly attractive to the adventurous spirits, to whom the "land of steady habits" seemed too steady and unambitious. It was there that William Judd, removing from Farmington, won his title of Major (in the 24th Connecticut regiment) and began the active career which closed with his impeachment in 1804 for having, while a justice of the peace, declared that Connecticut was without a Constitution,—a declaration which, as much as any other one thing, led to her having a very unmistakable one, fourteen years later.

The Pennsylvania proprietors also submitted their case to English counsel. They selected Charles Pratt, afterwards Lord Chancellor and Earl of Camden, and he gave an opinion in their favor. The judgment rendered by the royal commissioners, in 1664, in settling the boundary dispute between the Duke of York and the Colony of Connecticut, after a full hear-

* Col. Rec. of Conn., XIV, 161, 263.

ing, which had been solemnly assented to by the Colony, in Mr. Pratt's opinion deprived it of any claim of title west of the west bounds thus established. The Connecticut claim, on the contrary, supported by the opinions of the four counsel before mentioned, was that the west bounds were fixed merely as regards the patent of the Duke of York, and that it no more cut the colony off from her charter territory south or west of New York, than it added to her limits the plantations on the other side, in Rhode Island.

The response of the Connecticut General Assembly to the petition of the four thousand freemen was far from eliciting the universal approval of her people.

In March, 1774, a mass meeting of committees from twenty-three towns at Middletown adopted a warm protest, embodied in a petition to the legislature. The title to the lands, they said, was contested. It might prove defective. The incorporation of Westmoreland might be pressed in England as a cause for the forfeiture of the colony charter. Bloody tragedies might ensue from the clashing of jurisdiction between those claiming under Pennsylvania and those claiming under Connecticut. Emigration would be encouraged on the part of those who, should the title of the colony finally be determined to be invalid, would be reduced to poverty, and return to their deserted homes only to waste the residue of their lives as a burden on the community.

A war of pamphlets arose. There was a letter to J. H. Esquire, of 47 pages, printed at Hartford, in 1773. Rev. Dr. William Smith, Provost of the University (then College) of Pennsylvania, with the aid of Jared Ingersoll, wrote a paper in support of the title of the proprietaries under their charter of 1681, which was extensively circulated in Connecticut. Rev. Dr. Benjamin Trumbull, in 1776, published a voluminous answer.

But by this time subjects still more important had arisen to engage the public interest. The battle of Lexington had been fought. There was but one cause for patriotic hearts,—that of America. In the fall of 1776, two companies for the

Connecticut line in the Continental army were raised in Westmoreland. Enough more were subsequently added to make up a meagre regiment (the 24th Connecticut).

Connecticut had made preparations in 1774 for applying to the King in Council for the appointment of Commissioners to settle her dispute with Pennsylvania,* but in March, 1775, Governor Trumbull wrote to the Colony Agent at London not to press the matter "in a day of so much difficulty and increasing distress as the present between the two countries."†

In the fall of the same year he wrote to the President of Congress to express the hope that that body would intervene in the interest of peace. "It is far from our design," he said, "to take any advantage in the case from the present unhappy division with Great Britain. Our desire is that no advantage be taken on either side; but at a proper time, and before competent judges, to have the different claims to these lands litigated, settled and determined: in the meantime to have this lie dormant, until the other all-important controversy is brought to a close. The wisdom of Congress, I trust, will find means to put a stop to all altercations between this Colony and Mr. Penn, and the settlers under each, until a calm and peaceable day. The gun and bayonet are not the constitutional instruments to adjust and settle real claims, neither will insidious methods turn to account for such as make them their pursuit."‡

In December, 1775, the Congress devoted considerable time to the consideration of the questions thus presented. The Pennsylvania delegates insisted that their colony must have jurisdiction over the disputed territory, and said they would not abide the determination of the Congress, unless this were conceded. At last, each colony having proposed a vote that it would be content to accept, that of Connecticut was passed (December 20) by six colonies to four. This "recommended that the contending parties immediately cease all hostilities, and avoid

* Col. Rec. of Conn., XIV, 217-219.

† Stuart, Life of Jonathan Trumbull, 175.

‡ *Ibid.*

every appearance of force, until the dispute can be legally decided; that all the property taken and detained be restored to the original owners; that no interruption be given by either party to the free passing and repassing of persons behaving themselves peaceably through the disputed territory, as well by land or water, without molestation of either persons or property; that all persons seized and detained on account of said dispute, on either side be dismissed and permitted to go to their respective homes; and that, things being put in the same situation they were before the late unhappy contest, they continue to behave themselves peaceably on their respective possessions and improvements, until a legal decision can be had on said dispute, or this Congress shall take further order thereon; and nothing herein done shall be construed in prejudice of the claim of either party.”*

One of the New Jersey delegation who kept a journal of the proceedings of the Congress observes that “the Delegates of Penn^a were very angry and discontented with this Determination of Congress.”† The next day they offered a resolution that no more Connecticut people should settle at Wyoming until the title to the lands was adjudged. Meanwhile the General Assembly of Connecticut, moved by reports that an invasion of Westmoreland by five hundred armed men from the West Branch of the Susquehanna was apprehended, fomented by British influences,‡ resolved “that all the present inhabitants in said disputed territory shall remain quiet in their present possessions, without molestation from any person or persons under the jurisdiction of this Colony; provided they behave themselves peaceably toward the inhabitants settled under the claim of this Colony; and provided the persons belonging to this Colony, who have been lately apprehended on said lands by some of the people of Pennsylvania be released and all the effects, as well as those who have been already released as those now in custody, be restored to them. And all persons are

* Journals of Congress, I, 279.

† Am. Hist. Review, I, 297.

‡ Col. Rec. of Conn., XV, 179.

hereby strictly forbid making any further settlements on said lands without special license from this Assembly, or giving any interruption or disturbance to any persons already settled thereon. This temporary provision to remain in force during the pleasure of this Assembly, and shall not affect or prejudice the legal title of the Colony, or of any particular persons to any of said lands in controversy.”

A copy of this vote was hurried off to Philadelphia, and on December 23, 1775, was read in Congress. John Jay of New York at once moved that it be recommended to Connecticut “not to introduce any settlers on the said lands till the farther order of this Congress, until the said dispute shall be settled.” Such a vote was passed by four colonies to three. The Connecticut delegates protested against declaring it to have been adopted, on the ground that it was not carried by a majority of the colonies present, but their objections were overruled.*

The conflicts of jurisdiction, and seizures of person and property, recounted in the various papers from which quotations have been read, had been attended by very grave disturbances. From 1769, when after several years of inaction, the Susquehanna Company, which now comprehended some Pennsylvanians among its members, sent a new force of colonists into this valley, and found ten men, headed by the sheriff of Northampton County, established in a block house to oppose them, to the close of 1771, there was a constant succession of serious hostilities.

Under the Pennsylvania title the valley was laid off into two “manors,” the eastern side being called the Manor of Stoke, and the western side the Manor of Sunbury.

The Connecticut settlers put up a rough frontier fort, Fort Durkee, which was attacked by the Pennsylvanians with a four-pound cannon. A capitulation followed on terms that the Connecticut title to possession should be respected, till the pleasure of His Majesty should be known. The garrison marched out, and most of them returned to Connecticut; but it was not long before news followed that their houses had been

* Journals of Congress, I, 283; Am. Hist. Rev., I, 288.

plundered and their cattle driven away. The next year the Susquehanna Company retook the fort, seized the four-pounder and invested a block house in which fifty Pennsylvanians had established themselves. After a short siege a capitulation followed, stipulating that the property claims of the garrison should be respected until the disputes were settled by the King. This stipulation, in turn, the Connecticut settlers violated.

General Gage, then in command of the royal forces at New York, was called on by Governor Penn for aid, but refused to interfere.

Captain Ogden recaptured Fort Durkee. Colonel Stewart, one of the Pennsylvanians belonging to the Susquehanna Company, surprised and retook it by a night assault. Ogden built a new and stronger fort, Fort Wyoming. The settlers under the Connecticut title besieged and captured it.

Four years of almost undisturbed peace followed. The Pennsylvania proprietaries made no serious attempt to expel the settlers under the Connecticut title. Civil government was set up, at first, with no authority from Connecticut; afterwards by virtue of the Act of Assembly of 1774 which has been already mentioned.

In May, 1775, she constituted the town of Westmoreland a Probate District,* and in October, 1776, made it a county by the name of the County of Westmoreland, with a county court of its own. The Superior Court was to go out and sit there for the trial of capital cases, on the order of the Chief Judge, when necessary.†

During this period the proprietary government of Pennsylvania was coming to its close. In 1776 it gave way to a provisional government of the people. One of its last efforts was the unhappy invasion which again stained the valley with blood, on December 21, 1775. In this about two hundred were engaged on each side and several killed. President Stiles of Yale College, in his Literary Diary,‡ declares that it was a stratagem of the British ministry to excite confusion, pro-

* Col. Rec. of Conn., XV, 11.

† Records of the State of Conn., I, 7, 229.

‡ I, 660.

moted by Philadelphia Tories. The records of the Governor's Council in Connecticut, at a meeting held in the preceding month, show that they regarded the expedition, which was then being secretly organized, as really for the purpose of expelling the Connecticut settlers, though under cover of a broader design to prevent a union of the colonies against Great Britain.*

Three years later came the great massacre which gave the death blow to Connecticut in Pennsylvania. Tories and Indians to the number of about a thousand invaded the valley in July, 1778. The settlers had some warning of their coming and in June had applied, though in vain, for aid from the Continental army. Of the able-bodied men a large part were in that army. Forty or fifty more, recently recruited, and not yet schooled in the exercises of war, who were still in the valley, manned the defences, with such assistance as could be rendered by a few militia, and a reserve of boys and old men.

The story of the battle that followed has been often told. The settlers, in despair of reinforcements, determined to attack the enemy, hoping to surprise them. They found them ready and in line. A brisk action was followed by the total defeat of the American forces. Among those who fell was one of the two representatives of Westmoreland in the General Assembly of Connecticut, who had just returned from a session of that body. The whole number killed and missing was about three hundred.†

Thomas Campbell, the English poet, made the massacre the groundwork of his "Gertrude of Wyoming."

The seeds of civil war had, as we have seen, been planted in Wyoming, long years before the outbreak of the Revolution. It was to be a civil war arising from conflicting rights of property and jurisdiction.

The Revolution itself in every colony meant civil war. That was a civil war arising from conflicting claims of allegiance and conflicting theories of political liberty.

* Col. Rec. of Conn., XV, 179.

† Stone, Poetry and History of Wyoming, 192.

The civil war in Wyoming might have been avoided. Not so the American Revolution. It was a political necessity. England had become—with the development of the principle of a responsible ministry,—responsible to the House of Commons,—in fact, though not in name, a republic. She had slowly built up out of precedent and tradition an unrecorded but all-compelling scheme of government which in fact, though hardly yet in name, was constitutional. Yet England was denying to her sons across the sea the privileges which this scheme of government guaranteed to her sons at home.

“If,” wrote Froude in his life of Julius Cæsar, “there be one lesson which history clearly teaches, it is this: that free nations cannot govern subject provinces. If they are unable and unwilling to admit their dependencies to share their constitution, the constitution itself will fall in pieces from mere incompetence for its duties.” Or, he might have added, the subject provinces will throw off the yoke, and vindicate their independence.

To one who looks with eager glance towards the political future of the United States to-day, and anxiously asks himself whether, if our Constitution was framed only for and applies only to the people of the United States that make our Union, and carries no certain assurance of personal security to the millions in our Asiatic possessions, we can yet hold them indefinitely as against the world, and as against themselves, subjects, though not citizens, these solemn words of a great writer have a new interest.

But, in principle, we do not stand to the Philippines as England in 1776 stood to us. She was governing us avowedly for her own benefit. We are not governing them avowedly for our benefit. Nor are these children of the Pacific of such a stock as that of the self-reliant, sturdy, strong-handed American colonists of the 18th century.

Yet even to them, it was a hard thing to decide upon a war for independence. There was everywhere a strong division of opinion. It was the obvious policy and aim of the British government to stimulate and strengthen the spirit of the loyalists. In the city of New Haven, in 1776, nearly half the

people were British sympathizers.* The same I think would be true of Philadelphia.

John Butler, who led the invading forces at the battle of Wyoming, was of Connecticut birth. So was Zebulon Butler, who led in the defence,—a commissioned colonel of the 24th Regiment of the Connecticut line.

There have been riots and risings against lawful authority from time to time throughout American history. There have been, aside from the Revolution, but two civil wars; that which year after year disturbed the valley of Wyoming, and that between the North and the South.

The first came to an end in the way in which all controversies between independent States should, by submission to an impartial court. As soon as such a proceeding became practicable, by the adoption of the Articles of Confederation in 1781,† Congress, on the petition of Pennsylvania, appointed Commissioners to decide the controversy between her and Connecticut “relative to their respective rights, claims, and possessions” . . . as to “sundry lands” described by Pennsylvania as “lying within” her “Northern boundary.”‡ It is to the credit of both States that they were able to agree on who should be the Commissioners. They selected, and Congress confirmed for the position, Judge William Whipple of New Hampshire; Welcome Arnold of Rhode Island, a prominent merchant in Providence; William C. Houston, Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy at Princeton; Cyrus Griffin of Virginia, President of the Court of Appeals in Maritime Causes; and David Brearley, Chief Justice of New Jersey.

There was an ample array of counsel. From Pennsylvania came James Wilson, afterwards a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; William Bradford, afterwards Attorney General of the United States; Joseph Reed, who had

* See Stiles, *Literary Diary*, I, 540, III, 111; Boutell, *Life of Roger Sherman*, 43.

† Pennsylvania in 1779 had proposed and Connecticut had declined to anticipate that event, and proceed to a reference as if the Articles were in force. *Rec. of the State of Conn.*, II, 463.

‡ *Journals of Congress*, VII, 338, 339.

recently been for three years President of the Supreme Executive Council of Pennsylvania; and Jonathan D. Sergeant, who had been Attorney-General of the State. Connecticut selected William Samuel Johnson, who had, and well merited, the honorary degree of doctor of civil law from Oxford University; Eliphalet Dyer, who had been the original promoter of the Connecticut settlements in the valley of the Susquehanna, and the representative throughout of the Susquehanna Company; and Jesse Root, afterwards Chief Judge of the Superior Court and the author of two volumes of the earliest of American law reports.

Connecticut was overmatched, certainly as to the number and, it is to be feared, as to the ability of her representatives. The trial of such a controversy before such a tribunal demanded much more than a knowledge of the governing facts and the governing law. It called for all the powers that forensic oratory can bring to the aid of reason. Johnson had them, but Root, if we can judge him either by his private letters or published works, had a diffuse and discursive, not to say bombastic, manner of expression, and we have the word of John Adams, no incompetent observer of men, who saw much of Colonel Dyer in the Continental Congress, that he spoke "often and long, but very heavily and clumsily." "Dyer," he afterwards notes in his diary, "is long-winded and roundabout, obscure and cloudy, very talkative and very tedious, yet an honest, worthy man, means and judges well."*

In one incident of the hearing, Johnson's powers of oratory served us well. One of the lawyers for Pennsylvania had occasion to refer to an ancient document, recorded on a long roll of parchment, upon which Connecticut placed some reliance. It was interlarded with passages from the scriptures and he jocosely alluded to it as a specimen of puritanical fantasy. Johnson made the reply. Taking up the parchment, he read in his silvery voice and in a tone of reverential solemnity, the same phrases which had just been ridiculed, in such a way as to impress all in the court room with a sense

* Life and Works, II, 396, 422.

of awe. Then, suddenly letting it drop on the floor, as he lifted up his hands and eyes to heaven, he exclaimed "Great God! Is all this fantasy?" One who was present, in telling this story twenty years afterwards, said that at these words a chill went over the assembly so perceptible, that as he spoke he felt the same sensation creeping over him.*

The case for Pennsylvania, whatever may have been the merits of the paper titles, had the support of grave, practical considerations. Would it make for American peace and order to have one sovereign State (and in 1782 all were fully sovereign) possess and administer governmental rights in territory enclosed by the dominions of other sovereigns, geographically separated from her own by long distances and the interposition of other States? Would it not become for Pennsylvania such a sore spot as a British Gibraltar was to Spain, or a Portuguese Macao to China? Did not the Connecticut claim also prove too much? If it were just, would not she have like dominion over all the vast territory between the western bounds of New York and the Pacific Ocean? Had this been conquered by the common efforts of all the United States for her sole benefit?

These were questions not to be ignored. Answered in some sort they must be by the judgment which the Commissioners were to pronounce. The hearing was a long and fair one,† the court sitting from November 12 to December 30, 1782. The end was a brief and unanimous decision that Pennsylvania had "the jurisdiction and pre-emption of" and Connecticut no rights to the lands in controversy.‡ Many years afterwards it came out that the members of the commission, before entering on the trial, privately agreed that the decision of the

* Beardsley, *Life and Times of William Samuel Johnson*, 48.

† Connecticut indeed claimed that there should have been a postponement to enable her to produce important papers which were in England, but there is no reason to doubt that the Commissioners had reasonable grounds for ordering the hearing to proceed. It was subsequently claimed by those interested in the *Susquehannah Company*, that Pennsylvania had and concealed these papers. *The Susquehannah Title*, 21, 95.

‡ *Journals of Congress*, VIII, 44-63.

majority, whatever it was, should be concurred in by all, and that no reasons for the judgment should be announced.

The feeling between the two States and the yet delicate condition of the settlement probably made this course judicious. At all events, the Connecticut claim of title was now finally disposed of. There was never more to be a Connecticut in Pennsylvania. Not only had she had no governmental powers there, but all conveyances and grants under her authority were, in effect, invalidated.*

The settlers in the Wyoming Valley now numbered five or six thousand. Most of them held through the Susquehanna Company. When the claimants under the Pennsylvania title appeared to dispossess them, it was found no easy thing. Disaffection was general. Everybody was in the sheriff's way, except when called upon to assist him. Pennsylvania sent troops to assist him.† There was more fighting. As Burke has said: You cannot indict a whole people. Some of them applied to the legislature of Pennsylvania for relief and a "Quieting Act" was passed, providing for the appointment of Commissioners to inquire into the merits of their claims. After a few years, however, it was repealed. Many lost all their possessions.‡ Finally, in 1799, and 1801, came legislation that stood because it was bottomed on the will of the local majority. The holders of Pennsylvania titles were bought off by the State. The holders of Connecticut titles had theirs confirmed, on payment of about \$1 an acre.§

The battle of Wyoming is better known to historical students than is the territorial dispute of which it was the fruit. If

* *Satterlee v. Matthewson*, 16 Sergeant & Rawle's Pennsylvania Law Reports, 172. This seems a logical consequence of the decision, though it is doubtful if the Commissioners so supposed. See letter of December 31, 1782, by four of them to the Executive of Pennsylvania, given in *The Susquehanna Title*, 99.

† Her Council of Censors "held it up to censure" in September, 1784. *The Susquehanna Title*, 107.

‡ See *Mass. Hist. Coll.*, 7th Series, VI, Part 2, 177; Boutell, *Life of Roger Sherman*, 340, 341.

§ The course of legislation and of judicial decision in Pennsylvania, consequent upon the judgment of the Commissioners, is fully detailed in Jones on the Law of Land Office Titles in Pa., Chapter XXVI.

I have not given it more than a passing notice, it is not because I am insensible to its importance as one of the memorable things in American history.

The time will never come when stories of battle no longer interest mankind.

A man on a field of arms is in an abnormal position. How will he act? How did he act? These are questions that have the attractiveness always belonging to the unusual,—the importance always attaching to what must always nearly concern the public welfare.

Personal prowess is admired even when it is displayed for merely private ends,—when it is shown by the sportsman, the matador, the boxer or wrestler. Much more is it admired in one who is fighting for a country, or a cause.

It is not a question of victory. Nothing brings more of glory than a glorious defeat. The hopeless struggle at the pass of Thermopylæ will never pass from human memory.

But to Americans the great fruit of the battle of Wyoming was that it led to preventing war. In its ultimate results it showed it to be possible for two States, each warmly engaged in defending a claim having at least strong color of right, to come before a court of the United States and let their controversy go to a final determination there, precisely as if it were one between two private individuals. The Supreme Court of the United States, with its jurisdiction over suits of State against State, was erected on that basis, and no other single cause contributed more towards the adoption of that feature of our judicial system than the sad massacre of July 3, 1778.

The Wyoming controversy gave rise to numerous suits between private individuals. Two of these deserve mention in this connection.

One was entitled Van Horne's Lessee against Dorrance, in the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Pennsylvania, heard in 1795.* The plaintiff claimed title under a grant from Pennsylvania; the defendant, under a grant from Connecticut, confirmed by the Quieting Act of the Pennsyl-

* 2 Dallas' Reports, 304.

vania Legislature in 1787. The trial occupied fifteen days, before a jury; but at the close the court, Mr. Justice Patterson presiding, directed a verdict for the claimant under the Pennsylvania title as a matter of law.

The statute, he said, assumed to give a title, when none, that is, no valid one, existed before. It was an attempt to give away, by law, the property of one man to another man. It was therefore void under the Constitution of Pennsylvania, and it was the duty of the jury to find a verdict for the plaintiff and to take the law on this point from the court.

The cause was appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, but never pressed for a hearing there.

The second suit arose a generation later. Pennsylvania by this time had passed another Quieting Act. Her courts had held, in 1825, that if one claiming lands in the Wyoming Valley under a Connecticut title executed a lease of them, his tenant, contrary to the rule in other cases, could dispute his title. The Pennsylvania Legislature thereupon, in 1826, passed a statute that such a tenant could not dispute his landlord's title. A law suit arose on which this statute was relied on by the plaintiff. The Pennsylvania courts supported it as not contrary to the Pennsylvania Constitution, and the Supreme Court of the United States supported it as not contrary to that of the United States.*

* *Satterlee v. Matthewson*, 2 Pet., 380.

AN ALMOST FORGOTTEN NEW HAVEN INSTITUTION.

By REV. CHARLES RAY PALMER, D.D.

[Read February 17, 1908.]

The institution of which I am to speak, and attempt to revive the memory, was in its day widely known as "The Young Ladies' Institute." The home of it still stands, though somewhat decayed, and now transformed into a block of tenements. It is located near the middle of the east side of Wooster Square, and within the recollection of many was occupied by General William H. Russell's School for Boys.

I am indebted to Mr. Henry T. Blake, to Mr. Talcott H. Russell, and to Mr. Oliver S. White, for aid in ascertaining the record of this property, and to them I wish to make grateful acknowledgments. As to the Institute itself, I have had access to documents in the University Library, furnished me by the thoughtful kindness of Professor Dexter; to a memorial discourse commemorative of the first Principal, furnished me by his latest surviving daughter a few years since; to Camp's History of New Britain; to the Letter-Books and autobiographical recollections of the second Principal, in my possession; and to some other and minor sources of information. Of these I make free use in this paper.

I propose briefly to recite the origin and history of this institution, and, incidentally, its claim to be remembered.

Beyond a question, the originator of it was a man very noteworthy on other accounts—Prof. Ethan Allen Andrews, LL.D., a distinguished scholar, and a lifelong promoter of education in various ways. He was a native of what we now know as New Britain, formerly a part of the town of Berlin.

He was the son of Levi and Chloe (Wells) Andrews, and was born April 7, 1787. His father was a prosperous farmer, of excellent character, of high intelligence, and very much respected by his fellow-townsmen. The conditions of his early life were very fortunate for the future scholar. No pains were spared in his education. His preparation for college was commenced in Berlin; continued in Farmington, under the instruction of Rev. Dr. Noah Porter, Senior, and Mr. Samuel Cowles; and completed in Litchfield, under the care of Rev. Dr. Whiton. He entered college in 1806. He was not a robust youth, having been from childhood of a delicate constitution, and his college course was pursued under the limitations of continuous ill-health, attended with much physical suffering. But his high aspirations and indomitable will triumphed over these disabilities, and he graduated in 1810 with the highest honors of his class. It was a class, moreover, which contained some eminent men, including Profs. E. T. Fitch, Chauncey Goodrich and Ebenezer Kellogg, Gov. W. W. Ellsworth, and Samuel F. B. Morse. At first he gave himself to the study of the law, in the office of his former teacher, Mr. Samuel Cowles of Farmington. In Farmington, also, he found his future wife, Miss Lucy, daughter of Isaac Cowles. He was admitted to the Hartford Bar in 1813, and his earliest practice was in New Britain. Later he was appointed an aid to Governor Lusk, and in the last year of the war with England, in 1812-15, he served in New London. Returning to New Britain, he opened a school to fit young men for college. Very soon after he was elected to the Legislature, and he was repeatedly reëlected. But he gradually withdrew from both law and politics, and in 1822 accepted an election to the Chair of Ancient Languages in the University of North Carolina, at Chapel Hill, in that State. Here he found his true vocation, and entered upon the course of study to which he owed his highest distinction. In 1828 he removed his family to New Haven, and became connected with a school known as "The New Haven Gymnasium." This was established in that year by the brothers Sereno E. and Henry E. Dwight, sons of the

first President Dwight, as a first-class boarding school for boys. A colleague in this institution, Mr. Solomon Stoddard, became associated with him in the preparation of a Latin Grammar, which was long the main dependence of Latin students in this country. It has been said that even before coming here he had conceived the idea of establishing an institution for the higher education of young women, but whether he came with ulterior aims or not, he cordially coöperated with the Messrs. Dwight in their work, and when he entered upon an independent enterprise it was with their cordial approbation and backing. This enterprise was the Young Ladies' Institute, and an apprehension of his own daughters' needs seems to have given him the primary impulse to undertake it. So, at any rate, it has been repeatedly asserted.

But if it was in its beginnings his individual enterprise, he found in New Haven willing and strong coadjutors. There are indications that the ultimate shape of the project was the result of careful and deliberate consideration in which many bore a part. Thus, in Rev. Dr. Crosswell's Diary, we find the following entries:

Under date of March 17, 1829—"Mr. Hawks spent nearly the whole forenoon with me, and in the afternoon he came with Prof. Andrews to talk about a Female High School in New Haven."

Under date of June 22, 1829—"In the evening attended a meeting of some literary gentlemen at Prof. Andrews' to consult about a High School for Young Ladies."

Who these gentlemen were, we learn from another source. The original prospectus of the Institute, bearing date September 1, 1829, is preserved in the University Library, and to it is appended a card of endorsement to the following purport:

"The undersigned, having learned that Prof. Ethan A. Andrews proposed opening, in this city, an Institution for the education of Young Ladies, have the pleasure to state that we consider him eminently qualified, both in character and talents, for such an undertaking; and being acquainted with his views of an improved system of Female Education, we

think them highly judicious, and cheerfully recommend his proposed Institution to the patronage of the public."

This was signed by President Day, Professors Benjamin Silliman, James L. Kingsley, Nathaniel W. Taylor, Josiah W. Gibbs, Chauncey A. Goodrich, Eleazar T. Fitch and Denison Olmsted, Rev. Messrs. Samuel Merwin, Harry Crosswell, Francis L. Hawks and Leonard Bacon, Messrs. Sereno E. Dwight, Henry E. Dwight and Francis B. Winthrop. From the New Haven of that day it would have been difficult to select a more influential list of names than that. Quite a number of these gentlemen, moreover, not only gave these signatures, but enrolled their own daughters among the earliest students of the projected institution. The movement must have been in contemplation for a considerable time previous, for the building was erected in preparation for it. So, at least, I have been informed, and the prospectus speaks of it as "a new and elegant building." It was erected upon land belonging to Mr. Abraham Bishop, and presumably by him. Five years later he sold it, with the buildings thereon, and the conveyance is duly recorded. He describes it as his "homestead, which has been and is now occupied by the Young Ladies' Institute," and measurements show that the present front line is unchanged, while the side-lines then extended to a depth of 312 feet, thus including an area now nearly covered with various buildings. Why he calls it his "homestead" does not appear, for he never lived there, but it was almost wholly bounded by land of which he retained the ownership; indeed a large portion of Wooster Square itself originally belonged to him. The structure was of brick and consisted of a main building of three or three and one-half stories with two wings of two stories, the whole frontage being about one hundred feet. The interior arrangements were on a liberal scale, and well adapted to the purpose for which they were designed. At that date there were no buildings contiguous, so that the Institute stood quite by itself. The prospectus speaks of it as—"one mile from Yale College, in an open and healthy situation, commanding a fine view of the town and harbor, and the beau-

tiful hills which surround them." The compact portion of the town did not then extend much beyond Olive Street. The prospectus next enlarges upon "the peculiar advantages afforded by the town as the seat of literary institutions, its temperate and salubrious climate, the beauty of its situation and scenery, the high character of its long-established seminaries, the social, literary and moral character of its inhabitants," and its accessibility both by land and sea.

Here, then, in the autumn of 1829, the Institute was opened, and its career commenced. In many respects Professor Andrews was admirably adapted to the position he assumed. He was then about forty-two years of age, in the prime of his powers. He had had large experience of life, had won the reputation of a successful teacher, and certainly was a man of character, of learning, and of culture. His manners were refined and agreeable. Professor Thacher once described him "as a man whose whole life was an unchanging illustration of urbanity." He always appeared to be self-contained and dignified, yet always simple and unaffected. He was tall, erect, and well-proportioned; he had an open and pleasing countenance, a dark and at the same time lustrous eye. In a word he was rather a striking, without being an imposing personality. I saw him once, late in his life, and remember the impression then made by his genial and benignant bearing upon one regarding him with the veneration which his years and his honors inspired.

The general scheme of the Institute was on a large scale, so large as to seem to us from our present point of view somewhat ambitious. But that was a sanguine time, and to most men that which seemed to be desirable was readily assumed to be practicable. It was not merely a school for young ladies, like many another which has had its day, in New Haven and elsewhere in New England, that was projected. It definitely aimed at something far beyond that measure. This is made very apparent from the prospectus already cited, and still more by statements issued in connection with the catalogues which appeared later on. Thus we read: "the design of the Young

Ladies' Institute was to supply what seemed to the principals, and to many of their literary and scientific friends, a desideratum in Female Education." . . . "No Institution exists in this country with precisely the same objects, or with an organization in any considerable degree similar." "The course of instruction is intended to be so extensive, and the mode of prosecuting the studies so thorough, as to afford to young women the means of acquiring a systematic education, strictly adapted to their sex, and at the same time not inferior in value to what may be gained by the other sex in our High Schools and Colleges." Again we read: "the course of instruction to those who shall wish to pursue it for many years will be as extensive as that pursued at any of our Colleges," and, "the charge of each of the literary and scientific departments is committed to gentlemen of liberal education and of experience, not only in giving instruction in their own department, but also in conducting the other branches of Education."

An examination of the courses offered shows that these announcements were no mere pretences, suggestive of methods of modern advertising, but serious purposes, carefully planned, and the list of instructors engaged seems to be designed to fulfill the promises made. I find among them men known not only as graduates of Yale, and as having occupied chairs of instruction in connection with it, but men known favorably as educators elsewhere. Moreover, arrangements were made by which advanced students of the Institute, under proper guardianship, attended the lectures given in Yale College by Professor Silliman and Professor Olmsted, thus enjoying in their departments equal facilities with the corresponding classes in that institution.

There were two sessions of the Institute in each year, beginning respectively on the first of May and the first of November, and followed by vacations of four weeks each. It will be observed that the summer season was not then regarded as unavailable for educational purposes, nor were forty-four weeks too large a portion of the year to give to study. I notice, also, that to students who wished to continue in residence during

vacations, there was no extra charge. "Times change, and we change with them."

I directed attention a few moments since to the claim of the Institute to be unique—the only enterprise of its kind in the country. Unless this claim can be disproved, its real distinction is therein disclosed. It was an actual endeavor, and it was the first endeavor, in New England or elsewhere in the United States, to afford to young women equal facilities with young men. It may have been over-ambitious. It may have been premature. It may be impossible for us to discern whence it could expect an adequate financial support. But that it was generously conceived, and courageously undertaken, can hardly be disputed. From our present point of view it would seem manifestly to have demanded either an endowment, or a much larger working capital than either of its Principals ever brought to it. But if an institution is to be judged by the idea its founder attempted to realize; by what it aspired to effect for the public welfare, rather than by what it actually accomplished, then it should be remembered with honor.

What, it may now be asked, *was* accomplished? I have had in my hands two catalogues of the Institute, containing a list of the students from November, 1830, to April, 1833. In these I have counted 137 names. No catalogue was published in 1834, but I have the statement of one of those longest connected with the Institute as an instructor, that the whole number connected with it as students was about 200. While many of these belonged to families resident in New Haven, the rest were drawn from a wide area. Among the 137 names catalogued I find representatives of every New England State except Maine, of all the Middle States except Delaware, of all the Seaboard and Gulf States from Maryland to Louisiana, inclusive, except Florida, and in addition from the District of Columbia; i. e. from eighteen different States, and the seat of the National Government. Whence came the other sixty or more, I cannot affirm, but it may fairly be presumed that if I could, the list of residences would not be essentially different. A wider constituency could hardly have been antici-

pated for an institution so recently established. If a reason for this fact be sought, two or three things may be suggested. Professor Andrews had made an excellent reputation as a teacher in his position in North Carolina, and this may have helped the Institute, at the start. Again, Yale College had a wide repute in the country, and the fact that families had sons in the College may have operated to bring their sisters to a New Haven institution so strongly endorsed by the College Faculty. It certainly did in some instances. Still, again, New Haven was at that time a favorite summer resort for Southern people. The old Pavilion Hotel by the water side, and other places of public accommodation, brought hither a large summer colony, and this may have contributed somewhat to the growth of the Institute. At any rate, the number attracted to it from so large an area is noteworthy, and the high average of intelligence and of character was still more so. They were in the main susceptible of the culture which the institution aimed to effect. The examinations were always attended by the College Faculty, and their testimony was freely given that the results obtained compared favorably with those obtained in the College class-rooms. I may cite an instance illustrative of the work done. Miss Elizabeth Hoare, daughter of Samuel, of Concord, Mass., of the well-known family of that name, had mastered all the mathematics then embraced in the Harvard College curriculum, and sighing for more worlds to conquer, came to the Institute and found the instruction she wanted. The text-book selected was Vince's Fluxions, which was an optional on the Yale list, and usually chosen only by from one to three of the most advanced students in mathematics. It is recorded of her that in going through this text-book she asked assistance only in respect of a single equation. There was a wide interest at that period in philosophical studies, in all higher institutions of learning. It is recorded that the keen interest displayed, and the vigorous discussions carried on, in the class-room devoted to these studies at the Institute, would have done credit to any college in the land. It is further remembered that the instructors in some

other branches of study found the keeping well ahead of their classes no holiday task. But that the instruction was really creditable and inspiring there is no reason to question, and if there were, the testimony of the students, given in their maturer years in letters of grateful acknowledgment, might be cited to establish the fact. Indeed, it might be inferred from the lists of the instructors employed. Such names as Professor Andrews, Prof. William Tully, Dr. Isaac G. Porter, Mr. Stiles French, Prof. Charles U. Shepard, and others who might be mentioned, are sufficient warrant that the work of instruction was in no incompetent hands.

If more particular inquiry be made as to students whom the Institute enrolled, who, and of what kind they were, there is much to be learned from a study of the catalogue. I have found it to reward very careful investigation. I have endeavored, so far as it is practicable at this distance of time, to ascertain the family connection of the young women who are listed. In the case of those who came from remote States, very naturally, I have had little success. But of the 137 that I have mentioned I have identified more than half, and learned more or less in regard to them. Evidently they were older than the pupils of the average Young Ladies' School. Many of them had previously made use of the best private schools within their reach. Many were mature in character and understanding. A goodly number of them subsequently filled conspicuous places in American society. One finds in the list many of the New Haven names with which we are most familiar, e. g., Blake, Beecher, Bradley, Day, Dwight, Edwards, Forbes, Goodrich, Hotchkiss, Hubbard, Merwin, Phelps, Street, Taylor, Trowbridge, Whitney. Some have made their own names distinguished. Conspicuous upon the page stands the name of Miss Sarah Porter of Farmington, herself, I need hardly say, a famous educator. Other names represent young ladies better known by the names of the husbands whose future distinction they shared. I identify the wife of Gen. W. H. Russell. I identify in a number of instances the wives of well-known clergymen, physicians, schol-

ars, educators, public men. It seems to me to be noteworthy that we may recognize by name a grand-daughter of the first President Dwight, the daughter of President Day, the wife of President Woolsey, the wife of President Porter, first and second cousins of the living President Dwight, and the mother of President Hadley. None of us, I imagine, would be likely to pass over the name of Caroline Street, the wife of Admiral Foote. I may mention as one who only recently left us, the late Mrs. James D. Dana. Until within three days I had supposed Mrs. Maria (Heaton) Robertson, deceased a few weeks since, was probably the very latest survivor. But I have learned that there is one still living, and there may be more than one. This one is the widow of Doctor Chauncey Brown, who was born Julia Strong, and is now in her ninety-third year. I cannot take time to recite the whole catalogue, but if anyone is desirous to see the names I have an annotated list of them here. I imagine I have said enough to indicate that this body of students was from every point of view an unusual one.

The second year of the Institute saw increased numbers in attendance, and those who were interested in it were greatly encouraged. In the beginning of the third year, i. e., in November, 1831, there were some changes in the teaching force, and, among others, Mr. Ray Palmer, a native of Rhode Island, a graduate of the Yale Class of 1830, was brought hither from a Young Ladies' School in New York City, in which he had been teaching, and from that date until the Institute came to its end, I have the benefit of his papers in following the thread of the narrative I am pursuing. That year seems to have been a reasonably prosperous one in the Institute, and while the pressure of the burden of the necessary expenditures began to be felt, the dominant feeling was that of hopefulness. Before the end of 1832, however, some accumulation of the difficulties of the enterprise was appreciable, and it is evident that the hopefulness of Professor Andrews was somewhat seriously abated. Some trouble arose through complaints of the house-keeping, and a falling away of some of the students who were

members of the household. I trust it is not the slightest want of respect to the memory of Mrs. Andrews, to intimate that, estimable and admirable lady as she was, she was not as eminently qualified to administer and control a large household, as was her husband for the work of instruction, and she found her task very heavy. Then as Professor Andrews' burdens increased, and his troubles thickened, an event befell which precipitated a crisis. This was shortly after the beginning of 1833. Some years previous, Prof. Jacob Abbott (the father of Dr. Lyman Abbott) had been called from a chair in Amherst College, by some citizens of Boston, to establish in that city a school for young ladies. It had been known as the Mt. Vernon School, and had attained considerable repute. But Professor Abbott had become desirous to relinquish it, and was in search of some one to take his place. It appears from contemporary letters that in some way—just how I have been unable to detect—his attention had been directed to Mr. Palmer as a suitable person, and he having been married in the autumn previous, might be supposed to be ready for a promotion. Professor Abbott came here to see Mr. Palmer, but making some preliminary inquiries of Professor Andrews, discovered that *he* was open to a proposition to take the place in Boston, all the more that it was not a boarding-school. This discovery opened an extremely satisfactory prospect to Professor Abbott, and very naturally, and very properly, he gave the preference to the elder, and the more widely-known man, and said nothing to Mr. Palmer. In a short time it was announced in New Haven that Professor Andrews was to remove to Boston to become the Principal of the Mt. Vernon School. This purpose he carried out, and for some six years successfully maintained the reputation of that school. Then he returned to his old home in New Britain, and there spent the remainder of his years,* devoting himself to the laborious and expansive literary projects he had formed. The long list of his works I need not

* At one time during this period Professor Andrews was temporarily engaged in teaching in New Haven, but this engagement did not involve the removal of his residence from New Britain.

enumerate. In 1847 Yale gave him his honorary degree. He coveted retirement, but his townsmen were unwilling to let him remain in it. They elected him Judge of the Probate Court, and this office he filled for two successive terms, and would have been continued in it had he been willing to serve. The town of New Britain was erected in 1850, and he was unanimously chosen to be its first representative in the Legislature. When that body met he was made Chairman of the Committee on Education. He was the author of a report in favor of a revision of the Common-School System of the State, and a bill accompanying it, which became the basis of all subsequent legislation. He was an active promoter of the first State Normal School, and when its location at New Britain had been secured, was its steadfast friend and wise adviser to the end of his life. That event came peacefully on March 24, 1858.

The removal of its Principal was a very decided blow to the Young Ladies' Institute, and those interested in it feared the effect would be fatal to the enterprise. Mr. Palmer's first impulse was to relinquish his own position at the same time with Professor Andrews. But vigorous remonstrances having been made by the patrons of the Institute, whose daughters were his pupils, he decided to take less expensive quarters, and go on with the work of teaching upon a smaller scale. A house was actually selected for this purpose. Ultimately, however, he was persuaded to become himself the Principal of the Institute, and took possession of it about the first of April, 1833. Up to that date, while constantly engaged within the building, he had lived outside; now he established himself and his household in the south wing. I have alluded to his marriage in the autumn previous. I am minded by way of episode, thinking to enliven a little what may be a dull narrative, to tell you a story of that event, as an experience of real life easily possible seventy-five years ago, but hardly conceivable now. I have said the summer term of the Institute closed four weeks before the first of November. It was natural, then, that for the wedding of one of the instructors an early day in October should be selected, that he might have the vacation for his honeymoon.

The day chosen was the second, and the hour, noon. The last days of a term are very busy ones, and a conscientious instructor was likely to put off the leaving of his work to as late an hour as possible. In fact he planned to take the night-boat for New York on the first, which would give him ample time to reach his destination, which was Newark, N. J. But on the evening of the first, one of the sudden and sharp southeasterly storms, with which we are familiar, came down relentlessly. The gale was violent, and the prudent Captain would not leave the wharf. This was all well enough for him, but rather hard on the would-be bridegroom. It left him ninety miles away from his bride, with no means of reaching her, or of communicating with her. I have heard that merry-hearted girls, mindful of a familiar line of Gray's "Elegy," used to call him "the Ray serene." I do not think that epithet fitted him that evening! There was nothing for him, however, but to wait and take the morning stage-coach for New York, and this he did. Other people had been disappointed of going by the boat, and they did the same. It followed that the coach was overloaded. Moreover, the roads were very heavy from the rain. All day long it lumbered upon its slow way. To one impatient passenger, its rate of progress was most disheartening. It labored, it lingered, it languished. It paused, it halted, it tarried. It did everything but go. When at last it reached New York—because it could not help it—the hour was so late that the last conveyance for Newark had gone. He could not even get across the Hudson River. After vain attempts he betook himself to a hotel for shelter. He went to bed, but not to sleep. He lay the long hours through, watching the flickering reflection of a street-lamp upon the ceiling, in indescribable humiliation and dismay. Naturally, by the earliest possible conveyance in the morning, he was off.

Meanwhile, what had happened at the other end of the route? At noon of the second a large party of relatives and friends had gathered at the home of the bride. Naturally, she and her bridesmaids were looking their prettiest, and the groomsmen and ushers their best. The house was decorated,

the wedding-breakfast was laid, the parson was there in his robes—all things were ready, *except*—that very indispensable factor, the bridegroom. Where could he be? At first, there was some little joking at his tardiness, but soon the affair took a more serious aspect,—he did not come. After a long wait an adjournment was taken until the evening, and again all was ready to no purpose. After another wait, another adjournment was made until the following noon; a waggish brother of the bride giving notice that should the bridegroom not then appear, the bride would marry the first groomsman. As it was generally understood that this gentleman had been previously an unaccepted suitor, there was humor in this announcement to everybody *but him*, and this somewhat relaxed the strained feeling. The town of Newark was then not too large for everybody to know what was going on, and there was much excitement in it that evening. Hard thoughts and harsh words were current concerning the recreant bridegroom. The bride, while clinging to her faith in her lover, had a night of distress. But in the early forenoon he appeared, and all was explained. The wedding went happily off at last. When at length the pair drove up the street, the sidewalks were lined with throngs of people—curious, as I suppose, to see the bridegroom who had been twenty-four hours late for his wedding, and the bride who forgave him. Railroads and telegraphs have troubles of their own, and sometimes give other people trouble. But we little appreciate, I imagine, from how much trouble they save us.

To return to our narrative. To assume the principalship of the Institute was a bold undertaking for so young a man, with a wife much younger, younger in fact than many of the students themselves, and contemporary letters show that some of his friends were quite solicitous as to the experiment. But his card of announcement, which came out in the catalogue of 1833, following one signed by Professor Andrews setting forth the fact of his retirement, showed a good courage, and gave assurance that the Institute would continue on the lines originally laid down, and the new régime began. It might

be queried, how, if the work of housekeeping had proved too hard for Mrs. Andrews, could so young a matron as Mrs. Palmer hope to succeed in it; but the fact was that she had the counsel and efficient coöperation of her widowed mother, a woman whose character combined strength and beauty, who also, as all her friends were aware, was an experienced and skilful housekeeper. At any rate, the house filled up, the Institute took a fresh start, and a good year followed. I find no evidence that there was further criticism of the administration of the household, or any criticism of the instruction given in the class-rooms, but before the end of his first year as Principal, i. e., by the spring of 1834, Mr. Palmer had concluded, on his own part, that while he could make the Institute pay its own expenses, he could do little more, and as his heart had been set for many years upon ultimately entering the Christian ministry, he gave his landlord notice that after another session he should relinquish the enterprise. Accordingly, in August of that year, Mr. Bishop sold the property to Stiles and Truman French, and in the autumn, at the end of the session, the Institute was finally closed. In the beginning of the winter he removed his family to Boston, and in a few months entered upon a pastorate. Mr. Stiles French opened the building as a school for boys; and about 1840 Gen. W. H. Russell first leased and subsequently purchased it for his famous Military School.

The abandonment of the Institute was very greatly and very widely regretted, by its friends and patrons, and perhaps we ourselves may deem it to be regrettable. But it was probably inevitable. It was an institution welcomed by the few, and these perhaps of the best, but not appealing to the many, nor to such as could do anything adequate for its endowment. It involved too heavy financial responsibility for an individual to sustain. Had it passed into the hands of a corporation, and become possessed of sufficient funds of its own, there is no knowing whereunto it might ultimately have grown. But it probably was in advance of its time, and its five years of history, however creditable and fruitful, only demonstrated that

fact. Nevertheless it appeals somewhat to the local pride of a community like this that just such an institution, the first of its kind, an honor to its founders, of repute throughout the country, the spring of cultural influences which subsequently flowed far and wide, should have originated here. It was the pioneer of the many colleges for young women now so well known, and so great a power. Or, at any rate, it was a harbinger of the good things that were to come. It was in this conviction, and I think from no other reason—although it is not much against a man that he has some sentiment about his birthplace—that I yielded to a request, and prepared the paper, which I have had the honor to lay before you.

ELI WHITNEY BLAKE, SCIENTIST AND INVENTOR.

By HENRY T. BLAKE.

[Read December 21, 1908.]

Eli Whitney Blake was born at Westboro, Mass., January 27, 1795. His father was a country farmer of moderate means, and his uncle, Eli Whitney, on account of the boy's name, assumed the expense of his college education. He graduated at Yale in 1816 and soon afterwards entered the Law School at Litchfield, then conducted by Judge Gould. During his second year in that school he was called away by Mr. Whitney to aid him in the work of enlarging his arms manufactory at Whitneyville and in the general conduct of his business; Mr. Blake's brother, Philos, being associated with him in the same work.

While in the employment of Mr. Whitney, Mr. Blake did some outside engineering work. Among other things he made one of the preliminary surveys for the Farmington canal, having Mr. Henry Farnam as his assistant, and with this joint labor commenced a friendship between the two young men, which lasted through life. During this period also he was a member of the Second Company, Governor's Foot Guard and at the time of the Medical College riots in January, 1824, he was sent as lieutenant in command of twenty men to protect the Medical College building; a duty which was accomplished, and several of the rioters were captured by the military and lodged in jail.

On July 5, 1822, Mr. Blake married Eliza Maria O'Brien of New Haven, who, as a faithful and devoted wife and mother, shared his joys and sorrows for nearly fifty-four years, and who

died April 15, 1876. The domestic history of the pair, however, does not come within the purpose of this paper.

Toward the year 1822, Mr. Whitney's health began to fail, so that he gave less and less personal attention to the Whitneyville business. He died in 1825, leaving Mr. Blake and his brother Philos in charge of the arms factory and its affairs, which they continued to conduct until 1835. In that year these two with another, John, under the firm name of "Blake Brothers," started a factory of their own at Westville for making door locks and latches and other articles of domestic hardware. This firm was the first in this country and probably in the world to introduce the now universally used "mortise" locks and latches which are inserted into the body of the door; superseding the previous clumsy and disfiguring "box" locks and latches of English manufacture which were affixed to the surface of the door, and of which specimens may still be occasionally seen in ancient houses. They were also the first to manufacture numerous other household equipments promoting convenience and economy in domestic life which have since come into common use. This business was carried on at Westville until about 1880, when, the other two members of the firm having died, and the profits of the business diminished through excessive competition, it was brought to a close. Meantime, for many years Mr. Blake's personal attention had been fully occupied by the affairs connected with his most important invention, the Blake Stone Breaker (of which more hereafter), and he had now reached an age when repose was the first consideration. He therefore retired from active work and passed a quiet and happy old age in the bosom of his family. He nevertheless retained an undiminished interest in all the public and scientific questions of the day, until, in the full possession of his unusual mental powers, he died at New Haven, August 18, 1886, in his 92d year. The residence, No. 77 Elm Street, which was his home for the last fifty-six years of his life, is now occupied by the Graduates' Club.

An incident illustrating Mr. Blake's practical ingenuity, which created much interest at the time among the medical fra-

ternity of New Haven, may perhaps be related here. While he was in charge of the factory at Whitneyville, a small boy of the neighborhood stuffed a pebble into one of his ears as far as he could push it and was unable to get it out. Being a modest youth, he made no report of this achievement and in a day or two the pebble was so imbedded in inflammation that only a small part of its surface could be seen. The boy's suffering was intense and the local doctors could devise no way to remove the pebble except by cutting into the ear, an operation certainly painful, and possibly serious. Mr. Blake then took the matter in hand and removed the pebble in the following manner. Having pushed a stiff cardboard tube into the ear so as to press back the inflammation and expose more of the pebble's surface, he separated the end of a strong string into its component fibers, and inserting this end into the tube he spread the fibers over the surface of the pebble and fixed them to it with a strong cement. Then when the cement had been hardened by blowing air upon it with a bellows, a steady pull on the string brought out the pebble. In after years the late Dr. Knight frequently mentioned this operation to his students as a clever bit of surgery; and, within my own recollection, the pebble with its string and tube attached was preserved as a relic in the museum of the Medical College.

Throughout his long life Mr. Blake was keenly interested in all scientific subjects and problems, particularly those connected with the department of physics. He early became and always continued to be an active member of the Connecticut Academy of Science and Arts and served for a part of the time as its President. Possessing a spirit of original investigation, united with acute perceptions and mathematical abilities of a high order, he was a frequent contributor to the *American Journal of Science*, then conducted by the elder Professor Silliman, and was held in high respect by that distinguished man, who refers to him in "the Yale Book" as "an able investigator of mechanical and physical problems." Mr. Blake's first contribution to the *Journal* was in 1824 (he being then 29 years old), and was an elaborate treatise on the proper form for the teeth

of cog wheels. The paper, which occupies sixteen pages of the *Journal*, with mathematical demonstrations and diagrams, completely covered a field which had been only partially worked by previous writers, and was for many years thereafter referred to in scientific publications as "Blake's Exhaustive Treatise" on that branch of mechanics.

In 1827 he published a paper in the *Journal* entitled "The Crank Problem, with Remarks on the Transmission of Power by Machinery," and, in 1835, another, entitled "On the Resistance of Fluids, with Remarks on the Received Theory Relating to that Subject." These two papers, although nine years apart, are here mentioned together because their origin and main purpose was in both cases the same. In the first case, a dispute had arisen between two previous contributors to the *Journal* on the question whether there was a loss of power in the crank motion. In the second, there was a similar dispute between two other contributors with respect to the laws which govern the resistance of fluids. In both cases, Mr. Blake joined the discussion with a purpose to show that the dispute had been caused by the indiscriminate use by both parties of the same term "force" as applied to three different forms of its manifestation, viz.: Force as simple pressure; force producing motion for a certain distance, or a certain amount of work; and force producing a certain amount of motion or work in a certain time. These three forms of "force," he insisted, are different in kind as mechanical elements, and should be distinguished from each other in all mechanical discussions. The first form of force, he contended, consists of only one attribute, like linear measure; the second, of two, like superficial measure; and the third, of three, like solid measure; and the same word "force," he declared, can be no more properly used to express these three different things, than the word "foot" can be used indiscriminately to mean a linear foot, a square foot, or a cubic foot. The inevitable effect of such a careless use of language in mechanical discussions, he maintained, must be misunderstanding and confusion, not only between the contestants, but in the reasonings of each; and this result, he

claimed, was manifest in the papers under consideration. He then in each case took up the problem under discussion, pointing out the errors of the disputants both in their arguments and their results, and giving in each case what he claimed to be the correct solution.

In both these papers of Mr. Blake, written, as before stated, nine years apart, he took occasion to criticize the existing text-books and other treatises on Mechanics for not making clear this distinction between the different forms of force and their different values in physical discussions, declaring that so far as his "observation extended, more errors had arisen from misapprehension here than from all other sources." "It is this error," he says, "pervading treatises on mechanics which has rendered them worse than useless as guides to practical men on subjects relating to the application and use of mechanical power"; and adds the remark, "Until this distinction is laid down *in limine* as fundamental in reference to such application and use, theory and practice will woo each other almost in vain."

The last of these papers, which related to the Resistance of Fluids, was sharply replied to by one of the writers who had been criticized by it. In this reply he denied that Mr. Blake's solution of the problem in hand was correct, and he especially criticized his distinctions respecting the use of the term "force," charging him with presumption in differing from Newton, who made no such distinctions, and whose laws of force were universally accepted by physicists. To this attack, Mr. Blake rejoined at some length in a third contribution to the *Journal*, defending the correctness of his solution, and answering the charge of presumption as follows: "I am not aware that in the article referred to I impeached the demonstrations or conclusions of Newton. I imagine that the points which I called in question were rather inferences illegitimately drawn from Newton's reasonings. If, however, I have arrayed myself against Newton, I shall not retreat or seek refuge behind any *name*, but take my stand on the immutable laws of Nature. If these will not sustain me, let me be put down."

As supplementary to the foregoing and perhaps somewhat abstruse disquisition, it is proper to state that modern text-

books on physics make the same distinctions as those indicated by Mr. Blake in 1827 and 1836. "Force" itself, or simple pressure, is measured by its unit, the dyne. "Energy," or force in the form of work, is force multiplied by distance and is measured by the erg, or foot-pound. "Power" is work divided by time and its units are ergs per second, horse-power, kilowatt, etc. The terms for these physical quantities are still sometimes loosely applied, but the fact that their fundamental differences were pointed out so clearly by Mr. Blake at those early dates, indicates that he was in advance of his contemporaries in appreciating the distinctions to be made between them.

In 1848, Mr. Blake made another contribution to the *Journal of Science* in a paper entitled "A Theoretic Determination of the Law of the Flow of Elastic Fluids through Orifices." This paper was one of much practical importance and had some interesting consequences. It had its origin in the following manner: A new steam engine which had been purchased for the factory at Westville disappointed him with respect to the power it developed and he sought to discover the reason. After careful study, he concluded that the ports or passages for the steam entering or leaving the cylinder were not of the proper size. On writing for information to the reputable firm which had constructed the engine, he learned that the ports were in exact conformity to the rule long established and accepted by the best authorities. Mr. Blake thereupon looked up the authorities and the principles on which the rule had been arrived at and became convinced that the rule was incorrect. He therefore took up the problem anew to discover by mathematical investigation the law which governs the flow of elastic fluids through narrow openings. The abstruse processes by which he reached his final results are given in his paper and the conclusion was that the passages in a steam engine for the flow of steam from the cylinder should be twice as large as the established rule prescribed.

After this paper appeared in the *Journal* it was vigorously assailed by various experts in letters to the editor of the *Journal*, though no formal refutation of it was offered. The protests, however, were so numerous and respectable that Mr.

Blake determined to test the correctness of his views experimentally. Accordingly, during such time as he could spare from his pressing business, he constructed an apparatus for the purpose. In 1851 he published in the *Journal* a description of the apparatus, with an account of the test, the result of which established beyond dispute the soundness of his view as it had been previously demonstrated theoretically. Nothing more was heard from the critics, but there was a sequel to the incident twenty-four years later which remains to be told.

In the year 1866, Mr. Robert Napier of Glasgow, Scotland, the owner and manager of one of the most extensive establishments in Great Britain for the construction of ships and marine engines, published in the London *Engineer* an account of experiments made by him on the flow of steam through an engine, by which he had reached precisely the same results which Mr. Blake had demonstrated in 1848; such demonstration, however, being unknown to Mr. Napier. In January, 1875, Mr. Blake, who was unaware of Mr. Napier's experiments, was surprised by the receipt of the following letter:

HYDE PARK ST., GLASGOW, Jan. 2, 1875.

ELI W. BLAKE, ESQ.,

Dear Sir—In 1866, I published my views about the flow of steam, with the results of experiments, and was not aware until several years afterwards that you had published the self-same views more than eighteen years before me. I have no doubt that you, with comparatively few experiments to support you, would find it possible more difficult than I did to convince anyone of the truth of my views.

I think I may safely say that I should to this date hardly have convinced anyone had not Professor Rankine come to my rescue by writing papers in the *Engineer* in November and December, 1869, and through that, I understand that our views are accepted generally in Germany and among a number of mathematicians of the first class in Britain.

I thought you would like to see that you were not quite forgotten in the thing. When writing my letter to the *Engineer*, now sent (December 25, 1874), I had nothing to refer to as to the date of your views being published or I should have mentioned it.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT D. NAPIER.

Accompanying this letter was a copy of the *Engineer*, containing an acknowledgment by Mr. Napier of Mr. Blake as the prior discoverer of the new rule for the flow of steam, and

of his demonstration of it by a process of reasoning "which," says Mr. Napier, "I have to admit that I cannot understand, but I have met some to whom it was more convincing than my own."

Surely such a voluntary and cordial acknowledgment of priority from a British to an American discoverer is of itself worthy of commemoration as a notable historical event. It may be added that all steam engines are now built with ports constructed according to the rule first laid down by Mr. Blake.

In the course of his investigations into the properties of elastic fluids, Mr. Blake became impressed with a new view respecting the manner in which pulses or sound-waves are propagated through the atmosphere, and in 1848 he published a paper in the *Journal of Science* entitled "A Determination of the General Laws of the Propagation of Pulses in Elastic Media"; in which he maintained that the velocity of sound is not invariably the same under like conditions, as was then and still is generally believed, but that it is affected by the sound's intensity. This view he further supported by another paper which appeared in the *Journal* in 1850, entitled "Influence of the Known Laws of Motion on the Expansion of Elastic Fluids." In both these papers he developed at considerable length his theory as to the manner in which pulses of compression are propagated through elastic fluids like the atmosphere, the argument being contained in a course of reasoning which only those versed in the higher mathematics can follow. For many years thereafter Mr. Blake's business activities prevented him from pursuing his scientific investigations, but when in 1879 his Alma Mater, Yale, conferred on him the honorary degree of LL.D., he felt impelled to revive the discussion of the subject last referred to, as one in which, after thirty years' reflection, he found his views confirmed, and upon which he felt that there was something more to be said. He therefore took up the subject with new zest, and in December, 1881 (he then being nearly 87 years old), he submitted for publication in the *Journal of Science* a paper entitled "The Form, Formation and Movements of Sonorous Waves." In this paper he

reviewed the views of previous writers on the velocity and propagation of sound-waves through the atmosphere, and their disagreements with each other, and pressed his own theory as the only one which conformed to dynamic laws. The then editors of the *Journal*, however, were not prepared to accept for publication ideas which did not accord with those generally embraced by physicists, and declined the article. Whereupon Mr. Blake decided to place his views on record in another form. He therefore collected all the papers which he had written relating to the laws and properties of elastic fluids and published them in 1882, in a small volume for private distribution, under the title, "Original Solutions of Several Problems in Aero-dynamics."

In the preface to this volume he says that he presents these papers "as a contribution towards a more full development of an interesting and important branch of physics"; and after its publication he often expressed his confidence that the time would come when the truth of all the views set forth in the volume would be universally recognized by physicists, as that of some of them had already been acknowledged after a period of skepticism. Whether this expectation will ever be realized with regard to his theory respecting the varying velocities of sound-waves and their mode of propagation, still remains to be seen. While the general view continues to be that all sound-waves move with the same velocity under like conditions, it is admitted that such velocity, after many years of experiment, is not accurately known, and that a margin of doubt still exists sufficient to make the theory of varying velocities, at least within that margin, a possible one. In fact, some of the recorded experiments distinctly favor even a greater degree of variation than this. The question, therefore, seems remanded for solution, if it can ever be solved at all, to the realm of mathematics and dynamic laws. It was on the conviction that he had so solved it that Mr. Blake's confidence in the ultimate acceptance of his views was based; his attitude being that which was expressed in his language already quoted, in the case of another disputed position, "I take my stand on the immutable laws of Nature. If these will not sustain me, let me be put down."

We now come to that invention of Mr. Blake's which has given him a world-wide reputation as a promoter of human progress and prosperity. This invention, which is known all over the world as "The Blake crusher" (or, as he preferred to call it, "the Blake stone breaker"), received its United States patent fifty years ago this year, or to be exact, on June 15, 1858; and as half a century has now elapsed since its official birth, this seems to be an appropriate time to review the influence it has exerted during that period as an economic and social factor in this and other countries of our globe. As this paper, however, is of a personal nature in its primary purpose, it will be proper for me to begin with a brief account of the origin and development of an invention which was so important in its character and so far-reaching in its results. Fortunately we have Mr. Blake's own story of its achievement in a sworn statement submitted by him to the Commissioner of Patents in 1872, on his application for an extension of his patent; the law then requiring that on such application the applicant should show among other things the labor which the invention had cost him and its value to the public.

In this statement Mr. Blake begins by saying that his attention was first directed to the subject when, in 1851, he was appointed by the town of New Haven one of a committee to construct about two miles of macadam road on one of the principal avenues of the city. (This was Whalley Avenue from Broadway to Westville bridge.) "No work of the kind," he says, "had then been done in the neighborhood, and I believe that at that time there were not a dozen miles of macadam road in all the New England states." He says that he devoted himself at once to a careful and thorough study of all the books he could find on the subject, and found that no way had been devised to break stone into fragments except by hand hammers, costing two days' labor to produce only a cubic yard of road metal, "and this in coarser fragments than was desirable for a good road-bed." He adds: "the importance of a machine to do the work became immediately obvious and from that time for a period of seven years, scarcely a day, or an hour, passed in which my mind was not mainly occupied with the subject."

On careful reflection he saw that the problem before him was to contrive an apparatus which should act at the same time on a considerable number of stones of different sizes and shapes, and from which the fragments when reduced to the desired size should be rapidly and automatically removed. Three years had passed before his mind had clearly conceived the solution of this problem, viz., a pair of upright jaws converging downwards; the space between them at the top being sufficiently large to receive the stones to be broken, and that at the bottom small enough to permit the passage of such fragments as were broken to the required size; and then imparting to one of the jaws a short and powerful vibratory movement.

This simple device having been decided on, it still remained to organize the machine in its practical form; to fix the mode of imparting movement to the vibratory jaw in such manner as to secure the most compact arrangement of parts with the least amount of friction, and sufficient power to crush trap rock by a pressure of 27,000 pounds to the square inch. The method by which he met these conditions was often referred to by the late Prof. William P. Trowbridge in his class and public lectures as a notable achievement in mechanical combinations; but simple as it was, the study and computations involved occupied the remainder of the seven years that were spent on the invention. The form and strength of every part was worked out in detail on paper before a step was taken in construction, and so carefully and correctly was this done that the first machine set up proved to be as perfect in all its working qualities as the last one that has been yet produced after fifty years of experience.

Since Mr. Blake's patent has expired, and with it the exclusive right to manufacture his invention, vast numbers of stone crushers have been put on the market by other makers, many of which contain some immaterial modification in shape or arrangement of parts; but all being alike in the essential features which were original with Mr. Blake and were covered by his patent, viz., the upright convergent jaws between which the stones are crushed by a short vibration imparted to one

of the jaws. All of these machines, therefore, with whatever names they are labeled, are generically "the Blake crusher," and are so recognized by engineers and experts all over the world, with whom the terms "jaw crusher" and "Blake crusher" are synonymous. Whenever, therefore, this paper refers to "the Blake crushers" which are now in use, or have been since 1858, it means all machines by whomsoever made which contain the upright, convergent crushing jaws, constructed and operating as described in the Blake patent, including those in which the movable jaw has a rotary as well as a vibratory motion; just as all cotton gins that have been made or used, whatever slight changes may have been introduced in them by different makers, since they all possess the essential features which mark the original invention, are spoken of everywhere and by everybody as "the Whitney cotton gin."

The comparison just made was hardly needed as a reminder in this connection of that other mechanical creation, half a century before the genesis of the stone breaker; equally original, simple and complete, and which has had a like important influence on human conditions. The parallel features in the two cases are in fact remarkable. As Mr. Blake had no pre-existing machine or method of labor as a starting point for his invention, so Mr. Whitney was obliged to devise a new mode of separating the cotton fiber from the seed before he could contrive the mechanism to do it. In both cases the resulting machines were so simple and perfect for their purpose that they have never been materially varied from; and both are the only devices that ever have been or probably ever will be used for their special objects. Moreover, it is an interesting circumstance that two such epoch-making inventions as the cotton gin and the stone crusher should have been produced by uncle and nephew, born in the same village, residents of the same city, bearing the same name, and so intimately associated in their lives. The coincidences extended to the business history and results of the two inventions. In the case of Mr. Whitney, the European wars which lasted through the whole term of his patent cut off the exportation and practically the

production of cotton during that period. And in the case of Mr. Blake, the Civil war in this country and its after effects almost entirely prevented for many years the public improvements and new enterprises which would have created a demand for his machine. To both of them also came the usual experience of inventors in the activity of infringers and the law's delays, so that in the end neither of them reaped more than a very meager pecuniary reward for his genius and labors.

I have called the cotton gin and the stone breaker epoch-making inventions. By this I do not mean that either of them is to be ranked with those superlative productions of the human mind which have harnessed the forces of nature into the service of man, like the steam engine, the telegraph, the telephone, and photography. Neither are they to be classed as merely labor-saving machines whose effect is confined to the cheapening of production without ulterior social or economic results; though such was doubtless their standing until their wider influence began to appear. While the use of the cotton gin was confined to a few planters, its value was measured by the profit it brought to its users. But with the changes which it subsequently wrought in the commercial and political world, as well as in the domestic conditions of mankind, it took position as a conspicuous agency for national advancement in power and wealth and for the general well-being of the human race.

So in 1872, when Mr. Blake applied for the extension of his patent and was required to show the value of his invention, there being then only 509 of his machines in use in the United States, the value of the invention could best be shown by the saving of cost which up to that time it had effected in the various industries in which these machines had been employed. Accordingly, the proof was directed principally to this point, and it was shown by the undisputed testimony of numerous experts that the saving in money which had been caused by ten years' use of these 509 machines could not possibly be less than \$55,560,000, and was doubtless much more. What such saving would now amount to, nearly forty years later, several thousand machines having been in use for most

of that period, it would of course be impossible to estimate. Moreover, such an estimate, if possible, would be misleading, for the reason that by far the greater part of the work that the stone breaker has accomplished would not have been undertaken at all if hand labor alone had been available. In fact, the value of the invention has now ceased to be a question of figures and must be measured by the kind and extent of its influence on the social and economic conditions of mankind.

Applying this rule, therefore, it will be appropriate and possibly interesting to consider some of the methods in which the Blake crusher has operated during the last fifty years to benefit the human race.

We will consider as the first of these methods its advancement of civilization by the improvement of roads. It is a trite saying of obvious truth that "the civilization of a country may be known by its roads," and the corollary of this proposition is equally sound, that the civilization of any country is advanced by the betterment of its highways. It will hardly be believed by the present generation that fifty years ago a macadam road was so rare in this country as to be a curiosity, but it is nevertheless true that there were then hardly fifty miles of good macadam road in the whole United States. At that time the best macadam roads that existed anywhere were constructed of coarse hand-broken stone and their rough surface had to be painfully worn down to smoothness by the travel over it. At the present day such roads, being universally made with the use of the crusher, are, as we all know, smooth and hard as a floor at the outset. Doubtless it was this circumstance, as well as the less cost of construction, that gave rise to the enthusiastic movement for "good roads" which, beginning about sixteen years ago, has since pervaded this country and Europe, and brought about the International Congress on Road Improvement which was held in Paris in October, 1908. As respects its progress in our own country, I learn from our efficient state highway commissioner, Mr. Macdonald, that twenty-two states now give liberal aid to highway improvement. There are now (in 1908), he tells me, 38,622 miles of macadam public roads

already constructed in the United States and their mileage is constantly increasing. The state of New York in 1905 established a fund of fifty millions of dollars for the improvement of its public roads; and our own State Legislature at its last session appropriated \$500,000 as state aid to the towns for two years in similar work. That these highway improvements are rapidly changing social and economic conditions, especially in the country districts, is clearly evident. Better market facilities with the means of increased neighborhood intercourse and the consequent reoccupation of worn-out farms for cultivation, and villa sites; the establishment of Rural Mail Delivery with its results of a closer association of the rural population with the outside world and its intellectual activities; these and other changes which are in progress are clearly connected directly or indirectly with improved highways.

Another change from the same cause, both in city and country, which is obvious to every one with an eye, an ear, or a nose, appears in the swarms of automobiles which practically monopolize every avenue of travel or traffic. Forty years ago the late Frederick Law Olmsted, in enumerating the prospective beneficial effects of the Blake crusher through its general improvement of roads, predicted that one result would be the use of road locomotives for the transportation of freight. The road locomotives have surely come! Not as Mr. Olmsted anticipated, in the humble guise of a servant, but as haughty sovereigns of the highway, realizing that other vision of a more ancient prophet: "The chariots shall rage in the streets; they shall jostle against one another in the highways; they shall seem like torches, they shall run like lightnings." And he might have added, "With fiendish yells they shall tear up the roadways; before them shall be terror, and behind them death, dust, stench and destruction." Doubtless these new conditions indicate an advancing state of civilization, just as civilization develops new diseases of mind and body; but the problem how to separate the abnormal results from the normal; how to suppress the prevailing abuse while preserving the reasonable and beneficial use of these latest products of human ingenuity,

is one of the most pressing problems that now confront the present generation.

Railroads in this age of the world are only another form of highways, and we may therefore properly allude in this connection to the now general use of broken stone for ballasting railway tracks. The effects of this practice are to give greater stability and durability to the track and thus promote the safety and comfort of their daily millions of passengers. Those of us who can remember the stifling dust which always filled the cars not fifty years ago, and made long linen wrappers indispensable garments for every traveler, will appreciate the modern absence of this nuisance with gratitude to the stone crusher, through which it was abolished. The immense saving effected by broken stone ballast in cost of maintenance, both of permanent way and of rolling stock, will appeal with equal force to the railroad companies.

The second point of view from which we will consider the stone breaker is as a creator of wealth by its influence on the art of mining.

In most mining operations the ore is taken from its bed in masses of different sizes, the largest of which were formerly reduced to smaller fragments by hand labor preparatory to pulverization by stamps, rollers and other devices adapted to that purpose. Some of these ores are very refractory and so hard that under the old method of treatment they had to be roasted before they could be broken up by hammers, and this necessity, as well as the subsequent cost of hand-breaking, added largely to the expense of the metal extraction. Moreover, in the process of hand-breaking the ores of the precious metals, it often happened that pieces of ore that were temptingly rich found their way into the laborers' pockets, thus causing a serious loss in the business, the amount of which, of course, could never be known. With the advent of the Blake crusher, however, not only the roasting was done away with, but the hand-breaking and thievery also; the result being, as was testified to by several experts before the Commissioner of Patents in 1872, that many mines became profitable after its use which

before had been worked at a loss. This will be easily believed since it was also shown that the known and computable saving in mining expenses which had been effected by 375 Blake crushers in ten years was certainly not less than \$28,375,000. Since 1872, many times that number of jaw crushers have been operating in the mining regions of this country, and during the same period there has been an enormous increase in the annual metal output of the United States: that of pig iron having grown from 1,850,000 tons in 1870 to 25,442,000 tons in 1907; that of copper from 28,224,000 pounds in 1870 to 879,242,000 pounds in 1907; and that of silver from about 10,000,000 ounces in 1870 to 58,850,000 ounces in 1907. Fortunately for the stability of our financial system, the annual production of gold has only a little more than doubled during the same period.

It would be perhaps too much to claim that this remarkable growth in metal production is chiefly due to the use of the Blake crusher in mining; nevertheless, in view of the testimony above referred to, there can be no doubt that such use has materially contributed to it. To that extent, therefore, the invention may justly be regarded as an important creator of wealth, both directly to the mine owners and indirectly to the country at large, whose general prosperity is more or less enhanced by the development of its metallic resources.

A third method in which the Blake crusher has operated to promote human progress is by opening up new fields of industrial art, especially in connection with the use of concrete. In 1872, at the hearing before the Commissioner of Patents, it appeared that out of the 509 machines then in use in the United States, only eight were employed in the production of concrete, and these were in public works of such importance that cost was a subordinate consideration. Nevertheless, it was shown that the use of the machine in those works had saved at least fifty per cent. over the cost of hand labor; and it was also shown that by reason of the varying sizes of the broken stone product, only two-thirds as much cement was needed as for the stone broken by hand, while a better quality

of concrete was obtained. These facts led one of the experts who testified to them to express his belief that "as one effect of the Blake crusher, the use of concrete in this country would be largely increased and that it had a very great future before it." Confident as was the prediction, even its author could not have anticipated that in less than forty years so extensive and varied would the uses of concrete become, through the reduced cost and unlimited supply of its broken stone material, that the period would be already spoken of as "the Age of Concrete." Then it was chiefly employed for submerged foundations on an uneven rock bottom, and for the lining of reservoirs. Now the entire superstructures of dams, lighthouses, fortifications, sea walls and reservoirs are often composed of it. Whole blocks of commercial and manufacturing buildings are built of it for solidity, as well as security against fire and earthquakes; and it is hardly necessary to say that without the reduced cost and unlimited supply of broken stone, already referred to, the subaqueous and subterranean tunnels for travel and traffic, which are beginning to form such an important feature of our civilization, would not exist. So also in order to supply the five or six million cubic yards of concrete required for the immense locks and dams and other constructions of the Panama Canal the Blake invention has been practically if not absolutely indispensable.

Still less could that prophet of 1872 have anticipated the new and vast field for the use of concrete which has been opened by the recent invention or rediscovery of reinforcing it with imbedded steel rods. By the use of this device bridges are now constructed of concrete with spans of 200 feet or more; also steeples, domes and sky-scraping towers, composed of steel frames incased in concrete; not to specify the numerous applications of a humbler character with which we are familiar and which are appearing almost daily, concrete boats being among the latest to be announced. In fact, it would be hard to say what advancements in the industrial arts, which as yet are only abstract conceptions, may not in the future become concrete realities.

Lest it be thought that this last suggestion is of a merely humorous or fanciful character, I will refer to a new field for the use of concrete which is now being successfully cultivated in our own city and which owes its origin directly to the invention of the Blake crusher, since by that machine alone can trap rock be reduced cheaply and in large quantities to fragments small enough to pass through a half-inch screen. With this fine material a concrete is now made which can be moulded into the most delicate forms of architectural decoration, which, when set, become as hard and durable as granite. Thus it becomes possible to produce, at a moderate cost, architectural structures which in wealth and variety of ornament may rival the most splendid cathedrals of Europe and whose solidity and weather-resisting qualities will be even superior. Doubtless some critics may object that moulded decorations must necessarily be inartistic because cheap, but it is hard to see why they should be more inartistic in concrete than in plaster or bronze. Moreover, moulded forms in concrete, when hardened, may be tooled over by hand, thus giving them the reality as well as the effect of hand productions. Nevertheless, those who have seen the burlesque figures in concrete which were made here in New Haven by Mr. Laurie for the new government buildings at West Point, will be slow to admit that moulded concrete has no legitimate place in architectural decoration. The canons of art have been modified before now by new discoveries, like photography and color printing; and the spirit of art is or ought to be sufficiently progressive to welcome into its province every new invention or new material by which beautiful forms can be more widely diffused among the people. Such diffusion means artistic education, and if the artistic use of concrete shall grow to large proportions, as now seems possible, this also with its refining influences may be classed among the indirect benefits which the Blake Crusher has conferred upon mankind.

In the foregoing review of Mr. Blake's services to the world through his invention of the stone crusher, I have taken into account only its beneficial effects in our own country, and dur-

ing the first half century of its existence. When we consider that this machine is also largely used in all the civilized and some of the uncivilized countries of the globe, there, as here, promoting civilization, creating wealth, and advancing the industrial arts, and that it will so continue to be used in an increasing ratio for ages to come, we shall more fully appreciate the extent of that service; and will also recognize a reason why his name, which has become historic throughout the world, should not be without honor among his own people and in his own town.

REV. WILLIAM HOOKE, 1601-1678.

By REV. CHARLES RAY PALMER, D.D.

[Read March 22, 1909.]

I am to speak to you this evening of one of the early ministers of New Haven, now perhaps too little remembered. I refer to Rev. William Hooke, the colleague of Rev. John Davenport. It appears from a transcript of his registration in his college at Oxford that he was from Southampton, and was born in 1601. He is described as "the son of a gentleman," that term being, of course, an indication of social rank. Careful inquiry made more than fifty-five years ago, at the instance of the Hon. Abbott Lawrence, then Minister to England, elicited nothing more definite as to his family, however, than that the name was not an uncommon one in that locality. But in 1901 there was published (by Macmillans) a book entitled "Scenes of Rural Life in Hampshire among the Manors of Bramshott," by the Rev. W. W. Capes, who was the rector of Bramshott,* in which it was claimed that Mr. Hooke belonged to a family known in the seventeenth century as "the Hookes of Bramshott," a prominent family in Hampshire at that time, and well known to have had Parliamentary sympathies in the great civil war. A daughter of John Hooke of Bramshott, Anna Hooke, was the wife of John Pym, the famous Parliamentary leader, who has been called the founder of party government in England. We have facsimiles of the autograph and seal of William Hooke,† and the arms upon the seal are identical with those borne by the lord of the Manor of Bram-

* See the volume cited in Boston Public Library, p. 167, *et seq.* The publishers say the book is out of print.

† Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., Series IV, Vol. 7, at end.

shott. The inference is easy that, as Mr. Capes affirms, he was a near kinsman of that personage. Nothing is known, however, of his early years, or of his education, up to his entering college in 1616. Trinity College, Oxford, was the one chosen by him, or for him. This was the earliest Post-Reformation foundation, having been founded by Henry VIII in 1554, on the site of a suppressed Benedictine institution. Naturally it has its own honorable traditions. It takes a just pride in distinguished names upon its lists. Chillingworth, Selden, the elder William Pitt (Earl of Chatham), Roundell Palmer (Lord Selborne), Cardinal Newman (afterward Fellow of Oriel), Sir Richard Burton, Dr. E. A. Freeman, among the dead; and the Rt. Hon. Sir James Bryce, the present Ambassador of Great Britain in this country, among the living, are counted among its illustrious sons. When Mr. Hooke joined it, however, it was not much over sixty years old, and one of the youngest of the august sisterhood we know as Oxford University. But he did not altogether escape observation. Sir Anthony Wood, in his "*Fasti Oxonienses*,"—not too friendly an authority—says of him that "he was esteemed a close student, and a religious person." Having pursued his studies here, he received his B.A. degree on June 28, 1620, and proceeded M.A. on May 26, 1623. He took orders in the Church of England. The earliest note of him as a clergyman is that he was instituted to the Vicarage of Clatford, in Hampshire, May 4, 1627. This he left in 1632, and became the Vicar of Axmouth, Devon, July 26, 1632. His pronounced Puritan tendencies subjected him, like many others, to serious antagonisms and many embarrassments, and at length occasioned his emigration to New England. The date of his coming is not known with exactness, but it is believed to have been in 1636,—certainly it was not far either way from that year.* He was cordially received in Boston, by men to whom he was known. Rev. Richard Mather, the minister of Dorchester, and the progenitor of all the New

* He should not be confounded, as he sometimes has been, with another William Hooke, originally from Yorkshire, and a Representative to the General Court from Salisbury. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, Series IV, Vol. 7.

England Mathers, although four or five years older, had been his contemporary in Oxford, and he together with his colleague, the Rev. John Wilson (subsequently of Medfield, Mass.), became Mr. Hooke's friends and counsellors. In the following year, 1637, his name appears in connection with the purchase of Cohannet, now Taunton, from the Tettiquet (Titticut) Indians. He interested himself in the settlement of this region. A leading spirit in the movement was a woman of some note,* Mrs. Elizabeth Poole, who was the actual purchaser of the lands, and he became her spiritual adviser. He was one of the original members of the First Church of Taunton, and became its first pastor. Mr. Mather and Mr. Wilson took part in his ordination to this charge. There was installed with him on the same day the Rev. Nicholas Street, to be his associate and successor in the church in Taunton, and afterwards to follow him to New Haven, as is well known, and be a minister of the First Church there from 1659 to his death in 1674.

At Taunton Mr. Hooke became favorably known as an able and efficient minister, and he retained his office for about seven years. At least two sermons preached here by Mr. Hooke were published, and are still extant. They were Fast-Day sermons, and were published, one in 1640, the other in 1645. In 1839, on occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of the First Church in New Haven, the pastor, Rev. Leonard Bacon, D.D., preached a series of historical discourses, which subsequently were published.† Any one who speaks of Mr. Hooke naturally finds himself indebted to this volume. In one of these discourses he makes copious extracts from the first of these sermons of Mr. Hooke, intimating that but one copy of it was known to be in existence, and that was in the library of Harvard College. That was the opinion of President Everett, as late as the year 1850, but some half dozen copies or more were subsequently brought to light, and the whole sermon, together with others from Mr. Hooke's pen, was reprinted in Rev.

* Emery's Hist. of Taunton, Vol. 1.

Paper of James E. Seaver, Esq., in Collections of Old Col. Hist. Soc., No. 7, pp. 106 to 134.

† Bacon's Historical Discourses, New Haven: Durrie & Peck, 1839.

S. H. Emery's "Ministry of Taunton," Vol. I, and to this volume I am happy to acknowledge myself deeply indebted. Dr. Bacon's comment upon the style of the discourse is, that "while it has some touches of antique phraseology, it is far more ornamental, polished, and rhetorical, than the style of any other New England preacher of the day."* Similar expressions of opinion have been made by others, who have spoken appropriately of the scholarship displayed in the discourse, as well as of its spirit and its rhetorical excellence.

The Rev. Dr. Ezra Stiles, the President of Yale College from 1778 to 1795, was previously, from 1753 to 1776, the minister of the Second Congregational Church in Newport, R. I. From 1769 to his decease in 1795, he kept a careful and voluminous diary, now preserved in Yale University Library, and in 1901 it was transcribed, carefully edited, and published by the authority of the Corporation.† Under date of March 4 to 7 in 1772, Dr. Stiles records a visit to him from the Rev. Caleb Barnum, the seventh pastor of the Church in Taunton. He was a native of Danbury, and became minister at Taunton in 1769. In 1776 he was a Chaplain in the Continental service, and died at Pittsfield, Mass., of a bilious disorder contracted at Ticonderoga, in the retreat from Montreal. Incidentally, in this record, under date of March 5, Dr. Stiles records, on the authority of Mr. Barnum, the tradition that Mr. Hooke "was chiefly supported in Taunton by one man, a Mr. Williams, a Deacon of the Church." This tradition is fairly entitled to be regarded as a Taunton tradition, and if we accept it—and I know no reason why we should not—it is perfectly easy to identify the Mr. Williams referred to. He can have been none other than Mr. Richard Williams, who was in an important sense the father of the Taunton Church, and lived to the great age of ninety-three.‡ But why, we may ask, this deep interest in Mr. Hooke? Why did he make himself Mr. Hooke's chief supporter? He was a devoted friend

* Bacon's Discourses, p. 66.

† Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901. See Vol. 1, pp. 215, 216.

‡ Died in 1692.

of the Church. Yes, and that is one good reason. Is there another? Yes, if other Taunton traditions are reliable, he was a cousin of Mrs. Hooke. Mr. Emery quotes a manuscript authority,* originating not much later than twenty-five years after the death of Deacon Williams, for the statement that he was a descendant of a family of that name in Glamorganshire in Wales, and found a wife in Gloucestershire, England. In his "Historical Memoir of the Colony of New Plymouth," Hon. Francis Baylies tells us†—"a tradition has always existed among his (Mr. Williams') descendants that he was related by blood to Oliver Cromwell." These two traditions point one way. Oliver Cromwell, in the deed of jointure executed on the occasion of his marriage, is described as "Oliver Cromwell *alias* Williams." He was a great-grandson of Sir Richard Williams, who was a confidential agent of Henry VIII. and his family, it is well known, assumed the name of Cromwell, on taking possession of an estate. It was this same Sir Richard Williams of whom Deacon Richard Williams was reputed to be a descendant, and this descent would certainly make him a cousin of Mrs. Hooke, for her pedigree is beyond a question.

And now I wish to raise a query which has occurred to my own mind. Why did Mr. Hooke leave Taunton for New Haven? He had a home there, next door to his co-worker and friend, Mrs. Poole; he was highly esteemed there, and useful; he was to all appearance well situated there, and New Haven was in the far west, and a newer community. What led him away? I do not desire to affirm anything. I simply ask you, is it not possible, nay, is it not very probable, as we know he was a gentleman, that he felt that *with his growing family*—three children had been born to him there—he was becoming more burdensome to his wife's kinsman than he was willing to be; that the New Haven opening offered him an independent support, and at the same time would render more easy the support of Mr. Street by the Church in Taunton? At any rate, he went.

* Vol. 1, pp. 213-5.

† Part 1, p. 284.

The exact date of this removal is not known. But it was in the year 1644. Some time in that year he was induced to transfer his home and family to that then remote village, and become the associate of Rev. John Davenport, and the first ordained teacher of the First Church. It is related of him that for his inaugural sermon he chose his text from Judges vii:10, the words addressed to Gideon on the eve of his attack upon the host of Midian—"Go thou with Phurah thy servant down to the host." From this he drew the doctrine that "in great services a little help is better than none," and thus intimated that he was come to be "Phurah" to Mr. Davenport's "Gideon." In fact, however, as Dr. Bacon is at pains to point out, there was no official disparity between them. The distinction of the two was more theoretical than practical; both giving themselves wholly to the service of the church, and dividing between them the duties of the pulpit.

Mr. Hooke fulfilled in New Haven an honorable and useful ministry for about twelve years. His home was at the southwest corner of College and Chapel Streets, where now stands the Townsend Block. Two daughters were born to him there. His wife was Jane, daughter of Richard and Frances (Cromwell) Whalley, and a sister of Gen. Edward Whalley, so well remembered in the local history of the New Haven Colony. Mrs. Frances Whalley was a daughter of Sir Henry Cromwell, and an aunt of Oliver Cromwell, and thus Mr. Hooke was the latter's first cousin. I find it stated that there had been an intimacy between Mr. Hooke and Cromwell before he came to this country. At any rate, the relation between them was such that when the Commonwealth had been established, and Cromwell had risen to power almost imperial, it seemed the most natural thing in the world that Mr. Hooke should return to the country which he had left so reluctantly, and that with every prospect that a wide opportunity of usefulness would be open to him. Accordingly in 1654 he sent his family to England, and in 1656 removed thither himself. The New Haven Town Records make the date of Mrs. Hooke's removal November 27, 1654.

This was his final withdrawal from New England. The impression which he left behind him seems to have corresponded to the favorable judgment expressed by Dr. Bacon as to his preaching. Edward Johnson, in his "Wonder-Working Providence of Sion's Savior in New England," enumerates him among "the great supply of godly ministers" of which New England had the benefit, and styles him "the reverend and faithful servant of Christ, who was for some space of time at the Church in Taunton, but now remains called to office in the Church in New Haven,—a man who hath received of Christ many gracious gifts fit for so high a calling, with very amiable and gracious speech, laboring in the Lord." Cotton Mather enumerates him among "the Eminent Divines" who were considerable in New England, and calls him "a learned, holy, and humble man." Trumbull, in his "History of Connecticut," makes mention of him as "a man of great learning and piety, and possessing excellent pulpit talents." It is manifest from these and other notices that in his twenty years' residence upon these shores, he had earned for himself an enviable reputation. Dr. Newman Smyth, in his sermon on the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the First Church in New Haven, had this sentence: "The next face among the historical portraits which may be restored from our records, is marked by the same strong Puritan features, yet over it there seems to be cast a subtle refinement of spirit, and a more pathetic gentleness of expression, than is naturally associated with the Puritan type of character." This is a portrayal which I imagine the facts will fully justify.

So far as identified, Mr. Hooke's children were six in number,—three daughters and three sons. The two daughters born in New Haven were Elizabeth, baptized December 14, 1645, and Mary, baptized September 5, 1647. The other, the fact that in 1658 she was already married proves to have been older.* Later the two younger were married in England. His sons were John, Walter, and Ebenezer. John was born in 1634, apparently at Axmouth. He was a student at Harvard from

* See his letter to Winthrop.

June 13, 1651, to August 10, 1652, but did not graduate.* It is very probable that he went to England in 1652, soon after his leaving college, and that his object was to benefit by the rise of Cromwell. November 3, 1653, his father wrote a letter to Cromwell, preserved in Thurloe's State Papers, thanking him for "the bounty and favor shown to my son," and then discoursing upon the dangerous condition of New England. This son must have been John, so far as can be seen; and the favor acknowledged seems to have been his presentation to the Vicarage of Kingsworthy, a little north of Winchester. From this he was ejected in 1662. He removed to Basingstoke—eighteen miles away—where he gathered an Independent Church, to which he ministered nearly forty years.† He died in 1710, æt. 76. He was buried in Basingstoke, and a monument commemorates him there. When he left Harvard, his brother Walter took his place, to August 9, 1654, but he did not graduate. He went to England with his mother and the other children, proved a man of great promise, and died in 1671, to the great grief of his parents. Ebenezer was sent back to Connecticut,‡ to Governor Winthrop, but later became estranged from his family, ceased to write to them, and disappeared. I find no trace of him afterward. When Mr. Hooke left New Haven he gave his home to the First Church, in trust for beneficent uses.

Not long after his arrival in England, on January 12, 1657, he was appointed, together with Mr. Caryll and Mr. Sterry, to assist in a Thanksgiving service for Cromwell's preservation from evil designs recently discovered. A little later, April 13, 1657, he wrote to Governor Winthrop, with whom he was on terms of friendship, as follows:§ "As touching myself, I am not

* See Sibley's Harvard Graduates, Index.

† In 1663 he was appointed a chaplain in the Savoy Hospital, by Dr. Killigrew, then Master of that institution. The organization was a Master and four Chaplains. In 1702 the chaplains were deprived, and the Hospital dissolved. See the Proceedings in Stow's Survey of London, Ed. Seymour, Vol. III, p. 406.

‡ June 30, 1663, then about twenty years old.

§ Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., Series III, Vol. 1, p. 182.

as yet settled, the Protector having engaged me to him not long after my landing, who hitherto has well provided for me. His desire is that a church may be gathered in his family, to which purpose I have had speech of him several times; but though the thing be most desirable, yet I foresee great difficulties in sundry respects." This particular project of a church in Whitehall was not carried into execution, but an Independent Church was organized in Westminster Abbey, in which the Protector became a communicant. After the manner of royalty, however, he appointed for himself a list of domestic chaplains, embracing John Howe, Hugh Peters (who had been a minister of the First Church in Salem, Mass.), our Mr. Hooke, Nicholas Lockyer, Peter Sterry and Jeremiah White. The first preferment obtained by him seems to have been the Vicarage of Rousdon St. Pancras,* in Devonshire, not far from Axmouth, the scene of his former ministrations. Some months later he was made Master of the Savoy Hospital, a preferment both dignified and lucrative. This famous institution occupied a part of the site of the Savoy Palace, a royal residence built in 1245, and given by Henry III to the Count of Savoy, the uncle of Queen Elinor. The name Savoy clings to the locality still, while there is nothing left of the palace. There is Savoy Street, the Savoy Theater, the Savoy Hotel, and most noteworthy of all, the Savoy Chapel, famous in ecclesiastical history for some significant events. It was built in the reigns of Henry VII and VIII, almost entirely destroyed by fire in 1864, but restored by Queen Victoria. It formed an important part of the Savoy Hospital, and in it Mr. Hooke ministered until after the restoration of the monarchy. Thus placed he might reasonably have deemed himself most favorably situated. But his elevation was for a period far too short. In less than two years came the death of Cromwell, and before another two years the Commonwealth was at an end, and Charles II was king. The general course of events is sufficiently well-known. Of the experiences of Mr. Hooke in particular, the best information we have is derived

* Now joined to Up Lyme. (J. S. Atwood of Exeter, in *Winchester Observer*, May 17, 1884.)

from contemporary letters, his own and others. Fortunately a number of these have been preserved, and some forty years since were published in the Historical Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society. These include letters from Mr. Hooke to Governor Winthrop, to General Goffe, to Rev. John Davenport, and to Dr. Increase Mather. There are also letters from Mrs. Hooke, and allusions to Mr. and Mrs. Hooke in various other letters.

The outline of Mr. Hooke's experience is not difficult to trace. In a letter to Governor Winthrop, bearing date March 30, 1659, he writes: "I have been settled at the Savoy for the space of twelve months, yet holding my relation to Whitehall the same as in the late Protector's time"—and then proceeds to give an account of Cromwell's illness and death seven months previous, and of the accession of his son. Later he speaks of the political uncertainties consequent upon this change, and adds—"I know not what will become of us. We are at our wit's end." Nor was he needlessly apprehensive. In less than two months Richard Cromwell had succumbed, and disappeared from the stage of action; and in the confusion of the next twelve months Mr. Hooke could have seen nothing calculated to relieve his perplexities or dissipate his fears. Nor did the restoration of the monarchy have in it any hope for him. It was not merely that his party was overthrown, and he shared its fortunes. The very prominent positions which he had held, and his relationship to Cromwell, made him specially obnoxious to the ruling authorities in Church and State, and as time went on, he became more and more a persecuted and a hunted man. He was soon out of the Savoy, and was succeeded there by Dr. Gilbert Sheldon, afterward Bishop of London, and Archbishop of Canterbury; a man whose resolute purpose it was violently to suppress nonconformity, and to exterminate nonconformists. We learn from his letters to other Bishops and to subordinate officials, that he not only deemed this result desirable, but entirely practicable, an affair of a few weeks, or months, at the most, if the Bishops would only use the power and the means at their disposal. Unfortunately for him not all

his correspondents saw the facts as he did, and when he died, in November, 1677, the accomplishment of his task was as far off as ever.

Meanwhile, Mr. Hooke was cared for by his friends. Governor Winthrop—in England on business of the Colony—wrote to Mr. Davenport, October 16, 1661:* “Mr. Hooke did live with Col. Sydenham, but that gentleman and his wife being dead, he now lives in the house of one Mr. G., an honest man and a justice of the peace.” Later it appears that this was Mr. Gold, and that he lived at Clapham. Mr. Hooke himself wrote to Mr. Davenport, in the same month:† “I often lodge in Swan Alley, but I live in the family of a rich merehant, an honest man, to whom I and my wife are very welcome.” Other letters show that he had to seek a deeper obscurity. In June, 1663, he wrote to General Goffe: “You may know me hereafter by D:G: Letters are so often broke up that many are loth to write their names.” Some of his letters are signed in that way. Moreover, they were usually sent with great precautions by private hand, and this was not always enough to secure safety. In this very letter to General Goffe, addressed as to Walter Goldsmith, Goffe’s assumed name, he alludes to an experience of “a friend of his,” whose letter had been seized, with serious consequences, in spite of all precautions. We now know this “friend of his” was no other than himself, and we read between the lines that he meant Goffe should so understand it. The contents of this letter have at this late day come into our possession, and the story of it. It was a letter addressed to Rev. John Davenport, written at different dates in the winter of 1662-63, and despatched in March, 1663, the last date on it being March 2. It made eight quarto pages very closely written. Mr. Hooke dared not send it as a separate missive, or by public conveyance. He concealed it in a bundle of books directed to Mr. Davenport, and entrusted to Capt. Samuel Wilson, whose ship was engaged in trade to New England, through whom correspondence had been safely transmitted before. In due time Capt. Wilson’s ship was safely cleared from the port of London, and actually sailed. We may easily

* Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., Series IV, Vol. 8, p. 179. † *Ibid.*, p. 177.

imagine Mr. Hooke felicitating himself that all was safe. But contrary winds so delayed her that a month after she left London she was still in the Downs, off Kent, inside the Goodwin Sands. Meanwhile, some information had been lodged at Whitehall, which led the authorities to send officers after the vessel, while still waiting for fairer weather. They reached her, they overhauled her cargo, they broke open the innocent-looking bundle of books, they found the letter, and though it was unsigned, they had little difficulty in assigning it to "one Hooke, a minister." They found in it, moreover, enough sympathy with the persecuted nonconformists, and of antagonism to their persecutors, to declare it "seditious" and forthwith detained the vessel, and arrested and imprisoned the Master, whether at Deal, Dover or London, it does not certainly appear. This was serious, not only for Capt. Wilson, but for the owners of the ship and her cargo, to say nothing of the consignees on this side, and he petitioned for release. The petition is preserved in the State Paper Office,* endorsed "The Petition of Samuel Wilson," and reads as follows:

"To the King's most excellent Majesty;

The humble petition of Samuel Wilson, Factor,"

"Sheweth—

That your Majesty's Petitioner, having ignorantly received a seditious Letter from one Hooke, a minister, which person (hearing your Majesty's Petitioner was upon the said Account stopped in the Downes) immediately deserted his lodging. Your poor petitioner knew not the contents of the letter in the least, nor that he had any such letter, it being wrapped up in a bundle of books, and your petitioner not at all privy to the same.

Wherefore your Majesty's poore petitioner most humbly implores your Majesty's princely Grace and favor. That he may be released to proceed upon his voyage, he having 1200 pounds cargo of other men's on Board, and the ship having been gone a month onward the same voyage, there being another ship to set sail within this two days bound to the same port.

And your petitioner (as in duty bound) shall ever pray, etc."

* S. P. Dom. Car. II: 72, 16.

His petition was not unfavorably regarded, but he was bound in £1,000 for good, loyal conduct for twelve months, and, on demand, to present William Hooke to the Secretary of State, at any time within that period. He seems to have had substantial friends to stand by him, for the sureties were found, the bond was executed, he was released, and proceeded on his voyage. The bond is on file, endorsed "the Bond of Samuel Wilson of St. Catherine's parish, and four others, for his good conduct and non-disturbance of government, and presenting within a year to the Secretary of State, the person of one Hooke, author of a letter lately written to New England."

The letter was detained, and of course never reached its destination. It has remained in the State Paper Office these two hundred and forty-five years. Its existence has been known. Its contents have been calendared. Dr. John Stoughton made some extracts from it in his "Ecclesiastical History of England." The late Dr. Henry Martyn Dexter, as appears by a memorandum in his own handwriting, had the opportunity to read it and make some extracts from it. But I am credibly informed that it has not been published. Another letter, written to Mr. Davenport some time later, reached him and has been published. In June of 1908 Prof. G. Lyon-Turner, the treasurer of a historical society in England of which I happen to be an honorary member, wrote to me that he had read the long detained letter, and transcribed part of it, and could easily send me, if I wished it, a verbatim transcript of the whole. After consulting with our Professor Dexter, I wrote and asked for the transcript offered, together with any documents throwing light upon a story of the original. In due time I received what I had requested; and I would like to say here that I can hardly overstate my obligations to this English scholar for the courteous and generous coöperation extended to me through many months, in investigating the obscure facts connected with Mr. Hooke's history. I should have found my inquiries much more difficult but for his zealous and efficient assistance.*

* Since this paper was written some of the sources which my correspondent consulted for me have been published by him. This work is

I have given you the benefit of the information I obtained as to the history of the letter, and have deposited the transcript in the Library of Yale University. It is a valuable testimony to the life of the period as that appeared to one who was in the midst of it. It is much too long for me to read to you the whole of it, but of some things in it I may venture to speak. It will be natural to notice the glimpse which it gives us of the writer's own circumstances. I have said the letter was not signed, and throughout it he is careful not to call names, or indicate in any way his location. His allusions are most cryptic. "I am not, at present," he writes, "where I was when you last wrote to me, yet in the same family; but in a place of some privilege, not in parochial precincts." He knows, too, that the authorities are carefully scanning all letters that are sent by post for traces of him. He expresses devout thankfulness that thus far he has himself escaped arrest, and that his correspondence has been untouched. He recognizes, moreover, that there is need of greater caution than he has yet exercised. He says, "my handwriting is too well-known." He is aware, also, of the peril he is in from treacherous friends and mean informers, who would not hesitate to betray former associates. "Men have been trepanned," he writes, "into saying things against the King, by informers pretending to be one with them." He adds that recently four had been executed at Tyburn, who had been betrayed in this way. Thus, and in other particulars, it appears that he was in hiding, or in a seclusion not easily to be distinguished from that. The petition of Wilson, already quoted, indicates that when his letter was seized, he very promptly disappeared from the house where he had lodged, and whither he had removed was concealed. The bond-entitled "Original Records of Early Non-Conformity under Persecution and Indulgence." It is in two volumes and makes accessible to the world documents previously to be found only in the Public Record office in London, or the Library at Lambeth Palace. Published by T. Fisher Unwin, London, 1911. It may be found in the libraries of Harvard, Brown, or Yale Universities; in the Congressional Library at Washington, the Congregational Library at Boston, the Pennsylvania Historical Society Library in Philadelphia, and other leading libraries in the United States. References will be made to it later in this paper.

ing of Wilson to produce him on demand shows the disposition of the authorities toward him. That he was not arrested indicates, we may suppose, in what seclusion he kept himself, and how many were interested to protect him. In this persistent obscurity, and perpetual insecurity, he must have lived for a number of years.

It has been said that the art of letter-writing consists in giving to one's correspondents all the news of the day. Certainly, then, Mr. Hooke did his best to write a good letter to Mr. Davenport. In calendaring the items of intelligence—domestic, foreign, political, commercial, social, personal, which he recounts—I am surprised by the number and variety of them. Naturally he begins with the enforcement of the Act of Uniformity, which took effect on August 24, 1662, with severe and sad consequences to many. Multitudes of ministers, he says, were ejected from their churches, their habitations, their employments. Nor was this the worst, they were absolutely silenced. It was made an offence for them to be heard at all. "There is not an ejected minister," he writes, "or any other not conforming, that durst exercise in public, since August 24, excepting, perhaps, some one or two or thereabout, for which they have suffered." Moreover, it was easier to turn out of office two or three thousand men, mainly the choice of their congregations, than to appoint off-hand by authority worthy and competent successors to fill the vacant places, and in many cases ignorant, incompetent, unworthy men came to the front, even men of scandalous lives. Sympathy with the ejected ministers, and antipathy to the new incumbents, led to abstention by the congregations, and of this several instances are given; e. g., in one parish of 20,000 souls, only a score or two could be gotten together. The same motives led worshippers to assemble secretly, in places other than churches, but this had been forbidden by proclamation early in January, 1661, and to prevent it soldiers, constables and officers were employed in making diligent search, and often wholesale arrests. These proceedings at that time had no warrant in law except in some statutes of Elizabeth's time against heretics, but none the less they were

enforced with great vigor and ferocious cruelty. Naturally the letter speaks of this fact. It states, "multitudes have been surprised and forthwith carried to prisons." The various jails were filled, and a British jail in those days was beyond description. Many perished from want of air and from unsanitary conditions. It tells how these cruelties reacted, how civil and military officials showed mercy, and juries refused to convict, even under strong pressure from above. It tells further how the different denominations stood the persecution,—the Presbyterians being the least resolute to hold out against it, the Quakers the most resolute, and next to them the Baptists; how among the Independents there were differences of judgment, as to how far concessions might be made lawfully; and for aught I can see Mr. Hooke himself was as resolute as a Quaker. He proceeds to speak of difficulties in Ireland, and in Scotland, and of troops sent to the latter; of the banishment of a famous preacher there, who was gathering great crowds in the open air; of the favor shown to Roman Catholics, although the Act of Uniformity in strictness bore upon them as much as upon others; of the grievous urging of oaths of allegiance, and the imprisonment of such as in any point scrupled them, among others of Mr. Richard Saltonstall. The writer gives some curious tales illustrating the superstitions of the time, his own, and others; he descends to details so humble as recent fires, especially one that had fatal results. Passing, then, to more public matters, he tells of the talk there was of measures of toleration; how the Roman Catholics were disposed to promote them, and the Anglican bishops by all means to prevent them; how in view of the approaching meeting of Parliament, and the known sentiments of the King and many others, inclining to some modification of the Act of Uniformity, the bishops were bringing pressure to bear upon the Members of Parliament in opposition, and the country was greatly disquieted. He thinks it manifest that the prelatical party had gained nothing by their severe measures, but rather lost. But while a good many were hoping for a favorable change, he shows that he himself had little expectation of it; that while the Presbyterians were willing to

make important concessions in hope of peace, in matter of fact they were more obnoxious to the prelates than the other types of nonconformists.

He then proceeds to speak of the complete prostration of trade and industry from which the land was suffering, and to define its causes. His statements of fact are perhaps more interesting than his economic theories, and there is much less reason to question them. Writing on a later day, he says, "Parliament is now sitting again," and comments upon its proceedings. It at once showed its intolerant temper, and he comments upon illustrations of that. An attempt to call in question the release from the common jail of the Rev. Dr. Edmund Calamy, who had been imprisoned for preaching in his own church once when no other preacher had appeared, ran against the fact that the King himself had ordered the release, he having reasons of a personal nature to treat Dr. Calamy with consideration; and then of course came to nothing. The great expectation which had been entertained of relief from this Parliament had little result, and there was no let up of persecution. Prominent personages went abroad for safety, but in some instances exiles for conscience sake were arrested in France by order of the King, and returned.

The letter proceeds to give an account of a remarkable conjunction of planets, or trigon, as he calls it, and the various comments and expectations it excited; and then to give the foreign intelligence of the day, French, Dutch, and what we should call Prussian; also, of Turkish movements, strangely mixed up with the writer's interpretations of the Apocalypse. Then it returns to the condition of the ejected ministers, of their poverty, and the sufferings of their families, and the straits into which they had been brought. Then it adds: "As for the churches in London, they meet privately, and by parcels, divided into several companies; and during the winter quarter the dark evenings were advantageous to them to steal together into the corners." Then it speaks of the ill will which had grown up against the bishops, that had found expression even in the House of Lords. On the other hand, of the favor of the

King toward the nonconformist leaders, how he had sent for them, held long interviews with them, and held out hopes to them, so giving their opponents great uneasiness. Expectations arose of a Royal Indulgence based upon the King's prerogative, but this rumor brought a fresh outbreak of intolerance, petitions from Parliament against toleration, etc., and for the time fresh disappointments.

The remainder of the letter is of a more personal character. He speaks of his own health, and that of his family, of his own solitudes, depression, and fear; for these, by the way, are all subjective—showing anxiety lest he fail to do his duty, not intimidation by outward troubles; he congratulates Mr. Davenport on the marriage of his son; sends messages to his friends, tells of visits from representatives of the New Haven Colony, who, with Governor Winthrop, had sought him out, somewhat to his own uneasiness, to discuss the relations of the two Colonies of New Haven and Connecticut. He mentions Major Thomson, Capt. Scott, and Nathaniel Whitfield, and describes their conference upon the future of the New Haven Colony. Then with salutations and good wishes, the letter ends.

A subsequent letter to Mr. Davenport which has been published, and the letter to General Goffe already mentioned, add to the intelligence I have thus summarized, but on these I need not comment. Nor is it needful to speak of such public events as the great plague of 1665, the fire which consumed so much of London in 1666, or the alarms of the Dutch war in 1667, or the bad harvest in these latter years; except so far as they manifestly increased the perils, the privations, the distresses of the time, which Mr. Hooke as well as others had to meet.* More germane to his experience was a different class of events of which I may say a few words. On the 26th of December, 1662, word went forth from Whitehall that in the next session of Parliament the King would ask the House to concur with

* Since this paper was written, Prof. Lyon-Turner, in his indefatigable search for traces of William Hooke, has found evidence that in 1665, or early in 1666, he occupied a house in West Harding St. This gives us reason to apprehend that he was burned out in the Great Fire, for all the houses in West Harding St. were destroyed at that time.

himself in devising some means of freeing from the penalties of the Act of Uniformity those who, living peaceably, desired to worship in their own way. This is the talk of a general toleration to which Mr. Hooke alluded in his letter. But such a relief was anything but what the bishops and the King's ministers intended. The actual answer of the Parliament to this proposal of the King was the passage of the Conventicle Act, to go into effect on July 1, 1664, and continue for three years. This made the first offence of being in a meeting of more than five persons for any purpose not in conformity with the Church of England, punishable with a fine of five pounds, or three months' imprisonment; the second, of ten pounds, or six months' imprisonment; the third by transportation for seven years, unless the person convicted redeemed himself by paying one hundred pounds. This Act effectually suppressed all nonconformist gatherings, or drove them into deeper secrecy than ever.

The Act of Uniformity had fallen mainly upon the ministers, the Conventicle Act fell upon the people. Then having forbidden the ministers to be heard in the churches, and the people to assemble anywhere else to hear them, the authorities endeavored to devise an act to separate the pastor and his flock as far as possible from each other. The result was the passage of what was known as the Five Mile Act in October, 1665, to take effect on the 24th of March following. This Act would naturally bear heavily upon Mr. Hooke. It forbade nonconforming ministers to come within five miles of any corporate town, or any place where they had been in the habit of officiating, and incapacitated them for exercising even the functions of a tutor. This act crowned the series of hostile acts of which they were the target, and rendered them liable to heavy fines, and to imprisonment, with the alternatives of exile or starvation. There was a refinement of cruelty, it seemed to them, in making it unlawful for them to teach, because this was the only occupation open to them as educated men. The Puritan youth had a passion for education. The universities were closed to him. Very naturally, therefore, the ejected ministers who were university men were in demand as instructors, and all over Eng-

land they taught what we Americans might call underground academies, some of them migratory as well. In many a well-to-do family, moreover, men of this sort found employment as private tutors. It is more than possible that Mr. Hooke was engaged in this way. If so, the Five Mile Act must have added greatly to his embarrassments. The oppressive Conventicle Act, it will be remembered, expired by limitation in 1667, and for a time severities against the nonconformists were relaxed. When Parliament again met it set itself to renew the Act, and the House of Commons passed a bill to that intent, but before the Lords got to it, Parliament adjourned at the King's request, and the bill failed. It was seventeen months before Parliament met again, and during that period the nonconformists enjoyed more freedom than they had seen since 1662, and grew somewhat bold in it. In April, 1670, however, the Act was renewed, and made more severe than ever, so severe indeed as to provoke resistance, and in some degree to defeat itself. It is difficult to imagine how Mr. Hooke and his family subsisted during these terrible years, to the miseries of which many individual histories bear ample testimony, and we know that in the midst of them, in 1671, he lost by death a beloved son. We can hardly fail to feel that his case appeals to our humane sympathies very strongly.

Partial relief came at last, in 1672. On the 27th of March of that year the King issued his famous Proclamation of Indulgence, in which, after alluding to his care and endeavor for the preservation of the Established Church, and the many ways of coercion he had used for the reducing of all erring and dissenting persons; and reciting that evidently the sad experience of twelve years had shown very little fruit of all those forcible courses, he felt obliged to avail himself of that supreme power in ecclesiastical matters which was inherent in him; and accordingly directed immediate suspension of all penal laws against nonconformists and provided for the license of a sufficient number of places of worship for them, and of the teachers which the congregation gathered in these places should choose.

The nonconformists for the most part hailed this exercise of the Royal prerogative with joy and thanksgiving, and speedily applications poured in. As many as 3,500* licenses were granted within ten months. Among the best known licensees was John Bunyan, whose license was dated May 9, 1672.† Before this date, however, several applications had been made for the licensing of William Hooke. The first seems to have been made orally by some one whose name does not appear, as it is memorandumed with others in the handwriting of the head-clerk. It reads,‡

“William Hooke, } of the Congregational
 & John Langston his assistant, } Persuasion.
 desire to teach at the house of Richard Loton,
 in the Spittle Yard. London.”

The second§ was presented in writing by Dr. Nicholas Butler, and differs from the first in that as written originally it names an alternative place of meeting, thus, “in the Spittle Yard at present, and that it may be for the next year at his house in Angel Alley, Whitechapel.” But this alternative is crossed out as impracticable. The third|| is more formal than the others, and is in the handwriting of Robert Mascall, and is dated April 22, 1672. Perhaps the crossed-out alternative gives us the residence at that time of Mr. Hooke.¶ All three applications are marked, *granted*, but the actual entry of the licenses to William Hooke, John Langston,** and house of Richard Loton in the Spital yard, is dated the 20th of April, 1672, which shows that

* The discrepant numbers given by different authorities are easily explained. Some authorities count the documents; others the number of persons named in the documents. Now that the whole list has been published in “Original Records of Non-Conformity, etc.,” Vol. 1, pp. 193-623, each one of us can count for himself.

† Original Records of Non-Conformity, etc., Vol. 1, p. 471.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 237.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 255.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 258, Vol. 2, p. 987.

¶ The pronoun “his” is perhaps ambiguous. Did Richard Loton propose to change his residence, and wish to transfer the license with his goods? Or is it Mr. Hooke’s house that is referred to? Prof. Lyon-Turner thinks the latter conclusion correct.

** Original Records of Non-Conformity, etc., Vol. 1, p. 440.

the third application was needless, the desired license having been already signed and issued. August 2, 1672, Mr. Hooke wrote to General Goffe in view of this altered state of things*—“As touching us, we have now freedom without the least molestation to attend upon the Gospel and the ordinances thereof, and this liberty runs through city and country,—peradventure with regret to many, but it is the fruit of the favor of him who is in the highest place among us. And I think there is no restraint upon any, of whatsoever persuasion—no—not the Papists themselves, only they may not appear so publicly as others do.”

Thus had been wrought, to all appearance, a great deliverance, and it is not strange that high hopes were excited. But they were not to be realized. The Royal Proclamation was not cordially received by the country as a whole, not even by all nonconformists. It was opposed on constitutional grounds. A dispensing with the laws of the land by royal prerogative was hardly a process to be looked upon favorably by lovers of liberty, especially when the King was a Stuart. If it were once to begin, how far might it go? The House of Commons resolved, many nonconformist members concurring, that penal laws could only be suspended by Act of Parliament. When a bill was devised looking toward accomplishing by legislation such relief as the proclamation had given, while it passed the Commons it was held up in the House of Lords, and came to nothing. The King was ultimately constrained to cancel his proclamation, which he did on March 8, 1673. This left the condition of the nonconformist theoretically worse than ever. Practically, however, it was not, for a time. Although the laws were unchanged, the enforcement of them was enfeebled. The tide of intolerance had suffered a check, and some time elapsed ere it was at the flood again. But within two years the licenses were all revoked, and the relief was over. One of the first victims of the renewal of persecution was Bunyan, he being committed to Bedford jail. This was his second imprisonment, to which we owe “The Pilgrim’s Progress” (1675-6).†

* Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., Series IV, Vol. 8, p. 144.

† Biography of Bunyan, by Dr. John Brown, p. 258.

In many cases the applications for license in 1672 were the emergence into light of churches that in spite of all persecution had maintained themselves in darkness and secrecy. There is reason to believe this of the application in behalf of Mr. Hooke and Mr. Langston, and that the church in Spitalfields,—a well-known locality from one-half to three-quarters of a mile north-east of the present Bank of England, a region now almost wholly given up to industry—was one of the anvils that wear out many hammers. Mr. Langston was an Oxford graduate, a whole generation after Mr. Hooke, and lived until 1704. For the last seventeen years of his life he was pastor of the Independent Church in Ipswich, still existing. Of him there are somewhat full biographical notices,—not always quite consistent, and in respect to chronological indications not so definite as might be desired. But a careful study of them, and especially of the one supported by references to official documents,* points to the conclusion that he was in London from 1663 to 1677, and that from 1667 to 1677 he was “Assistant to Mr. Hooke.” Moreover, when he became pastor in Ipswich, he was received to the church by letter from a church in London, which my correspondent says, was “no doubt the church in Spitalfields.” I ask you particularly to observe the significance of these facts. They throw upon the situation we have been studying a strong sidelight. Assistant to Mr. Hooke? Then Mr. Hooke, from 1667 to 1677, and probably before, was in a position to require an assistant; that is, he was a pastor. In Spitalfields? That is the locality in which he was licensed in 1672; then his pastorate was there. But what a new impression we receive of the indomitable spirit of this man, this hunted and outlawed man, forbidden under heavy penalties to be found within five miles of the Savoy, that through all these troubled years he not only held on his way, but held on to the pastorate of that hidden organization, and persisted in ministering to it, that body “meeting by parcels” in obscure streets and dark hours, emerging only during the King’s Indulgence!

* Browne’s History of Nonconformity in Norfolk and Suffolk, pp. 369, *et seq.*

But when Mr. Langston left London in 1677, Mr. Hooke's years were far spent. We have some glimpses of these latest years. A discourse of his was published in October, 1673, during the period of his license, which amounted to a volume. A copy is preserved in the Prince Collection in Boston. An analysis of it, with liberal extracts, is published in the Rev. Mr. Emery's volume already cited. We have, also, a letter of his to General Goffe, dated April 2, 1674, in which he speaks of his own exercises of pain and grief, and of the distresses and perils of the time, in such a way as to awaken some apprehensions on the part of his correspondent. He rejoins on August 5, 1674, from Hadley, Mass., greatly deprecating such a loss as that of Mr. Hooke would be. He says, "Methinks I hear the churches crying to the Lord that they cannot spare you; and hope He will for their sakes lengthen out your life, and renew your strength, to do Him yet a little more service in your generation before you go hence." This seems to show that his usefulness was still recognized. We have finally a pathetic letter* from him written to Dr. Increase Mather, dated August 7, 1677, and a few months later, on March 21, 1678, came the end he anticipated. Still another discourse of his, however, published posthumously three years afterwards, has come down to us. A copy is preserved in the Library of the Antiquarian Society at Worcester, Mass.

In his letter to Dr. Mather, he speaks of his increasing infirmities, and gives expression to his expectation of death. "This, I think, is like to be my last letter to you," he writes. "God is pleased to enable me to preach hitherto, but my spirits are grown weak, and my breath is very short." His concluding words are a benediction. "The Father of Mercies, and God of all consolation, be with you, and bless your studies and labors in His work! *In Him I rest.*" These last noteworthy words, I imagine, give us the key to the inner man. They are extremely characteristic of him. They recur repeatedly in his letters. He was the embodiment of a calm, trustful courage; of a gentle but heroic spirit. I have searched his letters through

* Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., Series IV, Vol. 8, pp. 582-3.

for indications of any moral weakening in the face of the difficulties and hostilities which he encountered, but I have searched in vain. He speaks sympathetically of the wrongs and injuries of others, but never of his own. He reveals no particular consciousness of his own. He seems to be a man who takes his experience of life exactly as it comes, and tranquilly faces it exactly as it is. So manifestly true is this, that I marvel at him.

The published discourse of 1673, Dr. Leonard Bacon says he had never read. But the very title of it greatly impressed him. It was this, "The privileges of the saints on earth beyond those in Heaven." Had he read the discourse, he might have been still more impressed. But he queries,* "What sort of a man must he have been, who in his old age, disappointed, afflicted, persecuted, could write a book to show the privileges of the saints on earth beyond those in Heaven—the privilege of laboring for the Redeemer, and the privilege of bearing the cross, and enduring reproach and sorrow *for Him*?" We may leave that question unanswered. But the preacher's argument is, that the life of faith is nobler than that of vision; the life of hope, than the life of fruition; the life of patience, than one in which is no occasion for it; the life of loving sympathy with the alienated, the wretched and the miserable, than one where none of these can be! This man was no ascetic, no other-worldling, no dreamer, no sybarite, no lover of himself. Assuredly he fought a good fight; he kept his faith; let us hope he won a crown.

He was buried in Bunhill Fields,† that sacred spot in the heart of busy London, whither many pilgrim feet from New England are eagerly turned from year to year; where rest the ashes of Bunyan and of many more, upon whom bigotry put its brand in vain, for the more modern world does them honor, in remembrance of their services to learning, to letters, and to liberty.

I have endeavored to come as close as possible to the actual course of Mr. Hooke's experience of life. To the favorable

* Bacon's Hist. Discourses, p. 72.

† See List of Interments, in Trans. of Cong. Hist. Soc. for Sept., 1910.

circumstances of its early years, when he was a cadet of a family of wealth and distinction; or those in which as a graduate of Oxford, preferment in the Church of England awaited him; to the honorable record that he made upon these shores; to the very high position that he attained in England in the days of the Commonwealth,—the last period of his life presents a painful contrast. But he seems to have borne himself bravely and blamelessly from the beginning to the end. For his own sake and his family's, for Connecticut's sake, for New England's sake, we may wish he had not returned to England; if it were desirable to illustrate what virtues stern adversities may evoke from a generous human soul, we may think it well that he did return. A mural tablet on the walls of the Center Church in New Haven briefly commemorates him. I cannot but wish there were some more conspicuous monument to keep his memory green. At any rate Taunton and New Haven should be the last to suffer it to fade!

THE SEAL OF CONNECTICUT.

By SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL.D.

[Read November 22, 1909.]

It is difficult for us to enter into the conception of the nature of a seal, which was common to all Englishmen in the seventeenth century. To them, and to their forefathers for many generations, it was the most solemn form of authenticating any written expression of will, which was intended to alter legal relations.

We may not unfairly say that the legal value of a seal in any community is in inverse proportion to the education and intelligence of its people. In ages when hardly any except the priest or monk could write, and property was mainly massed in the hands of a few, the seal afforded a simple and generally effectual method of showing that a conveyance, a charter, or any other legal document, came from the hand, or with the approval, of those in whose names it might profess to speak.

Every great land-owner in England, by a century or two after the Norman conquest, had his own coat of arms. His seal was inscribed with this. No one, not of his name and family, could lawfully use it. He took good care that no one else should have an opportunity to do so, by keeping it in some safe and secret place, or perhaps carrying it about upon his person.

The Crown had its great and its privy seal. The ecclesiastical and municipal corporations had theirs.

In the time of Edward I, every freeman and some of the villeins had a seal.* A deed of land, according to English law, until long after the settlement of New England, was well exe-

* Blackstone's Commentaries, II, 305.

cuted if it bore the seal of him whose grant it was, though not his signature. Without a seal, or a legal substitute for it, a conveyance of land, though signed, is still in Connecticut no deed, and ineffectual to pass full title.

So late as the latter half of the eighteenth century, Sir William Blackstone declared, in his Commentaries on the Laws of England,* that every corporation not only could, but must have a common seal, for, he continued, it "being an invisible body, cannot manifest its intentions by any personal act or oral discourse: it therefore acts and speaks only by its common seal."

By the great seal of the State, the first and greatest of corporations, all important public acts were attested, and without its use, it hardly seemed to the popular mind, in early English history, to be possible to administer and uphold the government. When James II, driven from the throne of England, made his first attempt to escape from the kingdom, his last act, in crossing the Thames, was to throw the great seal overboard, in the hope, no doubt, that proceedings to displace him would thus be brought to a full stop.†

The great seal of a foreign power has always been recognized as sufficiently authenticating its official acts. The seal is said to prove itself. Every sovereign is supposed to be familiar with the appearance of the great seal of every other sovereign; and the same familiarity is imputed to his courts of justice.

In 1663, when Governor Stuyvesant was at odds with the Colony of Connecticut as to the Dutch title to some of the Long Island towns, he urged the directors of the New Netherland company to procure from the States-General a patent or letter defining the limits of the Dutch possessions in America, and recommended that it be "sealed with their High Mightinesses' Great seal, at which an Englishman commonly gapes as at an idol." This, he wrote, would help matters complicated by "the unrighteous, stubborn, impudent and pertinacious proceedings of the English at Hartford."‡

* I, 475.

† Macaulay's Hist. of England, III, 293, London Ed. of 1863.

‡ Documents relating to the Col. Hist. of N. Y., II, 488, 484.

Connecticut was settled under authority of those who had obtained grants from a public corporation under the name of "the Council established at Plymouth in the County of Devon for the planting, ruling, ordering and governing of New England in America," which was incorporated by the Crown on November 3, 1620. The charter particularly provided that the forty persons named as the original members and "their Successors shall have and enjoy for ever a Common Seale, to be engraven according to their Discretions; and that it shall be lawfull for them to appoint whatever Seale or Seales they shall think most meete and necessary, either for their Uses, as they are one united Body incorporate here, or for the publick of their Governour and ministers of New England aforesaid, whereby the Incorporation may or shall seale any Manner of Instrument touching the same Corporation, and the Manors, Lands, Tenements, Rents, Reversions, Annuities, Hereditaments, Goods, Chattles, Affaires, and any other Things belonging unto, or in any wise appertaininge, touching, or concerning the said Corporation and plantation in and by these our Letters-Patents, as aforesaid, founded, erected, and established."*

In a subsequent clause the corporation was empowered to constitute and discharge any "Governors, Officers, and Ministers," as it should think fit, and to make laws of government for the plantation, civil and criminal, as near as might be like those of England. It published, in 1622, a "Brief Relation of the Discovery and Plantation of New England," addressed to the Prince of Wales (afterwards Charles I), who while in his teens, by approving the suggestion of Captain John Smith, was the first to give the country that name, in any authoritative way.† In this the President and Council stated their purpose to be to set up a general government in New England at some

* Poore, Charters and Constitutions, I, 923-5.

† The first printed work in which this name was used, instead of the old term, "North Virginia," was Capt. John Smith's "Description of New England," published in 1616. Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., 4th Series, III, 96. Smith was the undoubted originator of the name New England, "but," he says in his "Advertisements for the Unexperienced Planters of New England or anywhere" (Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., 3d Series, III, 1, 20) "Mali-

convenient place, and parcel out the territory into several grand divisions or "counties." Each of these was to be under a chief head, with a staff of officers, such as a steward, comptroller, and treasurer; and each subdivided into manors and lordships. It had also, so the pamphlet proceeds, been "provided that all cities in that territory, and other inferiour towns where tradesmen are in any numbers, shall be incorporate and made bodies politic, to govern their affairs and people, as it shall be found most behoveful for the publick good of the same."*

On March 19, 1628, the Council, by a deed under its common seal to Sir Henry Rosewell and five others, and their heirs and associates forever, made a grant of lands for a settlement on Massachusetts Bay. They, having first associated twenty others with them, obtained the charter from the Crown, of March 4, 1629 (N. S.) under which Winthrop and his company set up the colony of Massachusetts.

Robert, Earl of Warwick, was the President of the Council at least as early as January 13, 1630 (N. S.),† and we have the high authority of Dr. Douglass and Dr. Trumbull‡ for the assertion that in that year the Council conveyed to him, by a grant soon afterwards confirmed by a royal patent, the territory which on March 19, 1631, he transferred by a deed under his own seal to Lord Say and Seal and ten others, and their heirs and associates forever.

cious minds amongst Sailers and others drowned that name with the echo of *Nusconcus*, *Canaday*, and *Penaquid*, till at my humble sute, our most gracious King Charles, then Prince of Wales, was pleased to confirme it by that title." In the petition to the King, of March 3, 1620 (N. S.) on which the patent to the Council of Devon was issued, the petitioners ask first of all, "that the territories where yo^r peticoⁿers makes their planta^{co}n may be caled (as by the Prince His Highnes it hath bin named) NEW ENGLAND." Documents relating to the Colonial History of N. Y., III, 2. Smith had been permitted to present to the Prince, in 1614, a copy of his journal during his voyage northwards in the spring of that year, and of his map of the coast above Cape Cod. Palfrey's Hist. of N. E., I, 94.

* Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., 2d Series, IX, 22, 23.

† He then signed a patent in favor of the Plymouth settlers, in which he is described as President.

‡ Trumbull, Hist., I, 547; Douglass' Summary, II, 160.

The Council had a regular clerk, but its records have not been preserved (although copies of part of them are extant),* and it is denied by some later historians that the Earl had any title to convey.†

To me it seems more reasonable to accept Douglass' and Trumbull's statement, justified as it is by repeated declarations of our General Court during the seventeenth century.‡

It is also supported by a letter from John Humfrey sent from London to Isaac Johnson§ in Massachusetts, under date of December 9, 1630, in which is found this passage: "My lord of Warw. will take a Patent of that place you writ of for himselfe, & so wee may bee bold to doe there as if it were our owne."|| It is at least a fair surmise that Johnson had previously written to Humfrey that the region of the Connecticut river was one adapted to an English settlement, and that in consequence of this news the Earl of Warwick had determined to obtain from the Council for New England a patent embracing it, to himself, but really for the benefit of those of his Puritan friends who were then contemplating a removal to New England.

Thomas Lechford, an attorney, who would not be apt to use words loosely, in his "Plaine Dealing," written in 1641, says of the Saybrook and Hartford settlements: "These plantations have a Patent."¶

Two years later, Parliament put the Earl of Warwick at the head of a commission of six Lords and twelve commoners, having jurisdiction over all plantations and islands occupied under authority of the Crown. Early in 1647, the Earl, as Governor in chief over foreign plantations, the Earl of Manchester and Viscount Say and Seal, speaking for this com-

* Massachusetts and its Early History, 162; Records of the Council for N. E., Cambridge 1867, 8.

† Massachusetts and its Early History, 148; Johnston, Hist., of Conn., 8, 109.

‡ Hinman, Letters, &c., 40, 43, 59; Trumbull, Hist. of Conn., I, 380, 543.

§ Coll. Mass. Hist. Soc., 4th Series, VI, 4.

|| Mr. Johnson had died more than two months before this was written.

¶ Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., 3d Series, III, 97.

mission, wrote to the colony of Connecticut recognizing its "jurisdiction" to administer justice, and stating that the committee did not purpose to "restrain the bounds of your jurisdiction to a narrower compass than is held forth by your letters-patents."*

This seems quite a plain recognition of its possession of what the two principal parties to the grant of March 19, 1631, the grantor and the ranking grantee, considered a proper title for the purposes of civil government. It claimed one by virtue of its purchase from Colonel Fenwick of the Saybrook properties, and from no other source.

The evidence that the Earl executed the deed to Lord Say and Seal and his associates is all that can fairly be required; and in that he professes to be the owner of the lands, and to convey them with "all jurisdictions, rights, and royalties, liberties, freedoms, immunities, powers, privileges, franchises, præminences, and commodities whatsoever, which the said Robert, Earl of Warwick, now hath or had, or might use, exercise and enjoy, in or within any part or parcel thereof."† It is certain also that those who received the grant, thus purporting to pass *jura regalia*, thought that they could appoint a Governor of the territory which it embraced; for in July, 1635, five of them "in their own names and in the name of . . . the rest of the company," signed a commission constituting John Winthrop, Jr., "Governor of the river Connecticut with the places adjoining thereunto." This document they signed individually, affixing their own particular seals, all impressed on the same piece of wax.‡

The Warwick deed or patent of 1631 was, in a measure, a family transaction. The Earl's family name was Robert Rich. One of the grantees, "the right honorable Lord Rich," was his eldest son, and another, "Sir Nathaniel Rich, Knt," a near relation.§ "Lord Brook" was Baron Brooke of Warwick castle. It would be natural for the Earl to hand the deed, as soon as

* Hubbard, Hist. of New England, Chap. LV.

† Trumbull, Hist of Conn., I, 525.

‡ *Ibid.*, 527.

§ See his will in Waters' Genealogical Gleanings, II, 872.

it was executed, to his son and heir. Such papers were then not recorded in any public registry of lands. The Council for New England surrendered its charter to the Crown in 1635; the civil war soon broke out, with all its work of wreck; and the family of the Earl became extinct in the next century. Under such circumstances it is not surprising that a copy of a copy of this Warwick deed is all that our State archives have to show to support our claim of a paper title prior to the charter of 1662.

It is important to observe that the Earl of Warwick had the common seal of the Council for New England in his possession for a considerable period, and at least as late as 1633, this being apparently against the will of a number of its members.* He could thus have executed, at any time, a deed in its name to some third party, simply by affixing the seal; and then taken a reconveyance from the latter to himself. The Council being a corporation and not a directing body within a corporation, the law made those who attended any meeting regularly appointed (though only one or two might thus be present), a quorum to transact business. At the meeting of November 4, 1631, held at Warwick House in London, at which but two were present, the Earl of Warwick and Sir Ferdinando Gorges, several important grants of lands were ordered. It is by no means improbable that at some of the regularly called meetings, which at this time were commonly held at Warwick House, the Earl may have been the only member present.

His deed to Lord Say and Seal and his associates was witnessed by two persons, one of whom was Walter Williams. A man named Williams was in his employment in 1632, and apparently had charge for the Earl of the corporate seal of the Council.† Probably he was the attesting witness, and if, as conjectured, there was an intermediate deed from the Earl, as President of the Council, under the corporate seal, to a dummy, who was to and did reconvey to the Earl personally, no one

* Massachusetts and its Early History, 147; Proceedings of the Antiquarian Society, 1867, Vol. IV, 110-113; Winsor, Narrative, &c., Hist., III, 309.

† Winsor, Narr. Hist., III, 370.

could have been more likely than this Mr. Williams to be selected for this office nor, when the two preliminary deeds had been made, to attest the third, by which the estate thus transmitted through him was made over to the real purchasers.*

The grantees under the deed from the Earl had a regular clerk, as appears from a letter of Lord Say and Seal to Governor Winthrop, dated December 11, 1661. In this he enclosed a letter to the Earl of Manchester, then Lord Chamberlain, requesting him to tell the Governor where he could speak with Mr. Jesup, "who," he adds, "when we had the patent, was our clerk and he, I believe, is able to inform you best about it, and I have desired my lord to wish him so to do. I do think he is now in London."†

In 1636 William Jesup is given a legacy in the will of Sir Nathaniel Rich of a kind indicating that he was in close personal relations with the testator.

In April, 1656, Bulstrode Whitelock records an official conference with the Swedish ambassador, attended also by "Mr. Jessop, one of the clerks of the Council,"—that is, of the Council of State under the Protector.‡ On April 10, 1660, "William Jessop, Esq." was chosen clerk of the House of Commons of the Convention Parliament.§ It is probable that he was the former clerk of the Council and also the same man who had been clerk of the Warwick patentees. The Earl of Manchester, who was the presiding officer of the Convention House of Peers, was a son-in-law of the Earl of Warwick; closely associated with him during the civil war;|| and one of the commission under his presidency for the government of foreign plantations.

One must not forget, in studying the documents of that century, that the law of moneyed corporations was still in its infancy. Such bodies did not always act, in making grants, by their officers, appointed for that purpose, under their com-

* A "Mr. Walter Williams" at about this time owned houses in Bristol. Waters, *Genealogical Gleanings*, I, 565.

† Trumbull, *Hist.*, I, 547.

‡ Memorials, Oxford Ed., IV, 243. William Jessop filled the same position in 1653 and 1654. Whitelock, *Journal of the Swedish Embassy*, II, 59, 456.

§ Parliamentary *Hist. of England*, XXII, 233.

|| Whitelock, *Memorials*, Oxford Ed., II, 262.

mon seal, as now. The first patent, for instance, under which the Plymouth settlement obtained any paper title, was a deed from the Council (of June 1, 1621) signed by six of the company only, individually, under their separate, private seals.* A later confirmatory patent (January 13, 1629, O. S.) on the other hand, though signed by the Earl of Warwick alone, purported to be executed by him in the name of the Council, and bears its common seal.†

The removal from Massachusetts, in 1636, to the banks of "the great river," and the foundation of the three river towns under Haynes and Hooker, was accomplished with the express assent of the Bay Colony, and a tacit understanding with the holders of the Saybrook Patent. There was at first no assertion that they were setting up an independent government. Not claiming to be a separate corporation, they had, of course, no common seal.

The Saybrook patentees, on the contrary, not only built forts, appointed Governors and employed troops, but procured and adopted a common seal.

The fact that they took this step is, of itself, strong evidence that they had a right to take it. It is unlikely that earls and viscounts, standing well at court, would undertake in such open fashion to infringe on the royal prerogative. Only if they were a corporation, or a branch of a corporation, could the grantees under the Warwick deed lawfully use a common seal.

If Charles I did not grant a charter of incorporation to them directly, he may have granted a patent confirming their land titles, and they may have been justified in adopting a common seal by a delegated authority. I refer, in this, to the clause in the charter of the Council of Plymouth giving it power not only to adopt a corporate seal as an English corporation established at Plymouth ("one united Body incorporate here"), but also any other seal or seals for public use by their Governor or other "Ministers of New England." The Council may not

* Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., 4th Series, II, 156; History of Plymouth Plantation, Mass. Hist. Soc. Ed., I, 246; Winsor, Narrative, &c., Hist., III, 301.

† Winsor, Narrative Hist., III, 369; Thorpe, American Charters, &c., III, 1846.

improbably have adopted a local seal for the Connecticut settlements, by some vote, no copy of which was preserved. Acts speak louder than words, and after any long lapse of years great weight must be attributed to the fact that a colonial seal was in fact adopted for the Saybrook plantation. It is a legal maxim that *ex diuturnitate temporis omnia presumuntur rite et sollenniter esse acta*.

The seal of the Saybrook patentees was nearly circular in form, of about the size of a silver dollar, and bore for its design fifteen vines, arranged in three rows, the first of six, the second of five, and the lowest of four. Above them a hand, seemingly thrown forward from the clouds, held a pennant bearing the legend, SVSTINET QVI TRANSTVLIT. There was a narrow but rather an ornate rim.

This muniment of jurisdiction and title was turned over by Governor Fenwick to the settlers in the upper towns, on and near the great river, after he had undertaken to convey to that "jurisdiction" all the lands covered by the Warwick patent, "if it come into his power." His first agreement to that effect was made December 5, 1644, and modified in 1646 by a commutation of certain customs duties, which it secured to him for a term of years, to an annual payment of £180.* In 1645 Fenwick returned to England, to become a member of the Long Parliament and colonel in the Parliamentary army. In 1649 he was appointed one of the Judges of Charles I, but did not sit, as such, at the trial.

Roger Wolcott, in his Memoir for the History of Connecticut, makes this statement in regard to the incident of the seal:

"The people of Connecticut for some time paid a rent or tribute to George Fenwick, Esq^r, captain of Saybrook fort. At length they bought the land and the fort of him and he promised to give them a deed but failed, but he gave them the Colony Seall. This I was told by Daniel Clark, Esq^r, who was the Secretary and a magistrate in the Jurisdiction at the time of the Charter."†

* Collections of the Conn. Hist. Soc., III, 328; Col. Rec. of Conn., I, 271.

† Collections of the Conn. Hist. Soc., III, 328.

The seal thus obtained from Colonel Fenwick was adopted as the seal of the Colony of Connecticut without any formal vote of the General Court, so far as appears on record. Probably they feared to have it known that they had taken such a step, lest it should savor too unmistakably of a claim of political independence. Charles I was still on the throne, and the event of the civil war was uncertain.

The seal thus procured was used as a common seal for the consolidated colony at least as early as October, 1647, when it was set by Governor Hopkins to a commission issued to John Winthrop as magistrate at New London.*

I have dwelt so long on these points in our early history because the title of colonial Connecticut to its soil has so intimate a connection with the title of colonial Connecticut to its seal.

Let me recapitulate shortly the positions which have been taken, and the salient facts mentioned.

Every corporation, whether it be a public or private one, has the right to select and use a common seal.

No other association of persons has such a right.

The Council of Plymouth for the planting, ruling, ordering and governing of New England, was incorporated in 1620 by a royal charter, giving them in express terms not only this right, but that of dividing New England into a number of local governments, each with a seal of its own and a Governor of its own.

This, in effect, authorized this Council to create other local public corporations within New England.

In or before 1622, the Council of Plymouth accordingly provided for the separate incorporation of all places where there should be any considerable number of persons engaged in trade, as self-governing communities.

In 1635, the Council was dissolved.

* This commission is in the State Library, in the Winthrop collections. See also Col. Rec. of Conn., I, 329, 578. Among other impressions of this original seal, now extant, is one in the Winthrop Collection of MSS. in the State Library, Vol. III, pp. 310, upon a commission to Daniel Witherall, as Judge of the County Court.

During the intervening thirteen years, the Earl of Warwick, its President and the keeper of its corporate seal, in 1631, executed a deed of the territory now included in Connecticut to an association of persons headed by Lord Say and Seal.

Four years later, in 1635, we find this association appointing a Governor of part of these Connecticut lands, at the mouth of the Connecticut river.

In 1636, he promotes the settlement of another part of them, higher up on the river, by what became the Colony of Connecticut. Not later than 1644, and probably much earlier, this Say and Seal association did what only a corporation could lawfully do, by adopting a common seal. In that year, the then Governor of the Saybrook settlement and commandant of the Saybrook fort is found to be in possession, as such, of this common seal, and transfers, in behalf of those whom he represented, the fort, and with it the seal, to the Colony of Connecticut, with the promise to convey to it thereafter all the rest of the lands covered by the deed to the association, should it come into his power to do so.

In 1647, we find the person first commissioned Governor of the Saybrook settlement, accepting from the Colony of Connecticut a commission as a local magistrate, authenticated under this same seal, as the seal of that colony.

Is it not a probable, if not a necessary conclusion from these facts, that the Earl of Warwick either had proper grants of the territory of Connecticut and authority to govern it, before his deed to the Saybrook company, or else that this deed was intended and regarded by all parties in interest as in legal effect the deed of the Council, of which he was the President and of whose common seal he was then the keeper?

As soon as Connecticut received her charter (October, 1662) the General Court declared that Westchester lay within the territorial limits which it prescribed,* and sent a copy of the vote to its inhabitants, certified under this same Saybrook seal.†

* Col. Rec., I, 387.

† Hoadly, The Public Seal of Connecticut, Conn. State Register for 1889, 438.

The device of the seal challenges curiosity. Why were rows of vines selected as the prominent feature? Why were these arranged in three rows, each containing a different number, and all together numbering fifteen?

The number of patentees under the Warwick deed was eleven. It might be suggested that the top row was to represent six of them, and the second the others. But none of the patentees had removed to New England. The motto indicates that those who are represented as receiving divine support had already been transplanted.

With more probability it may be surmised that it refers to the three principal plantations already made under patents from the Council for New England; that of Plymouth, that on the coast of Maine under Sir Ferdinando Gorges, and that of Massachusetts Bay.

It may well be, also, that there was no special significance in the arrangement of the vines in three rows, but that it was merely intended to depict a vineyard. An arrangement of a vineyard in three rows would be natural, in view of the form of the seal, and the practice of heraldry, under which a "charge" on a coat of arms, if repeated at all, is generally repeated thrice. The top row bisects the circle. The vines in each row were equi-distant from each other. More therefore could be put in the top row than in the others, and more in the second than in the third.

The wild grapes of this country made a strong impression upon the early voyagers who came here from the North of Europe. They gave it its name for the first discoverers—Vinland—and in the tract by Rev. Francis Higginson called "New England's Plantation," written in 1630, he says that "Excellent vines are here up and doune in the woods. Our Governour hath already planted a vineyard with great hope of increase."* This would sufficiently account for the selection of vines, rather than any other form of vegetation.

The design of each vine is so formal that it bears little or no resemblance to that of the wild grape of our woods. One who

* Life of Francis Higginson, 94.

saw an impression of the original seal in 1662, wrote that he supposed it to represent "the arborated craggy wilderness."*

The origin of the terse and striking motto I have been unable to discover. It was not framed by the Romans.†

Dr. Hoadly, in his article in the Connecticut Register, refers as a not improbable source to the eightieth Psalm. Here we find these verses:

"8. Thou hast brought a vine out of Egypt: thou hast cast out the heathen, and planted it.

9. Thou preparedst room before it, and didst cause it to take deep root, and it filled the land."

But then follows a lamentation over the bitter ruin that has since befallen it, and a prayer that God will return to its aid, and visit again this vineyard of His planting, and save His people. Here is nothing of the hopeful spirit in which spoke the faith of the founders of New England in the protection of God. That dictated the motto of Connecticut, and we see it reappearing at the beginning of the next century in verses written to greet its advent, by Judge Samuel Sewall of Massachusetts. They were sung by bell-men on the streets of Boston, just before daybreak on January 2, 1701, and the first two read thus:

"Once more, our God, vouchsafe to shine:
Tame Thou the rigor of our clime;
Make haste with Thy impartial light
And terminate this long, dark night.

Let the transplanted English vine
Spread further still: still call it Thine;
Prune it with skill: for yield it can
More fruit to Thee, the husbandman."

When the patent from Charles II, creating Connecticut a full public corporation, was obtained, the General Court immediately and formally declared the seal acquired from Colonel Fenwick to be the seal of the colony. On October 9, 1662, the

* Hoadly, The Public Seal of Connecticut, Conn. Register, 1889, 438.

† Professor E. P. Morris of Yale informs me that it has been searched for in vain by Latin scholars, in the classical authors.

charter was produced and publicly read before the freemen, and it was voted "that the Seale that formerly was vsed by the Generall Court shall still remaine and be vsed as y^e Seale of this Colony, vntill y^e Court see cause to y^e contrary, and the Secretary is to keep ye Seale, and to vse it on necessary occasions for y^e Colony."*

The Colony of New Haven, a few years after the establishment of the Commonwealth, ventured of its own authority to adopt a common seal.

No impression or description of this now exists, so far as I can ascertain.

The vote to procure one was passed by the General Court on May 30, 1655, in connection with the approval of the compilation of the general statutes made by Governor Eaton. It read thus:

"Ordered that a publike seale shall be provided at y^e charge of y^e jurisdiction, wch is to be y^e seale of this colony, the bigness of it, and y^e impression to be vpon it they leaue to y^e governour, and such other as he shall thinke fit to advise wth aboute it, to consider and order."†

One was thereupon cut, by Eaton's order, in England, and sent over on the same ship which brought the new statute-book. In May, 1656, he notified the General Court of the arrival of the seal and desired them to accept it as a token of his love.‡

On the seizure of the government of Connecticut by Sir Edmund Andros, in 1687, although the charter had disappeared, John Allen, the Secretary of the Colony, handed over to him the corporate seal.§ Gershom Bulkeley, in his *Will and Doom*, written not long after the resumption of authority by the freemen and General Court, in consequence of the accession of William and Mary, argued strongly from this circumstance that all charter rights to existence as a separate colony had been destroyed.

* Col. Rec. of Conn., I, 386.

† N. H. Col. Rec., I, 147.

‡ *Ibid.*, 186.

§ Conn. Hist. Soc. Collections, III, 141.

“And now,” he says, “both their common seal is gone and their officers are all gone by their own act. Is not this a cesser of the charter government? The seal disappears and the governors withdraw themselves, suffering their offices to expire without continuance, and is not this government now voluntarily laid down, deserted, and extinct?”*

When New York passed into the possession of Andros in September, 1688, the report made of the proceedings to the Lords of Trade and Plantations states that as soon as he arrived there “His Excellence sent for and received from Coll. Dongan the seal of the late Gov^t which was defaced and broaken in Councill.”† Probably the same fate befell the seal of Connecticut.

On the resumption here of charter government a new seal was procured of the same general design. A representation of it appears on the title page of Vol. IV of our Colonial Records.‡ The motto is cut in larger letters than those on that received from the Saybrook colony and the mode of displaying it is less symmetrical. To atone, perhaps, for the bolder lettering, TRANSTULIT is shortened to TRASTULIT. We had come to the dark age of colonial history, when the first generation of English settlers, led by graduates of Oxford and Cambridge, had passed away, and but a feeble beginning had been made towards founding classical learning in New England.

This seal was seemingly incapable of making a clear impression. On a commission dated in 1690, which has been preserved in the State library, are two wax seals, each apparently bearing the same stamp. One is almost undecipherable and the other not much better. The Secretary has put a note against the latter, explaining that it was affixed because the former was so bad.

The original seal received from Colonel Fenwick was one only adapted to printing on wax.

* Conn. Hist. Soc. Collections, III, 143.

† Doc. relating to the Col. Hist. of N. Y., III, 567.

‡ Cf. Preface to the same, v. Impressions on wax are preserved in the State library; Winthrop Coll. of MSS., II, 198 (June 30, 1690) and III, 312.

The fragility of sealing wax came to be generally recognized by the beginning of the eighteenth century as making some substitute desirable in the case of large seals on public documents of a permanent character. Letters had often been closed with paste. The thin sort of paste used for this purpose was called "wafer."* It was found that by allowing it to harden in the shape of little cakes, these could be quickly moistened and softened when wanted to close a letter. Such forms of paste were now called wafers,—a word previously used for any small, flat, edible cake. For a public seal, after being affixed to the documents, an evenly cut piece of paper of corresponding size called a "scarf," was pressed down upon them, on which the device on the die was printed by the use of a lever or screw press.

It was apparently in order to get the benefit of this modern mode of sealing public instruments that in 1711, it was ordered by the Governor and Council "that a new stamp shall be made and cut of the seal of this Colony, suitable for the sealing upon wafers, and that a press be provided with the necessary appurtenances for that purpose, as soon as may be, at the cost and charge of this Colony, to be kept in the Secretary's office."†

The authority thus given was liberally construed by the official, whoever he was, from whom the engraver took his orders. Not only was the new seal adapted for use with wafers, as well as with wax, but the size, shape and device were essentially altered.

Governor Wolcott's memoir, written in 1759, from which a quotation has been already made, refers to it thus: "In Governour Saltonstal's time the seal was new made and enlarged, but the impression and the motto is the same."‡

He must refer in these words to what was done under the vote of 1711, but his memory evidently betrayed him. That very careful historical scholar, the late Charles J. Hoadly, LL.D., State Librarian, in Vol. VI of the Colonial Records, gives a *fac simile* of the seal as recut in 1711, which represents it as

* Bailey's Dict., 1733, *in verb.*

† Col. Rec. of Conn., V, 1706-1716, 290.

‡ Conn. Hist. Soc. Collections, III, 328.

an oval, with a double border, containing the words SIGILLVM COLONIÆ CONNECTICENSIS, and enclosing three vines only, with the motto QVI TRANSTVLIT SVSTINET.* The hand which in the original seal emerged from the clouds to sustain a pennant bearing this motto is in this reproduction aimlessly stretched out above the pennant; and the whole design is stiff and unpleasing. The Saybrook patentees, no doubt, had their die cut in London. The American engraver was not yet equal to the British.

The blunder in Latinizing the name of the colony was obvious. When Lord Eldon, who was somewhat inclined to petty economies, died, the funereal hatchment set up over the door of his house bore the legend *Mors janua vita*. A passer-by noticed the slip of using the nominative, *vita*, for the genitive case. "No slip at all," said his companion: "his Lordship undoubtedly left particular directions to have it so, in order to avoid the expense of the additional letter which a diphthong would require."

No such parsimony can be imputed to Connecticut for (though after deliberating over it for some forty years), in October, 1747, the General Assembly voted "that the publick Seal of this Colony be altered and changed from the form of an oval to that of a circle, and that the same shall have cut and engraved upon it the same inscription, motto, and device that are on the present seal, with a correction of such mistakes as happened in the spelling and letters in the inscription and motto of the present seal, and the Secretary of this Colony is directed to procure such alteration at the cost of this Colony as soon as conveniently may be." Nothing was done by the Secretary, however, and the seal remained unchanged until the Colony became a sovereign State.†

It has been suggested that the reason which led the Governor and Council in 1711 to reduce the number of vines from fifteen

* An excellent impression on wax has been preserved in the seal set to the charter of Yale College in 1745. It is enclosed in a silver box; attached to ribbons dependent from the parchment; and is in perfect condition in all respects.

† Col. Rec. of Conn., VI, iii; IX, 333.

to three was thus to symbolize the three plantations of Hartford, Windsor and Wethersfield, whose people combined in adopting the Fundamental Orders of 1639.*

It seems to me much more probable, as surmised by Dr. Leonard Bacon,† that they desired to commemorate in this way the union of the three early colonies, which had been set up here in the preceding century.

The Connecticut of 1711 had risen out of the consolidation of three separate political communities:—the jurisdiction of Connecticut River having its seat at Hartford; the jurisdiction of the Warwick patentees having its seat at Saybrook; and the jurisdiction of New Haven having its seat at New Haven. With the first of these the second was virtually united in 1644, and the third in 1662. The triune character of the resulting Colony of Connecticut it was natural and appropriate to commemorate in this way.

An important step in that direction had been taken two years before. In June, 1709, the General Court directed an issue of colony bills of credit to “be indented and stamped with such stamps as the Governor and Council shall direct.”‡ The Governor and Council thereupon ordered “that the said bills of credit shall be all stamped with the arms of the Colony or such a figure as this.” A figure followed, circular in form, with the three vines in the center. One of the same description, except that it is oval instead of circular, and set upon an ornamental shield, appeared on the bills when issued.§

The seal made under the vote of 1711 was used more or less until 1784. As it purported on its face to be that of a colony, it was ill adapted, after Connecticut proclaimed her independence, for the service of a sovereign State. In a commission issued August 17, 1776, to Rev. Ebenezer Baldwin of Danbury, as chaplain of the fourth and sixteenth regiments of our militia in the Continental army, by “Jonathan Trumbull, Esquire, Governor and Commander in Chief of the State of

* Johnston, Connecticut, 73.

† Historical Discourses, 16, note.

‡ Col. Rec., 1706-1716, 111.

§ *Ibid.*, XV, 562.

Connecticut in New England in America" the subscription clause is, "Given under my Hand and Seal at Arms in the State aforesaid at Lebanon the 17th day of August, Anno Domini, 1776," and the seal affixed was impressed with the Turnbull arms, which the Connecticut Trumbulls had the right to bear.* On this three bulls' heads appear where one would look for the three vines.

The subscription clause of a commission issued by Governor Trumbull, at Lebanon, July 21, 1777, to Roger Sherman, Samuel Huntington, and Titus Hosmer, as delegates to the Springfield Convention of that year is of the same tenor. On the other hand, a commission preserved in the State Library, to Lieutenant John Hamlin, issued through the Secretary's office at New Haven, in 1776, has the old colonial seal used with this subscription clause: "Given under my Hand and the Seal of this State in New Haven the first day of November, A. D. 1776."

These papers indicate a natural resort to temporary make-shifts between the date of the Declaration of Independence and the adoption of a proper seal for the new-born State.

In 1777, an issue was made of colony bills of credit, which bear a device containing but a single vine. Of course it does not profess to represent the seal of the State.

It must always be remembered that what is commonly spoken of as the arms of the State or Colony is something quite different from the seal.

The Colony never had any coat of arms, properly so called. It could not have assumed one without royal permission; and this it never had. The State has not desired to perpetuate a system of Herald's Colleges and armorial bearings for a favored few, although finally, in 1897, it stated what its own arms were. Prior to that time, however, what were the arms of the State, in popular acceptation, had been described in technical terms, by Dr. Charles J. Hoadly, thus: "Argent, three

* Stuart, in his *Life of Jonathan Trumbull*, gives a cut of the arms, enclosed within a circle, probably taken from the Governor's seal, as the size and shape are the same.

vines supported and fructed proper.”* In other words, it was three fruit-bearing grape vines, emblazoned in their natural colors, on a white field.

While we have no statute in this State describing with accuracy the seal of the State, there is one, passed in the year last mentioned (1897) on the application of the Daughters of the Revolution, describing the flag, and, by reference, the arms. This is contained in Section 4889 of the General Statutes, and provides as follows:

“The dimensions of the flag shall be five feet and six inches in length; four feet four inches in width. The flag shall be of azure blue silk, charged with a shield of rococo design of argent white silk, having embroidered in the center three grape vines, supported and bearing fruit in natural colors. The bordure to the shield shall be embroidered in two colors, gold and silver. Below the shield shall be a white streamer, cleft at each end, bordered by gold and browns in fine lines, and upon the streamer shall be embroidered in dark blue letters the motto ‘Qui Transulit Sustinet’; the whole design being the arms of the State.”

In 1673, the General Court, in providing for a Revision of the Colonial Statutes which was soon afterwards published at Cambridge, ordered “that the impression of the Coloney Seale shall be affixed in the beginning of every law-booke,”† and it was done accordingly. Massachusetts in like manner had the year before put a wood-cut impression of her seal on the Revision of her Statutes.‡

Except in this instance, throughout the colonial era it was usual to put the royal arms on the title page of each Revision of the Laws of Connecticut, and at the head of each issue of Session Laws. It was omitted first in the Session Laws of the May Session, 1776, and Connecticut is styled, not, as before, “His Majesty’s English Colony of Connecticut in New England in America,” but the “English Colony of Connecticut in New England in America.” In the Session Laws of the October Session, 1776, it is first described as the “State of Connecticut.”

* Conn. Reg. for 1889, 440.

† Col. Rec., 1665-1677, 201.

‡ Green, John Foster, 11.

In May, 1784, the General Assembly adopted this resolution:*

“Whereas, the circumscription of the seal of this State is improper and inapplicable to our present constitution,

“Resolved, by this Assembly, that the Secretary be and he is hereby empowered and directed to get the same altered from the words as they now stand to the following inscription, namely, SIGILL. REIP. CONNECTICUTENSIS.”

The Secretary did not follow these instructions with exactness. The words descriptive of the seal itself were spelled out in full, thus: SIGILLUM REIPUBLICÆ CONNECTICUTENSIS.

He also re-arranged them so as to give a more symmetrical appearance to the whole device, and omitted the hand which for nearly two centuries had upheld the pennant or scroll bearing the motto.

At the October Session of the same year, the new design was approved by the Assembly and the seal made thenceforth the seal of the State. The fee to the Secretary for affixing it to any document was made one shilling.†

Apparently a sketch had been made of the seal as originally ordered, for a wood-cut of the State arms in such a form is prefixed to the published Session Laws of October, 1784. This coat of arms with the accompanying legends varies somewhat in detail from that of the Colony. There are the three vines arranged in an oval, upon an escutcheon; but the outer inscription around the rim is now *Connecticutensis Sigill. Reip.*, and the legend within the oval is shortened to *Qui Tra. Sus.*

The same design appears upon the title page of the Revision of that year, and heads each issue of the Session Laws down to that for the October Session, 1796, in which the device is considerably altered. The oval now stands alone, instead of being displayed on an escutcheon. The QUI TRA. SUS. which it formerly contained is omitted, but QUI TRANS- TULIT SUSTINET appears upon a narrow scroll beneath,

* Stat. Rev. of 1784, 64, 218.

† Stat. Rev. of 1784, 64, 218. Impressions are preserved in the State Library. Pearne Collection, 1759-1800, 34, 35.

each end of which curls over a sprig with leaves. The top of the oval is crowned by a garland of leaves, supported partly by the oval and partly by rosettes on each side of it, which falls low enough to touch the sprays rising from the bottom.

The Session Laws for the October Session, 1792, are headed by a device much like the former one, used prior to 1791; but that on the Laws of the May Session, 1793, is identical with that on those of 1791.

In the Compilation of the Statutes of 1796, the seal on the title page is in shape a shield, and the inner legend is *Qui Trans. Sust.* In that of 1808, *Qui trans. sust.* appears on a scroll under the shield, and on each side of the shield is a leafy branch. The title page of "Book II" of the Laws, commencing with those of the October Session of that year, but published in 1819, represents the arms with the motto inside the shield again, and abbreviated to QUI TRAN. SUST.

So far as the different changes in the words or place of the motto are concerned, it is to be remembered that mottoes form regularly no part of an English coat of arms. They are not mentioned in patents granting arms and form no part of the "estate" granted. Whoever has a grant of arms can adopt any motto that he pleases, and the officers of arms will then record it.

Until the eighteenth century, few coats of arms of English families had any appurtenant motto at all.*

The variations from time to time in the design of the State arms would seem to indicate that the Secretary, in printing the Session Laws or General Revisions, left a considerable latitude to the engraver of the wood-cut, or to the discretion of the printer in choosing which of several wood-cuts should be used.

The seal of the State itself, which was in the Secretary's keeping, remained identically the same from 1784 to 1842.

The frequent changes in the wood-cuts of the State arms seem to have attracted public attention by the time when the people became ready to frame their Constitution of government, and in that of 1818 we find these provisions on that subject:

* Fox-Davies, Complete Guide to Heraldry, 448, 449.

"Art. 4, Sec. 11. All commissions . . . Shall be sealed with the State seal, signed by the Governor and attested by the Secretary."

"Sec. 18. A Secretary shall be chosen. . . . He shall be the keeper of the seal of the State which shall not be altered."

In the next Revision (that of 1821), no design in the nature of a seal appears on the title page. Nor do we find one again in the Session Laws until 1827, when a cut is printed in the same form as that in the Revision of 1808.

In 1840 the General Assembly took the following action:

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State be instructed to ascertain the proper seal and bearings of this State, and report to the next session of the General Assembly; and also whether any legislative enactment is required for a proper description of said seal."*

It was probably unfortunate that we then had as Secretary that enthusiastic antiquarian, Royal R. Hinman. He knew so well the difficulty of the task thus imposed upon him, and was so unwilling to do anything imperfectly, that he never made any report whatever.

Apparently by this time the die for the seal approved in 1784 had become worn out, for in 1842 the General Assembly passed this resolution:

"Resolved, That the Secretary be and he is hereby authorized to procure a new state seal, similar to the one now in use."†

The seal procured under this authority was in use for about forty years.

The die was in fact a little broader than that of its predecessor, and each vine is made to bear three clusters of grapes, although in that the two upper ones had each four clusters and the lower one five. The press was a screw press, with arms some three feet long.

Originally, and for many years, the seal of 1842 was used with wax.‡ Later it was commonly used with a wafer and a

* Resolves and Private Acts, 1840, 67.

† Resolves and Private Acts, Special October Session, 1842, 17.

‡ Hon. N. D. Sperry, then the oldest living ex-Secretary of the State, informed the writer, in 1910, that this was the case when he was in office, which was in 1855 and 1856.

notched paper "scarf."* About 1880, the Secretary (the late Chief Justice Torrance) had a new die cut, as nearly like the old one as possible, under the directions of the chief clerk (Mr. Robinson S. Hinman), suitable for stamping directly on the document to be sealed, without the intervention of any wafer or scarf. A press of modern style, worked with a lever, was also procured.

The only special authority for this action was a Resolution of the General Assembly, passed in 1864, empowering the Secretary to procure "a new State seal, similar to the one now in use."† Dr. Hoadly, who was quite a stickler for forms, once said that the old die which, though still capable of use, had been laid aside, was the real thing, and the other was only "Hinman's seal."

During the period of the *interregnum* from 1901 to 1903, the old seal was carefully hidden away by Mr. Hinman in the vault of the Executive offices in the capitol, lest those who claimed that Luzon B. Morris was the real Governor should by chance get hold of it, and undertake to issue commissions or perform other acts of State.

The die of the seal of 1784 was engraved on a silver plate, which was soldered upon a brass shoe, still preserved in the State Library. The silver plate was given by Hon. Charles W. Bradley, in 1846, when he was Secretary of the State, to Yale College, and is in the University Library.

The die for the seal of 1842 was engraved on brass.

In 1889 a Secret Ballot Act was passed, requiring the Secretary to furnish official ballots and envelopes for the use of all the electors. The envelopes were to be "stamped with the seal of the State."‡

It is one of the traditions of the capitol that this was construed by the Secretary as requiring the great seal itself to be stamped on every envelope, and that in using the seal of 1882 for that purpose it was effectually used up.

* This was the practice in 1870, as the writer was informed by R. S. Hinman, Esq., the chief clerk in the Secretary's office for many years.

† Special Acts for 1864, 151; Hoadly, Conn. Reg. for 1889, 441.

‡ Public Acts of 1889, 155, Sec. 3.

The growth of the State has necessarily called for a more frequent use of the seal in many ways, and during the past thirty years three new ones in all have been cut.* Conformably to the provisions of the Constitution, the character of the device in all respects, however, has remained unaltered. One of these, engraved on copper, which was accidentally mutilated by being struck upon a pin, was recently deposited in the corner stone of the new State Library and Supreme Court building.

There have then, in the history of Connecticut, been three and only three great seals: that received from the original Saybrook patentees about 1644, and awkwardly reproduced after the overthrow of the Andros government, about 1690; that cut in 1711; and that now in use, the first die for which was cut in 1784.

The original motto has remained throughout unchanged, except that the words have been re-arranged; *SUSTINET QUI TRANSTULIT* being replaced in 1711, in the interest of better Latinity, by *QUI TRANSTULIT SUSTINET*. A human hand was represented near the motto in the two first seals, but disappeared in that of 1784.

The symbol of the vine or the vineyard has been uniformly retained, though with a change in number, which was first made in 1711.

The original seal contained no statement of what it was; nor did that which temporarily replaced it. In the second such a statement in Latin was added, and this was followed in substance in the third, when the colony had become a sovereign State.

But one thing, then, has stood absolutely the same upon her seal, during the whole life of Connecticut. It is the three words that expressed the faith of the fathers in the goodness of God. Those whom He had transplanted, they said, He is sustaining. Belief in God, and an attitude towards Him of reverence and

* So I am informed by Hon. Richard J. Dwyer, Deputy Secretary of the State, who has been connected with the Secretary's office during all that period.

thankfulness have ever been a characteristic of our people; and each succeeding generation for now nearly three centuries has thought it fit that they should thus be commemorated upon our seal of State.

THE BATTLE OF LAKE GEORGE (SEPT. 8, 1755) AND THE MEN WHO WON IT.

By HENRY T. BLAKE.

[Read December 20, 1909.]

At the southern end of Lake George there stands a monument which was erected in 1903 by the New York Society of Colonial Wars to commemorate one of the most desperate battles and important victories in our colonial history. The monument consists of a massive granite pedestal surmounted by two life-size figures in bronze which represent a colonial military officer in conference with an Indian chief, and the principal inscription on the pedestal reads as follows:

1903

THE SOCIETY OF COLONIAL WARS ERECTED THIS MONUMENT TO COMMEMORATE THE VICTORY OF THE COLONIAL FORCES UNDER GENERAL WILLIAM JOHNSON AND THEIR MOHAWK ALLIES UNDER CHIEF HENDRICK OVER THE FRENCH REGULARS COMMANDED BY BARON DIESKAU WITH THEIR CANADIAN AND INDIAN ALLIES.

The impression which this inscription suggests to the ordinary reader is that both Johnson and Hendrick were in command during the battle and that the victory was gained under their leadership. Neither of these inferences is correct. Chief Hendrick had been killed several hours before the battle was fought and several miles distant from its locality. Johnson had been wounded at the very commencement of the action and retired to his tent, leaving his second in command to manage the battle and he alone conducted it to its successful result. These are the undisputed facts of history. Moreover, it is universally agreed that Johnson's gross military neglect in making no preparations for the attack almost caused a defeat,

and that his equally censurable refusal to permit a pursuit of the routed enemy rendered the victory incomplete and valueless. All authorities concur in these points, and they also agree that the real heroes of the day were: *First*, Lieutenant Colonel Whiting of New Haven, Conn., who in the preliminary morning fight after the death of Colonel Williams and Chief Hendrick took command of their panic-stricken followers and not only saved them from destruction but incidentally the rest of Johnson's army also; and, *Second*, Gen. Phineas Lyman of Suffield, Conn., to whom, as already stated, Johnson turned over the command almost at the outset of the battle and who personally directed it for more than five hours thereafter till it ended in victory.

My subject, therefore, possesses a local interest for us, not only as sons of Connecticut but also as citizens of New Haven. Thousands of visitors from our State and hundreds from our near vicinity annually visit the beautiful and historic region where the monument referred to is situated, and others will do so down to the end of time, to most of whom the battle it commemorates is either entirely unknown or is dim and vague as a prehistoric legend. Not only on this, but on *general* grounds it devolves upon this, as on all other Historic Associations, to protest against misleading public records or inscriptions which tend to perpetuate injustice toward heroes of the past, whose names are already almost forgotten. For these reasons I have devoted the paper of this evening to an account of "The Battle of Lake George and the Men who Won it."

The three personages with whom our story will principally deal are Gen. (afterwards Sir) William Johnson, Gen. Phineas Lyman and Lieut. Col. Nathan Whiting; and it will be proper to begin it with some account of the previous history of these three individuals.

Sir William Johnson (to give him prematurely the title by which he is generally known) was born in Ireland and came to this country in 1735 at the age of twenty, to manage the large landed estates of his uncle, Admiral Johnson, in the Mohawk Valley. For this purpose and also for the purpose

of trading on his own account he established himself on the edge of the vast Indian territory which then extended indefinitely toward the north, south, and west of the continent. Being shrewd and ambitious and possessing the genial adaptability of his race to all conditions of life, and to all sorts of men, he neglected no method of ingratiating himself with his savage neighbors and of gaining their respect and confidence. Accordingly he observed strict honesty and firmness in his dealings with them, kept open house for them at all times, and often lived with them in their wigwams, where he wore their garb, greased and painted his face after their fashion, and in whooping, yelling, dancing and devouring roast dog became a recognized champion. By these and other accomplishments he so won their hearts that he was formally adopted into the Mohawk tribe and accompanied them as a member, greased, painted and befeathered, to an important conference with the whites at Albany. Owing to his influence with the Indians he was appointed, in 1750, by the Colonial government of New York, a member of the Governor's Council, which involved a residence for a considerable part of the year in the City of New York.

There he mingled with the best social circles, which doubtless conduced to amenity and polish in his manners; there also he became intimately identified with New York politics, which were as bitter and strenuous then as now, and which did not then any more than now conduce to the purity or unanimity of a politician's personal character.

In 1755, when war was declared between England and France, a colonial movement was planned to capture Crown Point on Lake Champlain, then in possession of the French. In this expedition the Colonies of New York, Massachusetts and Connecticut agreed to unite, and Johnson was commissioned by each of them a Major General to be in command of their combined forces. This appointment was made, not on account of his military reputation, for up to that time he had had no experience as a soldier; but partly on account of the influence it was likely to have in holding the New York Indians to the English side, and partly to the supposition that no one else

could be put in the general command without exciting local jealousy. For both these reasons the appointment was judicious and attended with good results. Through Johnson's efforts the Mohawks agreed to fight on the English side, and most of them afterwards did so, though others, and all the tribes near Canada, allied themselves with the French.

In connection with this appointment of Johnson as Commander-in-Chief of the Provincial forces for the proposed expedition, the three Colonies also united in appointing Phineas Lyman of Connecticut to be second in command. Like Johnson, Lyman had had no previous military experience except as captain of a militia company in Suffield, and his selection was doubtless due not only to his prominence as a citizen but to a recognition of those abilities and soldierly qualities which were afterwards displayed in a distinguished military career. He was born in Durham, Conn., in 1716. He graduated at Yale College in 1738 and married into a prominent Massachusetts family, his wife being an aunt of Timothy Dwight, who was afterwards President of Yale College. After graduation he became a lawyer and settled in Suffield, which, at that time, through an error in the laying out of the Colony's boundary line, was included in Massachusetts, but was afterwards, through his efforts, conceded to Connecticut where it belonged. He was for several years a member of the Connecticut General Assembly; at first in the lower house and afterwards in the upper branch, and his law practice is said to have been the largest in Connecticut. This practice General Lyman relinquished immediately after his military appointment, and proceeded to Albany, which had been selected as the rendezvous for all the troops and supplies for the proposed expedition.

The third one of the persons with whom we are now principally concerned was Col. Nathan Whiting, who was born in Windham, Conn., but had resided from boyhood in New Haven, being connected with the family of President Clap of Yale College. He graduated from Yale College in 1743, and in 1745 he took part in the expedition to Louisburg, where he

so distinguished himself that he was promoted to a lieutenantancy in the British army. After his return he engaged in business in New Haven, but when war broke out in 1755 his martial ardor revived and he accepted a Colonial commission as Lieutenant Colonel with the command of the Second Connecticut Regiment, which was raised for the movement on Crown Point. The regiment, which was made up partly of volunteers and partly of drafted militiamen, was assembled at New Haven, and on May 25, 1755, being about to depart for Crown Point, it marched, with Colonel Whiting at its head, into Rev. Mr. Noyes' meeting house on the Green to hear a discourse by the Rev. Isaac Stiles on "The Character and Duty of Souldiers." Some copies of the sermon still survive and show that the eloquent Divine did full justice to his subject and the occasion. He adjured his hearers to "file off the rust of their firelocks, that exquisitely contrived and tremendous instrument of death," also "to attend to the several beats of that great warlike instrument the drum, and to the language of that shrill high-sounding trumpet, that noble, reviving and animating sound"; he depicted their foes as "lying slain on the battle field with battered arms, bleeding sculls and cloven trunks," "while the good souldiers of Jesus Christ were all the while shining with all the beauty and luster that inward sanctity and outward charms lend to the hero's look." Fired with enthusiasm by these encouraging prospects, the youthful warriors departed for the seat of war and in due time arrived at Albany, where, by the middle of July, about 3,000 provincials were encamped. A large part of the Mohawk tribe had also arrived, warriors, squaws and children, among whom Major General Johnson, with painted face, danced the war dance, howled the war whoop, and with his sword cut off the first slice of the ox that had been roasted for their entertainment.

After various delays, a part of the motley army, under command of General Lyman, moved about twenty-five miles up the Hudson River to "The Great Carrying Place," from which there was a trail to Wood Creek, a feeder of Lake Champlain, on which Crown Point is situated. Here Lyman proceeded to

build a fortified storehouse, which the soldiers called "Fort Lyman," but which Johnson, with a politician's instinct, afterwards called "Fort Edward," as a compliment to the then Duke of York, and this name still clings to the important village which has since grown up at that place.

On the 12th of August, Johnson arrived with the rest of the militia and about 250 Mohawks out of the multitude who had been feasting and dancing at Colonial expense for a month at Albany. These were led by their principal sachem, Hendrick, commonly called King Hendrick, an aged chief of great renown both as warrior and orator, who had been to England twice, and wore a gorgeous uniform which had been presented to him by King George in person.

After consultation, it was decided not to approach Crown Point by way of Wood Creek but through Lake George; and to reach Lake George, fourteen miles distant, it was necessary to cut a road through the forest for the transportation of artillery, boats and stores. This task was accomplished in about a fortnight and on August 28, Johnson with 3,400 men, including Indians, arrived and encamped at the southern end of the lake. Six days later, September 3, Lyman joined him with 1,500 militiamen, 500 having been left to occupy Fort Lyman. Some of the cannon, bateaux and other war material had also reached the lake and the rest was slowly following in wagons along the newly-cut road. Not expecting any enemy, all these equipments and supplies as they arrived at Lake George were deposited along the shore of the lake in preparation for embarking them when everything needed should have come up. No action was taken to fortify the camp, though the erection of a permanent fort (afterwards called Fort William Henry) was begun with a view to establishing a future military post at that point.

Meantime, the enemy in Canada had been neither asleep nor idle. While Johnson's army had been slowly cutting their forest road to Lake George, Baron Dieskau, the commander-in-chief of all the French armies in America, a soldier of great distinction and activity, whose motto was "Audacity Wins," had advanced from Crown Point to Ticonderoga with a force

of 1,500 men consisting of 1,200 Canadians and Indians and 300 French Regulars. On the 2d of September he had left Ticonderoga by way of Lake Champlain and Wood Creek, and was now (September 4th) on the other side of the ridge which separates Lake George from Wood Creek pushing his way southward up that stream, his objective point being Fort Lyman. This post he expected to surprise and carry by assault, thus getting in the rear of Johnson, capturing the greater part of his stores and munitions and cutting him off from all future supplies and reinforcements. This he could easily have done, as Fort Lyman was held by only 500 raw militiamen and his approach was entirely unsuspected by the garrison as well as by Johnson himself. On the evening of September 7, Johnson first learned from a scout that a large body of men had been discovered about four miles above Fort Lyman and marching toward it. He immediately despatched a messenger with a letter warning the garrison of its danger and called a council of war to consider the situation. His own suggestion was to send 500 men the next morning to reinforce Fort Lyman, and 500 more across the country toward Wood Creek in order to seize Dieskau's boats and cut him off from a retreat. Old King Hendrick, however, repelled this proposal with an Indian's mode of argument by taking two sticks and showing that they could be more easily broken when separated than when combined. Relinquishing this plan, therefore, Johnson decided to send 1,200 men the next morning in a single body to Fort Lyman to coöperate with the garrison in its defence. The old chief still demurred, declaring that if they were sent to be killed there would be too many, but if to fight there would be too few. Nevertheless, this plan was adhered to and an order was issued that 1,000 men from the Massachusetts and Connecticut regiments, under command of Col. Ephraim Williams and Lieut. Col. Nathan Whiting, and 200 Indians commanded by Hendrick, should march to the aid of Fort Lyman early next morning.

While these discussions were going on in Johnson's camp, his messenger to Fort Lyman had been killed by Dieskau's scouts and the letter of warning found in his pocket. At

about the same time, two of Johnson's wagoners had been captured on their way to Lake George, and from them it was learned that Fort Lyman was defended by cannon, while Johnson's camp was unprotected even by breastworks, and that his artillery was lying unmounted on the shore of the lake. No sooner were these facts known to the Canadians and Indians than they protested with one voice against Dieskau's plan of assaulting Fort Lyman the next morning and insisted on making the camp at Lake George the object of attack. The ground of this preference was the invincible repugnance of militiamen and Indians to face artillery, and they could neither be cajoled nor reasoned out of such an excusable prejudice. In vain did Dieskau argue, threaten and implore; it was Lake George or nothing, and in the end he consented, with infinite disgust, to march against Johnson's camp in the morning.

Soon after eight o'clock, therefore, on the morning of September 8, two hostile armies were marching towards each other, one south, the other north, along Johnson's road. As the Canadian force was the first to start, we will follow their movement first. Moving from a point near Glens Falls, three or four miles north of Fort Lyman, they had advanced about five miles when they reached a narrow ravine between two steep, wood-covered heights, at the bottom of which ran the road and alongside of it a little trickling brook. The general appearance of the locality is almost unchanged to-day, though a railroad now runs through the bottom of the ravine and a highway and trolley track skirt its western side. At this point the Indian scouts announced that a large force was approaching from the direction of Johnson's camp and Dieskau immediately prepared an ambuscade to receive it. The Indians and Canadians were distributed for half a mile among the woods on the two sides of the ravine and the Regulars were posted across it at the lower end; thus forming a cul-de-sac of savages and militiamen, who then in complete concealment and perfect silence awaited the approach of their unsuspecting enemy. Strict orders had been given not to fire a gun until the English should become completely enveloped in the trap.

The party from the camp had started a little after eight o'clock, the Mohawks being in front, headed by Old Hendrick, who was so heavy and infirm that he chose to ride a horse which had been lent to him by Johnson. Then followed Colonel Williams with the Massachusetts men; and Colonel Whiting with the Connecticut Militia brought up the rear. The whole column, however, was somewhat promiscuously intermingled and proceeded with surprising recklessness in a helter-skelter fashion without the usual precaution of sending scouts at least a mile in advance. Thus proceeding, the head of the column reached the ravine and had advanced some distance into it when Old Hendrick's olfactories recognized a familiar odor and he called out "I smell Indians"! Just then came the crack of a gun from among the bushes and in an instant the air was alive with horrible yells, as if ten thousand devils had broken loose mingled with the din of musketry, which flashed and smoked and rained deadly bullets on the bewildered, staggering and falling provincials. As Dieskau described it later in his official report, "the head of the column was doubled up like a pack of cards." At the first fire Old Hendrick fell dead from his horse, and the Mohawks fled howling to the rear, spreading confusion and panic through the whole body. Colonel Williams sprang to the top of a large boulder to rally his men and was immediately shot through the head. And now the French regulars advanced, pouring murderous volleys into the huddled mass of militiamen, who crowded on each other in frantic efforts to escape the withering fire. To most of the Yankee boys it was their first experience of war, and if they thought of Parson Stiles' sermon, with its allusions to "battered arms, cloven skulls and severed bodies" the application to the case in hand was less promotive of "the hero's look" than a longing for home and mother.

The situation is thus described by Parkman: "There was a panic; some fled outright and the whole column recoiled. The van now became the rear and all the force of the enemy rushed upon it, shouting and screeching. There was a moment of total confusion, but a part of Williams' regiment rallied under

command of Whiting and covered the retreat, fighting behind trees like Indians and firing and falling back by turns, bravely aided by some Indians and by a detachment which Johnson sent to their aid." As this detachment was not sent out until after the firing had been for some time heard at the camp to be approaching, thus giving notice of a defeat, and then had two or three miles to cover before it reached the scene of action, it is evident that Whiting must have had the matter well in hand before it came up. A New York historian says: "After the death of Colonel Williams the command devolved on Lieutenant Colonel Whiting of Connecticut, who, with signal ability, conducted a most successful retreat. On account of the spirited resistance made by Colonel Whiting the enemy were an hour and a half driving the fugitives before them.* Governor Livingston of New York, in a letter written shortly afterwards, says: "The retreat was very judiciously conducted, after the death of Colonel Williams, by Lieutenant Colonel Whiting of Connecticut, an officer who gained much applause at the reduction of Louisburg." Johnson, in his official report, says (without mentioning Whiting's name): "The whole party that escaped came in, in large bodies," (a practical acknowledgment that the retreat had been well conducted,) and he also concedes that the delay which had been effected was of vital importance by giving time to put the camp in a posture of defence. Baron Dieskau, after his capture, expressed his admiration of Whiting's achievement, declaring that a retreat was never better managed; and Vaudreuil, the French Governor General of Canada, in a communication to his own government, admits that Whiting baffled an essential part of Dieskau's plan. This was to drive the routed provincials in confusion back upon an unprotected camp, and to rush in with them, spreading the panic, in which case he felt sure that his disciplined regulars, supporting the wild onslaught of his Canadian and Indian allies, would make victory certain.

That this plan, but for Whiting's leadership, would have been realized and would have succeeded, there can be little

* N. Y. State Hist. Assoc. Proceedings, Vol. 2, p. 18.

doubt. It was not until the firing was heard to be approaching the camp, thus evincing that "the bloody morning scout" (as it was long afterwards called) had been defeated, that any vigorous preparation was made for protection by any kind of barricade. The time was short, indeed, less than an hour and a half, for getting ready, but life and death were at stake, and in those few minutes the men worked in a frenzy. Trees were felled and laid end to end, bateaux, wagons, and other materials brought up from the lake and piled in heaps, and three or four heavy cannon dragged behind the barrier, where they were hurriedly mounted and placed in position. The fugitives were already swarming in. The more orderly bodies followed quickly after, and were rapidly assigned places among those who had been previously disposed at different points for the defence. Then and before the arrangements were fully completed, the savage pursuers came whooping and yelling through the forest, brandishing their weapons and making straight for the slight barricade, already exulting in an assured victory and massacre. They were checked for a moment by a volley of musketry, and immediately after the unexpected roar of artillery and the crashing of cannon balls and grapeshot through the trees around them sent them scattering in consternation through the forest, where behind such shelter as they could get they pushed as near to the barricade as they dared and shot at the defenders as they could get opportunity. And now the French regulars were quickly seen advancing in solid columns down the road, their white uniforms and glittering bayonets showing through the trees in what seemed to be an interminable array. The inexperienced militia behind the barricade grew uneasy, but the officers, sword in hand, threatened to cut down any man who should desert his post.

Dieskau felt sure that if he could hold his forces together for a combined assault he could carry the breastwork; but the Canadians and Indians were scattered through the woods, each man fighting on his own account and could not be collected or controlled. With his regulars, therefore, and such few others as he could gather, he made charge after charge against the

defences, now upon this side and now upon that but only to be repulsed at every point. The fighting spirit had begun to be developed in the defenders and the battle became one of promiscuous musketry for the most part, though the artillery was also vigorously served, now scattering a band of Indians who had collected in an exposed position, and now pouring balls and grapeshot at random through the forest, the crashing of which among the trees effectually encouraged the savages to keep at a respectful distance.

In the very beginning of the fight Johnson had been hit by a musket ball in the fleshy part of his thigh, but was able to walk to his tent, where he remained throughout the day, taking no further part in the action. General Lyman being thus left in command directed practically the entire course of the battle, and in the words of Dr. Holden of the New York Historical Society "conducted what is considered by all experts to be one of the most important Indian fights in history to a successful termination." To quote again from Parkman: "General Lyman took command, and it is a marvel that he escaped alive, for he was for four hours in the heat of the fire, directing and animating his men." "It was the most awful day my eyes ever beheld," wrote Surgeon Williams to his wife; "there seemed to be nothing but thunder and lightning and pillars of smoke."

Governor Livingston in the letter already quoted says: "Numbers of eye witnesses declare that they saw Lyman fighting like a lion in the hottest of the battle—not to mention a gentleman of undoubted veracity to whom General Johnson two days after the action acknowledged that to Lyman was chiefly to be ascribed the honor of the victory." Whether such an admission was correctly attributed to Johnson or not there is but one voice among historians on the subject and that is that Lyman, and Lyman alone, fought the battle as the officer in command, and that to him alone as the directing spirit is due the credit for its result.

Towards five o'clock in the afternoon the fight began to slacken. The Canadians and Indians had lost their interest,

as well as most of their ammunition, and were generally acting on an informal vote to adjourn. The regulars had been half annihilated; their ammunition also was exhausted and further efforts were hopeless. The provincials quickly perceived the situation and jumping over the breastwork with shouts pursued the retreating enemy. Dieskau was found on the ground partly resting against a tree, having been three times shot through the legs and body and left on the field by his own positive order, declaring that that was as good a place to die as anywhere. He was carried to Johnson's tent, where he was courteously received and his wounds attended to by the surgeons. It was with some difficulty that he was prevented from being murdered by the Mohawks, who were enraged at the losses they had suffered in the morning's scout, and especially by the death of Hendrick. As soon as his wounds would permit he was sent to Albany, and thence to New York, and afterwards to England, where he remained on parole to the end of the war. He then returned to France and died there in 1767.

The enemy having been routed it only remained to complete the victory by a vigorous pursuit in force, in order to cut them off from their boats and thus prevent their escape back to Canada. This course was, however, forbidden by Johnson, though urged by Lyman with unusual warmth, and for his refusal he was censured by his contemporaries as well as since by all later critics. But what he disallowed to Lyman was partially accomplished without his knowledge on the same day by a party from the garrison at Fort Lyman. These having heard the firing in the direction of the lake had sallied out to discover the cause of it, and proceeding cautiously through the forest late in the afternoon had come upon some 300 Canadians and Indians, skulkers and fugitives from Dieskau's army, near a small pond by the side of the road and just beyond the scene of the morning's ambush. These they suddenly attacked, though themselves much inferior in number, and defeated them with great loss after a stubborn resistance. The bodies of the slain were afterwards thrown into the pond and it bears the

appellation of "Bloody Pond" to this day. The scattered fugitives from this and the preceding conflicts of the day made their way as best they could to the boats which they had left at Wood Creek and returned through Lake Champlain, a worn-out and half-starved remnant, to Crown Point.

Johnson excused his refusal to permit a pursuit on the ground that he expected another attack, Dieskau having cunningly informed him that there was a large French force in reserve; his object no doubt being to give his routed followers a chance to escape. It seems incredible that Johnson should have given any credence to so flimsy a deception in face of the fact that Dieskau had allowed his troops to be defeated and half exterminated, and himself to be captured, without calling up his pretended reserves, and this excuse must be dismissed as insincere. Johnson also declared that his men were fatigued and disorganized by the events of the day and were not in a condition to pursue; but as he had been confined to his tent throughout the battle he could have known very little on this point in comparison with Lyman, who thought differently.

In view of these considerations and his subsequent conduct all writers agree that Johnson was actuated by jealousy of Lyman who had already been the chief figure of the engagement, and by the idea that if any more glory were achieved that day it would be difficult to monopolize it for himself. As Shakespeare puts it—

"Who in the wars does more than his captain can
Becomes his captain's captain; and ambition
The soldier's virtue, rather makes choice of loss
Than gain which darkens him."

[Ant. and Cleo., Act III, Sc. 1.]

However this may be it is certain that he promptly determined to secure for himself all the glory of the victory and also all its substantial reward, for his official reports not only omit all mention of Lyman but clearly imply that the whole battle had been fought under his own personal supervision and direction. In them he says not a word about his early retirement from the fight but circumstantially recounts all the details of its progress

in the manner of an eye-witness, commending by name the English officer Captain Eyre, "who," he says, "served the artillery through the whole engagement in a manner very advantageous to his character and those concerned in the management of it." After giving other particulars, he adds: "About four o'clock our men and Indians jumped over the breastwork, pursued the enemy, slaughtered numbers, and took several prisoners, including General Dieskau, who was brought into my tent just as a wound I had received was dressed."

As Johnson's wound had been dressed at least six hours before Dieskau was brought into his tent, it is impossible to acquit him of the deliberate intent to convey a false impression when he thus connects the time of receiving it with the very end of the battle. Nor is this conviction weakened when we read a semi-official despatch written the next day by his military secretary, Wraxall, to Governor Delancey, in which no mention whatever is made of either Lyman or Whiting, and he says in a postscript, "Our general's wound pains him; he begs his salutations; he behaved in all respects worthy his station and is the Idoll of the Army."

A side light is shed on the animus of these despatches by a fact which is mentioned by Governor Livingston and President Dwight. This is that there existed among some of Johnson's officers a cabal against Lyman, which was spreading disparaging reports of his conduct during the battle; reports so obviously false and malicious and so completely refuted by overwhelming testimony that they seem to have fallen flat at the time, and to have been never heard of afterwards.

On September 16, or more than a week after the battle, Johnson made an official report of the events of September 8 to the Colonial governors, in which again Lyman's name and services are completely ignored. In connection with the morning's conflict he mentions Lieutenant Colonel Whiting as "commanding one division of the scouting party," but makes no allusion to his management of the retreat. The following passage, however, is significant: "The enemy," he says, "did not pursue vigorously or our slaughter would have been greater

and perhaps our panic fatal. This gave us time to recover and make dispositions to receive the approaching enemy."

The statement that the pursuit was not vigorous would have been repelled by Dieskau, whose motto was always "Audacity Wins," and who had certainly pursued as vigorously as the resistance led by Whiting would permit; but notwithstanding this misrepresentation to Whiting's disparagement the acknowledgment clearly appears that the checking of the pursuit saved both the camp and the army from destruction. Considering that the report was being made to those Colonial authorities who were especially interested in Lyman and Whiting, the studious neglect to give either of them credit for the slightest service throughout the day bespeaks a spirit in its author which was anything but just, generous or honorable.

The magnitude, as well as the importance of the victory at Lake George was greatly overestimated, not only by the public at large but also by the British Government, both on account of the depression that had been caused by Braddock's defeat only two months previously, and also by the fact that it was the only gleam of success that enlivened the English cause in the Colonies that year. Johnson's reports, therefore, aroused great enthusiasm in England, and he was hailed as a conquering hero worthy of distinguished honors from a grateful country. Accordingly, soon after its receipt in London, he was created a Baronet by the Crown, and Parliament voted him a reward of £5,000. Captain Eyre, the only officer named in the report, was promoted to be Major, and Wraxall, whose only apparent military achievements were to accompany Johnson when he walked to his tent soon after the battle commenced, and to call him "The Idoll of the Army" when it was over, was given a Captain's commission. Lyman and Whiting received nothing except the applause of their own countrymen, who speedily learned the facts and placed the credit for the victory where it belonged. Their example has been followed by all historians. The New York Society of Colonial Wars alone has sanctioned Johnson's injustice by erecting a monument which ascribes to him alone the conduct and success of the battle, and consigns Lyman and Whiting to permanent oblivion.

Johnson took no step forward after the victory, though strongly urged by Lyman to seize and fortify Ticonderoga, then unoccupied, but continued to talk about advancing on Crown Point, and called for reinforcements and additional supplies for that purpose. These were sent him through the months of September and October and into November, but during all that period his army of more than 4,000 men lay inactive except for the work they did in erecting Fort William Henry. Meantime the weather was growing colder and the preliminary storms of winter became more frequent and severe. The soldiers, insufficiently sheltered and clothed, badly fed, and decimated by sickness, were all the time on the verge of mutiny and were deserting in large numbers. Finally, on November 27, it was resolved to break up the camp, and thereupon, a few men being left to garrison the half-finished fort, the rest of the army were dismissed to their homes.

"The expedition," says Parkman, "had been a failure, disguised under an incidental success." Vaudreuil, the Governor of Canada, presents the same view to the French Government in a despatch dated October 3. "M. Dieskau's campaign," he says, "though not so successful as expected, has nevertheless intimidated the English who were advancing in considerable force to attack Fort Frederick (Crown Point) which could not resist them." If this statement was well founded, it supplies a strong comment on Johnson's inactivity after Dieskau's defeat, for it indicates that had his army, flushed with victory, been pushed rapidly forward to Crown Point they might easily have captured the post and ended the English campaign with complete success. The actual outcome of it was that the close of the year found the French established at Ticonderoga in a better and stronger position than they had had at Crown Point, and fifteen miles nearer to the English settlements.

As this paper relates not merely to the Battle of Lake George, but also to the men who won it, it will properly conclude with a brief sketch of the subsequent lives of General Lyman and Colonel Whiting. But before dismissing Sir William Johnson from consideration it is only just to say that his career

after the Battle of Lake George developed nothing which reflects discredit on his military capacity, or his personal honor. During the continuance of the French War his influence with the Indian tribes was invaluable to the Colonies, and his efforts unceasing to maintain friendly relations between the two parties on a basis of justice and humanity. He was engaged in no other important military operations till 1759, when he went with a band of 900 Indians, as the second in command, under General Prideaux, on an expedition against Fort Niagara, and after the accidental death of Prideaux he succeeded to the chief command. In this capacity he conducted the siege of the fort with vigor, skill and courage. He fought a successful battle against a French relieving force, and after the capture of the fort firmly protected the garrison from his savage allies. He also, with his Indians, accompanied Amherst in the following year to Montreal and assisted in the investment and capture of that last stronghold of the French in Canada. This was his last important military service, but his influence with the Indian tribes of New York and Ohio continued to be beneficially exerted till the close of his life, which occurred in 1774. As an important factor in the making of American history he will always occupy a prominent and, on the whole, an honorable place.

As already stated, notwithstanding Johnson's studious concealment of General Lyman's part in the Battle of Lake George, which was successful so far as the British government was concerned, the true story was well known throughout the Colonies, and this was evinced in the following year by the renewal of his commission as Major General, which rank he continued to hold throughout the war. He was also repeatedly entrusted with important commands and took part in various campaigns against the French in Canada. In 1758 he commanded 5,000 Connecticut troops in the disastrous attack by General Abercrombie on Fort Ticonderoga, where he was among the foremost assailants and was with Lord Howe when he fell. Again in 1759, at the head of 4,000 men, he accompanied Lord Amherst in his successful expedition against Ticonderoga and

Crown Point, and in 1760 assisted with 5,000 Connecticut troops in the capture of Montreal. In 1761 he was again in Canada in command of 2,300 Connecticut soldiers, helping to complete the English conquest of that Province. After hostilities had ceased in Canada the seat of war was removed to the West Indies, and an expedition having been fitted out to capture Havana, Lyman was by the joint action of all the Colonies placed in command of the whole Provincial force of 10,000 men which accompanied it. The expedition sailed from New York in November, 1761, and in coöperation with another fleet and army sent out from England, struck the finishing blow of the war, Havana being taken and several French Islands conquered and occupied by the English during the year 1762. This was the last of Lyman's military experiences, as the war was ended by the Treaty of Paris in February, 1763. Throughout his active career in the army he had held the confidence not only of the public but of his brother officers, as a man of superior ability, integrity and wisdom, as well as of military skill, but unhappily, this confidence was the indirect cause of the disappointments and misfortunes which ruined his future life.

After the conclusion of peace, a considerable number of the officers and soldiers who had served in the Colonial armies, formed an association which they called "The Company of Military Adventurers," whose purpose was to secure from the British government a grant of lands in the new western territory which had just been wrested from France largely through their own personal efforts and often (as in Lyman's case) at the sacrifice of their private fortunes. General Lyman was selected by this organization as their agent to proceed to London, and there prosecute the claims and objects of the company.

In pursuance of this appointment, Lyman relinquished the idea of resuming his legal practice and went to England in 1763, where for eleven long years he pursued a weary and discouraging struggle with the officials in power to obtain their consent to the reasonable request which he brought to their notice. As Dr. Dwight remarks, "It would be difficult for

a man of common sense to invent a reason why a tract of land in a remote wilderness, scarcely worth a cent an acre, could be grudged to any body of men who were willing to settle upon it," and especially so when the petitioners were a body of veterans who had gained the victories by which the land was obtained, and whose occupation of it would be important for its future protection. Nevertheless, during all this time Lyman's appeals were met with indifference and treated with neglect. Appointments were made only to be forgotten, and promises, which were never fulfilled. Ashamed to return home without success, he lingered on, hoping against hope and striving against continuous discouragement, until, as Dr. Dwight expresses it, "he experienced to its full extent that imbecility of mind which a crowd of irremediable misfortunes, a state of long-continued anxious suspense, and strong feelings of degradation invariably produce. His mind lost its elasticity and became incapable of anything beyond a seeming effort." And under such conditions the best eleven years of his life were frittered away.

At length, about 1774, the petition in some form or other was granted. Still General Lyman, apparently unable to form new resolutions, failed to return home. His wife, distressed at his long absence, and by the privations which his family suffered in consequence, then sent his second son to England to bring him back. The appeal was successful and Lyman returned in 1774, bringing the grant of land to the petitioners, and for himself the promise of an annuity of £200 sterling. As for the grant of land, many of the beneficiaries were dead and others too old to avail themselves of it. The storm cloud of the Revolution also was now gathering fast and the younger part of his generation had other things to think of than that of settling a western wilderness. For these reasons the land grant proved practically valueless for its intended purpose; and as for his personal annuity, the speedy outbreak of Colonial rebellion, if no other reason, prevented its ever being paid.

The tract of land in question was situated on the Mississippi River, and was part of the territory then known as West

Florida. It included the present site of Natchez, where a French fort had been built and afterwards abandoned. To this malarious and fever-stricken region in 1775, General Lyman, then a broken-down man of fifty-nine, betook himself by a thousand-miles' journey over roadless mountains and bridgeless rivers, accompanied by a few companions, among whom was his eldest son, who was feeble both in body and mind. The son died soon after their arrival and shortly afterward the worn-out father followed him to the grave. "Few persons," says Dr. Dwight, "began life with a fairer promise of prosperity than General Lyman. Few are born and educated to brighter hopes than those cherished by his children. None within the limits of my information have seen those hopes, prematurely declining, set in deeper darkness. For a considerable time no American possessed a higher or more extensive reputation; no American who reads this subsequent history will regard him with envy."

This allusion to the happy prospects of General Lyman's family in early life, suggests that a few words be given to their pathetic fate. The story is related somewhat circumstantially by Dr. Dwight.

General Lyman's second son, who brought his father home from England, accepted, while there, a lieutenant's commission in the British army. In 1775, while in Suffield, he was ordered to join his regiment in Boston, which he did and served on the British side till 1782. It was probably the painful relations with their neighbors which this situation brought to the family in Suffield which caused Mrs. Lyman, in 1776, to remove, with the rest of her children, consisting of three sons and two daughters, to West Florida. Her elder brother accompanied them on the sad and toilsome journey. Within a few months Mrs. Lyman and her brother both died. The children remained in the country till 1782, when the settlement was attacked by the Spaniards. The little colony took refuge in the old fort and resisted the invaders until compelled to surrender on terms; but the terms were at once outrageously violated. In desperation the victims rose upon **their con-**

querors and drove them from the settlement, but learning soon afterward that a larger force was coming up the river to punish them, and fearing the worst of cruelties, the whole colony fled to the wilderness, aiming to reach Savannah, which was then in possession of the British. On their way they endured innumerable hardships and perils, suffering continually from hunger, thirst, fatigue and sickness. Once they were captured by a hostile band of savages, who were about to torture and scalp them, when they were miraculously rescued by the intervention and address of a friendly negro; but those who survived the terrible journey reached Savannah after wandering a distance of over 1,300 miles, through a period of 150 days. As a result of these experiences the two daughters died at Savannah. The three sons remained there until the war was over and then accompanied the departing British troops. One of them was afterwards in Suffield for a short time but soon disappeared, and what finally became of him and his two brothers, Dr. Dwight, although they were his cousins, was never able to learn.

As to the second son, he continued in the British service till 1782. At that time nearly torpid with grief and disappointment he sold his commission, but collected only a part of the purchase money, and that he speedily lost. He returned to Suffield penniless and almost an imbecile. Friends there endeavored to revive his courage and restore his mental balance, but in spite of all efforts he sank into listlessness and unkempt pauperism and in this condition he died. Truly, the comment of Dr. Dwight was well applied when he called his narrative "The History of an Unhappy Family."

The record of Colonel Whiting will be shorter and more cheerful. As we have seen, he held, during the campaign of 1755, the rank of lieutenant colonel only, but the next year the General Assembly voted him a colonel's commission, with its thanks, for the skill, courage and ability which "he had displayed at the Battle of Lake George and on other occasions." He took part in all the subsequent campaigns of the war, highly commended by both British and Americans as an officer of

uncommon merit, and when peace returned resumed his mercantile business at New Haven. In 1769 he represented New Haven in the Lower House of the General Assembly, and in 1771 was nominated for the Upper House, to which he would undoubtedly have been elected but for his death, which occurred in that year at the early age of 47.

Dr. Dwight described Colonel Whiting as "an exemplary professor of the Christian religion, and for refined and dignified manners and nobleness of mind rarely excelled." And Professor Kingsley in his Centennial Discourse of 1838 speaks of him as one of those citizens for whom New Haven had especial reason to be proud.

He was buried in the ancient burial ground on New Haven Green, but where, no living man can tell. In the Grove Street Cemetery can be found the mutilated fragment of a time-worn slab, leaning against the tombstone of President Clap, in whose family Whiting's boyhood was passed. The name has been broken off, but the inscription which remains records that the deceased died in "New Haven, full of Gospel Hope, April 9th An Dom 1771. Aet 47," and the stone is thus identified as having once marked the resting place of Col. Nathan Whiting.

And thus it happens that Lyman and Whiting, the men who won the Battle of Lake George together, and who suffered the same injustice in connection with that achievement, and who have been alike ignored in the only structure which commemorates the victory they won, are alike sharers in this fate also, that they both rest in unknown graves.

AN OLD NEW HAVEN ENGRAVER AND HIS WORK : AMOS DOOLITTLE.

By REV. WILLIAM A. BEARDSLEY, M.A.

[Read December 19, 1910.]

We are so accustomed to study the lives of men of large deeds, of men who have helped to mould and develop public affairs in one way or another, that we are apt to forget the man of humble calling, who lived and worked humbly, but who nevertheless deserves to be remembered for the success he achieved in his particular sphere of work.

Now any man, who in the past made anything which is highly prized to-day and will grow more precious as the years increase, deserves to be remembered. The irreverent and unsympathetic entertain a kindly pity for those who have a real veneration for old things. It is difficult for them to realize how anyone can derive pleasure from some musty volume or quaint print, save as its mustiness or quaintness is turned into cash. And yet there are those who prize old things not alone for what they are worth in dollars and cents, but for what they are in themselves; prize them for their associations, for their antiquity, and for their intrinsic merit. To such, collecting is a real joy, and the pleasure of a discovery, an experience to be remembered.

Among the old things which are highly prized to-day, engravings hold a foremost place. They are of great historic value, because our forefathers were largely dependent upon the art of the engraver for their illustrative work. It was the man with the burin and not the man with the camera who made their pictures, and the products of his art were as nothing, in point of numbers, to the products of the numerous photo-

graphic processes of to-day. A book was rich in illustration then if it had its one engraved frontispiece. To-day we string a wealth of pictures on a slender (sometimes very slender) thread of text. We are largely indebted to the engraver for the representation of historic scenes, and places, and personages. True he may have used his imagination a little, and added a detail here and there, or idealized a face a bit, but we are grateful for these representations nevertheless, and, if they are all that we have, we prize them for their historical significance.

Now New Haven was the home of one of these old engravers. His name was Amos Doolittle. But New Haven cannot claim him as one of her native sons, for he was born in Cheshire, Conn., May 18, 1754.* He belonged to the fifth generation of Doolittles in this country. Abraham Doolittle was the founder of the family in America, and from him came all who have borne that name, for his brother John, who settled near Chelsea, Mass., died without issue. Abraham was here in New Haven about 1640, and owned a house. Among the first settlers of Cheshire was his descendant, and representatives of the Doolittle family have ever been numbered among the inhabitants of that town, and have played their part in shaping its history.

Amos Doolittle was the son of Ambrose and Martha Munson Doolittle, and was next to the eldest in a family of thirteen. It is related as a striking coincidence that his twin brothers, Samuel and Silas, one living in Cheshire, the other in Vermont, and both insane, died on the same day and at the same hour.

Amos turned his attention to the silversmith's trade, learning it of Eliakim Hitchcock of Cheshire. He early came to New Haven, and here he made his home until his death in 1832. The house in which he lived stood on College Street just above Elm, and its site is now covered by the north end of East Divinity Hall. His shop was on the present College

* The old Ambrose Doolittle house in Cheshire is still standing, and is occupied. It is the first house south of the Power House on the line of the trolley, about a mile north of the center and is an old-fashioned leanto.

square, fronting the Green; about where Farnam Hall is, I imagine.

We find Doolittle's name among that goodly number of subscribers who, "desirous to encourage the military art in the town of New Haven," memorialized the General Assembly "to construct them a district military company by the name of the Governor's Second Company of Guards." Thus Doolittle was an original member of that illustrious and historic organization. It came into existence at a time when membership in it was a serious matter, for in less than two months after its incorporation the battle of Lexington was fought, and no sooner had the news arrived than Capt. Benedict Arnold got together his company, and proposed that they should go to the front. The larger part agreed to do so, and Doolittle was among that number. As a company they remained only about three weeks at Cambridge, when they returned to New Haven.

But soldiering was only a side issue with Doolittle, to be practiced when duty called. He was not exactly an "embattled farmer," but still he belonged to that class of soldiery, and it was a mighty good class too. He had now evidently turned his attention to engraving on copper, and this expedition to Cambridge, patriotic in its intent, was made to serve a practical purpose as well. That expedition was undertaken in the latter part of April, 1775.

In December of that year there appeared an advertisement in the *Connecticut Journal* to this effect—"This day published. and to be sold at the store of Mr. James Lockwood, near the College, in New Haven, Four different views of the Battle of Lexington, Concord, etc., on the 19th April, 1775.

Plate I. The Battle at Lexington.

Plate II. A view of the town of Concord, with the Ministerial troops destroying the stores.

Plate III. The Battle at the North Bridge, in Concord.

Plate IV. The south part of Lexington, where the first detachment were joined by Lord Percy.

The above four plates are neatly engraven on Copper, from original paintings taken on the spot.

Price, six shillings per set for the plain ones, or eight shillings, colored."

We are told that Doolittle was entirely self-taught as an engraver. That is charitable, for there is no use in incriminating anyone else. These Plates are exceedingly crude in every way, and if they had to depend upon their artistic merit and skillful workmanship for their value, they would come perilously near to being worthless. But their very crudity is perhaps their most valuable feature to the collector, or to anyone, for that matter. Aside from all that, however, an interest attaches to them as the earliest work of a man who was struggling with an art, of which as yet he knew practically nothing, and in which he never did rise to any high degree of excellence. And further, they have an historical interest. They cannot be regarded as accurate representations of the scenes depicted, of course, but still they were made by men who were portraying some things, at least, which they had seen with their own eyes.

And this brings me now to speak of the way in which they were made. We are indebted to Barber for our knowledge here. There was among those who volunteered and went to Cambridge, a young portrait painter, Ralph Earle. But Barber was evidently in error in stating that he was a member of the Foot Guards, for his name does not appear on the roster. Presumably he went along as a volunteer without being actually a member of the organization. They did not go as the Governor's Foot Guards, but as the New Haven Cadets.

Well, it was this Ralph Earle who made the drawings from which the Plates were engraved. Earle later went to England, studied under Benjamin West, and became a member of the Royal Academy. He did some work which brought him fame, particularly his painting of Niagara Falls, which has an interest for us in this connection, for this picture was exhibited throughout the country, and in course of time came to New Haven. Here his old friend and collaborator of a quarter of a century back was still his friend, as the following advertisement in the *Connecticut Journal* for June 25, 1800, shows:

"Perspective View of the Falls of Niagara. One of the greatest Natural Curiosities in the known world painted on the spot by the celebrated Ralph Earle will be exhibited to view This Day between the hours of 8 in the morning and 6 in the evening at the house of Amos Doolittle, College St. This painting is 27 ft. long and 14 ft. wide, and will afford the spectator as just an idea of the stupendous Cataract as can be represented on canvas. Price of admittance, 9d." It is quite possible that it was Earle who painted the portrait of Doolittle which is in the possession of the Society.

But we must return to the Lexington and Concord Plates. Like Doolittle, Earle was a beginner. As Barber says, "Both their performances were probably their first attempts in these arts, and consequently were quite rude specimens." Barber also tells us, on the authority of Doolittle himself, that "he acted as a kind of model for Mr. Earle to make his drawings, so that when he wished to represent one of the Provincials as loading his gun, crouching behind a stone wall when firing on the enemy, he would require Mr. D. to put himself in such a position." Earle made his drawing for the Battle of Lexington on the spot shortly after, and so far as the buildings are concerned we probably have a representation which approximates the truth, but as for the battle, which was in no sense of the word a battle, why that of course is largely imaginary. But the really interesting thing about this is that here is an attempt, rude though it may be, to depict the first shedding of blood in the cause of American Independence. It is not at all surprising that these Plates when published "made quite a sensation."

Doolittle was a practical man and had an eye to business no doubt in making his Plates, but, with his patriotic fervor, we may believe that he hoped they would help to inflame the people, and inspire them to action in the great contest which was already under way. And they would most certainly do that. Our first inclination as we look at these Plates is to laugh at their grotesqueness, but not so the men and women who first saw them. It was not the crude effort of a young and ambitious

man with the graver which would impress them so much as the fact that they portrayed actual scenes, and scenes in which their fellow-countrymen had lost their lives at the hands of the red-coats. One may hazard the guess that Doolittle's primitive work served another and larger purpose than merely to put him in funds, and that he hoped it would.

Now I have been speaking solely of the first Plate in the series, "The Battle of Lexington." The others are just as quaint and interesting, and the temptation to linger over them is strong, not only for their historical interest, but because they are the first crude attempts of a struggling, untutored genius to express itself on copper. We instinctively feel that the youthful engraver put his whole soul into them. As we look at them we can almost see the painful labor which begot them. These Plates probably constitute the first series of Historical Engravings executed in America, series mind you, for of course Paul Revere's separate Plates of the "Boston Massacre" and "Ships Landing Troops" were engraved prior to Doolittle's work.

The mistake has frequently been made of claiming Doolittle as the earliest Connecticut engraver on copper. There was an engraver here in New Haven who antedates him, Abel Buel. It is quite likely that he engraved the first book-plate for the Linonian Meeting of Yale College which was organized in 1753, that quaint old plate with the Chapel and North Middle in a small loop at the top, both looking as though they had suffered from some seismic disturbance, and were in danger of speedy collapse. And then there was Deacon Martin Bull of Farmington, almost ten years Doolittle's senior, who did some engraving. But, after all, the output of these men in point of quantity and pretentiousness was insignificant as compared with Doolittle's. Outside of Connecticut there were such engravers as Paul Revere, Elisha Gallaudet, James Turner, and Nathaniel Hurd, who were earlier, the latter being perhaps the best of our early engravers here in America.

But to return to the story of Mr. Doolittle. What occupied his attention next after his famous Historical Series it is not

possible to say with certainty, but in the *Boston Gazette* for Monday, May 19, 1777, this advertisement of his may be found—

“Proposals for Printing.

A new map of the state of Connecticut with some of the adjacent parts of the States of New York, New Jersey, and Rhode Island, collected from the best and latest Surveys.

Conditions.

1. The Plate will be 24 inches, by 16 in size.
2. The price to Subscribers to be One Dollar plain or Ten Shillings properly coloured.
3. It will not be delivered to Non-Subscribers under Eight Shillings plain or Twelve colour'd.
4. It will be published in about four weeks from this Date.
5. Those who subscribe for six Sets shall have one gratis.

N. B. If this work meets due Encouragement, the Author intends publishing other useful Maps. Subscriptions are taken in by the Printer hereof. New Haven, April 21, 1777.”

That is only a proposal. Perhaps it did not meet with a sufficient response to warrant him in carrying it out, for while it would not be safe to say that no copy is in existence, yet nothing is known of such a map where one might reasonably expect to get some knowledge of it.

His next production, or what we may assume to be his next, has an interest all its own, for it shows the ambitious, if somewhat daring, nature of this young self-taught engraver. In the *Connecticut Journal* for September 24, 1777, we find him advertising a plate, in the presentation of which, doubtless, he was moved by a patriotic impulse, as one likes to think he was, in a measure at least, in the presentation of his Historical Series. Those were momentous and intense times in the history of the nation. All eyes were on the Continental Congress, and we may well believe that its distinguished President, about whom the report was going around that he had written his name large on the Declaration of Independence that no one

might fail to see it, yes, written his name, as it was said of him later, "where all nations should behold it, and where all time should not efface it," would be a personage of rare interest to the people in general, and would fire the young engraver's ambition to portray his features on copper.

And so his advertisement reads, "Just published and to be sold by Amos Doolittle, a metzotinto Print of the Hon. John Hancock, Esq. Price 4 shillings plain, \$1.00 neatly coloured." Now the interesting thing about this is that it shows Doolittle's ambition in respect to his art, or if that be too strong, let us say in respect to his craft. He is experimenting with the mezzotint. That, speaking in the most general way, is the opposite of line engraving. It is the process of working from dark to light. The surface of the plate is roughened, and then by scraping, that degree of light is produced which the artist desires, according as he scrapes much or little. The great thing in the process is the preparation of the plate in the first place.

Whatever may have been the motive which prompted Doolittle to try the mezzotint process, apparently he did not feel warranted in making further use of it, for I know of no other attempt of his in that direction. And as for this John Hancock plate, it is doubtful if a copy of it is in existence.

We pass on now to the memorable year of 1779, memorable certainly in the annals of New Haven, for that was the year when her citizens had the chance to show the metal of which they were made. And it proved to be good metal too. It had the right ring. When the British sailed up the harbor and landed on the East shore and then on the West shore, they met with a welcome to be sure, but then it was hardly the kind of welcome which men court. They encountered those who were emphatically disposed to question their progress, who, as a matter of fact, did emphatically question it. Those men were fighting for their liberty, and they needed no other incentive of course, but, could it be possible that neighbor Doolittle's pictures were in any small way responsible for the patriotic fervor of that citizen soldiery which so valiantly con-

tested the progress of the British invaders? Did they remember those brave Provincials whose life-blood they had seen, by the aid of Doolittle's graver, mingling itself with the dust, yes, actually seen, for Doolittle was nothing if not realistic, as will be evident from a careful study of the Plates? Well, be that as it may, their defence was heroic, and the invaders soon found they were dealing with a very determined foe.

Among those who took part in the defence of the city on the west side was Mr. Doolittle. We know how stubbornly and valiantly those defenders resisted the progress of the enemy, but they could not hold them back. They were compelled to retreat into the town, the enemy following.

Of the various stories told of citizens respecting this invasion, and the disagreeable scenes which followed, one concerns Mr. Doolittle. It has been preserved by Barber, but I venture to give it here because it rightly has a place in my story, and as Doolittle was Barber's informant we have no reason to doubt its truth, in the essential facts at least. When Doolittle and the other defenders were forced to retreat into the town he at once went to his home, where his wife was lying sick, and throwing his gun under the bed, anxiously awaited the coming of the invaders, his anxiety being greater for his wife probably than for himself. In due time the enemy were before his house, and at once an English lady who resided with him stepped to the door and requested of the officer a guard for the house. He insolently asked her who she was, and being informed that she was an Englishwoman and had a son in His Majesty's service, he placed the house in the charge of a Highlander, with orders that no harm should be done to any of its inmates. But during the parleying, it would appear that some of the soldiers had entered the back door, and were searching for themselves, and looking under the bed found Mr. Doolittle's gun. Well, this complicated matters, and for a moment it looked serious for Mr. Doolittle, but again the Englishwoman came to the front, and explained that the law required every man to have a gun in the house, and the owner of that gun was as great a friend to King George as they were themselves.

They would have had some difficulty in believing that if they could have seen Mr. Doolittle that morning out there on the Derby road at Hotchkisstown popping away at some of His Majesty's subjects. But the good lady won and no harm came to Mr. Doolittle nor to his wife.

From this time on Mr. Doolittle's life, so far as we know, was devoted to the quiet pursuit of his occupation. War entered into it no more, save as he pictured some phase of it on copper. Other work than engraving was evidently done at his shop on College Street, though that occupied his attention for the most part, for an advertisement announces in a very dignified way, that specimens of Varnishing, Enameling, etc., might be seen at Mr. Amos Doolittle's painting-rooms, and one of his own prints carries the information that he had a rolling-press, which shows that he not only made his plates, but that he made the prints from them, and apparently did other printing also. At one time he evidently had Ebenezer Porter associated with him in the business. And in 1798 one Marcus Merriman advertises silver and metal Eagles, as made and sold by Amos Doolittle and himself. But, of course, engraving was his chief occupation, though it is not surprising that he should have made some use of his knowledge and experience gained as a silversmith's apprentice.

In 1782 there was published here in New Haven, "The Chorister's Companion, or Church Music Revised, containing besides the necessary rules of Psalmody a variety of Plain and Fuging Psalm Tunes, together with a Collection of approved Hymns and Anthems, many of which never before printed," to quote the title page quaintly engraved by Doolittle. It was printed for and sold by Simeon Jocelin and Amos Doolittle. He seems to have done a good deal along this line, for in 1786-7 he published in connection with Daniel Read, Vol. I of *The American Musical Magazine*. There were twelve numbers covering forty-nine pages, presumably all engraved by Doolittle, for Read was simply a merchant and kept a general store up on Broadway where you could buy anything from hardware to snuff and from hair powder to Gospel Sonnets. Apparently

the Magazine was not successful for it lived only a year. It was not a magazine in our sense of the word, for it had nothing in it but music. It had a high ideal, namely, "to contain a great variety of approved music carefully selected from the works of the best American and foreign masters." With that ideal it ought to have lived.

Well, the young Republic was started on its wonderful career, and George Washington, in peace as in war, was the man of the hour. It was not to be expected that this industrious and ambitious craftsman would fail to find a subject in him. Indeed I fancy that every American engraver felt that he was false to the highest ideals of his art until with his graving tool he had made the likeness of Washington. Those of you who have seen Mr. Charles Henry Hart's sumptuous volume, published by the Grolier Club, entitled, "Catalogue of the Engraved Portraits of Washington," will appreciate the significance of that statement. He describes eight hundred and eighty distinct plates, and six hundred and thirty-four different states of them, and it is hardly likely that his catalogue is complete. And mind you, these are only the portraits on copper and steel. Nor are there included any of those numerous scenes in which Washington is the central figure.

Ah, well, it was only natural that he should have been a favorite subject of the engraver. Of Doolittle's chief effort Mr. Hart has this to say, "I consider this one of the most interesting in the catalogue, not only as being one of the largest, if not the largest plate executed in this country at the time of its issue, but also on account of its extreme rarity." There are at least five variations of this plate. The one we possess in our Collection is, apparently, the third state of it. It bears the date October 1, 1791.

But what is the plate? Well, here is its title, ornate alike in its wording and its engraving: "A Display of the United States of America. To the Patrons of Arts and Sciences in all parts of the World this Plate is most respectfully Dedicated by their most obedient humble servants, Amos Doolittle and Ebn^r. Porter." Now one thing is clear from that, and it is that Mr. Doolittle is not catering to any restricted public.

He is out to conquer the world. And he is appealing to those who are interested in the promotion of the Arts and Sciences. As Doolittle's worthiest contribution to Washingtoniana it deserves a few words of description. In the center is the large circle enclosing the bust of Washington, and on the band of the circle is the inscription, "George Washington, President of the United States of America. The Protector of his country, and the supporter of the rights of mankind." Around this large circle and forming a frame for it is a chain of fourteen smaller circles. The circle at the top encloses the Arms of the United States, and on the band is the total number of inhabitants. For each of the thirteen original States there is a circle, enclosing the arms of the State, and in the band of each is the name of the State, its number of inhabitants, and its number of Senators and Representatives. Taking it all in all this is an exceedingly interesting plate, not alone because of its extreme rarity, but because of the originality of its conception, and the marked improvement in workmanship. Mr. Doolittle signs it both as its designer and engraver. It is evident that, during the thirteen years since his first pretentious effort, practice with the graver was not without its results, though he was not yet, nor was he destined to become, a great engraver.

We find him making maps for Jedediah Morse's American Geography, and folding plates of military tactics for Baron de Steuben's book, and in the American edition of Maynard's Josephus published in 1792, fourteen of the sixty plates are signed by Doolittle. We find him also making a portrait of Jonathan Edwards for his History of Redemption, and a portrait of Ezra Stiles and numerous plans for his History of the Judges of King Charles I. For Trumbull's History of Connecticut, he contributes plates of John Davenport, John Winthrop, and Gurdon Saltonstall, and a fine map of Connecticut. These are only some of his works along this line during the years just before 1800.

In 1799 he issued a New Display of the United States with the portrait of John Adams in the center, and with the coats of arms of sixteen States, Vermont, Kentucky, and Tennessee

having come into the Union. It bears the famous saying, "Millions for our defence, not a cent for tribute." There is nothing laudatory in the inscription. It is simply, "John Adams President of the United States."

In 1803 he put out another New Display of the United States. This time, of course, the portrait is that of Jefferson. But the plate is much smaller and simpler than his former "Displays," perhaps in deference to "Jeffersonian simplicity," for, according to his obituary notice in the *Columbian Register* for February 4, 1832, "Mr. Doolittle was an old Jeffersonian Democrat, adhering to first principles through evil and through good report."

In this new "Display" he has abandoned the circle for the square, except that Jefferson's bust, like Washington's, is enclosed in a circle. Around this is the inscription, "Thomas Jefferson, President of the United States, Supporter of Liberty, True Republican and Friend of the Rights of Man." Enclosing this circle is a square of little squares, each representing a State.

I have spoken of his "Display" as his chief contribution to Washingtoniana. But it was not his only contribution. He engraved for Trumbull's Funeral Discourse on Washington, published in New Haven in 1800, a portrait after the Joseph Wright profile. And in the Connecticut Magazine, or Gentleman's and Lady's Monthly Museum for January, 1801, there appears an engraved bust of Washington after Gilbert Stuart. This same plate reworked and relettered was afterwards published by Shelton and Kensett, the latter being Thomas Kensett, who was connected through his marriage to Elizabeth Daggett, with Doolittle. Kensett himself was an engraver. It was he who made the old Wadsworth map of New Haven. In 1812, or about that time, he removed from New Haven to Cheshire, where he had a little engraving shop. It is worth noting in passing that he was a pioneer in the great canning industry, for he was a member of the firm of Daggett & Kensett, which experimented with the process of preserving extract of beef in hermetically sealed cans, which was supplied to the United

States Government. Their store was on the west side of York Street, just north of Chapel. He was the father of the distinguished painter, John Frederick Kensett. This Cheshire firm of Shelton & Kensett published a number of Doolittle's plates, among them being Alexander I of Russia, Bonaparte in Trouble, Dartmoor Prison, and his Prodigal Son series.

The mention of Doolittle's connection with Kensett through the latter's marriage to Elizabeth Daggett reminds me that nothing has been said of his own matrimonial relations. That he was twice married I can safely affirm, though of his first wife I have been able to find nothing, save that her name was Sally, and that she died of a lingering consumption, January 29, 1797, in her thirty-eighth year. A lengthy poem accompanies her death notice, but obituary poetry is of little value when one is in quest of facts.

By this wife he had at least one child, a son, for in a letter dated June 4, 1798, written in reply to an inquiry about his doing some work, and in which he says he is unable to do it, Mr. Doolittle adds, "however I have a little son that has just begun the business, he has done some engraving in the copper plate way very well." Of this son I have not been able to learn anything, not even his name.

But this chance reference to him is not without its interest. The view of Yale College, a copy of which is in the University Library, is signed, "A View of the Buildings of Yale College at New Haven. Drawn and Engraved by A. B. Doolittle. Published April 6th 1807 by A. Doolittle & Son, College Street, New Haven." So far as I am aware, this is the only plate which is signed in this way.

Now whose plate is this? Undoubtedly it is A. B. Doolittle's, and that perhaps is the son's name. It was signed by him as the designer and engraver, and published under the firm name, so to speak, of A. Doolittle & Son. That is only a conjecture, but when we find that son's name, I shall be surprised if it is not A. B. Doolittle. There was an A. B. Doolittle who had a shop on Church Street, "nearly opposite the Church," and whose advertisement begins to appear in the paper early

in 1806. Besides the usual things found in a jewelry store, he advertises "Miniatures painted, and set in a handsome style. Profiles accurately taken, and all kinds of Devices painted and set." Could he be the same man as the one who signed that Yale print?

Mr. Doolittle's second wife was Phebe, daughter of Ebenezer and Eunice Moss Tuttle of Cheshire. They were married in New Haven, November 8, 1797. Thus through his second wife he became connected with the influential family of Tuttles. She died March 4, 1825, and with him is buried in the Grove Street Cemetery. It was her sister's daughter who married Kensett.

But from this digression we must return again to the consideration of his work. We find him now doing a good deal in the way of making illustrations for books, such as allegorical frontispieces for "The Guide to Domestic Happiness" and "The Refuge," also engravings of mechanical appliances and diagrams, and maps for a Bible Atlas, and, with others, plates for "The Self Interpreting Bible." In 1812 he published his map of New Haven, which was revised in 1817 and 1824.

It could hardly be expected that our little affair with England in 1812 should pass unnoticed by this patriotic craftsman. His "John Bull in Distress" undoubtedly expresses his feelings at the time. It is a little vindictive perhaps, but then there were extenuating circumstances. A half-bull, half-peacock is pierced through the neck by a hornet. The hornet is represented as saying, "Free Trade and Sailor's Rights you old rascal," while from its victim comes, "Boo-o-o-hoo!!!" This was published early in 1813, and has reference to the engagement between the "Peacock" and the "Hornet," when the latter, under the command of the intrepid Lawrence, won a signal victory. And, by the way, that victory inspired another Doolittle, this time to song. Eliakim Doolittle, a younger brother of Amos, composed a song, "The Hornet Stung the Peacock," which, for the time being, was immensely popular. Here is the way it begins,

“Ye Demo’s attend and ye Federalists too,
 I’ll sing you a song that you all know is new,
 Concerning a Hornet, true stuff, I’ll be bailed,
 That tickled the Peacock and lowered his tail,”

and so on through six more stanzas, with a chorus equally long for each stanza. And thus in their respective ways the Doolittle brothers gave evidence of their patriotic fervor. I think, however, that in this case the graver is mightier than the pen.

But we must not go on with this enumeration of his works. I have tried to mention those which will give us an idea of the wide field he covered, of the variety of subjects with which he dealt.

There is, however, a branch of his work about which I would say a few words before bringing this paper to a close, and that is his book-plate work. I believe there are nine book-plates which bear his signature, and several others are confidently attributed to him. It was the fashion at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries for individuals and libraries to have engraved book-plates or labels; sometimes they were very simple, sometimes they were very elaborate—a fashion which has again come into vogue. Oftentimes of course, in the case of individuals, the family coat of arms served as the book-plate, but in the absence of this symbol of aristocracy, and always in the case of the library, the engraver could use his imagination, and thus produce something awfully democratic perhaps, but at the same time quaint and interesting and individualistic, something which would rise above the monotonous level of heraldic designs. It was in the case of libraries, perhaps, that the engraver gave his ingenuity the freest play.

Of the known book-plates engraved by Doolittle, his four local library plates are by far the most interesting, as they are the most pretentious. Two are College plates, one for the Brothers in Unity and the other for the Linonian Library. The former was designed by Wm. Taylor, the latter presumably was designed as well as engraved by Doolittle. They are quaint

and crude both in design and workmanship. The plate for the Linonian Library is dated 1802. It is rich in allegory, and full of detail. The other two local library plates were the plates of the Mechanic Library and the Social Library Company. The former was organized in 1793, the first meeting of the organizers being held in the State House, February 5th of that year. This is probably the earliest public or semi-public library in the city. There seems to have been some connection between it and the Mechanic Society of which Mr. Doolittle was a member, or at all events his funeral was attended by the Mechanic Society, which would indicate his membership in it. The library never reached large proportions. A catalogue published sometime after 1801 shows nine hundred volumes. This library had two book-plates. The smaller, and as I suppose earlier, plate is not signed by Doolittle, but that he engraved it there can be little doubt in my judgment.

As an indication of some connection between this library and the Society of Mechanics it may be stated that this plate, only slightly altered, appears as a wood-cut in the advertisement in the paper of the meetings of the Society. For mechanics as for readers of books the motto was, "Improve the Moment." That was back in 1800. The larger and more elaborate plate carries his name as designer and engraver.

In 1807 another library was organized, though not incorporated until 1810. This was known as the Social Library Company, and for this Doolittle designed and engraved a book-plate. I might add that in 1815 the Mechanic Library was merged with the Social Library Company, and the two were known as the Social Library, which existed under this name until 1840. This Social Library Company book-plate is in some respects the best of Doolittle's book-plates. It has its defects, but on the whole it presents a very neat and attractive appearance. Across the top is a ribbon bearing the name, and underneath is a black cloud in which are two well-fed, sweet-faced cherubs, holding in their hands a huge scroll on which are the words, Theology, History, Biography, Voyages and Travels,

Classical, indicating the character of the books in the library. You will notice the absence of Fiction. This library frowned upon that branch of literature. In the distance is a large house on a knoll among the trees, while nearer is a body of water, and on the grass in the immediate foreground are books and scrolls, and a compass, and a globe. Underneath all is the perfectly proper sentiment, and eminently sage advice,

'Tis Books a lasting pleasure can supply,
 Charm while we live and teach us how to die,
 Seek here ye Young the anchor of your mind,
 Here suffering Age a blest provision find.

Another branch of his work is indicated by the following receipt given to the Treasurer of Yale College—

"Rec'd Newhaven September 12, 1817 of Elizur Goodrich, Esq. Sixty one Dollars for that number of Diplomas for the Bachelor of Arts graduated in Yale College this week—by me

AMOS DOOLITTLE"

But I must bring to an end the story of "An Old New Haven Engraver and his Work." If I have seemed to make much of insignificant things, you must remember that if from the story of a life like this the insignificant things are eliminated, there will be no story left. For we have not been considering a man of great deeds, but just one of those plain, industrious citizens who form the strength of every community.

That he was a valuable man in this community there can be no doubt. So far as I know he did not serve his fellowmen in high public office—in 1797 he was tax lister (assessor)—but he served them in that humbler way of quietly doing his duty as a citizen, and industriously working at his trade.

We have not even been considering a man great in his chosen occupation, for Amos Doolittle is not remembered for the rare quality of his work. It is enough for us that he was an old New Haven citizen who with head and hand fashioned those things which men everywhere, with a veneration for the quaint and the ancient, most highly prize.

Mr. Doolittle died January 30, 1832, after working at his occupation for almost sixty years. It is interesting to note

that about three weeks before his death he was engaged in helping to make a small plate of his Battle of Lexington, and it was his last work. It was most fitting that it should be. We may judge of the esteem in which he was held from the funeral notices in the local press. "He was a worthy and highly respected citizen. His funeral was attended by a large concourse of friends and relatives, together with the Mechanic Society, and his brethren of the Masonic Fraternity." "He was a gentleman of an amiable and obliging disposition—a Christian in all the relations of life." Fortunate indeed is he of whom that much may be said.

THE CONGREGATIONALIST SEPARATES OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY IN CONNECTICUT.

By REV. EDWIN P. PARKER, D.D., LL.D.

[Read February 20, 1911.]

At the beginning, in the New England Colonies, all persons were required to support the Congregational order of religion. This order or way soon fell into disrepute; serious divisions about matters of church government and discipline arose, and various restrictions of religious liberty and the rigorous enforcement of them created dissatisfactions and dissensions. For the composition of these troubles many efforts were made by church synods and the civil courts, which cannot here be reviewed.

In 1705, "proposals" were made and urged in Massachusetts to give to ministerial associations large powers and authority, even to making them standing councils. These proposals failed of adoption there, but were warmly approved by the conservative ministers in Connecticut. The Trustees of Yale College desired that the General Court should establish some stronger ecclesiastical government in this colony.

Governor Saltonstall, ex-minister of New London, whose influence over the clergy was predominant, and of whom Hollister says, "he was more inclined unto synods and formularies than any other minister of that day," was quite prepared to take up this task, and the General Court, under his leadership, saw fit to take action "from which would arise a permanent establishment among ourselves." Accordingly, in May, 1708, the Legislature passed an ordinance requiring the ministers of the churches to meet together at their respective county towns, with such messengers as the churches to which they belong

shall see cause to send with them, in June next, to consider and agree upon methods and rules for the management of church discipline; and, at the same meeting, to appoint two or more of their number to be their delegates who should meet at Saybrook, at the next Commencement to be held there, to compare results, and draw up a form of ecclesiastical discipline, and offer the same to the General Court at their sessions at New Haven, in October. That clause of this remarkable and mandatory ordinance, which includes "such messengers as the churches shall see cause to send," is an interlineation of the original resolution.

In compliance with this mandate, the ministers met and chose their delegates, who convened at Saybrook on September 9 (20, N. S.), and constituted what is known as the Saybrook Synod. Of the sixteen members of that Synod, twelve were ministers and eight of these were Trustees of Yale College. Two of the four laymen were from Saybrook, so that outside that town, the churches of the Colony were represented by only two laymen. No one appeared from New Haven County as representing any church. The business expected of the Synod was promptly done, and the Saybrook Platform was offered to the Legislature at New Haven, in October, whereupon the following ordinance was passed:—

"The Reverend ministers, delegates from the Elders, and messengers of the Churches in this government, met at Saybrook, Sept. 9th, 1708, having presented to this Assembly a Confession of Faith, Heads of Agreement, and Regulations in the administration of Church Discipline, as unanimously agreed and consented to by the Elders and messengers of all the Churches in this government, this Assembly do declare their great approbation of such an agreement, and do ordain that all the Churches within this government that are or shall be thus united in doctrine, worship, and discipline, be, and for the future shall be owned and acknowledged, established by law; *provided always*, that nothing herein shall be intended or construed to hinder or prevent any society or church that is or shall be allowed by the laws of this government, who soberly differ or dissent from the united churches hereby established, from exercising worship and discipline in their own way, according to there own consciences."

That clause of this act which reads, "as unanimously agreed and consented to by the elders and messengers of all the churches in this government," was a very ingenious accommo-

dation of the facts in the case to the exigency of the hour. So far from agreeing or consenting to the Saybrook Platform, the churches had not even the opportunity of considering it before it became, by act of Legislature, the established ecclesiastical constitution of the Colony. It did not emanate from them, it was not referred to them, it was not accepted by them, but was imposed upon them by a Legislature at whose mandate it had been framed and presented.

As for the *proviso*, it should be noticed that any toleration of dissenting parties granted by it, was carefully limited to such societies or churches *that were or should be allowed by the laws of the government*. Subsequent legislation shows that it was neither intended nor construed to apply to dissatisfied Congregationalists, but only to persons desiring to worship as Baptists or Episcopalians or some other denomination. In view of the great English precedent of 1689, granting toleration to dissenters, it would not be politic for the General Court of Connecticut to frame an establishment without some such *proviso*. The Episcopalians and Baptists here then were few and weak, but they were active in making the government realize that in case their rights were denied, the Colony would have to reckon with the home government. This Saybrook System grouped the ministers in District Associations, and the churches in District Consociations in which the ministers were prominent and dominant, and which were or became ecclesiastical courts with large jurisdiction and powers. Indeed, the words "Congregational" and "Presbyterian" became interchangeable in Connecticut. As late as 1805 the General Association referred to the Saybrook Platform as "the constitution of the Presbyterian churches of Connecticut."

I have stated these things at some length, because only a knowledge of them enables one to understand the attitude and action of those who subsequently attempted to withdraw from a system which they regarded as radically uncongregational, and which, as controlled and operated by the conservative ministers supported by the civil government, had become exceedingly obnoxious to them.

In 1717 a law was passed putting the choice of a minister in the hands of a majority of the townsmen who were voters. This act operated, in repeated instances, to saddling churches with ministers highly obnoxious to them, and in producing withdrawals and separations.

The *proviso* of the act of 1708, by which sober dissenters might be permitted to withdraw and worship by themselves, did not exempt them from taxation for the support of the established order. In 1727 Episcopalians, and in 1729 Baptists and Quakers, were granted exemption from this tax, or, more correctly, were allowed to draw from the public treasury for the support of their own worship a sum equal to that which they had paid in taxes for religious purposes.

In 1740, amid the excitements of what is known as the "Great Awakening," when conservative "Old Lights" and progressive "New Lights" were engaged in stout contentions, the General Court was somehow induced to pass an act for the suppression of "enthusiasm," which went far to nullify the toleration *proviso* of 1708, and to make it almost impossible for dissatisfied Congregationalists to obtain permission from the Legislature to worship apart. When their applications for such permission were denied, and they pleaded their rights under the *proviso* of 1708, they were told that persons commonly named Congregationalists or Presbyterians could not take the benefit of that act.

In 1742 a law was passed forbidding any ordained or licensed minister to preach or exhort within the limits of any parish without the consent of the minister and a majority of said parish. The penalty of so doing for one not an inhabitant of the Colony was arrest and deportation, and for an inhabitant of the Colony, deprivation of his salary. The civil government ordained that no one should have the benefit of laws as to the settlement and support of ministers unless he was a graduate of Yale or Harvard or some other Protestant university. The aim and object of these legalized restrictions of both personal and religious freedom were, *first*, to check and suppress the new "enthusiasm" in religion; and, *secondly*, to hinder and stay the strong-rising tendencies to dissent and

separation on the part of those Congregationalists who had become disgusted with the Saybrook System and the ultra-conservative operation of its machinery.

The connection between these two things was a subtle and intimate one. While many of the so-called "New Lights" were not "Separates," but fought out their contentions in the established churches, all the "Separates" were "New Lights," if not theologically, yet as in fullest sympathy with the "New Light" methods and motions. Just here, we must recall the "Great Awakening," which began about 1735 with the powerful preaching of Jonathan Edwards, and continued with some intermissions, for several years thereafter, mightily augmented by the preaching of George Whitefield. A tidal wave of evangelical revivalism swept over the land, nowhere more pronounced in its good and bad effects than in Connecticut. That mighty movement shook the churches of this Colony to their foundations. It was simply impossible for them to go on as they had hitherto gone, and, I may add, it was high time that they should be summoned, however rudely, to awake from their slumbrous condition.

Like all such great revivals, that one was attended with intense excitements and many disorders. It divided the households of faith, and brought their members face to face in strenuous contention, for or against its new methods, its demands for a larger liberty and for a more vital, fervid, active religious life and church.

There are few now who question the great preponderance of its beneficial results. Had the church-leaders in Connecticut been wise enough to regard this whole movement with something of Jonathan Edwards' blended conservatism and sympathy, and to guide and moderate it, it would have been well for all. But, good men as they were, they were simply shocked and disgusted with what seemed to them extravagance and fanaticism as well as disorder, and did their utmost, the Legislature supporting them by such acts as have been noted, to sweep back that tidal wave with their ecclesiastical brooms, and with the usual result of such endeavors.

Oliver Goldsmith, then living in England, describes, in one of his essays, the prevalent preaching of his time, as "dry, unaffecting, and insipid," and contrasts it with that of the *enthusiasts*, whose earnestness and unction gather multitudes and make converts. "Folly may sometimes set an example for wisdom to practice," he says, and "our regular divines may learn from even Methodists, and Whitefield may be a model to them."

What he says was profoundly true here in Connecticut. As a result of the Great Awakening there was a powerful pre-Methodist movement in the churches here. There were fervors often amounting to feverishness and occasional delirium. On the other hand there were imperturbable decencies and unconquerable frigidities. Here, in short, was a great revolt against a traditional and conventional sort of religion; against a church at ease in Zion, cold and torpid, and far from any blessedness by reason of its intimate relations with the State; a tremendous call for something better in the name of religion, and for a larger liberty.

The motions and endeavors of the reformers to secure what was requisite within the old churches met with utmost resistance, and soon, here and there, these people began to withdraw to associate in churches after their own convictions. But in so doing they encountered opposition. Legal permission was denied them, they were treated as law-breakers by the courts, cast out by the Consociations, and compelled to pay taxes for the support of the churches they had abandoned.

At this point we find them naturally and inevitably in revolt against the established ecclesiastical system. Men who cared little or nothing for any sort of religion could obtain permission to worship elsewhere than in Congregational churches, and be exempt from taxation in support of these churches, but those Congregationalists who would associate together in what they believed to be "the strict Congregational way," could obtain no such permission, no such relief, and forty years must pass before they could receive the same legal measure of toleration accorded to Episcopalians, Baptists and Quakers.

Perhaps the Saybrook System had no more earnest supporter than the historian Trumbull, but the second volume of his history clearly enough shows what frictions, follies, and injustices attended its operations. The church in Guilford, in which a controversy raged for five years, renounced the Saybrook Platform, to no purpose. The church in Canterbury vainly pleaded that it had never accepted that Platform. Then it refused to accept a minister chosen by a majority of the townsmen and ordained over them by a Consociation. Withdrawing and placing itself upon ancient Congregational grounds, it was declared illegal and schismatic.

In Mansfield the Separates chose a man to be their pastor, and on the day before that appointed for his ordination he was arrested and imprisoned. Baptisms administered by these ministers were solemnly declared to be invalid.

In Milford the Separates took refuge under the Presbytery of New Brunswick, for a season. The minister at Derby was expelled from his Association for preaching to a Baptist congregation in another parish. Yale College expelled two students from the town of Canterbury whose only offense was that, while at home, they had attended, with their parents, the Separate church in that town, and had thus "broken the laws of God, of this colony, and of this college."

In 1745 eight leading ministers published a declaration concerning George Whitefield, who was then in this country, that if he should come into Connecticut "it would not be advisable for any of our ministers to admit him into their pulpits, or for any of our people to attend upon his preaching."

Grant all that has been or may be said concerning Whitefield's indiscretions, for which there were provocations, and yet that sort of declaration concerning one of the greatest preachers of all times, and one whose labours in this land were fruitful in unmeasured abundance, is one, I think, which we all deeply wish had never been made public; one which makes a big and black blot on our church history.

Dr. Dutton has told the story of what is now "The United Church" in New Haven. Sober and devout men withdrew

from the First Church in 1742 and strove in vain for years to obtain legal permission to worship by themselves in their own way, taxed all the while to support the church they had left. For presuming to preach to that congregation on one occasion, Rev. Samuel Finley, subsequently President of Princeton College, was arrested and sent out of the Colony as a vagrant.

Elisha Paine, once a lawyer of repute in the Colony, and, afterward, the leading preacher among the "Separates," was imprisoned several times, his property was attached and portions of it confiscated, for preaching within the bounds of other ministers, and for non-payment of taxes to the regular ministry.

There was a deacon in the First Church of New Haven whose son was a deacon in the "New Light" or "Separate" Church. The child of this latter one died, and that former Old Light and Saybrook Platform deacon, in a written note, declined to attend the funeral of his grandson, because his son belonged to the "Separate" Church.

After the frame of the New Light meeting-house was prepared to be raised, all the long pieces of timber were cut asunder in the night. The intense hostility displayed against these so-called "Separates," and the persecutions they endured for protesting against and repudiating a system imposed upon them, might be illustrated at great length, but the laws enacted and enforced against them are sufficient. In the revision of the laws in 1750 some of the harsh enactments of 1742 disappeared, but not only had some valuable lessons been learned meanwhile, but serious warnings had come from England of a possible violation of the rights and liberties of Connecticut citizens under the common law.

The "Separates" have been described as a set of ignorant and fanatical folk, intemperate and disorderly. That they were, for the most part, from the humbler and less educated classes, is doubtless true. So were the followers of Jesus and his Apostles. That among them were some perfervid and indiscrete people—layfolk and preachers—is also true. As to

their intemperate and censorious speech, I fancy they had no monopoly of that, and were quite as much sinned against as sinning in that respect. Having scanned a great many of the manuscript and printed documents emanating from them, I am convinced that it would be very unjust to include them all under any such general, unfavorable description. As for education, for instance, when they undertook to establish a school of learning in which to train preachers, the General Assembly passed an act prohibiting the establishment of any college, seminary or other public school without their permission. These Separate, or Strict Congregational, churches held a general meeting for confederation, at Lyme, in 1784, and among their articles, all admirably drawn up, was this one:

“Any brother of any Church that may have gifts for public edification, ought to improve them in subordination to the voice of the Church: and when the Church is convinced that any brother has gifts and grace to preach the word to edification and honor of the Gospel, they ought to give him their approbation and recommendation to preach in the vicinity. But if he be disposed to travel, preaching far abroad, he ought to apply unto some ministers or Christian brethren who are publicly known for their good judgment and piety, or to the general meeting of the Churches; and he ought not to travel to preach without: and those who are disposed to be preachers of the Gospel ought to employ their utmost endeavors to furnish themselves with all branches of useful learning and knowledge, whereby they may become useful ministers, that the ministry be not blamed by their deficiency.”

The fact most needing emphasis is that, at that time, there was the most urgent need, here in Connecticut, for the revival of religion, for some of that very “enthusiasm” which seemed so dreadful to the conservative clergy, and which they strove to exclude from their sadly secularised and torpid churches. The “Separates” felt this need, strove to supply it, and because they were every way hindered and thwarted, withdrew.

They were the Methodists of their day, in respect of fervor, enthusiasm and all that. They tried to do what, subsequently, the advent of Methodism did with far greater success, and our fathers of the “standing order” looked upon the Methodists when they came in, and upon their fervors and enthusiasms, with the same disfavor as formerly upon those Separate

Congregationalists, only, fortunately, they had no longer any power to persecute them. As late as 1800, the Hartford North Association of ministers voted unanimously that it was "not consistent to dismiss and recommend members of our churches to the Methodists."

Earnestly as these men desired and strove for a more spiritual ministry and a more fervid and fruitful religious life, they no less earnestly desired and strove for an enlargement of their liberties. They called themselves "Strict Congregationalists," just as, in 1670, men in Hartford withdrew from the First Church in order that they might practice "the Congregational way of church order . . . as formerly settled, professed, and practised under the first leaders of the church in Hartford."

Higginson and Skelton of Salem, Wilson at Charlestown, John Cotton at Boston, Hooker at Newtown, all were ordained by the church. According to all the great authorities, Synods, Consociations, and Councils had only advisory power; and the right to ordain as to choose a minister is resident in the church. But—here was a Standing Court claiming judicial powers, and both asserting and exercising its powers to ordain, dismiss and discipline ministers; to organize and discipline churches, and to revise the decisions of its constituent churches. These Separates rebelled against this degenerate but dominating Congregationalism. They objected to the ordination of men over them by Consociations, believing, as their fathers believed, and as we now believe, that the right of ordination is resident in the church. They protested against a support of the ministry by taxation, authorized and regulated by civil law. They abhorred the criminal meddling of the civil government in parish matters, the civil enactments which so restricted liberty of worship, and the whole Saybrook system, as subversive of true Congregationalism. They stood for rights and liberties which we now regard as very precious.

Their justification is found, not so much in their able memorials to the Legislature, in their carefully drawn confessions and covenants, and in such books as those of Frothingham, as in the nullification and abrogation of the enactments against

which they protested, and in the allowance of the liberties for which they contended.

It seems to me unquestionable that it was in large measure due to them that the revision of the laws in 1750 omitted much previous harsh legislation, and that in 1784 the legal establishment of the Saybrook Polity was abrogated, and all citizens were thenceforth free to worship in whatever associations they might prefer, though all were still taxed to support some church. When the new Constitution was adopted, this last relic of the old order was abandoned and religion was left to the voluntary support of its various votaries. This was the logical sequence of the act of 1784, and for both of those acts great credit is due, I think, to those humble, resolute, much-harassed people here in Connecticut, who were capable of some enthusiasm in religion, and who for fifty years, bravely, though often blunderingly, fought the good fight here for spiritual and ecclesiastical freedom, against tremendous odds.

It often happens that in the victory of a movement, the sect or party which has propagated it disappears. It was so with these Separates, and it redounds to their credit that when the cause for which they contended and suffered was won, and their distinctive work was accomplished, they cared not much to continue longer as "Separates," but were content to disappear as district Societies. That is why the history of their several churches, some thirty in number, is veiled in obscurity, and why they have been overlooked, and the great service they rendered to the cause of vital religion and of religious liberty in Connecticut has been so little regarded. Some of them died out, some rejoined the old churches, some became Baptists and Methodists. The names of some of their ministers deserve to shine in the annals of our church history.

Dr. George Leon Walker long ago wrote that this chapter in our ecclesiastical history "awaits its proper treatment at the hands of some sympathetic historian." Should it ever receive such a treatment, I doubt not that the result will fully confirm what has been advanced in behalf of those Congregationalist Separates in this humble and imperfect study of them.

ROBERT TREAT: FOUNDER, FARMER, SOLDIER, STATESMAN, GOVERNOR.

By GEORGE HARE FORD.

[Read April 17, 1911.]

John Fiske, in his history of the "Beginnings of New England," says, "The native of Connecticut or Massachusetts who wanders about rural England to-day, finds no part of it so homelike as the cosy villages and smiling fields and quaint market towns. Countless little features remind him of home. In many instances the homestead which his forefathers left, when they followed Winthrop or Hooker to America, is still to be found, well-kept and comfortable; the ancient manor-house, much like the New England farmhouse, with its long sloping roof, and its narrow casements from which one might have looked out upon the anxious march of Edward IV, from Havenspur to the field of victory, in days when America was unknown.

"In the little parish church which has stood for perhaps a thousand years, plain enough to suit the taste of the sternest Puritan, one may read upon the cold pavement one's own name and the names of one's friends and neighbors; and yonder on the village green, one comes with bated breath upon the simple inscription which tells of some humble hero who on that spot, in the evil reign of Mary, suffered death by fire.

The colonial history of New England is so associated with that of the rulers of the mother country that, to comprehend the existing conditions, it becomes necessary in a measure to consider the characteristics of the men and the methods that controlled Old as well as New England during this period.

In the latter part of the reign of James I, bands of Puritans were found studying the subject of immigration to America. Considering the climate South too hot and North too cold, they decided to found their American colony on Delaware Bay.

The *Mayflower* sailed on its tempestuous voyage, and, driven by adverse winds, landed on the New England "stern and rock-bound coast," instead of Delaware Bay, making Plymouth Rock famous and Massachusetts the *accidental foundation of New England*.

The founders of Massachusetts and Connecticut were men conspicuous for their high character and marked ability. Livermore says of the New Haven colony: "The company was remarkable. Davenport and Eaton surpassed all other comrades in dignity and influence and in the colony were many wealthy Londoners."

Other distinguished men were Hopkins, the founder of three grammar schools; five able ministers, four school teachers; one became the first master of Harvard College, and the other the first New Englander to publish an educational work. Preceded by Winthrop, Saltonstall, Wareham, Hooker and others, important companies had arrived and settled in Massachusetts and the upper part of Connecticut.

Among the first-comers at Wethersfield appears Mr. Richard Trott, the name "Trott" being the original English family name of the American "Treat." The family history of this settler of Wethersfield is readily traced back to John Trott of Staple Grove, Taunton, England, as far back as 1458. Taunton, a place of English antiquity, was originally a Roman settlement and the family of Trott were evidently of Roman origin, as an entry made in the records of 1571 refers to Richard as "Rici" and Robert as "Robtus." This occurs in a deed from father to son which, translated from the original, provided that the conveyance was made on condition that the said Robtus was not to sell or surrender the premises to any person or persons except by the family name of Trotte.

This Taunton Manor, County of Somerset, by a coincidence, is the same parish from which came Thomas Trowbridge, one of

the original settlers of New Haven, from whom the distinguished family of that name have descended. The parish records of Taunton, I am told by Mr. Francis B. Trowbridge, carry that family name back to 1570.

With the authorities at command, we must assume that the name of Treat is absolutely of American coinage, as it does not exist in England. As far as known every person in the United States by the name of Treat is descended from Robert Treat. In the early records it was spelled "Treate"; even the name of the wife of Governor Treat is so engraved upon her tombstone at Milford.

The high social rank of Richard Trott or Treat, of Wethersfield, is demonstrated by the various offices of honor and trust that he held. Titles then amounted to something. Mr. was a mark of importance. "Esq." attached to a name indicated, as in Old England, a land-owner, and these titles were as highly esteemed as Hon. is now, not more than five per cent. of the community being then entitled to their use.

Richard Trott or Treat was frequently referred to in the records as "Mr." and "Esq." Some of the early writers assume that he arrived in the Saltonstall Colony in 1630; others that he was a deputy from Wethersfield as early as 1637; both theories are errors, as the records in England show that Katharine, the youngest of his nine children, was baptized there in February, 1637. The Connecticut colonial records show that he was chosen deputy in 1644 and annually thereafter for fourteen years; then being chosen magistrate eight times in succession until 1665.

With the names of John Winthrop, Mason, Gold, and Wolcott, his name appears as one of the patentees of the charter secured for the colony in 1660 from Charles II, by Governor Winthrop. He is said to have been a person of wealth and owned large tracts of land in what is now the town of Glastonbury. Frequent mention is made of him in the records as laying out lands. It is probable that Robert acquired some knowledge of surveying from his father.

Robert Treat was the second son and fifth child of Richard Treat, the first-comer. He was baptized in England, February,

1624, and was one of the original company that settled in Milford in 1639. Then a very young man, his name with nine others is recorded separately immediately after the forty-four church members. (These ten not being conceded the privileges of citizenship.)

Lambert says that at the first meeting of the planters, Robert, then under sixteen, being skilled in surveying, was one of the nine appointed to lay out the home lots. Stiles refers to him as being then seventeen years old. Some writers assume that he was studying theology under Peter Prudden, and thus came from Wethersfield to Milford with the Prudden family. While he did not have the advantages of a college training, he was certainly well educated, as is shown in after years, when he frequently made use of Latin and other languages.

He immediately became a conspicuous character in the town and the colony. Lambert gives him the credit of being the first town clerk of Milford, from 1640 to 1648. This must, to a certain extent, be tradition as the fragments of the records of the town of that period that are preserved do not confirm this. The New Haven Colonial Records first mention his name in 1644 and not again until 1653. This is accounted for by the fact of the loss of the records of that period, except so far as they refer to magistrates. From the year 1653, records preserved show that he was chosen deputy to the General Court from Milford and each year following until the court of May, 1659, when he was advanced to magistrate. He continued in that office until 1664, when, although again chosen, he declined to accept. Magistrates then not only constituted what is now the upper house of the General Assembly, but the Supreme Court of the State.

The confederation of New Haven colony effected in 1642 consisted of Milforde, Guilforde, Stamforde and Yennicoek (Southold). The Government for the whole jurisdiction was fully organized this year and for the first time are distinctly recorded the names of governor, deputy governor, magistrates and deputies.

Mr. Eaton was annually chosen Governor while he lived and generally Mr. Goodyear, Deputy Governor. They had no salary

but served solely for the honor and the public good. Francis Newman succeeded Mr. Eaton as Governor. In 1661 William Leete of Guilford was elected Governor, continuing in that office until the union with the Connecticut Colony was effected. At the General Court at New Haven, 1654, the court was informed that "Milford have chosen Robert Treat leutenant for their towne and desire he may be confirmed by this court." In 1647 he married Jane, the daughter of Edmund Tapp, who was one of the original founders and one of the seven pillars of the church.

A pretty story, told by Lambert and frequently repeated, is as follows:—"At a spinning bee or frolic on a Christmas night, Robert, being somewhat older, took Jane upon his knee and began to trot her. 'Robert,' said she, 'be still, I would rather be treated than trotted.'" She soon became the bride of Robert Treat. The story is conceded to be a clever reference to the name of Trott or Treat. The result of this marriage was eight children, four boys and four girls, although Savage, in his genealogy, gave the number as twenty-one; evidently the children of his son Robert were counted in this estimate.

William Fowler, the first magistrate in the town and an ancestor of Mr. Henry Fowler English, the donor of this building to the New Haven Colony Historical Society, was commissioned to erect the first mill in the colony. He was assisted in the enterprise by Robert Treat, who evidently retained a share in the mill, as it is mentioned in his will.

Charles I, "the star chamber ruler," was claimed to be a good man but a bad king. He had a cultured mind, was a devoted husband and fond father; but an unscrupulous ruler. He ruled, not because England chose him or considered that he ruled for the good of England or not. He assumed that he was placed upon the throne by the Lord of Hosts and he therefore governed according to his own ideas. A victim of his own mismanagement, his defeat at Marston Moor was followed by his death on the scaffold, to which he was condemned by his own judges, his death-warrant being signed by fifty-nine, including the regicides Goffe, Whalley and Dixwell, whose history is so closely interwoven with that of New Haven Colony.

During the two years' stay of the regicides Goffe and Whalley in Milford, tradition says that Robert Treat was among their selected acquaintances and friends and that when the letter was received from Charles II, commanding their arrest, Treat immediately signed a warrant and commanded the inhabitants of Milford to make a diligent search, well aware that no search, however diligent, would be successful in finding them within the town limits.

A period of ten years followed without interference on the part of the mother country, until 1660, when we find Charles II upon the throne.

Massachusetts and Plymouth had charter rights, Connecticut and New Haven only a voluntary form of government. The General Court of Connecticut immediately made formal acknowledgment of allegiance to the crown and applied for a charter. New Haven Colony hesitated and finally omitted to take such action.

Governor Winthrop of Connecticut in the early part of the year sailed for England. A number of his friends held high positions at Court. Possessing an extraordinary ring given his grandfather by Charles I, he found favor by presenting it to the King, and returned with that most remarkable and liberal charter, so broad and comprehensive, which settled the whole boundary line of Connecticut soil, including all that portion occupied by the New Haven Colony.

Great discontent prevailed in the colony. Treat and many others favored a union with Connecticut, yet were opposed to many of the conditions. The controversy was intense for some years. Davenport differed with Governor Leete on the subject. Many declined to pay their taxes and ignored the New Haven laws. The debt of the colony was increasing. Milford broke off from New Haven and declined to send deputies or magistrates to the General Court.

Under these conditions a Special Court was held at New Haven, at which the members of the court and the elders of the colony consulted upon the subject of a proposed union. After much discussion Robert Treat, Esq., and Richard Baldwin of

Milford were appointed a committee to accomplish the business with Connecticut.

The selection of Robert Treat was especially fitting, not only from his ability, but from his birth and connections. His father, Richard, as well as his brothers and brothers-in-law were patentees in the charter grant and occupied important positions in Connecticut. By marriage Treat was connected with the influential settlers Tapp and William Fowler, magistrates and pillars of the church.

As the result of the negotiations on May 1, 1665, both colonies, consisting of nineteen towns, amicably united and John Winthrop, Esq., was chosen Governor. (Branford was the only town that declined to accept the conditions of the union that were in many respects unsatisfactory to Robert Treat.) About this time Davenport, disheartened with the trend of events, removed to Boston.

Twice during the controversy between the two colonies, with Benjamin Fenn and Deacon Gunn, Robert Treat was sent by a company of distinguished settlers and dissenters to negotiate with the Dutch Governor for a settlement in New Jersey. It is said that the Governor took them in his private barge to examine Newark Bay and in the spring of 1666, Robert Treat sailed into the Passaic River with forty heads of families in the company, chiefly from New Haven, Milford and Branford, with Rev. Abraham Pierson, afterward one of the founders and the first rector or first president of Yale College, as their spiritual leader.

Adopting such articles as were cited in the fundamental agreement of twenty-seven years previous at New Haven, the town settled by them was called "Milford" until 1667, when the name "Newark" was adopted out of honor to the English home of Rev. Mr. Pierson. Every male member of the company signed the agreement and the signatures might well indicate to some that Davenport and Eaton were located on the banks of the Passaic instead of on the banks of the Quinnipiack. In the agreement Robert Treat's name heads the list.

Honoring Treat as their leader and pioneer, in laying out the lots, he was given first choice and chose the lot in Newark

now bounded by Market Street, Mulberry Street and Broad Street. He was Newark's first town clerk and recorder. At the first General Assembly in New Jersey in 1668, Captain Treat is referred to as one of the Deputies and later on as one of the Governor's Commissioners.

Barber and Howe in their Historical Collections of New Jersey speak of Newark's being indebted to him for its wide main streets and the beauty and extent of the public square, while Stearns in his history speaks of Mr. Treat as follows: "Next comes Robert Treat, the flower and pride of the whole company. To his wise energy, Newark owes much of its early order and good management."

In 1672 Treat returned to Connecticut and his first-love, Milford, never having sold his property there. He, however, left two of his children on the soil of New Jersey, and a memory in Newark that is cherished to the present day, and by all historical writers on the subject and at all historical local celebrations, Robert Treat is referred to as, and conceded to be, the father and the founder of the city of Newark.

We now approach the military career of Robert Treat. As before mentioned, as early as 1654, he was chosen lieutenant of the Train Band at Milford and by the General Court commissioned to take charge of the military affairs of the town. In 1661 he was elected captain. The year following his return from New Jersey he was commissioned as major and appointed second Commander-in-Chief of the forces to be raised in the Colony and sent against the Dutch. The existing conflict with the Dutch kept the colony in constant anxiety. Treat formed what was known as a "Committee of Safety."

The year 1675 was a serious year for the New England Colony. The Indians, who, after the conquest of the Pequots in 1637, for a long period seemed to be fairly peaceful, now became restless. New outbreaks occurred in the Plymouth Colony, in Massachusetts and Rhode Island. While Connecticut did not suffer as did the other colonics, her alliance with the New England Colonies made the situation serious. In this year, with a burst of uncommon fury, came the organized efforts of the various tribes in combined hostilities, resulting in the famous King

Philip's War, the most disastrous of the Indian wars in New England history.

One thousand men were ordered for active service by the United Colonies, the quota of Connecticut being three hundred and fifty.

John Mason, for years the most important and distinguished military commander of the State, was far advanced in years and infirm, and thus retired from further service. Robert Treat, looked upon as his most able military successor, was chosen "Commander-in-Chief of the Connecticut forces and commissioned to take charge of all the military forces with such arms, ammunition, provisions and appurtenances, all officers and all soldiers, marshaled, maintained and disposed of."

About the time Treat assumed command, Captain Lathrop of Massachusetts with a band of ninety picked men, known as the "Flower of Essex," and the best drilled company in the colony, had been led into ambush, overwhelmed, and only eight of their number escaped. The Indians in large numbers were making attacks with arrows tipped with burning rags shot on the roofs of the houses, destroying towns, ruining the crops of the farmers and driving the inhabitants from place to place. Treat quickly moved his forces to Massachusetts in defense and began his brilliant campaign at Deerfield, Northfield, Hadley, Bloody Brook and Springfield, and by his swift movements, arriving as he always did at a critical moment, turned defeat into victory. During this campaign, which lasted until fall, he had frequently been called back with his command to defend Connecticut and the promptness and skill of his manœuvres was remarkable and gave him great prestige as a commander.

At the close of the campaign, however, Treat resigned his commission. His resignation was not accepted. Instead, the General Assembly passed a vote of thanks for his good services and requested that he continue, giving him increased powers to raise and command all the troops necessary. Authorities say he was rapidly becoming second to none in the colony except perhaps the Governor.

Winter was approaching. The Indians had gone into winter quarters at their Narragansett fort near Kingston, R. I., to wait

until spring, when the shelter of the leaves would afford them greater advantages for warfare. The Colonies, however, deemed it wise to make an attack upon them while massed together, and the 10th of December, 1675, was the day appointed on which the attack was to be made. Every Englishman capable of bearing arms was commanded by proclamation of the Governor to hold himself in readiness to march at a moment's notice.

Major General Josiah Winslow was to command the expedition, with Major Samuel Appleton of Massachusetts, Major Robert Treat of Connecticut and Major William Bradford of Plymouth commanding their respective forces; Treat being selected as second in command to General Winslow. The entire force consisted of 1,127 men; 450 from Connecticut, with 200 Mohicans under Oneco.

It was a cold December day when Major Treat, with his command, left New London and began his march to join the forces near Wickford, camping in the open air in the midst of heavy snow.

The Narragansett fort stood on a hill in the center of a vast swamp, which was an island of about five or six acres surrounded by high palisades and in which were 3,500 Indian warriors. The only entrance was over a fallen tree protected by a block house, which, Hubbard says, "sorely gauled the men who first attempted to enter."

The beginning was most disastrous. Connecticut troops were driven back with heavy losses. Four Connecticut captains were killed at the head of their command and a fifth received a mortal wound. A bullet passed through the hat of Major Treat. The situation was critical when Oneco offered to scale the wall and force a real entrance. This was accomplished, and the Connecticut men under Major Treat entering the fort, saved the day.

This battle, known as the great swamp fight, was of great importance to the English. It was the most remarkable in New England and in the annals of the early colonies, and was won at the expense of many lives, including brave and valued officers. The Narragansetts never again offered any organized resistance.

Treat with the remainder of his army returned home immediately. Sometime afterward he was commissioned as Colonel of the militia in New Haven County. This being the first official reference on the records to a Colonel for New Haven County, we must assume that November, 1687, was the birth of what is now the Second Regiment, Connecticut National Guard; that such a regiment has been continuously in existence since that period; and that Robert Treat was its first Colonel.

Complications arose in reference to boundary lines between the Dutch and the New England Colonies, the Dutch claiming all the land in Connecticut south of the Connecticut River. The commissioners agreed upon to settle the dispute were Robert Treat, Nathan Gold, John Allen and William Pitkin. The conference resulted in the formation of Connecticut's western border line known as the "Ridgefield Angle," and the surrender to New York of the towns on Long Island previously belonging to Connecticut, and secured for Connecticut the present towns of Greenwich, Stamford, New Canaan, Darien and a part of Norwalk.

In the midst of these boundary disputes occurred the death of Winthrop after eighteen years of distinguished service. He was succeeded by William Leete who had been Governor of the New Haven Colony before the union of the colonies and Deputy of the Connecticut Colony under Winthrop after their union. Robert Treat was now chosen Deputy Governor and was annually reëlected until the death of Governor Leete in 1683, when he was elected the eighth Governor of Connecticut and the third under the new charter. By reëlection he held this office fifteen years, then declining to become Governor again was elected Deputy Governor for the following ten years.

We may with profit pause here for a moment and contemplate the high character of the early Colonial Governors. John Haynes, the first Governor of Connecticut, was said to have been an ideal representative of the civil life, as Hooker was the apostle of the religious. Coleridge, in referring to him, calls him "a religious and moral aristocracy."

The second Governor, Edwin Hopkins, was also a distinguished man. He was son-in-law of Eaton, first Governor of the New Haven Colony, who was a wealthy London merchant. He engaged extensively in trade and commerce; he established trading posts and country stores from New England to Delaware and left property in his will to establish the grammar schools bearing his name, that are in existence to-day.

Upon the death of Governor Hopkins in England, George Wyllys was elected the third Governor for one year. Wyllys was then seventy-two years of age, and is said to have been a gentleman of leisure, of high character and standing. He owned the square in the center of the City of Hartford on which the charter oak stood.

Thomas Welles, the fourth Governor, held the office for two terms. He was the first Treasurer of the colony and came to America in the interests of Lord Say in settling Saybrook.

John Webster, the fifth Governor, founder of the Webster family in America, an ancestor of Noah Webster, was said to be the most scholarly of the early Governors of the colony.

John Winthrop, Jr., the sixth Governor, youngest son of the famous Governor Winthrop of Massachusetts, was one of the foremost men in New England and his worth is expressed in a single sentence quoted from Mather, "God gave him favor in the eyes of all with whom he had to do."

Governor William Leete, seventh Governor, was a descendant of a distinguished family, which, as early records show, were land owners as early as the 13th century. He was noted for his integrity, was a popular official, and enjoyed the distinction of being Governor of both New Haven and the Connecticut Colonies.

Our little commonwealth, the Constitution State, denominated by historians as the "Birthplace of political freedom," as well as "The land of steady habits," has a history replete with dramatic incidents and full of events that excite interest and veneration.

The three periods which command the most intense interest occurred under the administration of Governors Robert Treat,

Jonathan Trumbull and William A. Buckingham. These three men may justly be referred to as the three war Governors of Connecticut. Soon after the election of Governor Treat, complications arose in England. James II proposed to revoke the Colonial charters and withdraw the privileges granted by Charles II in both Old and New England. This was undoubtedly the most critical period in the history of New England. The charters of all the New England Colonies were called for. It was proposed to annex Connecticut either to Massachusetts or to the Netherlands, or else to cut it in two at the Connecticut River and divide it between the two. The situation was perilous and the prospect of Connecticut being wiped from off the map as a State was for a time imminent.

Sir Edmund Andros, referred to as the "Tyrant of New England," was appointed Governor of all the New England Colonies. He arrived in Boston in December, 1686, authorized to take the government of all the settlements in New England into his own hands. Plymouth, Massachusetts and Rhode Island surrendered at once. He then notified Governor Treat that he proposed visiting Connecticut to take command of its affairs and possession of its charter. Treat opened negotiations and consumed months in writing, attempting to pacify him, and under one pretense and another succeeded in causing a delay of nearly a year or until the October following, when Andros became impatient and sent a messenger to notify Treat of his intention of coming to Connecticut at once.

The General Assembly immediately convened. Sir Edmund arrived, attended by a retinue and a bodyguard of troops, and was received with great ceremony and hospitality. Governor Treat escorted him to the Assembly, showing him marked attention. He was introduced, and the ceremonies and discussion of that famous afternoon and evening were begun.

Treat's plan and instructions were: First, prevent, if possible, the loss of the charter; second, failing in this, plead that the colony be allowed to remain undivided and unattached to any other.

It is said that the arguments on the part of Treat were made with great diplomacy. At all times he referred to Andros with

respect and friendliness. With his cool temperament, great wisdom and winning manner, he made a long address, stating the attachment the people had for their charter, the privations they had endured in procuring it and pleading that they might be permitted to retain it; that their territory should not be divided and that they would prefer to serve under Governor Andros. The afternoon wore away, Treat still arguing and pleading with marked skill and diplomacy, battling for the rights of the people.

Lights had to be brought in to enable the members to transact the business. The charter had been laid on the table before them during the discussion. Suddenly the lights were extinguished. Confusion followed and before the lights and order were restored someone had removed the charter. Discussion occurs as to whether the original or duplicate charter was before the body, or both, but this is immaterial. The original charter was written on three skins and is in the Capitol at Hartford, and the duplicate on two skins is in possession of the Connecticut Historical Society. It was the custom to execute all important documents in duplicate, so that if one was lost in transmission across the ocean, the other might be preserved.

President Stiles writes as follows: "Nathan Stanley, father of the late Colonel Stanley, took one of the charters, and Mr. Talcott, father of the late Governor Talcott, took the other." Other very reliable authorities, however, say that Captain Wadsworth and Captain Nichols of Hartford coöperated to save the charter. There must have been many assistants in the plot, however, as the lights were all extinguished simultaneously. Wadsworth grabbed the charter and hid it in the trunk of that venerable oak that thus became the most famous tree in the world. Later, Captain Wadsworth is supposed to have secreted the charter in his house, where it remained until the reëstablishment of the colonial government.

The day's proceedings were evidently planned and the indications are that Governor Treat was associated with the principal actors in the drama. Andros returned to Boston without the charter. Evidently he was much impressed with the qualities of Governor Treat, for the month following this episode,

he made him a member of his council and judge in this territory.

Governor Andros's administration was highly tyrannical. All the colonies from Maine to the Delaware were brought under his arbitrary rule, and this was a severe blow to their prosperity. He was responsible to no one but the King for whatever he might choose to do. While his headquarters were in Boston, one of the principal meeting houses there was seized. Taxes were imposed. Nothing was allowed to be printed without permission. All the records of New England were ordered to be brought to Boston. Deeds and wills were required to be registered in Boston and excessive fees were charged for this work. The titles of land were ordered revised, and those who wished the title confirmed had to pay a heavy tax. General Courts were abolished. Dudley, first assistant to Sir Edmund, openly declared the people had no further privileges except not to be sold for slaves.

When the news of the landing of the Prince of Orange in England was received in Boston in April, 1689, drums beat to arms and signal fires were lighted on Beacon Hill. The militia poured in from the country towns. The people rose in revolt and demanded Andros to surrender his position. Attempting to escape the authorities, disguised in woman's clothes, he was caught and imprisoned on board a ship and sent back to England.

Bradstreet, in his eighty-seventh year, was reinstated Governor of Massachusetts and Robert Treat in Connecticut. Treat, in resuming his office, stated that the "people had put him in and that he had ventured all he had above his shoulders." Immediately proclaiming the allegiance of the Colony to William and Mary, Treat by wise statesmanship secured a decision confirming the validity of the charter. At the age of seventy-six he declined reelection to the office of Governor and was succeeded by Fitz-John Winthrop. The Colony being unwilling to excuse him from public service, Treat was elected Deputy Governor for a second time and was continuously elected as such for the following ten years until at the age of eighty-six,

at his own request, he was excused from official duties, and retired from public life. He was Deputy Governor, 1676-1683, seven years; Governor, 1683-1698, fifteen years; Lieutenant Governor, 1698-1708, ten years.

Treat was a Deputy from Milford for at least six years and from Newark five more, and Magistrate in the New Haven General Court and assistant for eight years, serving nearly twenty years in the halls of legislation. He was seventeen years in the chair of Deputy Governor and fifteen years in that of Governor, including the two years under Andros, making in all a period of thirty-two years as Governor and Deputy Governor, or a total of fifty-two years of public service, a record unequalled in the history of this State or of any other so far as history quotes where the offices were elective.

During this period, in addition to the official duties required from him in the various offices mentioned, he was frequently appointed to hold court, to settle disputes of every kind and character that arose in the colony. He also adjusted differences between ministers and the people, and established boundary lines between the State and the different towns in the State. So well balanced was his judgment that he never made a legal mistake. The Historian Sheldon says, "He had the faculty for always being in the right place at the right time."

Robert Treat was a practical farmer. It is said he was often found with his hands upon the plow and called to the stone wall by the roadside to sign important papers, or to leave a half-turned furrow and muster his troops to quell some Indian disturbance or resist some Indian invasion.

He was an important land-holder, not only in his own town but in various towns throughout the State, many of which he had assisted in founding or surveying. Three hundred acres of his are mentioned between New Haven, Farmington and Wallingford: three hundred more in Killingly, now of Windham County; while his holdings in Newark were among the largest in that colony. He left a large fortune for a man of his time. (Among the items of his personal property, the inventory shows "two slaves" appraised at eighty-five pounds.)

It is said that no estate of consequence in Milford was settled between 1670 and 1700 without his assistance.

It is to be regretted that no portrait of Governor Treat exists. The chair that Governor Treat used officially is in good state of preservation and in possession of Mrs. Henry Champion, a descendant of the Governor.

The house in which he lived is illustrated in "Lambert's History of the Colony of New Haven," p. 138. Lambert states that it stood upon the original plot of Edmund Tapp, number 35, as shown in the map drawn in 1646. This would indicate that the house stood on the east side of what is now North Street, a few rods above the Plymouth Church and at the corner of Governor's Avenue. Atwater, in his history of the colony, also refers to it, but gives Lambert as authority.

A buttonball tree, which stood for a number of years in his dooryard, is said to have originated as follows: Using a green sapling to drive his oxen, Governor Treat was called upon for some public service. He stuck the sapling into the ground temporarily where he could readily pick it up as he came out of the house. It was forgotten, rooted and became a handsome shade tree.

In the early part of the last century a house was built upon the original cellar and foundation of the Treat house by Mr. Lewis F. Baldwin and his daughter. Mrs. John W. Buckingham now occupies the house.

Treat lived to see a distinguished family grow up around him. His children and descendants rose to positions of honor in this and other colonies. His oldest son, Rev. Samuel Treat, located in Massachusetts. Eunice, daughter of Samuel, married Rev. Thomas Paine, father of Robert Treat Paine, Revolutionary patriot, member of the First Congress, signer of the Declaration of Independence, Attorney General and Justice of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts. His son,* bearing the same name, born in 1775, was a distinguished poet in his day.

* This Robert Treat Paine was originally named Thomas. Not wishing to bear the name of Thomas Paine, the Atheist, by act of Legislation in 1801 his name was changed to Robert Treat Paine.

Thomas Treat Paine, born in 1803, was a noted astronomer and left a large property to Harvard College. His relative was the late Robert Treat Paine, known in our generation as a philanthropist, and for years President of the International Peace Congress, whose son the Rev. George Lyman Paine is now Rector of St. Paul's Church, this city. The church and our community are to be congratulated, and they welcome back to the colony so prominent a descendant of Governor Treat.

One son remained in Newark, where the family became prominent. Two remained in Milford, and many of Milford's old and honored men for the past two centuries have borne the name. One daughter married Rev. Samuel Mather of Windsor. The other, Abigail, married the Rev. Samuel Andrew, one of the founders of Yale.

Many of his descendants, bearing the name of Treat and other prominent names, are men distinguished either as statesmen, leaders, ministers or military commanders.

Governor Treat's death occurred on July 10, 1710. He was buried in the old cemetery at Milford. The stone, unique in its character and in good state of preservation, reads as follows:

HERE LYETH INTERRED THE
 BODY OF COLL. ROBERT
 TREAT ESQ. WHO FAITHFULLY
 SERVED THIS COLONY IN THE
 POST OF GOVERNOR AND
 DEPUTY GOVERNOR NEAR
 YE SPACE OF THIRTY YEARS
 AND AT YE AGE OF FOUR
 SCORE AND EIGHT YEARS
 EXCHANGED THIS LIFE
 FOR A BETTER, JULY 12TH
 ANNO DOM: 1710

His last will is full of expressions of tenderness, such as this: "Being aged in years and not knowing how suddenly the Lord may by death call me home from out of this life, but being

at present of sound understanding and memory, etc.” Then the will proceeds “as a pledge of my fatherly love and farewell kindness to my dear and loving children.”

On the Memorial Bridge erected at Milford in 1889, in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the settlement of the town, was placed on the Tower the largest slab in honor of Governor Treat.

Trumbull, 1797, says, “Few men have sustained a fairer character or rendered the public a more important service.” “Connecticut as a Colony and a State, 1904,” says of Treat, “He was a beau-ideal of a gentleman.”

Perhaps we cannot better close our references to the life and services of Robert Treat than to quote the tribute paid to him by Hollister in his “History of Connecticut, 1855” as it seems to round up briefly and concisely his many characteristics. It reads as follows:—

“Governor Treat was not only a man of high courage, but he was one of the most cautious military leaders and possessed a quick sagacity united with a breadth of understanding that enabled him to see at a glance the most complex relations that surrounded the field of battle.

Nor did he excel only as a hero; his moral courage and inherent force of character shone with the brightest lustre in the Executive Chair or Legislative Chamber, when stimulated by the opposition and malevolence of such men as Andros.

In private life he was no less esteemed. He was a planter of that hospitable order that adorned New England in an age when hospitality was accounted a virtue and when the term ‘Gentleman’ was something more than an empty title.

His house was always open to the poor and friendless and whenever he gave his hand he gave his heart.

Hence, whether marching to the relief of Springfield or extending his charities to Whalley or Goffe, while he drowned a tear of sympathy in the lively sparkle of fun and anecdote, he was always welcome, always beloved.

His quick sensibilities, his playful humor, his political wisdom, his firmness in the midst of dangers, and his deep piety have still a traditional fame in the neighborhood where he spent the brief portion of his time that he was allowed to devote to the culture of the domestic and social virtues.”

EARLY SILVER OF CONNECTICUT AND ITS MAKERS.

By GEORGE MUNSON CURTIS.

[Read January 15, 1912.]

To those who are lovers of old plate, and have become familiar with the various shapes and designs characteristic of Colonial days, it is interesting to note the slow evolution and gradual change in church and domestic silver from the simple and yet beautiful vessels of the seventeenth century to the more elaborate forms and greater variety of articles of the eighteenth century, which the growing luxury and more complex life of the later period demanded.

Judging by the examples that have survived, silver utensils of the seventeenth century were limited to spoons, the caudle-cup, the beaker, the chalice, or standing cup, the tankard, the flagon, and what are called to-day wine-tasters. The ornamentation on the earliest of these pieces suggests the conventional flower designs found on oak furniture of the same period.

The old inventories and wills, however, give us a list of articles once in common use which are doubtless no longer in existence.

Dr. Gershom Bulkeley died in 1713 in Glastonbury. He was a man of considerable distinction and wealth. By the terms of his will he bequeathed to a son a silver retort and to a daughter a silver cucurbit, a species of retort, shaped like a gourd, used, perhaps, to distil perfumes and essences, once the duty of an accomplished housewife.

In various inventories frequent mention is made of silver dram-cups, always lower in value than spoons. They were miniature bowls with an ear-shaped handle on each side, and

called dram-cups because they comfortably held a dram, or spoonful, and were used for taking medicine. Sometimes they were of pewter. Modern collectors have called them wine-tasters, which is clearly a misnomer. Our ancestors were not wine-tasters: they *drank* from beakers, caudle-cups, and tankards.

Other articles mentioned are silver platters and punch-bowls, whistles, hair-pegs, seals, bodkins, thimbles, clasps with glass centres, chains or chatelaines with scissors and other articles attached, shoe and knee buckles, and last, but not least, silver hat-bands,* worn only by those who affected the highest type of fashionable attire. Articles of gold were toothpicks, cuff-links, stay-pins, rings, brooches, buttons, and beads *ad libitum*. Doubtless a search through other inventories would reveal many other articles of silver and gold.

In the eighteenth century the colonist had greater wealth, and life had become more formal, and luxury more common. As a result, the silversmith had increased the variety of his manufactures, and used more elaborate designs, although he still clung to a simplicity of line and form that was characteristic of all early industrial art in America.

Although the earliest known silversmiths in New England had either learned their craft in England or been taught the trade by English workmen, there was no attempt to adopt the elaborate baronial designs of the mother country. Simpler forms were more in keeping with the simple life of this country.

As early as 1715, the man who had amassed a fortune could purchase coffee and chocolate pots, braziers (the fore-runners of the modern chafing-dish), elaborate urn-shaped loving-cups, porringers,—in a form which seems to have been peculiar to this country,—patch-boxes and snuff-boxes, toddy-strainers, and many trinkets dear to the feminine heart.

* Captain Giles Hamlin of Middletown (died in 1689 *ae.* 67) was a prominent figure in the early days of the Colony; he was the owner of a silver hat-band which he bequeathed to his daughter. The portrait of Pocahontas dated 1616 depicts her crowned with a mannish headgear, encircled by a golden hat-band.

By 1736, when tea had so far dropped in price that it had become a necessity, beautifully chased tea-pots had come into vogue, in delicate and pure designs, in forms now known as bell and pear.

The silversmiths were also making graceful sauce and gravy boats, quaint steeple-topped pepper-casters, beakers with single and double handles, cans with double scroll handles, three-legged cream-pitchers, candle-sticks and salvers shaped like patens, and in other forms.

Later in the century beautiful tea-sets and punch-bowls became popular, as graceful in shape and line as the Heppelwhite, Adam, and Sheraton furniture of that period. One of the most frequent of motives was the classical urn, which became as common in silver as in architecture. Meantime the tankard had increased in height, the flat lid had been replaced by a domed cover with a finial, and a band had been moulded around the middle of the body. It should be remembered that no tankard was made with a spout. It was a drinking-vessel pure and simple. The spout now so frequently found on these old pieces is quite a modern addition,—an attempt to make a pitcher.

Spoons in the seventeenth century were invariably rat-tailed. From the handle down the back of the bowl to about the middle ran a ridge, shaped like a rat-tail. This is sometimes thought to have been an attempt to strengthen the spoon, but its use must have been purely ornamental, for it adds little strength to these strongly made spoons. Sometimes the rat-tail was shaped like a long “V,” and grooved, while on each side were elaborate scrolls. The bowl was perfectly oval in shape, while the end of the handle was notched, or trifid.

This style of spoon was continued, with modifications, through the first third of the eighteenth century. Then the bowl became ovoid, or egg-shaped, and the end of the handle was rounded, without the notch.

The rat-tail was gradually replaced by what is known as the drop, or double drop, frequently terminating in a conventionalized flower or shell, or anthemion, while down the front of the handle ran a rib.

Later the bowl became more pointed, the drop was replaced by a tongue, and the handle about 1760, instead of slightly curving to the front at the end, reversed the position. A little later the handle became pointed, and was engraved with bright cut ornaments and a cartouche at the end, in which were engraved the initials of the owner.

During the first ten years of the nineteenth century a popular style was the so-called coffin-shaped handle, succeeded probably about 1810 by a handle with a shoulder just above the junction with the bowl, while the end became fiddle-shaped, or of a style now known as tipped,—shapes produced to this day.

Up to about 1770 spoons were of three sizes,—the teaspoon, as small as an after-dinner coffee-spoon; the porringer-spoon, a little smaller than our present dessert size; and the table-spoon, with a handle somewhat shorter than that of to-day.

So few forks have been found in collections of old silver that it forces the belief that they were generally made of steel, with bone handles. There seems no reason why, if in general use, silver forks should not now be as common as spoons.

In the great silver exhibition recently held in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, of more than one thousand pieces, there were only two forks to be found, and they were of course two-tined.

In the manufacture of silverware, as in every other form of industry, modern methods have worked a revolution. Now powerful lathes and presses accomplish in seconds the work of days under old conditions.

Nevertheless, we can produce no better silverware than could the old craftsman working with his primitive tools. The silver-smith of Colonial days knew thoroughly every branch of his trade. He was designer, die-sinker, forger, solderer, burnisher, chaser, and engraver. He was a many-sided man, and he did thorough work. Let no one fancy him as other than a man of might, for muscle and sinew were as needful in fashioning plate as in the trade of blacksmithing.

With his hammers, anvils, beak irons, testers, swages, punches, planishing hammers, and stakes and drawing benches,

he skilfully shaped the beautiful white metal, putting a feeling into his work that is generally missing in modern silver.

He used a lathe, probably worked by foot-power, not for spinning, but for shaping and truing a porringer, a beaker, or a bowl after the hammers and anvils had done their work. This is plainly shown by the mark left by the lathe in the centre of these vessels.

The metal was hammered while cold, and many times during the operation was annealed; that is, heated in a charcoal fire, to prevent brittleness and to make it tough.

With the planishing hammers and anvils, rotten stone and burnishers, a uniform and beautiful surface was produced that can never be attained by a modern workman using a buffing wheel.

Ornaments on the back of spoon bowls and handles were impressed by dies forced together by drop presses or under screw pressure. This is absolutely proven by the exact duplication of the pattern on sets of spoons. Accurate measurements show that these ornaments were not hand-work, for there is not the slightest deviation in dimensions.

The silversmith carried little manufacturing stock. It was the general practice to take to the smith the coin which it was desired to have fashioned into plate. These coins were melted in a crucible and poured into a skillet to form an ingot, which was then hammered into sheets of the correct gauge.

This explains the usual practice at that time of valuing a porringer or a tankard, or other plate, by saying that it contained so many Spanish dollars or English coins.

Probably most of the early plate was fashioned from Spanish dollars, once so generally in circulation in this country. They were not up to sterling standard, being only .900 parts fine, while sterling is .925 fine. Nevertheless, early plate seems to be whiter in color than that manufactured to-day.

Perhaps this is the explanation: hand-hammered or forged silver must be annealed very frequently, and in the old days this was done with the aid of a bellows in the open air, instead of in a furnace, as is done to-day. As a result, a film of oxide of copper was formed, which was removed by plunging the

article into what is called the pickling bath,—a hot diluted solution of sulphuric acid. This operation continued often enough would tend to make the surface almost fine silver; hence the white color.

Most smiths impressed the plate they fashioned with their trade-mark. The earliest marks were initials in a shaped shield or in a heart, with some emblem above or below. Later marks were initials or the name in a plain or shaped or engrailed rectangle or oval. In the early part of the last century the word "Coin"* was added, and about 1865 the word "Sterling" was employed to denote the correct standard.

Undoubtedly, the shops of the gold and silversmiths were small affairs, with no cellars or substantial foundations, being similar in that respect to those of blacksmiths. They were frequently built on leased or rented ground, and could with little difficulty be moved to other sites.

When Captain Robert Fairchild, of Stratford, sold his homestead in 1768, he reserved the right to remove from the premises a goldsmith shop. Such reservations were not unusual.

They were easily broken into by burglars, and "stop thief" advertisements in the local press were quite common. The shops of Joseph and Stephen Hopkins, of Waterbury, were entered in this way some eight or ten times in the decade from 1765 to 1775.

The writer well remembers a visit in 1875 to the smithy of one of these artisans in East Hartford. There, busily engaged, was an old man forging spoons for a Hartford jeweler. The building could not have been more than fifteen by thirty feet, and yet there was ample room for every emergency. The smith had learned the trade, just as his predecessors of earlier days had done, and perhaps was the last of the fraternity.

The knowledge that America had silversmiths during the Colonial period came as a complete surprise and revelation to

* When the United States Mint was established in 1792, the standard of silver coinage was fixed at $.892\frac{4}{10}$ fine. In 1837 the standard was raised to .900 fine. Therefore, "Coin" stamped on plate does not indicate .925, or "Sterling" fine.

most of those who were so fortunate as to see the splendid examples of their work exhibited at the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston in 1906.

That these craftsmen were equal in skill to their English rivals cannot perhaps be claimed in every respect on account of the lack of demand for highly florid ornamentation, but it may be safely stated that American silversmiths produced wares that for beauty of shape, sense of proportion, and purity of line were not surpassed in England; and, if occasion demanded, elaborate ornamentation in most attractive designs was fully within the grasp of American workmen.

Working in silver was a most respectable craft, and many of the men who followed the trade were of excellent social standing, particularly in Boston. One can say without fear of contradiction that the best silver-work in this country was done in that town.

The earliest American silversmiths of whom record has been found were Captain John Hull, coiner of the Pine Tree Shilling, mint-master of Massachusetts, and merchant prince, and his partner, Robert Sanderson, both of Boston, and working in the middle of the seventeenth century.

They were succeeded by men who were also past masters of the craft, such as David Jesse, who is thought to have been born in Hartford; Jeremiah Dummer; John Coney; John Dixwell, son of the regicide of that name who resided in New Haven for so many years; the Edwardses; Edward Winslow; William Cowell; the three Burts; the Hurds; and last, but not least of this very incomplete list, Paul Revere, father and son, the last the hero of Longfellow's famous poem.

These men were craftsmen of the greatest skill, and the many examples of their work still extant show that they upheld the standards and traditions of their trade in a manner worthy of the highest praise.

The work of a number is to be found in Connecticut to-day, particularly in the churches. In fact, a considerable part of the early communion silver in this State was made by Boston silversmiths.

Jeremiah Dummer (1645-1718) is represented by thirteen silver vessels in our churches, one more than John Dixwell has to his credit, although the latter was born in New Haven, and must have known many men in the Colony.

But Dummer is of interest to us in another way. When the government of Connecticut decided in 1709 to issue paper currency, or Bills of Exchange, the agents of the Colony apparently selected him to do the mechanical part of the work; that is, the engraving of the plates and the printing of the bills.

Journals of the Council for 1710 show transactions with Dummer relating to this currency, and in 1712 Governor Saltonstall laid before the Council Board the bill of Jeremiah Dummer for printing 6,550 sheets of this paper currency.

The inference seems clear that Dummer not only printed, but engraved, the first paper currency of Connecticut. His one-time apprentice, John Coney, had the distinction of engraving the plates for the first paper money issued by Massachusetts some years previously, the first issued on this continent.

Part of the trade of a silversmith was to engrave on the metal coats-of-arms, ornamentations, or the initials of the owners, and, of course, the transition to engraving on copper was easy and natural. Several of the early engravers did their first work on silver, Paul Revere, and our own Amos Doolittle among the number.

The early church silver is of very great interest not only on account of its beauty and quaintness, but also because of its association and history. Nothing else brings us into such intimate touch with the life of our forefathers. Generation after generation of the sturdy Connecticut stock have hallowed it by the most religious act of their lives.

The beakers, caudle-cups, and tankards were frequently in domestic use before they were presented to the churches, the offering of devout Christian men and women. This plate is nearly all in precisely the same condition as when first dedicated to God's service.

Too many of our churches have banished these sacred memorials to safety deposit vaults in our cities and to boxes and

baskets stored in attics in our country districts. The substitution of the individual cups is, of course, the cause of this change.

Would it not be most fitting if these discarded memorials were deposited in some central place where the protection would be ample, and yet where their historical and religious significance would not be hidden and their beauty and workmanship could be studied and admired?

While not so likely, when silver is stored in a safety deposit vault in the name of a church, there is always, when placed in the custody of an individual, the danger not only of fire and burglary, but that it may be utterly forgotten, and thus, through carelessness or dishonesty, finally drift into alien hands and be lost to the church forever. The silver of more than one Connecticut church has been destroyed by fire, and in one case the writer's visit resulted in the locating of church silver that had been completely forgotten. Fifty-seven Connecticut churches still preserve their ancient silver. Much of it is of great historical interest, and some of it of very great beauty.

The oldest piece of communion plate in this State belongs to the Congregational Church in Guilford. It is a quaint old beaker with flaring lip, and is marked in pounced engraving "H. K." on the side. It was the gift of Henry Kingsnorth, one of the first settlers of that town and a man of substance and worth. He died at the age of fifty in 1668 during the great sickness, as it was called, and his will reads:

"I give and bequeath unto y^e church here fifteen pounds to buy any such utensills for the sacrament withall as they shall see cause." The beaker was made by William Rouse, of Boston, a contemporary of Captain John Hull, the mint-master.

One of the beakers belonging to the Congregational Church in Groton bears the engraved inscription, "The Gift of S^r John Davie to the Chh. of Christ at Groton." It was made by Samuel Vernon, a silversmith of Newport, R. I. The story of the beaker is this: John, who was a son of Humphrey Davie, of Hartford, and a cousin of Sir William Davie, of Credy in Devon, England, graduated at Harvard in 1681, and became one of the first settlers of Groton and its first town clerk. In

1707 his cousin, Sir William, died without male issue, and John of Groton succeeded to the baronetcy. Barefooted and in his shirtsleeves, he was hoeing corn on his farm when the messenger arrived to tell him of his good fortune and to salute him as Sir John Davie. He soon left for England, and the beaker was his parting gift.

Belonging to the ancient Congregational Society of Norwich-town is a two-handled cup made by John Dixwell, and bearing the inscription in quaintly engraved letters, "The Gift of Sarah Knight to the Chh. of Christ in Norwich, April 20, 1722." She was Madam Knight, who wrote a diary of her trip from Boston to New York in 1704. For a number of years she was a resident of Norwich, and lies buried in the old graveyard in New London.

There are sixteen silver beakers owned by the First Congregational Church, New London, and two of them bear the inscription, "The Gift of the Owners of the Ship Adventure of London, 1699." They were made by two Boston silversmiths working in partnership, John Edwards and John Allen. A ship named "Adventure" and built in London was owned at that time by Adam Pickett and Christopher Christophers, of New London. It does not seem a wild flight of the imagination to conjecture that these beakers were presented to the church as a thank-offering either for a profitable mercantile venture or for a fortunate escape from some harrowing experience at sea.

In 1725 Governor Gurdon Saltonstall gave by will a silver tankard to this church, and in 1726 his widow made a like gift. In 1793 the church by vote had these two vessels made into three beakers by J. P. Trott, a New London silversmith, but care was used to preserve the old inscriptions.

The Congregational Church at North Haven owns a large baptismal basin on which is inscribed, "The Gift of the Rev. Ezra Stiles, D.D., LL.D., President Yale College, to the Congregational Church in North Haven, 1794." He was one of the most distinguished men of his time, and a native of North Haven.

There was a time when the First Congregational Church, Hartford, could boast of an array of plate made by these early silversmiths. This fact is revealed by the ancient Court of Probate records. In the early part of the last century a pinch of poverty was felt, or else it was thought that the style of these vessels was too old-fashioned. Whatever the cause, the plate was sold.

In the collection was a fine old mug made by William Cowell, of Boston, and presented by Mrs. Abigail, the wife of Rev. Timothy Woodbridge, pastor of the church from 1683 to 1732. On the mug is the inscription, "Ex dono A. W. to the First Church of Christ in Hartford, 1727."

In 1883 William R. Cone, of Hartford, found the mug in the possession of J. K. Bradford, of Peru, Ill., whose grandfather, Dr. Jeremiah Bradford, had bought it of the church in 1803 for \$15. Mr. Cone was able to buy it for \$75, and re-presented it to the church.

In 1840 the Second Congregational Church, Hartford, procured a new communion service, made from its ancient silver, melted down. The old inscriptions were faithfully copied, and tell of the following gifts: a tankard, given by John Ellery in 1746; two cups, engraved "The Dying Gift of Mr. Richard Lord to the Second Church of Christ in Hartford"; two cups, engraved "The Gift of J. R. to the South Church in Hartford"; and two cups, engraved "S. C." The church now owns only one piece of ancient silver, a beautiful tankard given by William Stanley in 1787.

Hartford is not the only town which has lost its ancient church silver. The Congregational Church in Saybrook sold its plate in 1815 (but fortunately it is still in existence), and the Congregational Church in Wallingford remodeled its ancient plate in 1849, in a style popular at that period, while the Congregational Churches in Wethersfield and Cheshire lost their communion silver by fire a number of years ago. The East Hartford Church plate nearly met a like fate only a few months ago.

The Congregational Church in South Windsor owns two beautiful beakers made by John Potwine, a silversmith of that vicinity, and presented by Governor Roger Wolcott in 1756.

The Congregational Church in Fairfield has a beautiful collection of plate: two handsome tankards, dated 1753 and 1757; two fine chalices presented by Captain John Silliman in 1752; three beakers and a cup with a handle. On Saturday evening, May 1, 1779, this silver was in the home of a deacon, General Silliman, and for convenience it had been placed in a corner of his bedroom. That night a company of British soldiers landed on the shore of Fairfield, and stealthily made their way to the good deacon's home, and made him a prisoner. The noise of the entering soldiers awakened Mrs. Silliman, who hastily threw some bed-clothes over the silver and, although the house was ransacked, the communion plate was not discovered.

The First Congregational Church, Bridgeport, has a large collection of ancient silver; but its most noteworthy piece is a tankard made about 1738 by Peter Van Dyke, of New York. It is a small one, only six inches high, and has been disfigured by the addition of a spout in modern times; but the ornamentation on the handle in most elaborate arabesque scrolls and masks, and around the base in acanthus foliage, is the most beautiful ornamentation that has been found on any ancient silver in America.

One of the most interesting collections of communion silver in the State belongs to the Center Congregational Church, New Haven. It consists of thirteen beautiful caudle-cups and a large baptismal basin.

The latter was made by Kneeland, of Boston, and was presented to the church by the will of Jeremiah Atwater in 1735. Its history is quite interesting.

Early in the eighteenth century Mr. Atwater, a wealthy merchant, made a purchase in Boston of a cargo of nails. In one of the kegs, beneath a layer of nails, he found a quantity of silver money. He wrote to the Boston merchant, and told him of the money found in the keg, and asked how it could be

returned to its rightful owner. The reply stated that the keg was bought for nails and sold for nails, and had passed through many hands, and it would be impossible to trace the original owner, and that Mr. Atwater must dispose of the money as he saw fit. He finally concluded that he would give the money to the church, and had it wrought into a baptismal basin. This was the traditional story as told to Dr. Leonard Bacon by the two eldest children of a Jeremiah Atwater, who was a nephew of the original Jeremiah. On the following facts we can absolutely rely. Mr. Atwater made his will in 1732, and died the same year. The will says, "I give and bequeath unto the First Church of Christ in New Haven the sum of fifty pounds to be improved for plate or otherwise, as the pastor and deacons shall direct." This story in full was told by Dr. Bacon in the *Journal and Courier*, July 15, 1853.

During the British invasion of New Haven in 1779, all the communion silver was hidden in a chimney in the house of Deacon Stephen Ball at the corner of Chapel and High Streets, where Yale Art School now stands.

In the Congregational Church, Columbia, is a beaker presented by Captain Samuel Buckingham in 1756. When the centenary of the founding of Dartmouth College was observed a few years ago, this beaker was taken to Hanover for the occasion because of its intimate association with Dr. Eleazar Wheelock.

When Canterbury was settled about 1690, a number of the pioneers were from Barnstable. The interest of the older town apparently did not wane, for by the church records we find that in 1716 the church in Barnstable presented to its daughter more than two pounds sterling, which was invested in a silver beaker still in use in the Canterbury Church, and inscribed, "The Gift of Barnstable Church, 1716."

Belonging to the Congregational Church, Windham, are three ancient silver beakers, inscribed, "John Cates legacy to the Church in Windham."

Cates was a mysterious individual, and probably the earliest settler in Windham. Barber, in his *Historical Collections*, says

he served in the wars in England, holding a commission under Cromwell. On the restoration of Charles II to the throne, Cates fled to this country for safety, and, in order to avoid his pursuers, finally settled in the wilderness of what is now Windham. He died there in 1697.

Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, possesses two ancient and interesting pieces of communion silver: a beautiful cup or chalice, made by John Gardiner, a silversmith of New London, and a paten.

The tradition is that they were originally owned by Rt. Rev. Samuel Seabury, first bishop of Connecticut, and presented by him respectively to St. James's Church, New London, and Calvary Church, Stonington. Around the chalice runs the inscription, "Given by Dr. Yeldall towards making this chalice \pm oz. 7 dwts. 1773." Who Dr. Yeldall was, is not known, but in an advertisement in a New London newspaper in 1775 it is stated, "Dr. Yeldall's medicines may be had of Joseph Knight, Post Rider." Presumably, therefore, he was well known in that vicinity.

Some fifty years ago, at Bishop Williams's request, these memorials of Bishop Seabury were presented to the Divinity School.

This brief account of the ancient silver belonging to the churches of Connecticut by no means exhausts the subject, either historically or from other points of view.

One might continue describing in detail the display of ten beakers and massive baptismal basin belonging to the First Church in Middletown, the fine array belonging to the Congregational Church in Stratford, and the seven very ancient and beautiful candle-cups owned by the old church in Farmington. Not less worthy of mention is the silver of the First Church in Milford (two of the pieces having been made by a Connecticut silversmith), and the fine silver of quaint design belonging to the Congregational Church in Guilford.

The United Church and Trinity Church, New Haven; St. John's Church, Stamford; the Congregational Church, Durham; Center Church, Meriden; First Congregational Church,

Derby; Congregational Church, North Haven; and many others,—have beautiful collections of silver of great interest, most of it made by the silversmiths of Connecticut.

In private hands, among the old families of the State, a considerable quantity of old plate remains, but the great bulk of it has disappeared forever,—most of it consigned to the melting-pot, to issue thence in modern forms of nondescript styles or no style at all. The temperance movement in the early part of the last century is responsible for the disappearance of quantities of old plate. Many of the old porringers, tankards, beakers, mugs, and cans were transferred into spoons and forks by our local craftsmen, of whom Hartford and New Haven had so many.

What stories of this iconoclasm could have been told by Beach, Ward, Sargeant, Pitkin, and Rogers, of Hartford, and Merriman, Chittenden, and Bradley, of New Haven!

Indeed, one begins to believe that every town of any importance in this State had its local spoon-maker, whose trade was nearly as familiar to the inhabitants as that of the village blacksmith.

But, of all causes for the disappearance of old plate, none was equal to the feeling that the good old silver utensils of the forefathers were old-fashioned. It is the same subtle influence which banished to garrets and outhouses the beautiful furniture of the same period, and gave us in exchange the Empire styles and the mid-century products of the so-called furniture butchers.

It is surprising to find what quantities of plate were owned by some of the rich men of the Colony. To give a few illustrations: Rev. Samuel Whittlesey, of Wallingford, who died in 1752, had silver to the amount of 108 ounces, consisting of tankards, porringers, beakers, salt-cellars, spoons, etc.

Captain Joseph Trowbridge, of New Haven, who died in 1765, owned 234 ounces of plate.

In March, 1774, the home of Hon. Thaddeus Burr, of Fairfield, was entered by burglars, and plate was taken which must have amounted to several hundred ounces. In a list published in a newspaper at the time are such articles as chafing-dishes,

tea-pots, porringers, tankards, silver-hilted sword, beakers, cans, sugar-dish, and spoons *ad libitum*.

Governor Theophilus Eaton, who died in 1657, left plate valued at 107 pounds sterling.

The greater part of the early domestic silver found in Connecticut was made by the silversmiths of Boston, New York, and Newport. This was but natural, for Connecticut had no large commercial ports where merchants grew rich through foreign trade and accumulated wealth in sufficient quantities to invest very large sums in the productions of the silversmith's art.

In one respect the conditions in Connecticut one hundred and fifty years ago were much like those of to-day. If a man of wealth desired to purchase an article of exceptional quality and worth, he was quite likely to patronize the merchants and craftsmen of those far-away cities, Boston and New York, where styles were sure to be of the latest fashion and workmanship of unusual merit, while a man of slender resources naturally depended on near-by shopkeepers and artisans.

However, Connecticut had many silversmiths, and a number of them did most creditable work when their services were demanded, although, owing to the influence just stated, their products seem to have been distributed almost wholly in their own localities,—one might indeed say among their fellow-townsmen.

One never finds in Hartford the work of a New Haven smith, or in New Haven the product of a man who was working in New London, except when recent migration has carried the ware from home.

As a result, these silversmiths, in order to eke out a living in communities that were not lavish in accumulating their work, were obliged to turn their attention to various other trades. Some were clock and cabinet makers; others were blacksmiths and innkeepers; and others, to use a homely phrase, were jacks-of-all-trades.

Many of them advertised extensively in the weekly press, and these appeals for custom vividly illuminate the social and

domestic demands and requirements of their patrons, and present striking pictures of the times.

The earliest silversmith of Connecticut of whom record has been found was Job Prince, of Milford. Very little relating to him has been discovered. Apparently, he was born in Hull, Mass., in 1680. He died evidently in 1703, for the inventory of his estate is on file in the Probate Court, New Haven, dated January 24, 1703-04. It includes a set of silversmith's tools, a pair of small bellows, a pair of silver buckles, tobacco-box, tankard, porringer, and six spoons. The Princes were evidently a seafaring family, and even Job owned a Gunter's scale and a book on practical navigation.

The next silversmith in Connecticut was René Grignon, a Huguenot, who had lived in various parts of New England and finally settled in Norwich about 1708, for in that year he presented a bell to the First Church there. He attained considerable importance during his brief residence, and, judging by the two pieces of silver still extant, which it is safe to ascribe to him, was an expert craftsman. He stamped his work with the letters "R. G.," crowned, a stag (?) passant below, in a shaped shield.

He died in 1715, and his inventory contained the usual stock in trade of a gold and silversmith. His tools he left to his apprentice, Daniel Deshon, who was afterwards a silversmith in New London and ancestor of the family of that name once quite prominent in that town.

Grignon did a considerable business, for debts were due his estate from persons in Windham, Colechester, Lebanon, New London, and Derby.

Next in chronological order was Cornelius Kierstead, a Dutchman by descent, baptized in New York in 1675. He followed his trade in that city until about 1722, when he appeared in New Haven with two other New York men and leased land in Mount Carmel and in Wallingford for the purpose of mining copper. They were not the first men to search for the red metal in that region, for Governor Jonathan Belcher and other Boston men had sunk thousands of pounds in copper

mines in Wallingford, and the net results or profits, so far as can be learned, were the holes in the ground.

It is perhaps needless to say that Kierstead's venture was not successful, but the incident apparently settled him as a permanent resident of New Haven. On the map of New Haven, dated 1724, his home is indicated as on the west side of Church Street, a short distance below Wall Street, and just north of the home of Moses Mansfield, the school-teacher, whose father-in-law he was. He was still living in New Haven in 1753, for in that year the selectmen placed him in charge of a conservator, giving as a reason that, "on account of his advanced age and infirmities, he is become impotent and unable to take care of himself."

In a few Connecticut churches we find examples of his work: a caudle-cup in the Congregational Church, North Haven; a baptismal basin and a two-handed beaker in the First Congregational Church, Milford; and a tankard belonging to Trinity Church, New Haven. There are also two other pieces extant made by Kierstead,—a fine punch-bowl and a large candlestick. He was certainly a most skilful craftsman.

The next to record is John Potwine, who was born in Boston in 1698, and followed his trade there until about 1737, when he moved to Hartford. For a time he seems to have continued as a silversmith, for three beakers made by him are owned by the Congregational Church, Durham, and two by the church in South Windsor. A fine silver-hilted sword is owned in Hartford, which was doubtless made by him, and probably once belonged to Governor Wolcott. In the recent silver exhibition held in Boston were several examples of his work, which prove that he was a silversmith of very high order.

He was apparently for a while in partnership in Hartford with a man named Whiting, and later was a merchant in Coventry and East Windsor, dying in the latter place in 1792.

Shortly after Potwine's advent appeared another silversmith, not of Connecticut lineage,—Pierre, or Peter, Quintard, who was of Huguenot extraction and was born in 1700. He was registered as a silversmith in New York in 1731, but in 1737

moved to what is now South Norwalk and there passed the rest of his life, dying in 1762. There is a caudle-cup made by him belonging to the Congregational Church, Stamford; and in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, are two fine beakers bearing his mark. His inventory shows that he also made gold and silver jewelry, rings, beads, and knee and shoe buckles.

New Haven, the richest town in the Colony, was evidently quite a centre of silversmithing. The map of 1748 shows that Timothy Bontecou, also of Huguenot descent, was located on the west side of Fleet Street, which ran from State Street to the wharf. He was born in New York in 1693, but learned his trade in France, and was certainly living in New Haven as early as 1735. He was the victim of an outrage by a mob of British soldiers at the time of the invasion of 1779, and died in 1784.

From 1770 to 1800 the junction of Church and Chapel Streets was a favorite stand for silversmiths. On the southwest corner were located the following men in the order named: Captain Robert Fairchild, Abel Buel, and Ebenezer Chittenden.

Captain Fairchild was born in Stratford in 1703. Shortly afterwards the family moved to Durham, and there the young man first followed his trade. He became prominent, representing the town in the General Assembly from 1739 to 1745; was an auditor of the Colony in 1740 and received the title of captain in 1745. He removed to Stratford about 1747, and in 1772 to New Haven, and, when a very old man, to New York. It is probable that, while in Stratford, John Benjamin was his apprentice. He was certainly a silversmith, but only one or two pieces of his silver-work are known to be in existence. It is said that he made the brass weathercock still capping the spire of the Episcopal Church, which was used as a target by a battalion of British soldiers quartered in Stratford during the winter of 1757-58.

Captain Fairchild was an excellent silversmith, and a number of pieces of his work are still in existence, including two tankards, several beakers, an alms-basin, two braziers, and many spoons. While located at the corner of Church and

Chapel Streets, New Haven, on land leased of Trinity Church, he must have been quite active in his trade. We find him advertising in April, 1774, that "he carries on the goldsmith's and jeweler's business at his shop adjoining his house near the south-east corner of the green, where he will do all sorts of large work, such as making of tankards, cans, porringers, tea-pots, coffee-pots, and other kinds of work. Those who please to favor him with their custom may depend on having their work well done and on reasonable terms."

In 1779, to vary the monotony of trade, he advertises a few hogsheads of choice West India rum for cash, and in 1784 he tells us that he has opened a house of entertainment, and has provided a new and convenient stable. The same newspaper announces, under date of November 26, 1794, that Captain Robert Fairchild, late of this city, has just died in New York.

His next-door neighbor on the west, and separated from him by a narrow lane now known as Gregson Street, was Abel Buel. He was a man of singular versatility and inventive genius. He was born in 1742 in that part of Killingworth now known as Clinton. He learned the silversmith's trade of Ebenezer Chittenden in East Guilford, now Madison.

Before he had attained his majority, he was convicted of counterfeiting, and confined in New London jail. On account of his youth he was soon released, but to the day of his death he bore the scars of cropped ear and branded forehead.

Like other Connecticut silversmiths, his activities were not confined to his trade. He must have moved to New Haven about 1770, and he was soon appealing for custom in the local press. He had already invented a machine for grinding and polishing precious stones, which had attracted considerable attention, and in recognition of this service his civil disabilities were removed by the General Assembly. In his shop, the old Sandemanian meeting-house, he had established a type foundry, for which he received a grant from the General Assembly.

In 1775 he was in some trouble with the Rivingtons, printers of New York, and had apparently absconded; but he soon returned and again made his appeals to the public. In 1778

he established a public vendue. In 1784 he advertised his map of the United States, which, he said, "is the first engraved by one man in America." His advertisement of 1796, perhaps better than any other, gives an idea of his activities:

"Mariners' and surveyors' compasses and other instruments cleaned and rectified, engraving, seal and die sinking, seal presses, enameled hair worked mourning rings and lockets, fashionable gold rings, earrings and beads, silver, silver plated, gilt and polished steel buttons, button and other casting moulds, plating mills, printers blacks, coach and sign painting, gilding and varnishing, patterns and models of any sort of cast work; mills and working models for grinding paints as used in Europe; working models of canal locks, drawings on parchment, paper, silk, etc., by Abel Buel, College Street, New Haven, where there is a decent furnished front chamber to let by the week."

The same year he advertised that "he has on exhibition the wonderful negro who is turning white," the authenticity of which phenomenon was vouched for by no less a person than Timothy Dwight, President of Yale College. In 1798 he advertised a useful machine for planting onions and corn which he had invented. In 1795 he established a cotton manufactory, which President Ezra Stiles, of Yale, stated in his diary would prove a success.

He was the coiner of the first authorized Connecticut coppers, produced in a machine of his own invention. His roving disposition carried him to various parts of the world, and, like other rolling-stones, he gathered no moss, but died in great poverty about 1825.

There are still extant various pieces of silver made by Buel, notably four two-handled cups belonging to the Congregational Church, North Haven.

The following story, gathered from the Colonial Records of Connecticut, shows that he did important work and was considered a skilled silversmith:

In 1771 the General Assembly, desiring to show its grateful sense of the many important services rendered by Richard Jackson, Esq., of London, who for some time had acted as

the Agent of the Colony at the Court of Great Britain, manifested its appreciation by adopting a vote of thanks, and appropriating a sum not to exceed £250 to secure some proper and elegant piece or pieces of plate to be presented to him. It was to be engraved with the arms of the Colony, and inscribed with some proper motto expressive of respect.

The commission for this work was given to Abel Buel, and he forthwith began to fashion the plate; but some months later, because of the certainty that there would be large duties to pay when the plate entered England and the fear that Buel would not be able to complete the work in time, the commission was withdrawn from him and given to a silversmith in England.

Just west of Buel's stand were the house and shop of Ebenezer Chittenden. He was born in Madison in 1726, and for a number of years worked at his trade in that place, removing to New Haven about 1770, possibly in company with his son-in-law and apprentice, Abel Buel.

Thirteen beakers and a flagon 17¼ inches high, made by him, have been located in Connecticut churches. He was a man of excellent connections. His mother was a sister of Rev. Dr. Samuel Johnson, of Stratford, father of Episcopacy in Connecticut, as he is called, and first president of King's College, now Columbia University, New York, and his brother Thomas was the first governor of Vermont. He was quite intimately associated as a skilled mechanic and friend with Eli Whitney, inventor of the cotton-gin, and for many years he was either warden or vestryman of Trinity Church, New Haven. He died in 1812.

On the other side of Church Street from Robert Fairchild was located the silversmith shop of Richard Cutler, while on Court Street were the home and shop of Captain Phineas Bradley, who was a skilled workman and saw service in the Revolution. His brother, Colonel Aner Bradley, was also a silversmith. He was born in New Haven in 1753, learned his trade there, and served in the Revolutionary War at Crown Point and Ticonderoga, and was wounded in the Danbury raid, 1777. He retired as colonel of militia. After the war he

settled in Watertown and followed his trade until his death in 1824.

Marcus Merriman, who was born in Cheshire in 1762, came to New Haven when a boy. He saw naval and military service in the Revolution, part of the time in the company of Captain Bradley.

His first advertisement appeared in 1787, and thereafter he was constantly asking for custom. He apparently did a large business for the times in his shop on State Street.

Thirteen of his beakers and a caudle-cup have been found in Connecticut churches, and his spoons are not uncommon in New Haven County. It is probable that he produced more silver than any other early Connecticut silversmith. He died in 1850.

Amos Doolittle, born in Cheshire in 1754, certainly began his business career as a silversmith, having learned his trade of Eliakim Hitchcock, of that place. He advertised several times that he worked in silver, but the greater number of his announcements had relation to engraving, and are of interest. He successively advised the public that he has published a mezzotint of the Hon. John Hancock in colors; Mr. Law's Collection of Music; that he does printing on calico; that he engraves ciphers, coats-of-arms, and devices for books, or book-plates, and maps, plans and charts; that he has published the Chorister's Companion, and that he does painting and gilding; and in 1790 that he is publishing an elegant print of Federal Hall, the seat of Congress, with a view of the Chancellor of State administered the oath of office to the President. He died in 1832.

Other silversmiths of the period in New Haven might be mentioned, such as John and Miles Gorham, Charles Hequem-burg, and Samuel Merriman, who all did creditable work.

In Hartford, after Potwine's day, perhaps the most skilled craftsman was Colonel Miles Beach, who was born in Goshen in 1742, and followed his trade in Litchfield until 1785, when he moved to Hartford and opened a shop about ten rods south of the bridge on Main Street. His first partner was Isaac

Sanford, and later he was in business with his former apprentice, James Ward. Spoons bearing his mark are found in Hartford and vicinity, and there are four interesting chalices, made by him in 1794, belonging to the Congregational Church in Kensington, Berlin. He saw active service in the Revolution, and he was chief engineer of the Hartford Fire Department from its organization in 1789 to 1805. He died in 1828.

James Ward, just mentioned, was one of a family of silversmiths. His father, brother, and probably grandfather, all followed the trade in Guilford. He was born in Guilford in 1768 and, as already stated, was apprenticed to Colonel Beach. After the firm of Beach & Ward was dissolved in 1798, Ward for a time continued alone at a shop about ten rods north of the bridge at the "Sign of the Golden Kettle." A number of silver pieces made by him have been found in Connecticut churches, as well as spoons in private hands. He was a good craftsman and, like other Connecticut smiths, did not strictly confine himself to his trade, for we later find him making and dealing in pewter worms for stills, dyer's, hatter's, and kitchen coppers, and various sorts of brass and copper goods, and casting church bells. He became quite prominent and influential in Hartford, and died in 1856.

No early Hartford silversmith ever used the advertising columns of the local press to a greater extent than did James Tiley, born in 1740. His first announcement was in 1765, which states that "he still does gold and silversmith's work at his shop on King Street, Hartford." This was the old name for State Street. Another notice says that his shop was a little east of the Court-house on the street leading to the ferry. When the brick school-house which stood on the site of the present American Hotel in State Street was blown up by a gunpowder explosion in May, 1766, Tiley was among the number of those seriously injured. For many years he pursued his calling until financial difficulties overtook him in 1785. Later he advertised that he had opened a house of entertainment in Front Street at the sign of the "Free Mason's Arms." He was a charter member of St. John's Lodge of Free Masons in 1763, and he

was also a charter member of the Governor's Guard, now First Company of the Governor's Foot Guard, at its organization in 1771. He died in the South in 1792.

Next door to Tiley in 1774 was Thomas Hilldrup, watchmaker, jeweler, and silversmith, from London, whose motive it was to "settle in Hartford if health permits and the business answers." He therefore requested the candid public to make a trial of his abilities, assuring them he was regularly bred to the finishing branch in London. He later returns his unfeigned thanks to those who favored him with their custom or interest since his commencing business here, their favors having exceeded his most sanguine expectations. Somewhat later his shop was situated south of the Court-house at the sign of the "Taylor's Shears."

In 1777 he was appointed postmaster and began a series of migrations to various locations. While occupying this position, it is related that Sheriff Williams drove up to the office one day and was informed that it had been removed. He replied, "Hilldrup moves so often he will have moved again before I get there."

Hilldrup was evidently blessed with a vein of humor. In one of his announcements he states "he has silver watches which will perform to a punctilio, and others that will go if carried, and he has a few watches on hand upwards of one year which he is willing to exchange with the owners for what the repairs amount to."

He died about 1794, and, judging by the amount of his inventory, he did not find later that the favors of a discriminating public exceeded his most sanguine expectations.

Other silversmiths of the period in Hartford were Ebenezer Austin, whose shop was on the west side of Main Street, a few doors south of Pearl Street; and Caleb Bull and Norman Morrison, the latter a grandson of Dr. Norman Morrison. Bull and Morrison worked in partnership, although one suspects Morrison was the silversmith of the firm. He was reared in the family of Captain Tiley. He was lost at sea in 1783, and shortly after Caleb Bull, who had married his widow,

advertised the silversmith's tools for sale, and says they are the most complete in the State. Captain Bull was a member of Hartford's first City Council, and was one of the first board of directors of the Hartford Bank.

At a somewhat later date Jacob Sargeant was working in a shop next door to the United States Hotel. His spoons are still found in Hartford County.

Middletown's earliest silversmith was apparently Timothy Ward, the son of Captain James, and born there in 1742. Little is known concerning him, and that little indicates that he was lost at sea in 1767 or 1768. In November, 1766, he made a will in which he says he is "bound on a long sea voyage, and may never see land again.

The Boston commissioners' records on July 10, 1767, announce the arrival of the sloop "Patty" from Connecticut, Peter Boyd, master, with Timothy Ward on board, a goldsmith from Middletown. Less than a year later, on May 2, 1768, his will was proved in court, and his inventory was filed, containing a list of silversmith's tools, which tell us that he was a craftsman of merit.

Apparently the most skillful of Middletown's silversmiths was Major Jonathan Otis. He was born in Sandwich, Mass., in 1723, and began business in Newport, R. I., where he continued until 1778. As he was an ardent patriot, and the town was in the hands of the British at that time, he moved to Middletown, and died there in 1791. Eleven of his beakers and cups have been found in Connecticut churches,—six in Middletown, four in Suffield, and one in Durham.

Antipas Woodward, born in Waterbury in 1763, began business in Middletown in May, 1791, taking the shop under the printing-office vacated by Timothy Peck, another smith, who was moving to Litchfield. Moses, the brother of Antipas Woodward, was running this printing-office overhead at that time; but the building was soon destroyed by fire, and Antipas then moved to the shop formerly occupied by Major Otis. He must have been an excellent silversmith, judging from a fine porringer made by him which is owned in Boston.

Other smiths of the period were: Samuel Canfield (1780-1801), who was also sheriff, and whose shop in 1792 was ten rods south of the town-house, and in 1796 a few rods north of the printing-office; his one time apprentice, William Johannot, whose shop was south of the corner of Court and Main Streets (perhaps the site now occupied by the Farmers and Mechanics Savings Bank), opposite Mrs. Bigelow's tavern, and who about 1792 moved to Vermont; Joseph King, whose shop in 1776 was at the northwest corner of Main Street and Henshaw Lane, now known as College Street. Apparently, his business was not a profitable one, for it devolved on Samuel Canfield, in his official position as sheriff, to make a number of calls on his brother craftsman during a period of years which must have been unhappy ones for Joseph.

In November, 1785, David Aird, with true British pride, announced in the local press that he was a watchmaker from London, and that he carried on the business in all its branches two doors north of the printing-office; whereupon Daniel Walworth, with due and becoming humility, informed the public that, while he was not from London, he was a goldsmith and brass-founder, and that he performed all kinds of gold, silver, copper, and brass work in a shop nearly opposite the printing-office.

About 1800, Judah Hart and Charles Brewer were working at the silversmith's business in a shop which stood at the northeast corner of Main and Court Streets. Two or three years later Hart moved to Norwich, and Brewer took as a partner Alexander Mann. In a year or two Mann left him, and began to manufacture guns. Brewer continued to do business at the same old stand, in later years as a jeweler only, and died in 1860. Spoons bearing his mark are common in Middlesex and New Haven Counties, and in the Congregational Church in Durham are three beakers made by him and presented in 1821.

It has been stated that some of the Connecticut workmen turned their attention to various pursuits; in fact, were jacks-of-all-trades. Abel Buel has been cited in illustration of this statement, and the activities of Joel Allen, who was born in

Southington in 1755, deserve equal prominence. He was a spoon-maker, engraver, brass-worker, carpenter, general store-keeper, and tinker, and yet he did excellent work. Opportunity has been given to examine his day book, running from 1787 to 1792.

In his shop he sold everything from pinchbeck* jewelry to castor hats, including spelling-books, Bibles, dry goods, groceries, drugs, meats, and hardware. In 1790 he moved to Middletown, and began to engrave for the silversmiths, working principally for Samuel Canfield. In 1790 he rendered a bill to the Congregational Church in Middletown for taking down the organ, adjusting and mending the pipes, putting in new ones, mending the bellows, and charged £9 for all this work.

He engraved the map of Connecticut published by William Blodgett in 1792,—an excellent piece of work. He made book-plates, engraved seals and coats-of-arms; he painted and gilded chairs and mirrors; and, when Major Jonathan Otis, silversmith, died in 1791, he lettered his coffin. During this busy career he found time to make silver spoons and jewelry. He died in 1825.

Guilford was the home of two excellent silversmiths, Billious Ward and Captain Samuel Parmele.

Ward, the son of William Ward, who was probably a silversmith, was born in 1729. Two patens, five beakers, and a number of spoons have been found in Connecticut marked "B. W.," and doubtless made by him. He died in Wallingford in 1777 of small-pox, whither he had gone to visit his intimate friend, Rev. Samuel Andrews, rector of the Episcopal Church, who at that time was in dire disgrace, owing to his sympathies with the British side of the Revolutionary quarrel, and was confined to his own premises.

Captain Samuel Parmele, who received his title in 1775 and saw active service in the Revolution, was born in 1737. He was prominent in Guilford, and was an excellent workman.

* Chr. Pinchbeck, London watchmaker, eighteenth century, invented an alloy of three or four parts of copper with one of zinc, much used in cheap jewelry.

In the Congregational Church in that town are a baptismal basin and a beaker made by him, and spoons marked "S. P." and "S. Parmele" are not uncommon among the older families of that vicinity.

Norwich, which, as everyone knows, was at an early date one of the most important and wealthy towns in the Colony, had a number of skilled smiths. Perhaps the most important was Thomas Harland, who was born in England in 1735 and came to Norwich in 1773, where he died in 1809.

In addition to the trade of silversmithing he was an expert watch and clock maker. In 1790 he had twelve workmen in his employ, his annual output being two hundred watches and forty clocks. He also produced quantities of jewelry, which is described in his advertisements as "Brilliant, garnet and plain gold rings, broaches, hair sprigs, ear jewels, and gold and silver buttons." His assortment of plate consisted of "Tea pots, sugar baskets, creamieures, tea tongs and spoons."

Among his apprentices afterwards in business in Norwich were David Greenleaf, Nathaniel Shipman, and William Cleveland, grandfather of President Grover Cleveland. Eli Terry, inventor of the Connecticut shelf clock, also learned his trade of Harland, as did Daniel Burnap, the expert clock-maker and silversmith of East Windsor.

Joseph Carpenter, born in 1747, was another enterprising silversmith whose shop still stands fronting on the old town green. In it was lately found an engraved copper plate from which his business cards were printed.

His name is surrounded by a graceful grouping of silver tea-set, cake-basket, mug, spoons, tongs, buckles, watches, rings, a clock, and a knife-box, illustrating the articles in which he dealt. At the top appear the words "Arts and Sciences" on a ribbon scroll, while cherubs floating in clouds hover over these treasures.

Other silversmiths working in Norwich were William Adgate, Samuel Noyes, Gurdon Tracy, Charles Whiting, Philip and Roswell Huntington in the eighteenth century, and Judah Hart and Alvan Willcox of the firm Hart & Willcox, Thomas C.

Coit and Elisha H. Mansfield of the firm Coit & Mansfield, and William Gurley, in the early part of the nineteenth century.

New London, another enterprising and wealthy town, had its quota of silversmiths. Mention has already been made of Daniel Deshon (1697-1781).

John Gray (1692-1720) and Samuel Gray (1684-1713), both born in Boston, followed their trade in New London at an early date. Two interesting pieces made by the latter, a can and a snuff-box, were in the recent silver exhibition in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

Captain Pygan Adams was the son of Rev. Eliphalet Adams, pastor of the Congregational Church, New London, succeeding the Hon. Gurdon Saltonstall when the latter became governor of Connecticut.

Captain Pygan (1712-1776) was a prominent man, and represented the town in the General Assembly at most of the sessions from 1753 to 1765. He was appointed by the Assembly to many responsible positions, as auditor, overseer of the Mohegan Indians, and one of the builders of the lighthouse at New London in 1760. He was also deacon of his father's church. He is called a merchant in the History of New London; but his father, in a deed of gift to Pygan in 1736, calls him a goldsmith, and Joshua Hempstead in his diary has three entries which show that, when he needed anything in the goldsmith's line, he patronized Captain Pygan. In 1735 he bought of him a pair of gold sleeve-buttons, in 1738 some plated buttons, and in 1744 Pygan replaced the broken mainspring of his watch.

Additional evidence puts him in the class of the best silversmiths Connecticut has produced. In 1910 a fine porringer bearing the mark "P. A." was sold in Guilford. A rat-tailed spoon and tankard owned in Lyme, and several fine spoons owned on the eastern end of Long Island, are also so marked. No other known silversmith had these initials.

John Champlin (1745-1800) also worked in New London, and evidently did a good business. In 1779 his shop was entered by burglars, and the list of stolen articles gives one an

excellent idea of the contents of a gold and silversmith's shop of that period: "12 strings of gold beads; 40 pairs of silver shoe buckles and a parcel of silver knee buckles; 3 or 4 silver plated and pinchbeck knee buckles; 6 silver table spoons; 3 dozen tea spoons; 10 silver watches; a large quantity of watch chains, keys, main springs, stock buckles, stone rings, jewels, broaches, etc." On November 30, 1781, he notified his old customers and others that, since the destruction of his shop by the enemy,* "he has erected a new one by his dwelling in Main Street."

John Hallam (1752-1800) was another enterprising silversmith. In 1773 he advertised, "At his shop near the signpost, makes and sells all kinds of goldsmiths and jewellers work as cheap as can be had in this Colony." He engraved the plates for the bills of credit issued by the Colony in 1775.

His inventory on file in the Probate Court contained the following plate: two tankards, a can, a cup, two porringers, milk-pot, pepper-box, sugar-bowl, punch-ladle, and many spoons.

John Gardiner (1734-1776), one of the family associated with Gardiner's Island, who fashioned the beautiful chalice belonging to Berkeley Divinity School, must have been a smith of exceptional skill.

Jonathan Trott, a Boston silversmith, was a skilful craftsman, and in that town are still preserved a number of pieces of plate made by him. He went to Norwich in 1772, and there kept the Peck Tavern for a short time. He moved thence to New London, where he died in 1815. His two sons, Jonathan, Jr., and John Proctor, were also silversmiths, and there is in Lyme a tea-set of the style popular about 1810 marked "I. T.," and probably made by Jonathan, Jr. John Proctor did a large business for the times, and much plate, both hollow and flat, bears his trade-mark.

Belonging to the Congregational Church in Middlebury are two old cups, or beakers, presented by Isaac Bronson and Josiah Bronson in the year 1800. They do not bear the marks of the maker.

* The burning of New London by a British force under command of Benedict Arnold.

These interesting vessels were probably made by some near-by silversmith, and the only man of that vicinity whose record makes it safe to assume that he was the craftsman in question is Israel Holmes, who was born in Greenwich in 1768, and came to Waterbury in 1793.

His house stood on the site of the present St. John's rectory. In 1802 he was engaged to go to South America by a silver mining company, and died on the voyage. His inventory, filed in August that year in the local Probate Court, contains a list of silversmith's tools, which shows that he was a smith of considerable practice and experience.

There ought to be many spoons in that vicinity made by Holmes. Joseph, Jesse, and Stephen Hopkins, and Edmund Tompkins at an earlier date than Holmes, were goldsmiths in Waterbury; but it is probable that their work was confined to the making of jewelry.

Joseph Hopkins's peculiar claim to distinction was in the number of times his shop was visited by burglars. Five times between 1766 and 1772 was he the victim of these outrages, either because his stock was of more than ordinary value or because of the enmity of some neighbor, and in 1780 his shop was destroyed by an incendiary fire,—a record of misfortune unique among Connecticut silversmiths.

Although there is no evidence that many of Connecticut's silversmiths fashioned articles more pretentious than spoons, it was probably due not to lack of ability, but to absence of demand.

Captain Elias Pelletreau, of Southampton, L. I., was a smith of excellent reputation, who fashioned many pieces of plate. His day book shows that he was called on to produce tankards, porringers, tea-pots, silver-hilted swords; in fact, everything that a full purse could demand.

At the outbreak of the Revolution he removed to Simsbury, Conn., where he resided for a few years. An examination of his day book shows that not once was he called upon during that period to fashion hollow-ware plate. His work was confined to spoons and the jewelry and trinkets in demand in that region.

This list of early Connecticut silversmiths is by no means complete. There were many others who did excellent and creditable work, and were successful and capable men; but a sufficient number have been mentioned to show that Connecticut has reason to be proud of the record, especially considering the limited field in which these men were obliged to work and the strong competition from larger and wealthier towns than were to be found in this Colony.

The question of high prices, about which we hear so much nowadays, was evidently as troublesome one hundred and fifty years ago. In the issue of the *Connecticut Courant* for August 17, 1767, a two-column article appeared, discussing exports, imports, and home manufactures, urging lower prices on all articles made in this Colony by artificers and mechanics, and complaining that they are eager to raise prices when prices rise, but are very slow to reduce them when prices fall.

Two enterprising gold- and silversmiths, Joseph Hopkins, of Waterbury (whose shop had so many times been broken into by thieves), and Martin Bull, of Farmington, considered that this complaint gave an excellent opportunity to gain a little patriotic publicity and at the same time to advertise their wares. In the issue of August 24, 1767, the following letter was printed:

“We, the subscribers, goldsmiths of Waterbury and Farmington, being convinced of the truth of the sentiments expressed in this paper No. 138, and sensible of the obligation that lies upon every person in this popular Colony to conduct so as will have a natural tendency to advance the good of the whole; hereby inform the public that (notwithstanding we have the vanity to believe that our demands have ever been short of any goldsmith in this Colony) we are determined to serve all our customers for the future, demanding only seven-eighths of our usual acquirements for labour; excepting in making silver spoons and silver buttons, which has ever been lower than the wages of most other tradesmen.

JOSEPH HOPKINS.
MARTIN BULL.”

It has long been a current tradition that many of the silversmiths were also blacksmiths, and the following reply to the letter by Hopkins and Bull shows that the tradition is based on fact, although it is certain both these gentlemen were skilled artisans and of good standing in their respective communities. In the issue of August 31, 1767, we read the following letter:

“MR. GREEN: In your last, two persons calling themselves Goldsmiths ‘Inform the Public that they have the vanity to believe their demands have ever been short of any Goldsmith’s in this Colony.’ Vanity indeed, with great propriety! When in the article of Gold Necklaces (in which they have been so celebrated) they have had a price equal to any one, reckoning the Labour and the advance on the Gold;—and it is surprising those gentlemen did not see into what a dilemma their expressive vanity leads them; for they ‘Are determined to serve all their Customers for the future’ at a rate short of the former—viz: ‘Demanding only seven-eighths of their usual acquirements for Labour.’ Why this alteration? Is it because they are determined to engross the business by representing to the Public that they sell cheaper than anybody else—Vanity!—Or is it not rather because they are conscious to themselves of having injured their customers by over-rating Labour done by Blacksmiths and Tinkers, and mean to make restitution that way; for they seriously express a sense of the obligation that lies upon ‘Every person in this popular Colony to conduct so as will have a natural tendency to advance the good of the Whole.’

“But for men to set up themselves for Standards for others, that have acquired their skill by hire of journeymen—it is to be wished the Legislative Body would pass an act that no man should set himself up at any trade without having served a regular Apprenticeship of seven years, and have a Certificate from his master. Then we should not see every Blacksmith and Tinker turn Goldsmith.”

“THE MICROSCOPE” AND JAMES GATES PERCIVAL.

BY JAMES KINGSLEY BLAKE.

[Read March 18, 1912.]

On Tuesday, March 21, in the year of Grace 1820, there appeared on sale in the then elm-shaded town of New Haven, a modest little sheet of four pages, denominated *The Microscope*. The name of the printer which appeared on the title page was that of A. H. Maltby & Co., No. 4 Glebe Building, but the only clue which was given by which the editors might be identified, was the somewhat mysterious announcement, on the same page, that it was “edited by a fraternity of gentlemen.” The price is moderate enough to be sure, only three cents a copy, especially when it is considered that it is promised that the paper shall be published twice each week, on Tuesday and Friday mornings, and that “each number is to consist of at least four octavo pages.”

The first number contained a statement by the members of the fraternity, outlining the policy to be pursued by it, which was in brief to be as follows: The paper was to contain essays on topics of every variety, but in order “to prevent the monotony of sober prose,” it was agreed that there should be interspersed from time to time, “the lighter and more welcome effusions of the muse.”

Its readers were further especially assured that the little magazine was not intended “to subserve, either directly or indirectly, the interests of any political party or religious sect,” for its editors had “no solicitude to increase the number of Presbyterians or Episcopalians,” nor did they “desire to fill the ranks of the friends or the opponents of the administration”;

in short, they proposed not only to live up to the classic motto which adorned their title page, "Tros, Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur," but also to do their best to stay the progress of the overwhelming flood of partisan publications which were "daily starting up like hydras from every corner . . . to poison the fountain of social and even of domestic enjoyment." Though this was the plan which they proposed, they nevertheless cordially invited their subscribers to suggest any improvements and agreed, as far as it was possible, to comply with such suggestions, with "this one reservation, that whatever may be the consequences, nothing irreligious, immoral or indelicate shall be suffered to stain our pages."

We could easily imagine, if the editors in the second number had not themselves told us, the trepidation of the fraternity when they had placed their little *Microscope* on the tables of the gentry of this college town, to be peered through by the critical eyes of that literary circle. They confess they hoped for success, like every other author, who "if suns revolve without affording any nourishment to his vanity, still flatters himself that when fable shall have thrown an obscurity around the present century, the future antiquarian will in some auspicious hour, light upon his volumes and present them to the admiration of a wondering world."

Let us hope that they were allowed to enjoy the praise their efforts deserved in the day of the appearance of their paper, even as I, in the guise of "the future antiquarian," am now presenting their volumes for your "admiration."

I wish for their sakes and for yours, that they had some better sponsor, and yet I am glad to be able to do this simple act for this fraternity of gentlemen which was actuated by no hope of financial gain for themselves in undertaking the burden of this publication, but solely by a high desire to improve the literary taste of their community and distract its attention from the party sheets above referred to as well as incidentally to add "to its stock of innocent and rational amusement." I say I am glad to do this slight thing for them at this late date, for just six months later, when the last number of *The*

Microscope appeared, the editors admit that they are disappointed in being obliged to suspend so soon, not so much because the paper had resulted in a financial loss to themselves “since the hope of emolument was not the motive that led to the undertaking,” but because they had learned that a paper of the character they had tried to produce did not appeal to the public at large. I am sorry they were thus disappointed, for they must have worked hard; and their noble ideals to publish a purely literary paper, without a comic supplement, is deserving of the highest commendation, and might be followed with advantage by some of our modern journalists.

As I have said, they write in their second number of the trepidation with which they awaited the reception of their offspring, and they tell of the places in town which they visited to catch any gossip that might be dropped about the paper, or its editors.

They first went to the market at the corner of State and Chapel Streets, but the only topic of conversation there was “the fall of the price of coffee occasioned by the introduction of rye into the economy of the country,” which sounds as if Postum had even then begun its attacks upon the comforts of the domestic breakfast table. From this they went to the Postoffice, then situated on Church Street, but here “mail robbers, slavery and steamboats” were the only affairs deemed worthy of discussion. Thence they wandered to the reading room (possibly of the Social Library, a forerunner of the Young Men’s Institute), where “Ivanhoe engrossed the conversation of the morning,” although they record that they overheard a dispute in progress between two dandies as to who deserved the credit of having invented the kaleidoscope, which only shows how metropolitan New Haven was, even in the modest days of 1820, for from an article on the London fashions of the period, elsewhere published, we learn that “Kaleidoscopes were invented in 1818 and instantly became the rage, everyone carried one about and thousands were sold.”

We often hear it said that in those good old days of early simplicity, the subject of dress did not occupy the thoughts

of men and women as it does in these luxurious times—and yet, if we may judge from some of the essays in *The Microscope* which the editors say was so named, not because it would enable its readers to see things “apparently larger than they really are” but “to examine them nearer than could be done with distinctness of vision by the naked eye”—we must believe that the dress of the sterner sex at least was a matter occasioning then much more solicitude than at present.

Two of the articles treat respectively of “Dandies” and “The Dandy Club of New Haven,” the last purporting to be written by one of its members, in which “corsets for the waist,” “stays for the coat,” “bracers” for the arms, “hippers, bishops and plumpers,” not to speak of “whale bone cravat stiffeners” and other bygone beautifiers are discussed with mock solemnity.

Corsets for men seem to have especially roused the ire of the editors and a petition appears in a later number addressed by the Ribs to “His Excellency, the Head and rightly acknowledged Governor of the Human System,” detailing the sufferings they and the internal organs of the body were made to endure “by a certain formidable machine designated and well known by the title of Corsets,” which the hands had made and fastened around the petitioners.

The over-fondness of the students of that day for display in dress is thus touched on in some verses contributed under the *nom de plume* of “Smoaker.”

“Let’s hasten, (sorrow is a passion transient)
To College; here I am afraid we’ll find
It’s pupils now what they were not in ancient
Times. The reason you enquire—as if ever
It’s officers or laws were better—never

The answer; truth compels me to declare
That learning now and science both must yield to
Fashion, whose blandishments the mind ensnare
And which in abject servitude they’ve kneeled to,
Were a professorship of taste erected,
The lectures would be those the least neglected.

* * * * Shall Yale renew the fire
Poetic, with resplendent lustre beaming
From Humphreys, Barlow, Dwight? Shall it expire
When Trumbull’s setting sun shall cease its gleaming?”

If the writer of these verses felt thus discouraged about the undergraduates, another author felt no less so over the lack of interest shown by the community in the affairs of the College, and the failure of the General Assembly and the public at large to help in easing its financial burdens; especially when he compared it with the “noble generosity which has been manifested towards the University of Cambridge not only by the legislature of Massachusetts but also by individuals.” In that institution, he says, “new professorships have been established on firm foundations, their library and apparatus have been greatly increased . . . and instances of private munificence have been exhibited, which have not been paralleled in any other State in the Union, but, unfortunately for Yale, it is located in a State limited in extent and population. The views of the inhabitants of a small independent district are usually circumscribed, and in no country is the truth of the observation more strikingly exhibited than in this State. Every donation made by the legislature to the support of this institution has been felt by the inhabitants for years and produced a groan which nothing could have elicited unless a direct attack on their purses.”

But in the end the author sees a brighter day approaching when emigration to the west shall decrease and the wealth of the country increase, and there shall be men, especially east of the Alleghenies, who shall have the time and means to devote their own lives to the acquisition of learning, or will give money to enable others to do so, or as the writer prophetically says, at that time, “it will become more fashionable for men of fortune to part with some of their superfluous riches, in order to acquire that reputation which those who evince this liberality, so justly merit.”

This article may not have been in vain, for perhaps it may have been this very appeal, published in 1820, that brought those gifts of Sheldon Clark of Oxford, Conn., to Yale, beginning with one of \$5,000 in 1823, and followed by others which amounted in all to \$30,000; Clark’s entire estate being eventually bequeathed to the College by his will, dated only three years after this number of *The Microscope* appeared, and

this seems all the more probable when we remember that one of his donations was for the promotion of Graduate Study, an object for which the writer especially pleads in this essay, and one which Mr. Clark, on his farm in Oxford, would probably not have thought of without some such suggestion.

Articles on the desirability of giving to Yale perhaps have so familiar a sound to our ears, that you may wonder that I have quoted one of them as part of my paper, but I must confess that this is not the only topic discussed in *The Microscope*, that is still before us. One from the pen of "Serena," on the comparative mental abilities of men and women, treats of a subject that is still debated with vigor in all well-regulated families, though the masculine claim of the intellectual inferiority of women is not always met as Serena meets it. She says, if it is true that women do not have the proper intellectual culture, it is the fault of the men themselves, for "it is in the power of gentlemen to make their female associates what they would wish them to be" . . . therefore "Let respectable gentlemen show that they duly appreciate a refined taste and a cultivated understanding and they will find them greatly increased" among the fair sex.

Poor Serena is greatly depressed at the state of society as it existed in 1820 and she thus exclaims in justification of her attitude: "Why is it that the indiscreet, volatile and uninformed Gloriana is the favorite toast of the day? . . . Gloriana is a beauty. But why is it that with all Gloriana's personal attractions, she is less a reigning belle than the coarse and ill-bred Victoria? . . . Victoria is an heiress. Since then intelligence and moral worth are no longer necessary to gain distinction in society, it is not surprising they are not more cultivated!"

I must confess, however, that I was not so much surprised at seeing gifts to colleges and woman's sphere discussed in these pages as I was in reading some verses published on July 7th, in which the then prevailing method of celebrating our nation's birthday was called in question.

I had supposed that the attempt to bring in a "safe and sane Fourth" was a modern innovation and yet lo, this movement

seems, so far as New Haven is concerned at least, to have started more than ninety years ago. Let me quote a verse or two from “Cleon’s” lines:

“Reclined on my pillow I courted repose,
 Yet thought of the pleasure which morn should disclose.
 How Phæbus his circuit should rapidly fly
 And usher upon us the Fourth of July.

But when nature exhausted had sunk into sleep,
 And fancy had ceased her long vigil to keep,
 Just then the loud cannon seemed rending the sky
 To welcome the dawn of the Fourth of July!

As the sun in its progress the morning revealed
 The bells from the steeples incessantly pealed
 And seemed with the roaring of cannon to vie
 In rendering vocal the Fourth of July.

But my country I blush—shall the day of thy birth
 Be distinguished by freemen, by revelling mirth,
 Shall the sober and honest with vice oft ally
 And in toasting and shouting spend Fourth of July?

Oh when shall religion diffuse its mild ray
 And mingle its light with the light of this day!
 When the bosom of virtue shall not heave a sigh
 But with pleasure shall welcome the Fourth of July!”

In the same way the so-called modern movement for Town Improvement also received the support of the little *Microscope* in its day, and a continuation of the poem by “Smoker” already quoted, details some of the things that needed reforming here in 1820. He first describes the methods of reaching New Haven and the landing on the Long Wharf, as follows:

“If you dislike the Steam boat’s fare or racket
 And choose a *smaller* evil,—take the packet

Which lands you on a wharf a mile in length,
 Of mud and stone and wood—these all uniting
 To render it a monument of strength
 Where pleasant walks and prospects all inviting,
 On Sunday after Church in pleasant weather
 Men, boys and negroes all walk down together.

There is a better promenade, the Green,
 And why do they not choose the best of places?
 Can’t be that Sunday they would not be seen

Thus walking. 'Tis not being *seen* disgraces!
 If on both sides the Wharf, stores were erected
 Its looks would be improved—but 'twas expected

That we should want the water t'other side,
 For once much faster was our commerce growing
 Than harbour mud: and vessels here could ride
 Borne on the buoyant wave then full o'erflowing
 The dark blue flats at times when tides were highest.
 O treacherous sea! that aid thou now deniest.

* * * * *

And now my heart begins to swell with pride,
 That pride which every citizen possesses—
 And they who seem to have it not, but hide
 Their feelings, 'tis hypocrisy suppresses
 That fond delight, which nature's bent pursuing
 Is always seen when we're to strangers shewing

Our Churches: when I wish to quench that pride,
 Attentive gazing at the State House does it.
 The Church's not half so gothic at its side
 As he must own, who for a moment views it
 (Mine may be easier quenched than that of others)
 The burying yard and State House are twin brothers.

* * * * *

The burying yard—which since 'tis past its prime
 To slow decay we without shame abandon.
 For not a fence, the sacred spot encloses,
 Beneath whose turf, our fathers' dust reposes."

Such an attack could not fail of results.

I have pointed out how Mr. Clark's gift to the College followed the article on Connecticut's parsimony. Can there be any doubt that these verses, published in May, 1820, helped to rouse the sentiment that in October of the same year caused the Common Council to appoint a committee "to inquire and report whether the ancient burying ground should be enclosed, or some other course be adopted to evince respect for the dead and the feelings of the survivors"; which committee duly reported later that "the conditions were a disgrace to the City, and in accordance with their recommendation, the old monuments were removed in June, 1821, to the Grove Street Cemetery, the ground was levelled, and the marble memorial tablet placed on the rear wall of Center Church, all at the expense of the municipality.

Thus you see our little *Microscope* can lay claim not only to the credit of having discussed many topics of interest in the short six months of its being, but also of having accomplished something as well for the benefit of the community in which it lived and died.

You need not think from the quotations which I have thus far made that *The Microscope* contains nothing but what is praiseworthy, or that it would satisfy the magazine reader of the present day for a steady diet. As we wander through its pages we are certainly impressed by the fact that the literary style and taste of that day has become as obsolete as the fashion of its garments and that all the decorations of its prose and verse, that then no doubt appeared so elegant, seem to us now as artificial as the “hippers, corsets and whalebone cravat stiffeners” of their authors.

The tomb occupies a much more prominent place in their poetical and romantic landscapes than in ours, and if we were to judge the authors from their works, we should suppose that they were one and all incipient Lord Byrons in the last stages of physical decline, who spent most of their time draped over the monuments of their departed friends, who were invariably cut off in the bloom of early youth, instead of being, as they really were, as healthy a lot of New Englanders as ever enjoyed a solid breakfast of codfish balls and buckwheat cakes on a winter’s morning.

Just listen to the following cheerful effusion, written by “Emma,” only a few verses of which I have space to quote, and which is entitled:

“LINES, WRITTEN ON A PARTICULAR OCCASION.”

“Clad in the tomb’s cold drapery
 Thy semblance glides before me now,
 I saw thee on thy silent bed
 Ere the first day of death was fled.
 Thy cheek was beautiful in death
 As when the rainbow vanisheth
 It leaves a soft, a tender hue
 Athwart the circling arch of blue.

Closed was thine eye, no spirit there
 Beamed forth to chase the Soul's despair.
 Thou too whose limbs unshrouded lie
 In dark Columbia's ocean wave,
 I hear the sea birds nightly cry
 Careering round thy lonely grave!
 And when the night is soft and still
 I see the mellow moonlight play
 On thy sad grave as murmuring there,
 The reckless waters roll away.
 This form (i. e. the author's) shall rest within the tomb
 That robe upon this breast shall lie
 Uplifted by the fitful breeze
 That howls above my cemet'ry."

Hear also these verses of doleful prophecy addressed by honest Tutor Wickham to Miss —— whom he compares to a rose, as follows:

"This may thine emblem prove
 Thou too may'st soon decay
 For not our fondest love
 The approach of death can stay.

His harbinger Disease
 Before thee soon may stand
 And all thy glories seize
 With pale and ruthless hand.

Thy form the funeral pall
 May hide in deepest gloom
 And tears of sorrow fall
 Upon thine early tomb!"

But let us turn from these gloomy themes that seem to have had such an attraction for our ancestors, at this period of our literary development, to some articles of a lighter vein, for by careful peering through the lenses of this *Microscope* a few cheerful spots can be found among the dark specimens like those I have just quoted. Here is a song appearing in the sketch of a village vagabond called Gabriel Gap, which has the real flavor of the old time Yankee Sea Ballad and which, in the story, is sung by a recruiting sergeant of marines, clad in his uniform with his pigtail hanging down behind as he sits in the tavern tap room. It is called

“THE TOP OF THE WAVE.”

“Tho’ now we are sluggish and lazy on shore,
 Yet soon shall we be where the wild tempests roar
 Where the winds thro’ the hoarse sounding cordage shall rave
 And fling the white foam from the top of the wave.

Yet soon o’er the waters the Essex shall sweep,
 As she bears all the thunders of war o’er the deep
 While the hands that are hard and the hearts that are brave
 Shall give the bold frigate the top of the wave.

And tho’ some among us may never return,
 His comrades shall sorrow, his messmates shall mourn;
 Tho’ his body may lie in a watery grave,
 His spirit shall rise to the top of the wave.

Then a health to John Adams and long may he reign
 O’er the mountain, the valley, the shore and the main
 May he have the same breeze, that to Washington gave
 In his cruise o’er the waters, the top of the wave.”

But perhaps I have quoted enough from *The Microscope* to give you an idea of its general character. There are many other articles that I might read from, to advantage, and other poems that would entertain you, but you remember that the title of my paper was two-fold and I must pass to the second half without further delay. But before I leave *The Microscope* to discourse of Percival I must pay a brief tribute to some other members of the fraternity, who labored so hard to uplift their fellow townsmen. As I have stated, the names of the editors were not given on the title page of the magazine as it appeared, but as I have not said, all the contributions are signed with fictitious names, which according to the fashion are either classical or romantic in their sound; for example: Alcander, Menelaus, Admonitor, Ephebus, Philoclericus, on the one hand, and Montague, Ludovico, Edgar, Theodore and Albert, on the other.

But history records the real names of some of these authors, and among the more prominent are the following: Judge Whiting, Tutor (Horace?) Hooker, Tutor Jos. D. Wickham, Cornelius Tuthill, D. L. Ogden, J. G. C. Brainard, Nathaniel Chauncey, J. S. Townsend, Henry E. Dwight, Dr. J. G. Hard-year, A. M. Fisher, and last but not least, he whose name

formed part of my title, James Gates Percival, or as he was proudly spoken of by later Yalensians, "our own Percival."

I am afraid many of my hearers never heard of "our own Percival," and how it would hurt his sensitive vanity if he did but know it, and yet in 1821, when his first volume of poems appeared, Edward Everett wrote in the *North American*: "This little volume contains the marks of an inspiration more lofty and genuine than any similar collection of fugitive pieces from a native bard. . . . He shares with few the gifts which make him a classical American poet," and Whittier wrote of him in 1830, "God pity the man who does not love the poetry of Percival. He is a genius of Nature's making, that singular high minded poet! He has written much that will live while the pure and beautiful and glorious in poetry and romance are cherished among us."

While these eulogies now seem hardly justified, Percival was undoubtedly a man of varied mental gifts. He was a linguist of unusual attainments. He is said to have had command of every language on the European continent except Turkish, besides Sanskrit, Gaelic, Latin, Greek and many of the dialects of India. He was also a geologist and botanist of ability and he believed he was also a great poet.

Some of his contemporaries, as we see, shared this opinion also, but his verses never appealed to the public, largely I think because they lacked genuineness and spontaneity and were essentially artificial. Lowell, who attacks him most savagely, says that while he might have made a good professor of poetry (for he is always telling us what poetry should be), he never could be a writer of good poetry, because he was not by nature a poet, and because he also lacked a musical ear, and in this Lowell is right. As we know, poets are born, and cannot be made even from men who are good linguists or geologists, even though they may have in addition, as did Percival, a gift of rhyming words, and can copy some of the examples of others, who really had the divine spark.

Professor Beers, who has written a sketch on "our Percival," was obliged to invent a word to describe Percival's poetry, and it is a very apt one. He says his verses are of the sort

that used to appear in those little gilded booklets, adorned with a steel engraving of "Emma at the Tomb" as a frontispiece and called "The Souvenir," or "The Gem," which always used to lie on our marble-topped center tables. For this reason, and for want of a better one, he applies to these verses the adjective of "gemmy"; and "gemmy" they most certainly sound to modern ears, and yet, as the most distinguished of *The Microscope's* contributors, and as one of New Haven's characters of bygone times, I cannot close my paper without a short account of "our own Percival"; as odd a stick as ever wandered beneath New Haven elms and wrote "gemmy" poems!

Percival was born in Berlin, Conn., September 15, 1795, and went to school with his uncle, the Rev. Mr. Woodward of Wolcott, against whom he acquired a violent prejudice, which, like most of the many prejudices which he had during his life, seems to have been unwarranted. Whether this is so or not, I am sure the reverend gentleman could not have deserved the following anathema, which Percival hurled at him in a poem called "The Suicide," which first appeared in *The Microscope*, taking up two whole numbers of the innocent little sheet, with its gory lines.

"Ye who abused, neglected, rent and stained
That heart, when pure and tender, come and dwell
On these dark ruins and by Heaven arraigned
Feel, as you look, the scorpion stings of Hell.

* * * *

Yes, you will say poor weak, and childish boy,
Infirm of purpose, shook by every sigh,
A thing of air, a light fantastic toy—
What reck we if such shadows live or die?

* * * *

Where minds like this are ruined, guilt must be.
And where guilt is, remorse shall gnaw the soul,
And every moment teem with agony,
And sleepless thoughts in burning torrents roll.

And thou arch moral murderer hear my curse,
Go gorge and wallow in thy priestly sty;
Than what thou art I cannot wish thee worse—
There with thy kindred reptiles
Crawl and die!"

Percival entered Yale in 1810, and there his muse seems to have been actively employed. Ever athirst for praise, he used to post his productions up on one of the buildings, or on one of the Campus elms, and then listen with eager ears to the comments with which they were received. He roomed, while in College, in the northwest corner room on the fourth floor of South Middle, and was considered a good scholar as well as a budding poet of promise. A Moorish tragedy which he wrote, called "Zamor," was accepted by the faculty and produced to an awe-struck audience at the time of his graduation. After receiving his degree he was invited to settle in Hartford, by a classmate, and believing that it was a literary center where his genius would be appreciated, he moved there and made it his abode for a short period.

Hartford did not, however, show that degree of appreciation at his decision that he anticipated, for though he was cordially received, his tendency to talk at great length on single topics not of general interest, in so low a voice as to be almost inaudible, militated to some extent against his social success, and he therefore promptly shook the dust of that city from his feet, and let loose the blasting breath of his curse on the snug little town at the head of sloop navigation, which he denominates "Ismir" in his poem, from which I only quote six of the sixteen verses:

"Ismir, fare thee well forever,
 From thy walls with joy I go,
 Every tie I freely sever
 Flying from thy den of woe.
 * * *

May the knell of ruin tolling
 Wake thee from thy feverish dream
 While the awful bolt is rolling
 And the hags of vengeance scream.
 * * *

When thy walls and turrets riven
 By that bolt to earth are hurled,
 Ruins share in fury driven,
 Blot thy memory from the world.
 * * *

Wrapped in gory sheets of lightning,
 While cursed night-hags ring thy knell,
 May the arm of vengeance brightning
 O'er thee wave the sword of Hell.
 * * *

When the flood in fury swelling
 Heaves thy corpses on the shore,
 May fell hyænas madly yelling
 Tear their limbs and drink their gore.

* * *

Ismir! land of cursed deceivers,
 Where the sons of darkness dwell,
 Hope, the cherub's base bereavers,
 Hateful City! fare thee well.”

Having expressed his opinion of Hartford in this unmistakable style, he no doubt felt that he would promptly meet with a correspondingly hearty welcome in New Haven, and he therefore returned here to take up the study of botany and medicine under Dr. Eli Ives. But, as usual, he found some disappointment awaiting him, for it is said that while engaged in these studies he was crossed in love, and in his despair endeavored to end his own life by the novel, if somewhat uncertain and laborious, process of hitting himself on the head with a stone. It is perhaps unnecessary to state that he was unsuccessful in this attempt, and when *The Microscope* began to appear in 1820, his head had apparently so nearly recovered from any damage he may have inflicted on it, that he was able to contribute some of the verses for which he had, up to that time, found no outlet.

To be sure it required some urging to get him to submit his first contribution, for it is recorded that when the Rev. W. C. Forbes, then Rector of the Hopkins Grammar School, suggested to him that he send some of his poems to the new publication, “though he confessed to some curiosity to see himself in print . . . he was as modest and as coy as a young maiden,” but after his first poem, “Napoleon,” appeared, his fear abated, and he became a frequent contributor. His poems at once attracted attention and emboldened by their success he published a volume of them in 1821, which was received with applause by many of the American reviewers, to his intense delight. It must have been quite a feather in the cap of the editors of *The Microscope* to reflect that they had introduced the rising American poet to public notice and Percival ought to have appreciated the opportunity they gave him, but when

a year later (in June, 1822), Percival had fallen out with his old friend Cornelius Tuthill, he spoke somewhat scornfully of the paper and its editor, in a letter to a correspondent. "I write," he says, "very small, because I intend to put as much on my paper as I can. If you cannot read it in any other way you must get a microscope, not the New Haven *Microscope*; for although the editor of that glorious affair calls himself my foster father in the Muses and, amid the many insults which his well-meaning stupidity hangs upon me, declares that, had it not been for his clearing the way by inserting a few articles of mine in his great miscellany, I never should have dared to face the public, I say notwithstanding this, I hope my immortality is not tacked to such perishable stuff. I am really ashamed to say anything of myself since my return here. I have been left entirely alone. There seems to be in the better circles of New Haven—if there are such—a marked neglect, a studied determination not to know me. But though they cannot value me, they cannot destroy my reputation abroad . . . I begin to think there is a difference between P. the poet and P. the man and that they can never be associated, without injury to the former. I suppose the keen-scented New Haveners have caught something about me, which makes them think I am not worth notice."

Indeed he had become so disgusted, that he went down to Charleston, S. C., and spent the winter there, where he was quite a literary lion, publishing his verses and returning to New Haven in 1823 in better spirits.

At this time he lived on Chapel Street, where Munro the Florist now is, which was then the house of a Mr. Johnson, and when the great Fitz-Greene Halleck, "fresh from foreign travel, fashionably dressed and of fascinating address and graceful conversation," came to New Haven, he called to see his brother-poet who never blacked his shoes, or indulged in any self-adornment of any kind, and after Percival's shyness had passed away, they enjoyed each other's company. Alas! would they have talked thus cheerfully had they known how soon the poems of both would be relegated to the same limbo of departed spirits.

I will not attempt to follow Percival in all his wanderings and disappointments; suffice it to say that he left New Haven again, writing in one of his letters, “I abandon New Haven. I have not a solitary friend here, not one congenial mind, not one whom I associate with”; that among other positions that he tried and gave up was that of an instructor at West Point, which he obtained through the good offices of John C. Calhoun, who said with a sad shake of his leonine head, when he was told that Percival had resigned in a huff, “Ah well, he’s a poet, he’s a poet!”

Several volumes of his works had appeared by this time, and being known as one of the great American poets, he was requested by an enterprising publisher to select from his writings a few of the poems which he considered his best, to be included in a gift book to be published under the alluring title of “Elegant Extracts,” a name more suggestive to modern ears of a proprietary medicine than a book of poetry. He chose the following: “Setting Sail,” “Address to the Sun,” “A Picture,” “Liberty to Athens,” “Consumption,” “The Coral Grove,” “The Broken Heart,” “How Beautiful is Night,” “The Wandering Spirit” and “A Tale.” How many of them have we ever even heard of! Possibly one, “The Coral Grove.”

In 1827, he returned to New Haven again, to assist Mr. Noah Webster in editing his dictionary, and though his knowledge of languages was of some assistance to the lexicographer, their labors together seem to have been accompanied by that friction that usually appeared when Percival lent a helping hand.

From this time till 1853, he was almost a constant resident of our town, and his slender, narrow-chested, stooping figure, dressed in the shabbiest of patched gray clothes, with a colored cambric necktie and an old camlet cloak wrapped about him, became a familiar object on the streets. Shy and sensitive, he slipped along, his dark brown head covered with an old glazed cap, which in winter was adorned with a pair of sheepskin ear tops worn with the woolly side in. Percival’s distaste for society seems to have increased to such an extent that he lived practically as a hermit. Ladies he studiously avoided, and he

admitted only a very few chosen men to his lonely apartment. His particular cronies were Dr. Erasmus D. North, professor of elocution at Yale, David Hinman, the engraver, Hezekiah Angur the sculptor and Edward C. Herrick the college librarian, and often, it is said, they sat and talked together till the early sunrise lighted the quiet streets of the sleeping town.

His favorite haunts in town were the college library and the Young Men's Institute, where he would pore over a book in some secluded corner, reading rapidly, and if he found the leaves uncut he would peer in between the folded pages and continue his perusal apparently without difficulty.

Up to 1843, he roomed on Chapel Street, next to the Lyon Building, over Sydney Babcock's store, and he took his meals at Bishop's Hotel, where the Postoffice now stands. I do not know the nature of the dishes he ordered, nor do I intend to cast any discredit on the character of the cooking in Landlord Bishop's hostelry, but as a voracious historian I am bound to record the fact that it appears that at this time the poor poet was greatly troubled with frightful attacks of dyspepsia.

The market for poems by "our Percival" I also regret to say was dull, and though his income from this source was eked out by editing various books, he had no ability to hold any position with a salary attached to it for any length of time, and so he was soon reduced to great poverty. In 1832, he writes to Prof. George Ticknor that his income is about \$65.00 a year! In 1835, this desperate situation was somewhat relieved by his appointment to make a geological survey of the State of Connecticut, but when he had rendered his report in 1843 he was again cut off from this source of income, which was small enough even while it lasted. "\$600 a year," Percival writes, "out of which I defrayed all expenses, travelling expenses included!"

I have said that the poet was very shy, and yet he seems to have mingled in New Haven society to some extent, and though it was often difficult to get him to talk, when he had once overcome his bashfulness, his flow of conversation would go on for hours at a time, in a low uniform tone of voice, that

was peculiarly monotonous and trying to his audience. On one occasion the savants of the Connecticut Academy were kept for hours listening to a talk by Percival on the geological formation of East Rock, until at last Professor Silliman with great presence of mind, as the speaker stopped for an instance for breath, leaped to his feet and adjourned the meeting *sine die*, an affront that Percival never forgave.

It is also related that on another occasion he kept James A. Hillhouse and a party of friends out of their beds until 2 o'clock in the morning, while he (doubtless remembering his experience with the Academy) discoursed without pause, for the entire period, on the advantages and peculiarities of hickory trees.

As I have said, his knowledge of foreign languages was extensive, and of some profit to him, and yet his study of German led him into one vagary which was hardly to be expected, namely a desire to produce the German songs he delighted in, on some musical instrument. The choice of the proper vehicle to express this longing was limited by his purse, as well as by his lack of musical education, so on the advice of the Hon. Benjamin Noyes (himself a performer), he decided on the unpretentious accordion. This was in 1836, when this instrument, now somewhat derided, I understand, by the best artists, had just appeared before the musical world, which was then still somewhat uncertain as to the possibilities which might be latent in its bellows-like interior, and yet Percival, we are assured by his biographers, mastered all its intricacies in a single night. “Never,” writes one of his enthusiastic friends, who fails to elucidate his remark further, “Never have I, before, or since, heard such music from an accordion!”

I have referred to Percival's weak voice, which was at times almost inaudible, and it is probably fortunate that this same lack of noise-producing power appeared in his performances on his chosen instrument. “The ear,” writes Mr. Noyes, in speaking of the notes the poet produced, “had to be exceedingly attentive, even when alone, to detect them.” This same propensity for inaudible music was not confined to his selec-

tions on the accordion, for he often entertained his audiences with singing of the same variety. At one time, at a party, he sat in a retired corner of the room, his gaunt form and melancholy face bent over his accordion, "his eyes full of the wild fire of genius and looking," writes this correspondent, "like a minstrel come down from another age." The expectant spectators supposing he had not yet begun, continued talking, but the concert was really in progress, and continued in the same purely psychical manner for some time longer, for, as the narrative continues, the poet's "soul had floated off upon his melody, and he had that sufficient reward that many a bard has—the silent rapture of song!"

Do not think I consider this little peculiarity a fault in the character of our strange New Haven poet; on the contrary, I regard Percival's attempt to educate his audiences to appreciate the delights of inaudible music one of his most praiseworthy endeavors, and I only wish the fashion could be perpetuated and adopted by all beginners in the art.

His delight in music had one good result, however, for it served to draw him out from his seclusion, and in the Harrison Campaign of 1840, he was one of the organizers and active members of "The New Haven Sing-Song Club," which rendered Whig songs at the political rallies in honor of "Tippecanoe and Tyler too." The verses which he wrote for the Club's use are far from "gemmy," and they ring true with the spirit of the genuine enthusiasm of an actual crisis, instead of being adorned, like his poetry, with the bogus sentiment that went with "bowers" and "dells" and "silent tombs" and other Byronic trappings that were then regarded as necessary for real poetic utterance and which it would have taken a greater genius than Percival's to have discarded.

Let me quote a part of one of these war songs which was sung to the tune of "The Campbells are Coming."

"Bold Tippecanoe has come out of the West
To deliver the land from a horrible pest;
A plague such as Freedom before never knew
Has fled at the touch of Old Tippecanoe!

The foul spot that darkened the roll of our Fame,
 The black lines recording our Annals of Shame,
 A proud hearted nation no longer shall rue,
 They've all been expunged by old Tippecanoe.

A hard work he'll have the foul palace to clean,
 But soon it all garnished and swept shall be seen
 And decently simple and plain to the view,
 Shall the House be that shelters Old Tippecanoe!
 No carpets from Brussels, no Vanity Fair—
 Nor gold spoons, or bouquets or ormolu there!
 Good stuff from our workmen shall furnish it through
 The Mansion of patriot Tippecanoe.

No parties exclusive, no Minuet Balls,
 No Levees à la Royale shall flout in his Halls,
 The string of his door shall be never drawn through.
 Always Welcome's, the word with Old Tippecanoe.
 No Banquets he'll give à la mode de Paris,
 No wines of great price on his board shall you see,
 But Sirloin and Bacon and Hard Cider too,
 Shall be the plain fare of Old Tippecanoe.

Then let us all stand by the Honest old Man,
 Who has rescued the country and beat little Van.
 The Spirit of Evil has gotten its due,
 It's laid by the strong arm of Tippecanoe!
 In the Front Rank our Nation shall now take its stand,
 Peace, Order, Prosperity, brighten the land!
 Then loud swell the voice of each good man and true—
 Success to the Gallant Old Tippecanoe!”

After such a stirring ballad there could have been no other result than the complete rout of little Van and a sweeping victory for the advocates of Tippecanoe and Hard Cider. But alas, for the uncertainty of human success! Just a month after his inauguration Harrison died, and at the Commemorative services in Center Church, the hymns of mourning sung were from the pen of Percival, which had before inscribed such songs of victory.

In 1843 he left his quarters on Chapel Street, and moved out to the Hospital, where he rented three rooms in the top of that building, which he occupied till about 1851, when he left them at the urgent request of the Hospital authorities. Here he lived the life of a recluse, splitting his own wood

behind the building, and taking his meals of crackers, herring and dried beef, in his own quarters. The furnishings of these were of the scantiest; a cot, mattress and blankets, but no sheets or pillow. The rooms were never swept and he kept the door tied up in some way with a rope; just how I can't quite understand from his biographer's account. Only a few chosen visitors were admitted; if any one else called, he talked to them in the entry, though it is said that when Longfellow visited him to pay his respects, Percival received him in the reception room of the Hospital.

His poverty was extreme, and though his shyness and eccentricities prevented him from making many friends, New Haveners felt proud to claim him as a fellow citizen, and excused his idiosyncrasies, as did Calhoun, with a shake of the head and the half pitying words, "Oh well, he's a poet, he's a poet!" And yet, in spite of this charitable attitude which many took towards him, I have no doubt he had many snubs, especially from strangers, which wounded his sensitive vanity sorely.

When Ole Bull came to New Haven in 1844, for example, Percival composed an ode to him in Danish, an achievement which the local newspaper, *The Daily Herald*, proudly announced to its readers with the comment "we have poets who can make the Muse talk in their own vernacular, but to endow her with the gift of tongues is a power confined to our fellow citizen," and yet, unfortunately for Percival, the violinist understood Danish better than the editor, and when Percival presented a copy of the ode to him after the concert, he only glanced carelessly over it and patronizingly remarking that there were only a few mistakes in it, he laid it aside without further comment.

In 1853, Percival left New Haven to make a geological survey for the State of Wisconsin. Either in his absence or shortly after he left the Hospital, some of his admirers built a little house for him to occupy on his return, situated on the east side of Park Street near George, but he never occupied it long, if at all, for he died in Wisconsin, May 22, 1856, and the house was subsequently removed.

Such, in brief, is the career of the strange man who was first introduced to the reading public of America through the pages of *The Microscope*. Like the paper itself, he failed to make the lasting success in literature for which he strove, but, like it, he never lowered his ideal, and like it, “nothing irreligious, immoral or indelicate was suffered to stain his pages.”

It was a period when our national literary style was affected, sentimental and often crude, and Percival’s poems and the productions of the editors of *The Microscope* reflect the times, but they were a gallant fraternity of gentlemen after all, men we all might emulate, “voices crying in the wilderness,” who strove with all the light that was within them to improve the culture of their times, and to offer some literary refreshment to the thirsty souls of their fellows.

Let us therefore, wish a happy repose to their gentle shades, and return *The Microscope* and the poems of “our Percival” to the library shelves, where they will again undoubtedly accumulate the shroud of dust which our perusal of them this evening has removed for the first and last time in many years.

THE FUNDAMENTAL ORDERS AND THE CHARTER.

By REV. SAMUEL HART, D.D.

[Read October 21, 1912.]

The government of Connecticut began with the appointment of a constable for that new plantation on the 3d day of September in the year 1635. Three companies had come, or begun to come, from the Dorchester and Newtown and Watertown of Massachusetts Bay to found places of the same name just below the head of navigation on the further side of the great river to the west; and those who rather grudgingly gave them leave to depart still took care that they should not be quite without the form of civil administration. Presently the authorities in the Bay issued a commission to eight men, two from each of the settlements just named and two from Agawam further up the river, at the desire (we are told) of those who were removing and who judged it "inconvenient" (that is, unseemly) to go away without any frame of government. It was dated the 3d day of March, 1636—before Mr. Hooker and his immediate company had arrived—and it was to hold but for a year. The commissioners were authorized to try civil causes, to punish offenders, and to make orders for the peaceable and quiet conduct of the new plantations. How far the Massachusetts General Court held that it was granting

NOTE.—The chief authorities and sources for this paper are the "Colonial Records of Connecticut"; Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull's "Historical Notes on the Constitutions of Connecticut" (Hartford, 1873); Governor Baldwin's "The Three Constitutions of Connecticut" (in Vol. V of New Haven Colony Historical Society papers; page 182 line 8, read 1645, new style); Judge William Hamersley's "Connecticut, the Origin of her Courts and Laws," in Vol. I of "The New England States" (Boston, 1897).

a power to be exercised under itself, and how far the Connecticut adventurers were ready to acknowledge responsibility to the Court which issued the commission, we cannot tell. Probably all knew that the three river settlements, as they were called, were below the Massachusetts line as defined by charter, and Mr. Pynchon had hopes that he also was outside of the Bay jurisdiction; probably the Connecticut "Court"—for so it was named from the first—would have declared that it represented those who had withdrawn by permission from under the authority of the Massachusetts Court. At any rate, we have no reason to believe that any one here would have thought of carrying an appeal there, or that any one there claimed, through the commissioners or otherwise, any authority here.

The first "Court holden att Newton" (that is, Hartford), of which we have any record, was on the 26th of April, 1636. But the abrupt way in which its record begins makes it almost certain that there had been one or two meetings before that date. The business of the day was varied: it had to do with the swearing-in of three constables, trading with the Indians, the ordering of strange swine, and the organization of a church in Watertown. Six more meetings were held before the year of the appointment of the commissioners had expired, at the last of which the three plantations were given their present names. All sorts of business was transacted at these meetings, as by one sovereign government, including the defining of "the bounds of Dorchester towards the Falls and of Watertown towards the mouth of the River." Near the end of March there was another meeting, the commissioners apparently assuming that they could "hold over."

But on the first day of May, 1637, the records begin with a new heading, "Generall Corte att Harteford"; and after the names of six of the former commissioners as present, we find, with the heading "Comittees," the names of three men from each of the river plantations. We do not know how they were elected or who gave order for their election; but there had certainly been the introduction of a new democratic element into the government, as soon as the jurisdiction was free from all

semblance of connection with the aristocratic colony of the Bay; and quite probably the feeling that a declaration of "offensive war against the Pequott" was impending, and that it would be necessary to make requisition upon the people of the several towns for its maintenance, suggested this provision for representation. (In April of the next year, by the way, Agawam was represented at the General Court by both magistrates and committee-men.) Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull quotes from a letter of Rev. Thomas Hooker, written in the autumn of 1638, which enables us to see how the Court was constituted. He says: "At the time of our election"—probably in March—"the committee for the town of Agawam came in with other towns, and chose their magistrates, installed them into their government, took oath of them for the execution of justice according to God, and engaged themselves to submit to their government and the execution of justice by their means and dispensed by the authority which they put upon them by choice." This falls in with the doctrine of Hooker's sermon so often quoted, and points the divergence of the principles of the Connecticut jurisdiction from that of Massachusetts; for in the latter, as Winthrop confesses, though "the people had long desired a body of laws, great reasons there were which caused most of the magistrates and some of the elders not to be very forward in the matter." On the 9th of February, 1638, the record closes with these words: "It is ordered that the General Court now in being shall be dissolved, and there is no more attendance of the members thereof to be expected except they be newly chosen in the next General Court."

There must have been an election, then, holden on or before the 8th of March, which is the date of the next record, at which eight magistrates were present and eleven committee-men; the twelfth "committee," a Wethersfield man, was fined for his absence "1s. to be forthwith paid."

This court transacted all sorts of business: it took up the case of an Indian's imprisonment at Agawam, and decided "to pass over Mr. Plummer's failings in the matter"; it made a contract with Mr. Pyncheon about the price at which he

would furnish corn; it gave orders as to the treatment and discipline of the Indians; it ordered 50 "costlets" to be provided for military use; it appointed Captain Mason a public officer, with power to train the military men in each plantation ten days in every year, "so it be not in June or July," and ordered that all persons above the age of sixteen years should bear arms, not tendering a sufficient excuse or being or having been commissioners or church officers, and provided also for magazines of powder and shot: and it made a rule that "whosoever doth disorderly speak privately during the sittings of court with his neighbor or two or three together shall presently pay 1s. if the courte so think meet." There was, then, evidently an organized government by a legislature and judicial court, consisting of two bodies of representatives, one chosen by the whole body of citizens within the jurisdiction, the other made up of four committees of three chosen by the citizens of the four plantations respectively; they evidently sat together, but we are not told how the vote of the court was taken.

Now all this was done, and a form of civil government was adopted—even if its permanence was not guaranteed—before the famous sermon or lecture of Rev. Thomas Hooker was preached on Thursday, the last day of May, 1638. The lecture may well have been, as Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull said, "designed to lead the way to the general recognition of the great truths which were soon to be incorporated in the Fundamental Laws" or Orders; but it is quite too much to say that it was the original inspiration of those "Orders." Mr. Hooker's "doctrine" in the discourse, as Henry Wolcott's cipher was deciphered by Dr. Trumbull, was three-fold: "1. That the choice of public magistrates belongs unto the people by God's allowance; 2. The privilege of election which belongs unto the people, therefore, must not be exercised according to their humors, but according to the blessed will and law of God; 3. They who have power to appoint officers and magistrates, it is in their power also to set the bounds of the power and place unto which they call them." The second

point of this "doctrine" has to do with personal duty and its motives; it is matter of exhortation; and it cannot be brought to an external test. But the first and third, that the people may elect their own magistrates and that the same people may also set the bounds of the magistrates' power, had been acted on already; and there is not the slightest reason to think that the congregation who listened to the lecture, including the members of the General Court, needed persuasion on these points, though they probably were pleased to have an apologia for what had been done and for what it was in their minds to do. And while there can be no doubt of Mr. Hooker's influence or of the direction in which it was applied, it certainly was not needed to move the people of the jurisdiction to act on principles of government which they had already accepted. Dr. Bacon's remark that the sermon is "the earliest known suggestion of a fundamental law, enacted not by royal charter, nor by concession from any previously existing government, but the people themselves," attributes to the preacher what the people had already accepted as a principle, having learned it perhaps from the minister of Hartford, but also quite certainly from the influential lawyer of Windsor.

We may be quite sure that the Fundamental Orders of the fourteenth day of January, 1639, did little more than put definitely into writing a rather complicated form of administration already in use, and also—no little thing, indeed—provide for a head of the government in the person of a governor; and this latter may have been thought by some to be rather a weakening than a strengthening of the pure democracy which had been founded. At any rate, on the day just named, "the inhabitants and residents of Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield, cohabiting and dwelling in and upon the River of Connecticut and the lands thereunto adjoining"—or at least so many of them as were thought fit to form a compact with one another, for their democracy did not imply universal suffrage—meeting together as one body did associate and conjoin themselves to be as one Public State and Commonwealth. Such indeed they had been; and yet it was no little thing which they did when,

with the help of a skillful mind and pen, they put their articles of agreement into writing. For, as has been so often pointed out, it was the first time in the history of the world that a body of men, recognizing no allegiance to any human authority, though they had been and might have held themselves to be subjects of a government which had an organized colony not far from them, constituted for themselves, in a formal way and with the impressiveness of a written document, an absolutely new and independent commonwealth. The commonwealth and the general court, indeed, date from a few years further back; but the "orderly and decent government established according to God," with duties and powers and restrictions put into writing and published, dates for Connecticut and for the civilized world from this 14th of January, 1639.

This Constitution, for such it really was, contained eleven Fundamental Orders; and in them we see so much either stated or implied in the records of General Courts held before this time, that we are warranted in believing that in other matters not evidently new we have the continuation of principles already recognized and acted upon. They were the principles of a true self-regulating democracy, assuming sovereignty and providing for its own perpetuation. The more important, for our purpose, may be thus stated. Once a year the whole body of citizens were to choose a governor and at least six other magistrates from a list put in nomination at a court held not less than six months in advance; a very ingenious plan, as it continued for many years, for securing reëlection of a large part if not all of the magistrates who did not make themselves specially obnoxious; for each person nominated was voted for or against severally in the order of nomination. Also, twice a year, before each regular meeting of a General Court, the admitted inhabitants of each of the three towns—Agawam being dropped out, as belonging to Massachusetts—and of each of such other towns as might be admitted, were to meet and choose three or four deputies to be members of the court; and here at any rate there was great room for freedom of choice and the possibility of fre-

quent change. Thus a general court of governor, magistrates, and deputies was constituted, having the supreme power of the Commonwealth. In case the governor and magistrates should neglect or refuse to call the court, the freemen might order their own constables to summon them and thus might meet together, apparently in a mass meeting, and have all the powers of the court; thus provision was made against any wilful or accidental stoppage of the wheels of government. Also—and this is an anticipation of a bicameral legislative body in a democracy, which has hardly received the attention it deserves—the deputies might meet by themselves before they went into the court with the governor and magistrates, to inquire into their own elections and to “consult of all such things as may concern the good of the public”; in fact, they might prepare business for the court and bring it in with the strong sanction of their agrément. But the sovereignty remained where it had always been, in the whole body politic of the jurisdiction. There was no recognition of any higher sovereignty; the governor—the only person, by the way, who was required to be a church member—was sworn to maintain all lawful privileges of this commonwealth, and also all wholesome laws made by lawful authority here established, and to further the execution of justice according to God’s word; and the magistrates’ oath was in the same tenor and almost exactly in the same words. In everything there was the calm assertion of independence, as well from Massachusetts as from England.

Thus was the practice of a few years, somewhat modified, put into writing to serve as fundamental orders or constitution for the jurisdiction of Connecticut; and under this form of government Connecticut continued for twenty-three years, undisturbed by changes which took place in the government of the Bay Colony or of England, a government by itself and for itself. Yet there were changes made in the methods of that government. Nothing had been said in the Orders, adopted (it must be remembered) by the vote of the whole community, as to any possible amendment of them; it might be assumed, one would say, that the same authority would be needed for the

amending as for the first establishing of so important a document. And one change was thus made in 1660, allowing the reëlection of the governor, which had been forbidden by the first of the orders. The court of April propounded the amendment to the consideration of the freemen, and desired that proxies on the question should be sent to the May court. The proxies, in the form of written or blank votes received in the several towns and sent to Hartford at the time of the election, approved the change; and John Winthrop the younger, who had up to this time been governor in alternate years, was thenceforth elected each year continually until his death in 1676. But in another important matter a fundamental order, or as we should say a section of the Constitution, was amended by a vote of the General Court without any reference to the people. It had been required that the governor or other moderator and four others of the magistrates at least should be present, with the major part of the deputies, to make a quorum of any court. In 1665, it was "ordered and adjudged" that three magistrates besides the moderator should be the number required for a lawful court. And at the same time it was required that to make a vote of the court there should be the concurrence of the major part of the magistrates and the major part of the deputies there present, either magistrates or deputies being allowed—it is expressly said—a negative vote. Thus the court became an assembly of two bodies, debating together but voting separately, and a great change of a democratic nature was made, and that without reference to the parties who were most concerned, the whole body of freemen.

Perhaps it has not been sufficiently noticed—though Judge Hamersley called attention to it when writing on the origin of the Courts and Laws of Connecticut—that the court of those early days exercised judicial as well as legislative functions. It sat as a "general court" for the exercise of all powers and as a "particular court" for the trial of a special case. There were particular courts as early as 1639, in which the magistrates sat with the governor and the deputy governor, but without the deputies from the towns; and we find mention of a jury

both before and after the date of the fundamental orders. The orders themselves say nothing as to the particular courts or the juries; it is evident that they were looked upon as a part of the former administration which had not been modified by the written law. In October, 1639, less than nine months after the orders were adopted, provision was made for the establishment of a court in each town, consisting of three, five, or seven of the chief inhabitants to be chosen annually, and to meet once in two months, with jurisdiction over parties living in the town in civil causes not exceeding 40 shillings; the right of appeal to a higher court was guarded. The office of these men was not the same as that of the townsmen or selectmen, though doubtless the same persons might be chosen to both offices; and there is no reason to think that they had juries in their courts. (At the same session, by the way, a beginning was ordered to be made for the preservation of a record "of those passages of God's providence which have been remarkable since our first undertaking these plantations," under the direction of the General Court; this was just 200 years before the renewal of the charter of the Connecticut Historical Society and the beginning of its active existence.) We have thus a true judicial system, the administration of justice, "according to the laws here established, and for want thereof according to the rule of the word of God," acknowledged to be, rather than placed, in the hands of those called magistrates, who sometimes shared this power with the deputies but as a rule administered it by themselves, lesser cases however being disposed of (when possible) in town or neighborhood courts. It may be that facility of pleading was found to be an encouragement of litigiousness, which indeed some have called a Connecticut failing from the beginning; for we find in the records as early as 1642 an entry declaring that "it is the apprehension of the General Court that the particular courte should not be enjoined to be kept above once in a quarter of a year." Five years later an addition, in form of an interpretation, was made to the tenth of the fundamental orders, declaring that for a particular court it was not necessary to have the presence of the governor or deputy gover-

nor and four (that is, a majority) of the magistrates, which was required when they made a part of the General Court; but that two of the magistrates with the governor or the deputy governor, or three magistrates when neither of the higher officials could attend, might hold a particular court. The sessions of this court, which dealt with both civil and criminal cases, became pretty frequent; in 1646 there were six and in 1647 seven, at all of which except one a jury was empanelled. The whole matter of juries was regulated by the general court in 1644-5. After a while assistants and commissioners were appointed for newly admitted towns which had no resident magistrate; and from them came by development, Judge Hamersley tells us, the "Justices of the Peace." A grand jury of twelve persons, called as a rule year by year, was first ordered in 1643, to make presentment of any misdemeanors they knew of in the jurisdiction; and in 1660, grand jurymen were appointed for the several towns, the number of which had increased to ten. Probate matters, with allowance of wills either written or nuncupative, were regulated from 1639; intestate estates were to be taken charge of by the "orderers of the affairs of the towns" and the goods divided "to wife (if any be), children, or kindred, as in equity shall be seen meet." In all this time the population of the whole jurisdiction was less than 1,000, and the number of freemen probably did not exceed 150.

Thus, under the fundamental orders and their expansion, matters went on, until the application for a charter and its grant by the Crown of England made Connecticut in law what it had already been sometimes called, a Colony of England. In the time of the Commonwealth no change had been necessary here; but the end of the Commonwealth and the restoration of the Stuarts made it a matter of prudence and of safety that this thriving jurisdiction, situated between the stronger and wealthier jurisdictions of Massachusetts Bay and New York, and exposed to the attacks of enemies, should have the protection of the government of the mother country. And the changes which had taken place and were impending beyond

the sea made it also a matter of prudence and of safety that this independent community should preserve its independence and continue to exercise the rights of self-government which it had so carefully and ingeniously secured and held. It is interesting to note that, as the practices of the years before 1639 were carried over, with some amendments for the better, into the fundamental orders, so the rules of these orders and the practices under them were carried over, likewise with some amendments, into the charter.

There is not time to speak at length of the petition for the charter, the draft of such a document which Governor Winthrop carried to England, the influence which he brought to bear upon Charles II and his ministers, and the way in which it extended the jurisdiction of Connecticut so that it included that of the New Haven confederacy. The suppliants prayed for a continuance of their former liberties, rights, authorities, and privileges; and these were all confirmed by that most remarkable document of 250 years ago, signed on St. George's day, exhibited to the commissioners of the United Colonies in Boston in September, and read in the audience of the freemen in Hartford on the 9th day of October, as to which one wonders how it ever passed the Privy Council or obtained royal approval. The people of Connecticut looked upon it as granted at their petition and accepted by themselves quite as really as their former constitution; they found in it a confirmation of their own free government, and they interpreted what they deemed "minuter parts" in the new documents in accordance with the former principles which were not contravened. It is easy to see how all this could be held and made the basis of action. The charter enacted the freemen of the Company and Society of the Colony of Connecticut into a "Body Corporate and Politick"; it ordered that there should be a governor, a deputy governor, and twelve assistants, to be chosen once a year by the freemen; and that the assistants, with the freemen or deputies of the freemen not exceeding two from each town or city, should have twice a year a general meeting or assembly; that the officers should take oath for the performance of their

duty, nothing being said as to the form of what is called "the said oath" or of a promise or declaration of allegiance to any external authority; that the governor and assistants assembled in courts might "make ordain and establish all manner of wholesome and reasonable laws statutes ordinances directions and instructions not contrary to the laws of this realm of England," nothing here being said as to the necessity of any royal or other approval or as to any way of determining the fact of a conflict with the laws of the realm; Connecticut interpreted the words to mean that any law of its own could hold within its borders, with the possible exception of cases in which England had made a different law expressly for this very colony. It will be seen that the General Court, which soon began to be called the General Assembly, was continued, that judicial authority emanated from that Court, and that the authority of the governor was somewhat increased.

The charter seems to have expected that all the freemen would meet in person before the assembling of the General Court, "then and there to advise in and about the business of the company" or corporation; and certainly it required that the governor, the deputy governor, and the assistants—these corresponding to the former magistrates and now twelve in number—should be chosen at the annual meeting of the company by the major part of the members of the company then and there present. It has seemed to some careful students, as to our present governor, that the charter intended to pass the real management of the Colony to the governor and assistants, oftener called the governor and council; and he notes that the letters from the Crown officials in England were generally addressed to the governor and council. Yet the charter did provide for the election of deputies, not exceeding two persons from each place town or city, elected by the major part of the freemen of the respective towns cities and places; and, as Governor Baldwin himself says, "Whatever the intention of its authors may have been, Winthrop's charter, when it reached Connecticut, was read as if it made the deputies of the freemen as full a part of the legislature as they had always been." And perhaps the

Crown lawyers meant no more by the clauses which imply that in some cases the governor and assistants might act without the deputies from the towns, than the people here were accustomed to see in the frequent sessions of the particular court. In point of fact this part of the assembly was presently, by vote of the general assembly itself, constituted a council, "to act in emergent occasions"; and though the vote was repealed two years later, it was re-enacted in 1675.

The assembly on the 9th of October, 1662, having read the charter to the freemen and declared it to belong to them and their successors, went about its business as usual. But first it put the document into the custody of three chosen men, directed the constables to collect corn from their towns "to discharge the country's engagement for the charter," ordered that the seal of the general court be retained as the seal of the Colony, accepted the submission of certain plantations and inhabitants formerly of the New Haven confederation, and declared "all the laws and orders of this Colony to stand in full force and virtue, unless any be cross to the tenor of our charter." In fact, Connecticut maintained from the first that the charter made no real difference in her form of government, and that this document was in reality in the nature of a contract, the Crown benefiting by an increase of territory, acquired by the labor and at the cost of the colonists, and also by the allegiance of a well-placed body of subjects, and the Colony gaining an assurance of protection and of interest in the affairs of the mother country. Thus indeed the preamble reads; and thus the rights derived from the charter were declared to be "sacred and indefeasible," and the charter itself was declared "to stand upon the same basis with the grand charters and fountains of English liberty." "This construction of the charter"—I use Judge Hamersley's words—"as a confirming grant by the Crown of the form of self-government already established by the people, was maintained with unvarying persistency, marked by shrewd caution as well as stubborn courage."

And the General Assembly had no more hesitation in amending the charter than the General Court had had in amending

the fundamental orders. The charter, (as has been already noted,) provided that once in the year for ever, the governor, deputy governor, and assistants of the company should be newly chosen for the year ensuing by the greater part of the said company (of freemen) being then and there present; and in this it followed what was evidently the original custom or rule, giving occasion for an ambiguity in the use of the term General Assembly, which sometimes means the personal assembling of the freemen and sometimes their assembling by their deputies or representatives with the governor and magistrates. This would serve as long as the freemen all lived within a few miles of the place of assembling; but at the date of the charter there were freemen of the Colony in towns as remote as Saybrook, New London, and Norwalk, and the number was then increased by the incorporation of the New Haven jurisdiction. Before this time the freemen of the remote plantations, as we know from the wording of a record in 1660, had been used to send their proxies, that is to say to transmit their ballots, duly cast in freemen's meetings and sealed up, to Hartford, that they might be counted with the votes of those who were assembled there. In all probability this rule or custom was continued, and the more readily because it had been a provision of the fundamental agreement at New Haven; at any rate, it was confirmed or reëstablished in 1670, and that in the very teeth of the charter, that all the freemen should or might, on the second Thursday of May yearly, attend at Hartford either in person or in proxy, and consummate the election of the general officers of the Colony. The method of proxy voting, which was held in the towns on the last Tuesday of April, was that the freemen voted first for governor, then successively for deputy governor, treasurer, and secretary, and the ballots in each case were sealed up. Then the twenty nominations made for assistants were read in order, the names taken first being those of the men already in office who were renominated or willing to accept reëlection; each freeman voted in each case, putting in a marked ballot if he wished to vote for the person named or a blank ballot if he preferred to vote against him: the ballots in the case of each candidate were sealed up; and

when all were counted at Hartford, the twelve candidates who had the largest number of marked ballots were declared elected assistants for the year.* The provision as to voting by marked or blank ballots is as old as the fundamental orders, and probably can be traced further back in England. The "stand-up law" was not passed until 1801.

Another amendment of the provisions of the charter, without authority from the Crown or even from the body of the freemen, was made in 1698. After the granting of the charter, the assistants or Council and the deputies had continued to sit together in one house, probably voting separately as of old; but now the General Assembly divided itself into two houses. The governor and deputy governor with the Council met as the "upper house," the governor or his deputy presiding; and the representatives of the towns met as the "lower house," choosing their own speaker. This act, though in the line of governmental development and (we may think) encouraged by the changes of the revolution in England which gave rise to modern parliamentary government, was in its nature revolutionary. It attached the governor to one branch of the assembly, that in which most of the judicial power was vested, and it removed him from immediate contact with the other branch, in which most of the legislation would be apt to originate. About the same time it was ordered that justices of the peace should no longer be chosen annually, but should hold office during the pleasure of the General Assembly. Both these acts, said Samuel Welles writing to Governor Fitz-John Winthrop, were expected to "strengthen the government, when they are not at the dispose of the arbitrary humors of the people, and yet subject to be called to account by the General Court." To us, the former change at least might seem in reality to strengthen the power of the democratic element. Certainly it seems to have been believed that the omnipotence of Parliament was

* This use of the word "proxy" is noted in the new Oxford Dictionary as peculiar to Connecticut and Rhode Island, and is marked as obsolete. Proxies, in the sense of documents authorizing one person to vote for another, have never been known in English elections or legislatures except in the House of Lords; they were discontinued there in 1868.

communicated to the General Assembly of Connecticut under its charter; and it would have taken much persuasion to convince the people of Connecticut that their legislature, or General Assembly, had not sovereign powers.

And Connecticut, rather warily to be sure, but very plainly, did under the charter and before independence of the British Crown was secured exercise sovereign powers. Its legislature granted a University charter to the Collegiate school of 1701; it issued bills of credit; it divided intestate estates in violation of the law of England though in accord with the law of Deuteronomy; it framed or assumed a common law divergent from that of England. Thus it claimed and exercised the powers of a sovereign, and to those powers it set none but moral limits. John Read, the great colonial lawyer, argued from a Connecticut standpoint in 1743, when he said: "God and nature have given unto mankind, or human society, a power of assent and dissent to the laws by which they are to be governed (those only excepted which proceed from absolute sovereignty); and this is the known privilege of Englishmen, to be governed by laws to which they have, in one form or another, given their consent."

At the time of the Revolution, which issued in the recognition by Great Britain of the independence of Connecticut and twelve other States, this State did not need to frame a Constitution. In October, 1776, the General Assembly, declaring that the King of Great Britain had abdicated the government of this State, approved the Declaration of Independence, absolved the inhabitants from allegiance to the British Crown, and enacted "that the form of Civil Government in this State shall continue to be as established by charter from Charles the Second, King of England, so far as an adherence to the same will be consistent with an absolute independence of this State on the Crown of Great Britain."

In 1784, a revision and codification of the laws being made, it was solemnly declared that "The people of this State, being by the Providence of God free and independent, have the sole and exclusive right of governing themselves as a free sovereign and independent state; and having from their ancestors derived

a free and excellent constitution of government, whereby the legislature depends on the free and annual election of the people, they have the best security for the preservation of their civil and religious rights and liberties.”

This action and this declaration were not submitted to the people, but they were accepted by them; and it was not till 1818 that the principles of the Charter of 1662, received from the Fundamental Orders of 1639, and reaching back to the very foundation of the Colony, were embodied in a formal Constitution.

BRITISH PRISONERS OF WAR IN HARTFORD DURING THE REVOLUTION.

By HERBERT H. WHITE.

[Read January 20, 1913.]

The inland location of Hartford, rendering it comparatively safe from attack, either by sea or by land, and the fact that it was an important strategic point, were not the only reasons for its comparative security throughout the War for Independence. In character its people, from the earliest settlement, have been courageous yet discreet, determined yet diplomatic. These are traits that make for peace and prosperity, and although in its history it has faced local crises or shared in widespread events of war, disaster or political revolution, it has remained unmolested, peaceful, and prosperous. During the period of the American Revolution, it was never entered by the enemy other than as prisoner, spy, or ambassador. Moreover, its loyalty to the cause, the ardor of its patriots, its generous aid in men and money, and the presence of such influential men as Governor Trumbull, Colonel Wadsworth, Silas Deane, and others, brought it into prominence early in the war.

These considerations undoubtedly account, in a measure at least, for its selection as one of the important places for the consignment and safe keeping of captured prisoners and suspected or known loyalists. Other Colonies bore their share of responsibility and burden, but I think Connecticut held a position of great importance in this work. The Continental Congress at Philadelphia regulated the disposal of prisoners, and as the General Assembly was often in session here with Governor Trumbull in attendance, the greater portion of those consigned to Connecticut were brought first to Hartford. Some

were later placed in other towns, but all were more or less directly under the care of the local Committee of Safety. The surprise and capture of Fort Ticonderoga, only three weeks after the battle of Lexington, was planned here in Hartford and financed mostly by Hartford County men.

We learn through Trumbull's History of Hartford County that "they borrowed money from the Colonial Treasury to defray the expense, giving their individual obligations with security. Their proceedings were carried on ostensibly without the knowledge of the Assembly, then in session, and a committee was appointed to complete the arrangements for this daring project. This committee selected sixteen men from Connecticut, who went to Pittsfield, where Colonel James Easton of that town, a native of Hartford, joined them with forty men from Berkshire County. At Bennington they were reinforced by one hundred men, and Colonel Ethan Allen, born and raised in Connecticut, took command of the expedition. The result of the attack is well known, but the initiative taken by Connecticut has not always been recognized. At the same time that Ticonderoga was taken, was captured also Major Skene of Skenesborough, a prominent loyalist, with several members of his family. They were sent to Hartford with Captain Delaplace, the commander at Ticonderoga, and other officers. The remaining prisoners, forty-seven in number, came later, under the escort of Mr. Epaphras Bull."

Captures from the enemy soon began to be frequent and numerous. The *Connecticut Courant* of August 5, 1775, reports "three Tory prisoners brought last Saturday from New Canaan and committed to jail." August 26, "A number of gentlemen were brought to this town from New York, where they were lately taken up on suspicion of entertaining sentiments unfriendly to the American States." The fate of the Ticonderoga prisoners may have furnished General Washington a suggestion regarding the disposal of some of the more prominent persons captured, whom he thought should be kept safely and treated humanely, because, at this time, by his orders, came also Major Christopher French (to whom I shall refer

later) and four others of his party, arrested at Gloucester, Mass., shortly before.

The following is a copy of the minutes of the Connecticut Committee of Safety, September 14, 1775.

"At a meeting of the Governors &c present—The Gov. laid before us a request and desire of the Hon. General Assembly of the Massachusetts Bay, communicated by the Hon. James Otis, President of the Council representing that their jails are generally crowded with prisoners, etc. and moving for liberty to send some of their prisoners into this Colony. And in consideration of the circumstances in this case, it is agreed and resolved, that altho we have many prisoners from the Northward, and much burdened in many ways, and are very greatly in advance, yet, from our great affection for the common cause, this Board do not refuse to receive some of the prisoners referred to, but depend that said Assembly will also apply to R. I. and N. H. Assemblies or Conventions for the same purpose and send as sparingly as may be; and those who may be sent in pursuance of this license shall be received in the Counties of Hartford and Windham for the present and until this Council shall determine otherwise."

In November, Governor Trumbull informed the Continental Congress that "Major Gen. Schuyler hath lately sent prisoners taken at La Prairie or thereabout and by his letter of Oct. 27th ult., informs me that he intendeth to order the officers and soldiers, with women and children, in all nearly 200, taken at Chamblly, into this Colony under my direction." From the *Courant*, August 12, 1776, we read of the arrival of a new batch of Tories, "between twenty and thirty," and it adds with apparent glee, "They are a motley mess."

In 1777 prisoners taken at Princeton and on Long Island were brought here, among them several Hessian officers, and later a number of Burgoyne's soldiers, Colonel Spade, a Hessian, being one. Others were Captain Williams and Lieutenants McFarlan and Smith of the Royal Artillery, officers Gregory and Stanhope of the King's Navy, Governor William Franklin of New Jersey (a son of Benjamin) quartered just over the line in South Windsor, Governor Montfort Brown of Providence, one of the Bahama Islands, Mr. Sistare, born at Barcelona, Mayor Cuyler and party from Albany, consisting of Mr. Monier, Postmaster, Lieutenants McDonnell and Dun-

can, Mr. Delancy, Mr. Hilton, attorney, and Mr. Herring, Mayor Mathews of New York, transferred later to Litchfield, Captain McKay, captured at St. Johns, Peter Herron, a Tory, and Captain Jacob Smith, taken at Long Island. All these are disclosed from only a partial search of the records. Undoubtedly many more were received here during the war who, with those already mentioned, made quite a formidable company injected into the life of the little community. Their care and custody, occupation and comfort, laid a full burden of responsibility on its citizens, for we must bear in mind that in 1775 there were only 5,000 people in the town, which then included within its territorial limits West and East Hartford and Manchester.

The prisoners arrived in more or less destitute condition, physically and financially, but all were made as comfortable as circumstances would permit, and the townspeople could afford. Some of those on parole were housed in private families, others lived at the taverns. They were allowed to go about within prescribed limits and they entered somewhat into the social life of the community. Some of the common soldiers were lodged in jail, but more were sent to Newgate Prison in Simsbury. In 1777 the prisoners from Newgate Prison were taken to the Hartford Jail and probably the Prison was not used again until 1780. At one time the prisoners were confined in the Court House, but on October 11, 1776, the General Assembly ordered these prisoners to be removed to other quarters in charge of Ezekiel Williams, Commissary of Prisoners (Sheriff).

To the townspeople the coming of the first captives must have been a great event. They had seen the companies of Patriots, some of their own kinsmen, march forth to war, and had learned from letters and the occasional newspaper reports of far distant skirmishes and battles. But here was a sight of the enemy face to face, comparatively harmless to be sure, in his present condition, but the real thing, nevertheless. They must have met hostile eyes as they walked about, and sometimes have heard uncomplimentary, perhaps insulting remarks about themselves or their king. They in turn looked down on the

populace as country bumpkins, rude and coarse, base traitors to the government of His Glorious Majesty, George the Third. But there were gentle people among both victors and vanquished and many evidences of warm-hearted courtesy were shown on both sides. In contrast with the busy, bustling life of our town to-day, that comprises, within the ancient boundaries, more than 125,000 people, it is interesting to look back to the simple village life a century and a third ago, its quietness disturbed by the excitement and alarm incident to the great struggle then in progress. Human nature was much the same as it is to-day; violent passion and hatred, exultant, boisterous nagging and teasing by the boys, suspicion and watchfulness, obstinacy and misunderstanding on the part of the elders, gentleness and warm sympathy at times by all.

The citizens who lodged and boarded these unfortunates could not be expected to bear the expense personally, nor were the prisoners on parole at all backward in asking for pocket money and other essentials. For instance, Major French demanded a daily allowance of 17s. 6d for himself and the gentleman with him.

The whole question was brought before the General Assembly at its May session, at which a committee was appointed to take the matter in charge, but it is evident from the following Act of the same body, passed in October, 1775, that if anything had already been done, it was insufficient to the needs of the occasion.

“Whereas this Assembly at their session in May last appointed Col. Wolcott, Capt. Samuel Wadsworth, Capt. Ezek. Williams, Mr. Epaphras Bull, Henry Allyn Esq., Col. Fisher Gay, Col. Matthew Talcott, Col. Jas. Wadsworth, Capt. Jona Wells, Ebenezer White, Esq., and Col. Jonathan Humphrey, a Com. with instructions at the expense of this Colony to take care of and provide for a number of officers and soldiers with their families etc., who were then prisoners of war in the town of Hartford, and this assembly being informed that such prisoners are now in this Colony and no provision is made for their confinement and support, therefore resolved that the Com. aforesaid be empowered and they are hereby fully authorized to take care of and provide for all such prisoners as are or shall be ordered and directed to this Colony by authority in the same manner as in said Act they are directed.”

The townspeople and others who had made advances in caring for the prisoners were afterwards reimbursed, as we learn in the account of the General Expenses of Connecticut for taking Ticonderoga, etc., rendered by the Committee in November, 1775. In this account are found the payments to

Ely Warner, jailor	£22-13-6	
Jennet Collier, tavern	12	
	31- 0-5	
John Haynes Lord	10-15-0	
	17- 9-0	
E. Williams, Sheriff & Com.	51-14-0	
	65- 0-0	
Patrick Thomas	1- 5-0	211-16-11
For boarding and providing for the prisoners.		
Doctor Tidmarsh	5- 6-0	
Dan'l Butler	4- 9-8	
E. Fish	1-12-0	
Cheaney	10- 0-0	
Asa Yale	19-3	22- 6-11
For doctoring, medicines and dieting sick prisoners.		
Stephen Turner	4-16-0	
Providing for and tending sick prisoners.		
Uriah Burkett	0- 6-6	
Digging grave for a prisoner (John McKuell, who died June 17, 1776).		

In 1776 Epaphras Bull was appointed Commissary of the prisoners of war in this State, to observe all the orders of the General Assembly and the Continental Congress, and to make monthly returns of the conditions of said prisoners to the Board of War appointed by Congress. This action probably settled the matter satisfactorily, as no complaints of any consequence were afterwards made.

We may readily imagine that the prisoners, especially the officers, who chafed under their paroles, were continually seeking to enlarge their liberties and kept the Committee of Safety and other officials busy in passing on their various requests and complaints. In October, Major French preferred a request to Governor Trumbull for permission to be removed to Middletown, "together with the gentlemen with him, who are of the same persuasion," in order that they might "worship according to the Church of England in which he was educated." The

request was refused because, in Middletown, was greater opportunity for escape, but they were told they could worship at Simsbury, where there was an Episcopal Seminary. The change to Simsbury was unwise, as we shall see later. They were, however, allowed sometimes to walk to Middletown to Church on condition of returning the same day.

Social life between citizens and prisoners did not always run smoothly. Sometimes the prisoners were suspected of hostile designs or violations of parole, which they hotly denied. They often treated the citizens with superior disdain, and it is not surprising that minor broils and outbreaks occurred. When the Colonial Arms suffered reverses, and their fortunes of war were at a low ebb, as surely they were at times, the prisoners became jubilant and insolent. Their boundaries would then be curtailed and they would be put into jail for safe keeping. In fact some escaped, by the aid of disloyal Americans; were recaptured, escaped again, and gave no end of trouble. Perhaps short sketches of a few of the more prominent may shed a little light on the times and manners of this stirring period.

As already noted, among the captured at Ticonderoga was Major Andrew P. Skene (son of Governor Skene), his aunt, two sisters, and Mr. Brook, who was looked upon as a bigger enemy to his country than Major Skene. The Major immediately petitioned the General Assembly for permission for himself and family to return to Skenesborough or to have someone care for his property there. The ladies were soon released and sent to Quebec under escort of Capt. John Bigelow. His expenses for this trip, 150 pounds, were repaid by the General Assembly. Major Skene was held longer, but was afterwards exchanged for Jemmy Lovell, a classmate of Governor Trumbull, and later delegate to the Continental Congress. The elder Skene figured quite prominently here for a time. I find a short sketch of him in Jones's "History of New York in the Revolution":

"Col. Philip Skene, or Gov. Skene, as he was called after his appointment as Lt. Gov. of Ticonderoga and Crown Point and Surveyor of His

Majesty's woods and forests bordering on Lake Champlain,' was a Scotchman whose wife was a descendant of the famous William Wallace. He was born about 1720, entered the British army at age 19, came to America in 1756 in the French War, was at the repulse of Ticonderoga under Lord Howe, and in 1759, was in command of Crown Point. In 1763 he went to England, got an order from the King for a grant of land, returned in 1765, obtained from New York a patent for a tract of 25,000 acres embracing a settlement, which he named Skenesborough. In 1788 that name was changed to Whitehall, its present appellation. While he was absent in England in 1775, Ticonderoga was captured and his family brought here as prisoners."

He returned to Philadelphia in June, 1775, and was immediately arrested by order of the Continental Congress as a "dangerous partisan of administration," was consigned on parole to Governor Trumbull of Connecticut and so remained until his exchange in 1776.

He joined Burgoyne's expedition in 1777 and surrendered with it at Saratoga, October 7, 1777. He was Burgoyne's adviser and was said to be the person who advised him to proceed direct to Fort Edward in preference to the route by Ticonderoga and Lake George. This insured the construction of a good road through his domains and united the waters of Lake Champlain with those of the Hudson. King George Third, in remarking on the plan of campaign, advised the Lake George route, saying, "If possible, possession must be taken of Lake George and nothing but an absolute impossibility of succeeding in this can be the excuse for proceeding by South Bay and Skenesborough."

Thus the canny Scot, though openly loyal to His Gracious Majesty, sought to enrich himself without personal expense by the opportune use of the King's soldiers. The arduous work delayed and weakened Burgoyne's Army so greatly as to become no small factor in its later disaster.

During his sojourn in Hartford, Governor Skene was not popular, as the *Courant*, October 16, 1775, would indicate by this item of news:

"It is reported that General Washington a few days ago sent in a Flag of Truce to Boston, proposing the exchange of prisoners. Maj. French for Col. Parker, Lt. Knight of the Navy for Capt. Scott, and His Excel-

lency Gov. Skene for *Corporal* Guile of Capt. Doude's Co. of riflemen. The two former were accepted with readiness, but the last exchange, General Gage rejected with scorn as an insult to his understanding, so that in all probability we shall have the honor of His Excellency, Gov. Skene's residence among us—God knows how long."

It is, however, from the diary of Major French, left behind when he escaped in December, 1776, that we are able to cull information concerning the life and feeling among the townspeople and their treatment of prisoners. The *Courant* from time to time, however, gives us another side of the picture.

Major French appears to have been a middle-aged, sentimental Irish gentleman, small in stature, of considerable refinement and culture, ardent in his loyalty to his King, somewhat hot-headed at times, assuming military and paternal command over other officers imprisoned here, insistent on his rights, obstinate to an unnecessary degree, a genial companion among his equals and warm-hearted and sympathetic to those in trouble. His diary begins January 1, 1776, about eight months after his capture and four months after his arrival here.

He and four others, Ensign Rotton, Terence McDermott, volunteer, and Goldthorp and Allen, privates, arrived at Gloucester, having sailed from Cork early in 1775. They brought a quantity of clothing intended for General Gage's Army in Boston. They were arrested as they landed and sent to the Committee of Safety at Philadelphia, who, having obtained their paroles, ordered them transferred to General Washington at Cambridge. They set out under escort of Captain Webb, aid-de-camp to General Putnam. The Committee of Safety probably had in mind the possibility of an exchange for one or more of the Patriots imprisoned in Boston. General Gage, however rejected all proposals and French was then consigned to Hartford. His parole read as follows:

"Christopher French, Major of his Majesty's 22d Regiment of Foot, a prisoner in the power of the Com. of Safety for the Province of Pa., and being kindly treated and protected by them and enlarged on parole, do hereby solemnly promise and engage, on the honor of a soldier and a gentleman, that I will not bear arms against the American United Colonies in any manner whatever for the space of twelve months, or until I may

be exchanged; nor will I during that time, take any measures to give intelligence to General Gage or the British Ministry or to any person or persons whatever, relative to American affairs, but will proceed with all convenient expedition to General Washington and submit myself to his further directions; and that I will not directly or indirectly attempt to procure any person or persons whatever to rescue me, and that I will not go on board any British ship of war during the continuance of my engagement not to bear arms."

His exchange, apparently acceptable in October, 1775, as above noted, was not made, and he therefore remained here, an unwilling prisoner for seventeen months. French soon got into trouble with the authorities on the question of wearing his sword and on some other matters. The dispute became so heated as to call forth letters to General Washington from both the Committee of Safety and the haughty Major. Washington's answer shows that nobility of character so justly attributed to him. It reads as follows:

*"Gentlemen:—*Your favor of the 18th instant and one from Maj. French on the same subject have come safely to our hand. From the general character of this gentleman and the acknowledged politeness and attention of the Com. of Hartford to the gentlemen entrusted to their care, I flatter myself there would have been a mutual emulation of civility, which would have resulted in the ease and convenience of both. I am extremely sorry to find it otherwise. Upon reperusal of former letters respecting this gentleman, I cannot think there is anything particular in their situation which can challenge a distinction. If the circumstances of wearing their swords had created no dissatisfaction I should not have interfered, considering it in itself a matter of indifference. But as it has given offence, partly perhaps by the inadvertent expressions which have been dropped on this occasion, I persuade myself that Maj. French, for the sake of his own convenience and ease and to save me farther trouble, will concede to what is not essential either to his comfort or happiness farther than mere opinion makes it so. On the other hand, allow me to recommend a gentleness even to forbearance with persons so entirely in our power. We know not what the chance of war may be, but let it be what it will, the duties of humanity and kindness will demand from us such a treatment as we should expect from others, the ease being reversed. I am, gentlemen, your very obedient and most humble servant.

GEORGE WASHINGTON."

About the time French begins his diary, he spent an evening with Gen. Charles Lee, a soldier of unpleasant memory, who spent several days in Hartford in January, 1776. Washing-

ton had ordered Lee to proceed from Cambridge to Connecticut to recruit fresh troops and to march to the vicinity of New York to watch and intercept General Clinton, should he try to disembark his army. French persuaded Lee to write a letter to General Washington to grant him liberty to go to Ireland on his parole, but Washington, February 10, 1776, declined to grant the request, rebuked French for making it, and suggested that he "compare his situation with gentlemen of ours, who by the fortunes of war, had fallen into the hands of their enemies. What has been their treatment? Thrown into loathsome prison and afterwards sent in irons to England—and then say whether he has cause to repine his fate." Washington probably was referring to Ethan Allen's fate.

In French's diary, May 10, we find the following letter to General Lee, which, though somewhat involved in one or two sentences, exhibits a delicious sense of flattery and sarcasm:

"*Sir*:—No doubt you remember that when you passed through this place in Jan. last, you made a bet of ten guineas with me that Quebec would be taken by the Provincials in the course of the current winter. That event has not happened (nor is there now the least prospect that it ever will, as there are accounts, not only of its having been re-inforced by a part of His Majesty's fleet and a large body of his troops, but that his Excellency, General Carlton has drove them entirely from before it) and indeed your own papers, unaccustomed as they are to communicate to the public anything which argues against their successes, have lately inserted some very desponding letters from that quarter; they also regret that you was not sent to command them, and though, as you are become our enemy, I cannot be so gross as to wish you had with success, yet I am not so much yours as to envy you the honor you might have acquired by a well-concerted retreat, which though you might not have affected, yet I know you would have attempted, a circumstance which, from your being at the head of raw and undisciplined forces, could only have added to the brilliancy of your measures. You will please direct Mr. Lawrence, Treasurer here to pay me, which will much oblige, Sir, Yours most etc.

C. F."

Peculiar interest attaches to this letter in the exhibit of the craven spirit of Lee under the keen insight of Major French. If we lay the letter alongside the record of Lee's behavior at Monmouth more than two years later, the characterization appears almost prophetic. Lee, in charge of the advance

column, under specific orders from Washington to attack, reached a position from which it could be made with every promise of brilliant success. Suddenly, without apparent reason, he ordered (attempted) "a well concerted retreat" which "he did not effect" wholly because the quickwitted Lafayette, realizing the significance of the movement, informed Washington, who immediately hurried to the front, deposed the cowardly Lee from his command, restored order and spirit to the soldiers, and saved the day. Washington's anger was probably never stronger nor more thoroughly justified than on this occasion. It is to be regretted that the patriots did not discern General Lee's character as readily as did Major French.

The defeat of General Montgomery at Quebec in December became known in Hartford about the middle of January, 1776. It stirred the populace to wild excitement and they looked for any excuse for expressing their rage and resentment. Major French describes in his diary a lively and somewhat thrilling experience with a small band of patriots.

"Tuesday, 16 January, '76. An account came of the defeat of Gen'l Montgomery at Quebec on the 31st of December, between the hours of four and six in the morning, in which he was killed and his Second in Command (Arnold) wounded, etc. This day we all, viz. Capt. McKay, Messrs. Rotton and McDermott, and I went, according to a prior agreement, to dine with Gov. Skene, who is a prisoner of war in the West Division, five miles from us, in a sled. Capt. McKay drove us, and as is customary, hallooed a good deal to the horses, which we did not conceive could give umbrage or have any bad consequences.

"In the evening whilst we were playing at whist for our amusement, we were informed that upwards of 20 men were assembled at a house immediately opposite to us, who were determined to attack us because they said we were come there to make merry and rejoice at their misfortune at Quebec. We retired to an upper room, in number five, (viz. Gov. Skene, Capt. McKay, and his servant, Ensign Rotton, and I. McDermott had returned to town upon some business or amusement of his own) determined to defend ourselves to the last and to die rather than be insulted. We sent a negro man* to the house to find out what was doing, who soon returned and told us the Capt. of the Militia (one Sedgwick) was endeavoring to persuade them to desist, and that he believed he would succeed. In a short time the woman of the house (who was greatly frightened) went out and at her return told us they had dispersed."

* Presumably Gov. Skene's slave.

Thus ended this affair happily without bloodshed, but it seems the infection spread, for on

“Wednesday 17th January, four of the Committee came to us and told us that thirty or forty of the populace at Hartford had assembled with a resolution to come out and insult us and had gone so far as to say that if they, the Committee, did not do their duty, they would. They proposed that we should return to Hartford to quiet the minds of the people, to which we readily consented, telling them we should be sorry to be the occasion of any commotion. Three people came on horseback to meet us and turned back as if to escort us in triumph. Last night a paper was fixed up at the meeting house door and another at the State House, the words of which were taken from the 4th verse of the 58th Chapter of Isaiah, viz. ‘Behold ye fast for strife and debate and to smite with the fist of wickedness. Ye shall not fast as ye do this day to make your voice to be heard on high.’* This was imputed to us, and they said McDermott, who, as has been observed came in that night, was sent in to put the papers up. I should have observed that Capt. McKay’s calling to the horses was interpreted into shouts of triumph for their defeat.”

We have all heard of the custom of the Negroes of Connecticut in Colonial days of electing one of their own race as Governor over them. This occurrence was so unusual to a stranger like French that he makes note of it, referring also to that annual event of former Connecticut life that, even as late as my own boyhood time, was called “Election Day.” In his diary, May 9th, we read,

“The election of a governor etc. came on when the old one (Trumbull) was reëlected, he marched in great state, escorted by his guards† in scarlet turned up with black, to the State House and from thence to the meeting house. The next day the negroes, according to their custom elected a governor for themselves, when John Anderson, Gov. Skene’s black man was chosen. At night he gave a supper and ball‡ to a number of his electors, who were very merry and danced till about three o’clock in the morning.”

The election of Governor Skene’s Negro naturally created a strong suspicion of a plot on the part of the British officers here. Governor Skene was closely questioned and his lodgings searched for any evidence, but none was found and he hotly

* This was a Fast Day by order of the Provincial Assembly.

† These were our own dear Foot Guard, then only five years old.

‡ This supper and ball were given at Knox’s tavern, where French lived.

denied the existence of any hostile move. The Negro also confessed ignorance of any disloyal purpose, and declared that another Negro suggested his appointment and he entered into the suggestion as a piece of diversion. It had cost him \$25. As no plot was discovered, the fears of the people were dispelled.

The stir over the supposed loyalist Negro plot had no more than quieted when, on the 20th of May, French writes:

"The meeting and schoolhouse bells were rung before 5 o'clock this morning by one Watson, Printer* and one Tucker in order to raise a mob to send us all to jail; they assembled accordingly and forming a committee of their own, sent them to the Town Committee, then sitting for that purpose, but were pacified by these last."

The Committee in these stirring times certainly did not find life one continuous round of joy and pleasure.

The grievance of Watson and Tucker may have been due to the fact that French had tried to shield a prisoner, who was charged with speaking disrespectfully of the Continental Congress. He also had a spirited conversation with General Lee (when he was here), replying to the charge that Parliament was composed of a set of rascals, said that not an individual in Parliament was so great a rascal as the Continental Congress, individually and collectively. The Committee (of patriots) were also charged by him with the intention of obliging the soldiers (prisoners) to work at building powder mills, making powder, saltpetre, arms of any sort, and casting of cannon and shot.

This the Committee, however, publicly denied and expressed the opinion that it would be unsafe to employ the prisoners in any work of this nature.

May 18th Captain McKay broke jail and escaped, but was soon caught. We find two accounts of the event. Major French said,

"22d May Capt. McKay, who left 18th May was caught at Lanesboro, four miles from Pittsfield, Mass., brought back. He was beaten and bruised by his captors."

* Of the *Connecticut Courant*.

Now from the *Courant*:

“The infamous Capt. McKay, who is so lost to every principle of honor as to violate his parole and endeavor to make his escape, as mentioned in our last, was last Monday apprehended and taken by a number of gentlemen at Lanesborough in Berkshire County, and on Wednesday following, was safely brought to this town and lodged in the common gaol. His servant, McFarland, together with a certain John Graves of Pittsfield, were likewise taken with him and both were committed to prison. Graves is an inhabitant of Pittsfield, in the province of Mass. Bay, where he has considerable property; but, being instigated by the devil and his own wicked heart, he had undertaken to pilot Capt. McKay to Albany, and had promised fresh horses at proper stages on the road, to expedite his flight. Query: What does the last mentioned villain deserve?”

Also from the same issue of the *Courant*:

“Last Thursday Gov. Skene, who has been some time past in this town, was committed to gaol by order of the Committee for the Prisoners, for refusing to sign his parole.”

The narrative of events for the next few months can perhaps best be told in French’s own words, with what additional information is supplied by the *Courant*. Continuing his diary, we read:

“On 1st July—“The Com. passed a resolve that the prisoners should not go out after dark on pain of imprisonment. Next day some of them went to the Com. to represent to them that their resolve prevented meeting to supper at the reasonable hour of nine o’clock and to request that they would name 10 or 11 o’clock for the hour of parting, and that they might imprison anyone found out after that time, but they were told they must conform to their customs and abide by their resolve.”

“11th July—I saw a proclamation of the 4th inst. by which the Continental Congress declared the Colonies Free States and independent of Great Britain. Sentries were now kept constantly near our quarters at night because (I was told) they apprehended we received and sent intelligence.

“Col. Humphreys, Mr. Epaphras Bull, Brazier, and Mr. Nichols, attorney, had come from the Com. to search our quarters for firearms and ammunition, apprehending as ’twas said that I intended to head a party of Tories and cut all their throats. ‘The wicked man shall tremble at his own shadow and shall be afraid when there is none to hurt him.’”

The conduct of the prisoners was now becoming so suspicious that the following proclamation was published:

"July 15th, 1776—Com. at the several towns of Springfield, Westfield, Hartford, Etc.

"1. Resolved, whereas dangerous weapons have been found on some of the prisoners; the several committees be desired to make special search in each of their packs, pockets, etc. for the discovery of any such weapons or inimical letters therein contained.

"2. That the said prisoners be not suffered to go out of any town or parish where they reside, upon any occasion or pretense, without a special permit from the Committee of such town or parish, nor allowed to be absent from their employers at any time without their leave; and that no leave of absence ought to be given them later than $\frac{1}{2}$ hour after sunset, and that they have no leave to be absent on Sundays, except to attend public worship.

"3. That the venders of spirituous liquors ought not to suffer any of the said prisoners to be drinking in their respective houses, either at their own expense or others; but if either of the committees of the respective towns and parishes, shall judge it expedient and needful that they have strong drink, they shall appoint some suitable person to supply them; but in a very sparing and moderate manner.

"4. That whoever shall employ any of the above said prisoners, shall, within the space of three weeks from the time of their receiving them, transmit to the Committee from whom they received them, a copy of their agreement.

"5. That no person may purchase any clothing or wearing apparel whatever, belonging to the said prisoners.

ELISHA PARKS, *Chair.*

JOHN PYNCHON, *Clerk."*

Following this proclamation, Major French discovered that he had lost his pistols (or thought they had been stolen) and that he could not conveniently comply with the above named order; this we infer from the following advertisement in the *Courant*, August 19, 1776:

"Whereas the Com. of Safety at Hartford have insisted that Maj. French should deliver to them a case of pistols which were in his possession and were some time since stolen, or at least, taken away without his privity; he hereby offers a reward of one guinea to any person who will deliver them to the printer hereof or to Mr. Knox, tavern keeper near the Ferry House, Hartford, nor shall questions be askedR. They are locking pistols with the cock in the center and have silver thumbplates."

July 13, he notes in his diary:

"Wrote to General Washington, reminding him of the termination of my parole 12 August next, and my desire to be exchanged."

He was not released at the expiration of his parole, probably because he had made himself obnoxious to the Committee by assuming authority over the actions of other prisoners (subordinate officers) in matters relating to church-going and their loyalty to King George. He had also been obstinate and discourteous when rebuked for this misconduct.

In these days of the up-to-date reporter, we can hardly find more vivid imagery in expression and exuberance of rhetoric than the *Courant* exhibits in its account of the following occurrence:

“Hartford, July 29—

“Last Thursday one James Mahar, an Irishman, and of a savage and bloodthirsty disposition, was committed to gaol for an act of outrage to Lieut. McDermott, a regular officer, and a prisoner in this place, in giving him a dangerous wound with a cooper’s knife. Mahar is a ruffian who properly belongs to a man-of-war in the service of the British King, and it is greatly to be regretted that he found means of escaping from them, as such fellows ought never to be on the land unless closely confined. Mahar it seems, being at the house of Mr. Knox, (who by the way was not at home) became so impertinent and troublesome that Mrs. Knox grew uneasy and gave intimation that her comfort was intimately connected with his leaving the house. These hints, instead of producing the desired effect, brought on a paroxysm of rage, and drew forth a shower of infernal rhetoric from the magazines of his wrath. A number of the regular officers in the chamber, perceiving the disagreeable situation of Mrs. Knox, one of them, viz. Capt. Hill, looking out of the window, desired her, if she could get a kettle of hot water, to scald the fellow out of the house. It must be noted that these officers conceived they had sundry times met with personal abuse from Mahar, and on that account, as well as Mrs. Knox’s, perhaps, interfered in the quarrel with less reluctance. The thoughts of being scalded, however, gave new sensibility to the feelings of this nervous rascal, and furnished him with a fresh supply of vengeance for the inventors of such an *inflammatory* expedient to clear the house. Mahar in the first place, as an *inflammation* of his feelings, consigns Capt. Hill over to damnation, and then gives him to understand that if he would venture down, he might receive a further conviction of his folly in being officious in the quarrel, upon which Capt. Hill descended and Mahar was soon stretched in a horizontal posture and levelled with the dust. By this time it is easy to see that nothing short of blood could appease the wrath of the incensed Mahar—He arose from the earth and went deliberately to a house a few rods distance and having armed himself with a cooper’s knife (handle and blade perhaps 2 feet in length), returned, doubtless with intent to take the life of his antagonist, but Capt. Hill defended himself with a billet of wood, till at length he sprang

behind him and clinched hold of his arms, whilst Maj. French and Mr. McDermott were endeavoring to wrest the knife from his hand. In this struggle Mahar gave the wound, which probably would have been fatal if the use of his arms, like a man pinioned, had not been greatly restrained by Capt. Hill. The above is a true representation of the facts, as they appeared from the evidence on examination before a magistrate."

Mahar publicly apologizes in the *Courant*, August 12. James Mahar issues notice saying, "I will take back my wife," whom he had previously advertised for having left him, and that he is sorry for the affray at Mr. Knox's. We quote his words:

"Mr. McDermott's misfortune yields me the most cutting reflections, though as far as the operations of intoxicating spirits can extenuate the criminalities of such rash and unguarded actions; I hope my fellow men will view me in as favorable a point of light as possible, and afford me all the indulgence which the nature of the case will admit."

Matters were comparatively quiet for three weeks, until on August 19, a quarrel occurred in the Knox house over the kicking over of a chair by Ensign Moland, who said, "Damn the chair." Mr. Knox reproved him and he threw the chair over again and said, "Damn the chair, and you too." Knox retorted, "You rascal, do you damn me in my own house?" upon which Moland knocked him down and Mrs. Knox got a black eye for trying to part them. Next day they were all reproved before Mr. Payne and Mr. Wadsworth.

In the early part of August, considerable correspondence passed between Major French and Captain Delaplace because the latter went to church at which the Continental Congress and the success of the American armies were prayed for. Delaplace justified his act in spirited terms, but finally desisted. French, on August 28th, was, however, brought before a committee, Jesse Root, chairman, Mr. Payne and Samuel Wadsworth, accused of the "heinous" crime (as he called it) of issuing orders and directions which were termed in libel of the State of Connecticut. He was told to withdraw his order and to sign a new parole. He refused and went to jail. In jail he continues his diary, and writes:

"Sept. 3d. A young lad who was working at some picketing which was putting round the gaol for fear we should escape, said in the course of talking of the defeat of the Provincials on Long Island, that he did

not know but the Regulars might soon be in possession of Hartford, but he was pretty sure we should not live to see it. Upon asking him why he tho't so, as we were all in good health, he answered that he was 'sartin sure' the people would put us all to death, as he had heard some of them declare they would.

"4 Sept. This night one of the sentries over us was Mr. Root, the Chairman of the Committee's son, so scarce of men 'are they?'

"5 Sept. I am informed my son was wounded at the attack on Long Island—Thanks to the Gods—my boy has done his duty.

"10 Sept. Capt. McKay and Mr. Graves made their escape this night in a manner which surprised all without as much as us of their fellow prisoners, since there was no appearance of any breach and two strong prison doors were bolted and the outside one locked."

The *Courant* for September 23, 1776, advertises their escape as follows:

"70 DOLLARS REWARD—

"Escaped from Hartford gaol in the State of Connecticut, in the night following the 10th inst., one Samuel McKay, a Lieut. in the British service, taken at St. Johns and confined by the Commission for having before broke his parole by running away, and one John Graves of Pittsfield, who was imprisoned for being a vile Tory and assisting said McKay in getting away as before said. Said McKay has a wife in Canada, is of light complexion, light colored hair and eyes, considerably pitted with small-pox, has a long nose, is tall in stature, has a droll, fawning way in speech and behavior, uncertain what clothes he wore away; had with him a blue coat with white cuffs and lapels, a gray mix't colored coat, and a red coat, white waistcoat, a brown camblet cloak lined with green baize, and a pair of brown corduroy breeches. Graves is short in stature, has long black hair, brown complexion, dark eyes, one leg shorter than t'other, appears rather simple in talk and behavior, had a snuff color'd surtout and coat, green waistcoat and white flannel ditto, leather breeches and white trousers. Whoever shall take up and return to the gaol in Hartford the aforesaid McKay and Graves shall be entitled 50 dollars reward for said McKay and 20 dollars for said Graves by

EZEKIEL WILLIAMS, *Sheriff.*

Hartford Sept. 11, 1776."

Returning again to the diary:

"11 Sept. We were confined more rigidly on account of their escaping. I sent two pair leather breeches to be cleaned, which were not allowed to pass till narrowly examined. Our sentries were doubled. The next day we were even more closely confined to the lockup behind two doors, and allowed to speak to my servant only through bars and in the presence of the sentries."

"13 Sept. We made a paper night-cap (the emblem of the Committee) and put it on a little iron figure of a man smoking and which had been the front of an and-iron in our gaol room and broke off; we also made him a paper petticoat on which we wrote the following lines with a small alteration from Hudibras—

'I like a maggot in the sore
Do that which gave me life devour.'

This we put in our iron window for the inspection of passengers."

Here the journal of Major French ends. We may reasonably infer that the escape of the other prisoners made him feel quite lonesome and think it was time for him to "get busy" and to make his break for liberty. He did so on November 15th, together with Ensign Moland and three others, but they were caught at Branford and brought back. The following advertisement in the *Courant* of November 18th may have stimulated their pursuers:

"Whereas Major Christopher French, Ensign Joseph Moland, and John Bickle, belonging to the British Army, Peter Herron, a Tory, and Capt. Jacob Smith, who was taken lately on Long Island in Arms, all escaped from gaol last night to join the British Army; said French is little in stature, said Moland and Herron are tall and thin, said Bickle is middling fixed and of ruddy countenance. All persons and especially all officers, civil and military, are requested to assist in pursuing and taking said prisoners. Whoever shall take up and return either of said prisoners to Hartford gaol shall be entitled to a premium of ten dollars and all necessary charges paid by

EZEKIEL WILLIAMS, *Sheriff.*

Hartford Nov. 16, 1776."

On December 27th, he, Moland, and one other, made a second attempt to obtain liberty, this time with success, thanks to the aid of Rev. Roger Viets, the Simsbury clergyman, who secreted them. Viets was arrested, tried in January, 1777, sentenced to pay a fine of twenty pounds and to suffer a whole year's imprisonment.

John Viets was the first keeper of Newgate Prison, which was opened in December, 1773. Query: Was Rev. Roger Viets, who aided Major French's escape, a relative, and was this a reason for suspecting Warden Viets of disloyalty? If so, it may have a bearing on the removal of the prisoners to Hartford in 1777.

The Selectmen of Hartford petitioned the General Assembly, January 8, 1778, that the prisoners be removed to some other place; complaining "that the continuing of the prisoners in this town was attended with innumerable ill effects; that the public stores and magazines were greatly exposed and in some instances lost; that intelligence was communicated to the enemies of the country; that the prices of the necessities of life—wood, meat, and clothing—were much increased by the British officers and their servants who do not stick at any sum to obtain the same, and that there was danger of their forming combinations with the blacks to injure the lives and property of the people."

Although we have not found records of the escape or release of other prisoners, it is probable that there were such from time to time. Some were no doubt exchanged, others may have died. Toward the close of the war, Congress entered into negotiations with the State of Connecticut for the use of Newgate Mines as a prison for the reception of British prisoners of war, but peace was declared before arrangements were completed.

We are able to locate some of the places of interest mentioned herein. We must remember that even as late as 1850, much of the principal business and some of the best residential section of the town lay east of Main Street.

In the days of the Revolution, the Committee of Safety all lived on Main Street. Jesse (afterwards Judge) Root, corner Main and Kingsley Streets; Benj. Payne, lawyer, next house south of Col. Jeremiah Wadsworth, the present site of our Public Library; Capt. Samuel Wadsworth, near Main and Asylum. Knox's tavern was near the Ferry House, possibly on the present Kilbourn or on that part of Commerce Street now included in the Connecticut Boulevard. Widow Collier's tavern occupied the site of the old United States Hotel on the north side of City Hall Square, and Hill and Wright's leather shop, where Major French sent his breeches to be mended, was next door. Epaphras Bull was a brazier (or worker in brass) whose shop was opposite the South Meeting House (the present South Congregational Church). The *Courant* office (Watson the Printer) was on Main Street by the great bridge (corner

Main and Wells). Governor Skene and family were made comfortable at the then Hooker house, still standing at the top of Elmwood Hill (opposite the present red schoolhouse).

The jail stood on the site of the present Case, Lockwood & Brainard Building, corner Pearl and Trumbull streets, and was then so far out of town that at one time the prisoners for debt in confinement there, petitioned the General Assembly (then sitting at the State House, the site of our present City Hall) that the jail limits be enlarged so far East as the Court House, "representing that they labor under many inconveniences, hardships and disadvantages,—By reason that the Gaol is in so retired and back part of the town so seldom frequented by any of the inhabitants of the Town." The grim humor of this petition is evident when we reflect that, if granted, it would have technically put the whole General Assembly into jail by its own act whenever it should be in session.

THE FENIANS OF THE LONG-AGO SIXTIES.

By LAURENCE O'BRIEN.

[Read March 17, 1913.]

Senator John P. Hale of New Hampshire said that all over this country, throughout Canada, and in Ireland, there are hundreds and thousands and hundreds of thousands of true-hearted Irishmen, who have long prayed for an opportunity to retaliate upon England for the wrong which for centuries that government has inflicted upon their fatherland.

The senator knew well what he was talking about; his maternal ancestor was the daughter of Jeremiah O'Brien of Machias, Maine, who with his six sons fought the first naval battle of the Revolution, and captured two English war ships off the harbor of Machias.

The Fenian soldiers in the British army were ready to take the field when called upon. The Civil War in this country was over; President Andrew Jackson called upon England to pay for the damage done to American shipping by the *Alabama*, the *Sumter*, the *Florida*, the *Shenandoah* and all the fleet of blockade runners. The British Premier refused to pay and gave little attention to the President's call. Secretary of State William H. Seward took hold and quietly notified the officers on the Canadian border not to interfere with the Fenians if they wanted to take Canada, which they were getting ready to do. Seward let it be publicly known that England refused to acknowledge the *Alabama* claims. It was the Irishmen who raised the cry, "We will collect the claims for the United States." Gen. Benjamin F. Butler told Seward he could raise eight regiments in Massachusetts without expense to this country. The Fenians were marching to the border of Canada and

Gen. John O'Neil took his advance guard over and fought the battle of Ridgeway, where he defeated General Booker, who met with a complete disaster. The British Premier saw the way to acknowledge the claims and paid up, but the United States shipping has not been restored since that time.

The Fenians were stopped in their invasion of Canada by order of Seward and then we gave our attention to fighting in Ireland. When news of the battle of Ridgeway was telegraphed over the country United States soldiers left their posts to help the Fenians. Ninety per cent of General Sheridan's command at New Orleans went up the river. General Shafter was ready with the first regulars. He sent Gen. Thomas Sweeney with word that when the fight was on he would follow with all the regiment. But Seward ordered the fighting stopped, and the soldiers had nothing to do but go back to their commands. The railroads gave them their passage free and the steamboats on the Mississippi and Ohio rivers carried them without charge. They had left without leave of absence, and they assembled at Carrollton, above New Orleans, and sent one of their number to report at the barracks in New Orleans. When the officer of the guard saw the messenger he called out in a loud tone: "Here, get on duty and no other questions asked." Word was sent back to the men in Carrollton, who reported for duty in like manner. Gen. Phil. Sheridan knew where they had been.

England arrested some of the Fenian leaders in her army and sentenced eight of them to death, a punishment which was commuted to life imprisonment for high treason. Among them was John Boyle O'Reilly, who after a couple of years' captivity in Australia took a small boat and went to sea, and after some days adrift was picked up by the New Bedford whaleship *Gazelle*. After many narrow escapes he arrived in New York, bringing news of his comrades whom he left in Western Australia. The British Premier Gladstone released all the civil prisoners, but would not hear any appeal for releasing the soldiers. Finally the Fenians in this country sought secretly for financial aid to rescue them, and more than a hundred thou-

sand responded with their mite. They knew what they were doing it for, and in less than a year a sufficient sum was received. At a convention held in Baltimore in 1874, a committee, of which Capt. P. O'Connor was a member, recommended that the work of rescue be entrusted to James Reynolds of New Haven, John W. Goff and John Devoy of New York City. This committee went to Boston and consulted with John Boyle O'Reilly, also with Captain Hathaway, mate of the whaleship *Gazelle*, who befriended O'Reilly in his escape. They planned, and bought the bark *Catalpa*, and engaged J. B. Richardson to fit her as for a whaling voyage. Richardson made his son-in-law captain and entrusted him with the knowledge of the mission for which the vessel was intended. A trusted man, Dennis Dugan, was brought to be one of the crew. Before the ship reached Fayal the captain had forty barrels of oil which he shipped home to New Bedford. After a good passage, they arrived off Bunbury, Western Australia. One of the passengers, Capt. George S. Anthony, found it necessary to confide the object of the voyage to his mate, Smith, who said he would stand by him to the death.

After the *Catalpa* left New Bedford one of our greatest men, John Breslin, was sent overland by way of San Francisco, where he was joined by another true man, Thomas Desmond. Both went to Western Australia and made arrangements to rescue the prisoners, communicated with them and had everything in readiness when the *Catalpa* should put into Bunbury for supplies. When Anthony got in touch with John Breslin, a place was agreed upon where he would come ashore on the coast nearest the point where Breslin would arrive with the prisoners. When they came thither by means of horses and traps they got into the boat and were soon out on the sea looking for the ship. Several hours passed before she espied the boat and headed for them. In the meantime when the escape of the prisoners was discovered at the prison in Fremantle, a gunboat, the *Georgette*, was sent out to look for them and was now in sight. A stiff breeze was in favor of the *Catalpa*. The captain of the *Georgette* saw the prisoners get on board the ship

and he came up within hailing distance of the *Catalpa* and demanded surrender of the prisoners, or he would blow the masts off the *Catalpa*.

Captain Anthony ran up the Star Spangled Banner and said: "There are no convicts on this ship; every man on board this ship is a free man. We are on the high sea; this is an American ship, there is the American flag, fire on it if you dare." At that time the ship was sailing fast and Captain Anthony wanted to get where he could make a good tack. The captain of the *Georgette* thought that he would be run down. He turned and kept at a distance; and Captain Anthony put his ship before a fair wind and sailed for New York, where he landed his men all safe and in good health in July, 1876.

The Irishman who could forget what the Stars and Stripes have done for his countrymen deserves that in time of need that flag shall forget him.

Capt. Henry C. Hathaway, chief of police of New Bedford; John C. Richardson the agent, Capt. George S. Anthony who made the expedition a complete success, and Mate Smith, were all true blue Puritan Yankees.

In the year 1865, I was "State Center" of the Fenian Brotherhood in Connecticut. In the month of August, John O'Mahony wrote me a letter stating that the fight for freedom would begin in Ireland as soon as the harvest was gathered, and we should see that none of it was allowed to go out of the country. He also informed me that all officers of military skill and ability, who expected to help in the fight, should arrive in Ireland before the rising, as the blockade would then be on and it would be difficult to get in afterwards.

I notified the sympathetic officers who lived in my district, and we reported at headquarters in New York and received our instructions. When I was going aboard the steamer to sail I was met by Secretary James W. O'Brien, who told me the council wanted me to remain in New York until further orders. News had just arrived of the seizure of the newspaper, *The Irish People*. After one week's delay in New York I was instructed as to my mission by John O'Mahony, who gave

me a bag of one thousand sovereigns, in gold, a second bill of exchange for £1,500, which was the money regarding which the Belmonts informed the British, and later, John O'Mahony had a lawsuit about—the money was never recovered. O'Mahony also gave me a sealed dispatch, not to read until I was one day at sea. I was to commit it to memory and to destroy the dispatch before I arrived in Ireland. I carried out my instructions correctly, by giving to Col. Thomas Kelly the money, which was much needed at the time, and wrote the dispatch for him. I was then to hold myself in readiness to take the field at short notice.

I went to Tipperary and found all the young men willing and ready to do their part. After one week spent in my native town, Caher, I returned to Dublin. Daniel Donovan of Lowell, Mass., told me I was wanted at No. 19 Grantham Street; I reported and was sent to Paris in December to meet John Mitchell, who informed me what his business was. I returned to Dublin and wrote out the information conveyed to me by Mitchell, and after it was read the paper was burned in my presence. After a couple of weeks, I was notified to report for a journey and bring my valise. I was sent to locate in Paris until further orders, and there received all money coming from America, and receipted to John Mitchell for the same. During my stay in Paris, December, 1865, January, February and March, 1866, John Mitchell turned over to me one hundred and thirteen thousand dollars (\$113,000.00), all of which I sent to Ireland by messengers, and not one cent of which was lost or fell into the hands of the enemy. The messengers to whom I gave the money were, William O'Donovan, Nicholas Welch, Garret O'Shaughnessy, and the Misses Ellen and Mary O'Leary. Think of the true grandeur their faithfulness portrayed. The habeas corpus act was suspended in Ireland. The division of our people in this country left us in a bad fix. They had expected war with Great Britain over the *Alabama* claims. That prospect had now suddenly vanished and with it much of our hopes. In Ireland we were preparing to strike and spent the money in getting ready, when all at once our

supply was cut off. Had we been notified we could have governed ourselves accordingly. I left Paris to go to Dublin, but when I arrived in Liverpool in March word was sent from headquarters for me to remain there, and to ask the chief men in Liverpool to find quarters for the officers who had escaped arrest in Ireland, and nobly the organization responded. As the men arrived I had places to send each. Among the lot was the notorious Corydon, who, in company with Capt. John Ryan, was located with Austin Gibbons at Richmond Rowe. Also Michael O'Brien, the Manchester martyr, who gave his life for the cause, whose last words on earth were: "God save Ireland."

The council in Dublin sent word that we would be called upon to go to Ireland, and that they would notify us when they were ready. We agreed that we would remain there as long as there was a chance for a fight.

In January, 1867, I went to Ireland by way of Holyhead and Kingstown, and in Dublin I met Ned Duffy—the noble fellow was then sick, but he said that when we were fighting it would revive him. Gen. Thomas Francis Burke, Major John Delehanty (who had served under Sherman), and I, were to meet in Clonmel, and be prepared to join with the Waterford forces when they would come up the valley of the Suir, but, while waiting in Clonmel, word came to us that we were to rally at or near the junction at Tipperary. But some one without authority sent word to Col. John O'Connor in Kerry, "that all was ready," and he called upon his men and they commenced in Killarney to strike terror to our foes. When the news reached us that they were up in Kerry, we came to the conclusion that the best thing to do was to prevent the British troops from Curragh Camp getting to the south. Major Delehanty contracted a cold during his stay the previous month in London, and was so sick that General Burke and myself were obliged to send him to Fethard, where he died a couple of days after reaching there. General Burke started for the place of rendezvous and finally reached it. My route was by way of Cashel, where I was trying to hire a car to take me to Golden,

when I was arrested and brought before one of the most cold-blooded scoundrels I ever saw, and, of course I was committed to jail for being a stranger. There was a special jury convened in my case. As I had traveled through the country for nearly a year and on the Market and Fair days mixed freely among the people, I passed all right; but not having any references I was detained in Cashel for the next two weeks. During my detention in Cashel I was four times brought before the grand jury, and all kinds of questions were asked me.

When for the fourth time I was brought before a packed jury, and they gave me to understand that they had no business to detain me if I could get some one or two friends who would come and vouch for me, I told them that I did not have a friend. A man, whose name I afterwards learned was Martin J. French, came with a lot of armed police, and read to them a warrant to convey me to Clonmel jail, by order of the Lord Lieutenant. When arrested I gave the name of Osborn, but in the Lord Lieutenant's warrant it was "Osborn, or O'Brien." They had learned who I was, but not from me. I was escorted in irons, by armed police to Clonmel jail, and after three weeks there were fifteen Fenian prisoners confined in the jail. I sent word to my friends outside that no one must come near me, or intimate that they knew I was there. After about five months my confinement was getting monotonous; we were all called together in the yard, formed in line, and in came four policemen followed by a man whom I never saw before, and after him French, who pointed to me and said "that is Osborn, that's him." Not one of my companions ever saw the man before, nor did I. After they were gone I was called into the office and there was old French with others I did not know. The man who came into the yard commenced to read a paper which he had in his hat. When he would hesitate old French would tell him what to say from a paper he had before him on the desk. The contents of the papers were that the witness swore he had known me for three years, and that he was present where I had addressed meetings, urged and conspired to overthrow Her Majesty's government in Ireland, and that I was a dangerous

and suspicious person. This witness was the notorious Talbot who met his just deserts sometime later. A month had passed, when we were again lined up in the yard, and who should come out guarded by policemen but the notorious Johnny Corydon. A part of his testimony was a copy of what Talbot had sworn in my presence a month previous, and I was then charged with high treason against Her Most Gracious Majesty, and a separate charge of treason felony was laid against me. I then saw that I was an object of attack, and that it was about time to be doing something in my own behalf, for it seemed clear to me that they were bound to kill me. I then looked at my prison surroundings and formed two plans of escape. The first was to make a break in daylight by getting over the walls while some workmen were repairing the roof, to have a horse and saddle in waiting, and escape to the country, and if I did not succeed end my life in fighting. But when I went to my cell that evening I examined the cell window bars and formed my second plan to cut the bars and escape through the window, which I succeeded in doing. While in prison, my comrades and I were confined in cells from three o'clock afternoon until six o'clock next morning; during the day we were in one of the yards. There were about two hundred prisoners who came in with General Burke when he was arrested at Ballyhurst. One of them was a young boy, who became an object of persecution by the officials, who first tried on him torture and close confinement and threats of jail for life, if he did not tell them all he knew about General Burke and the other leaders. When torture and threats failed, they changed to offers of reward and bribes of money, and showed him the money, but he was proof against all temptations and proved true to his colors. His answer first and last was that he was a journeyman tailor, and was away from home looking for work, and his kit of tools was found on his person—a needle in a piece of cloth with some thread in his vest pocket. When his trial came he was discharged for want of evidence. This was Jerome Byrne, who was a messenger to Gen. Tom Burke and an aide to him at Ballyhurst, one of many, good and true.

Take our countrymen throughout Ireland and England and whether wearing the red coat of the soldier, the green stripe of the peeler, or the blue of prison warden, they have a warm spot for the old land and those who would fight for her, and among the wardens of Clonmel jail I found two good friends who granted any request I asked of them. Through one of them I was able to keep up communication with friends outside. This was Mat Meehan, who died before I escaped. The other, Patrick McCarthy, who is now my close neighbor in New Haven, brought me the files and tools with which I cut the bars, and gave me the points about the jail rules and time of guards that helped me in my plans, and also furnished me with some strong twine. While I was working nights it was necessary to keep off suspicion, and the way I did it was, I quarreled with the wardens, and I choked one of them one day, and he hollered murder! The others came at me with muskets and I was marched into the office. The governor ordered me confined in the condemned cell. I was kept there for two days on low diet. I was then put back in my old cell with the reprimand to behave myself or 'twould be worse for me. In consultation with three of my comrades I formed the idea that if I succeeded it would be a good plan to place suspicion on the governor and the deputy governor. We caught some young birds and I gave them to the deputy's son, and my comrades saw me do it. I used to go to the office window and ask favors and thank them in a loud voice as though it was all right. I would make signs and motions with my hands and talk to the family of the deputy governor, and all this was seen by my comrades.

In the meantime the strong twine that Patrick McCarthy brought to me I gave to three of my comrades, who were in one large cell, and they made a rope of three thicknesses, and when after a month's labor, all was ready I notified friends outside that I would come out between twelve and one o'clock on the night of the 18th of September, which I did not succeed in doing until between four and five in the morning of the 19th. The friends who were waiting for me went away in despair at three o'clock, but when I came to my senses after

being stunned in falling from the outside wall, just before day-break, I started for the country and met friends four miles away, with whom I remained for two days in rest.

In the fall off the wall I broke my right collar bone, and my face was badly disfigured, but after four days I traveled nights by way of Mullinahone into the county of Kilkenny, along the Booley mountains, crossed the river Suir at Granny Castle by taking one of Lord Bessborough's pleasure boats, and when on the Waterford side shoved the boat adrift.

While in Ireland, after I escaped from jail, all my travels were done in the darkness of night; the leaders of each town always sent for me in the person of a true and faithful guide. As a rule I traveled on the road, for the police were terror-stricken and never were out of their fortified barracks after dark. Once after I left Killmaganny before I got to Fiddown, my guide and I made a cut through some fields and when we came out on the road it was in front of a police barracks. There were two police there and when they saw us they got inside the barracks in haste and didn't even bid us good night. I was well armed, and I looked towards my guide, who reached for his revolver and whispered to me saying: "I'll stand by you to the death." With a comrade like that the force of any one police barracks would not discommode us.

We were not interfered with and when I told Mr. O'Donnell, who was a miller at Fiddown, of the courage and pluck shown by my guide he assured me that all his men were of the same stuff, brave and true. O'Donnell was the heaviest taxpayer in that part of the country. He knew all the people of his district and would not allow a doubtful or suspicious man to be admitted into his ranks. I remained in O'Donnell's charge while he went to the city of Waterford, and William Hearn sent a good man to guide me to the city. O'Donnell came with us to within one mile of Granny.

The men in Waterford sent a boat up from the city to meet me, but when my guide gave the signal, boats appeared in all directions. The river was full of poachers and my friends thought it was a trap for them and did not come to the signal, and that is why we had to take a boat of our own. After many

trying ordeals I got into the city and relieved the anxiety of friends, who were well pleased at my safe arrival. I remained in Waterford seven weeks, when a merchant prepared one of his schooners and told the captain that I was his brother-in-law and had had a fight with the police and he must take good care of me, which he did. After being three days wind-bound, on the fifth day I arrived in Cardiff, Wales, where I procured black clothes and got to London and stopped with a friend until midnight, and left London for Paris by way of Newhaven and Dieppe, and when I got to Dieppe I immediately sent a letter to my father for money. The next day I arrived in Paris and the first man I met at the bankers, Bowles, Drevet & Co., was Captain Bowles, head of the firm. We had been comrades in New Orleans during the Civil War and served together on Gen. James Bowen's staff. When he saw me in the club room he hugged me with joy, but he was more than pleased when he found that I was the O'Brien of whom he had read so much in the papers, and rejoiced at my escape. He took my arm and introduced me to his head clerk and ordered him to honor any call for money that I should make, and told me to do all my banking business with the firm. I drew 150 francs which I assure you was welcome, and it lasted me until my own money arrived from New Haven. That night I met William O'Donovan, Nicholas Walsh, and Alfred O'Hea, who did not have a hundred dollars to spare, and after I stood the supper for three I told them I engaged them to have a series of dinners as guests with some American officers, who were then sojourning in Paris. For two weeks we enjoyed the company at the dinners of our American friends, who were delighted at the opportunity to show their good will to us and the cause in which we were engaged.

Before I left Paris for home I learned all about the effect my escape had had on the authorities in Clonmel. When I was missed at six o'clock in the morning by one of the wardens he was bewildered, and shouted "Osborn is gone," and gave the alarm. The others came to know the cause, and one of them ran to the governor, who hurried half-dressed and ran up the stairs in his excitement, not looking ahead; when near the

top of the fourth flight he jumped into John Forgarty, who was carrying his bucket from the cell to be cleaned in the yard; the governor got the contents of the bucket on the head.

The governor did not stop at this accident, and when he reached my cell he kept running around. He was bewildered and confused; over half an hour passed before they alarmed for the police, and then called for the military, both foot and horses, who scoured the country in every direction and searched all suspected places in town. In the afternoon my friends learned I was safe out of town, and they then helped the police to try to find me in the town, and had some fun in placing suspicion among some of the enemy.

The board of prison guardians held a court of inquiry, and my comrades were brought before it and all had the same story to tell; that I had no friends outside or in the country that they knew of, the only friendship they saw was shown by the governor's family; they told what they saw me do and heard me say, and how I gave the pet birds to the governor's young son and heard me express thanks for favors in the office, all of which was true.

The court suspended the governor and deputy governor and removed their families from inside the prison pending the investigation by the Lord Lieutenant the week following, when the same routine followed, and my friends had the same story to tell. The two priests who visited me the day before I escaped were summoned and put under oath, which they did not like, Father Lonergan of Ballylooby, who christened me, fretting for fear I would be caught. Father Power did not like it for fear it would prevent his promotion, but he was loyal to the Crown and he became bishop of Waterford. While talking to them in the jail office it came to my mind that if I succeeded they would have to prove their innocence of knowledge about my escape, but they were exonerated,—the court found the same verdict as the previous one. Old Grubb, the governor, took it to heart, that after thirty-three years' service he should be suspected, and he died in five weeks. He was a cold-hearted man, and we had our revenge.

THOMAS GREEN.

By ALBERT C. BATES.

[Read April 21, 1913.]

It seems necessary in giving any sketch of Thomas Green, an early Connecticut printer, to begin back almost at the first settlement of New England by the English. Among those who came to Massachusetts in 1630 with the Winthrop party was Bartholomew Green and his family, including his son Samuel, then sixteen years of age. In 1649 this Samuel undertook the management of the printing press at Cambridge, which had been conducted for ten years by Stephen Day under the patronage of Harvard College and at the expense and under the general supervision of Rev. Joseph Glover. From this time until the close of his business career Samuel continued in the work of printing in Cambridge. He died in 1702 at the age of 87 years, having been the father of sixteen* children. At least three of his six known sons and the brother of the wife of one of them became printers.

One of these three sons, Timothy Green, removed from Boston to New London in 1714 and became the second printer in Connecticut—Thomas Short, the brother of his sister-in-law having been the first—and continued in the work there until his death in 1757. Five of his six sons who lived to maturity followed the printer's trade.

Among these sons was Samuel, sometimes called "Samuel, junior," or "Samuel, printer," who was born in Boston in 1706. He came with his parents to New London in 1714, and thereafter made that place his home. Although a printer Samuel had no office of his own, but was doubtless employed

* Thomas says nineteen.

by his father, Timothy. He married in 1733 Abigail, daughter of Rev. Samuel Clark, late minister at Chelmsford, Mass. He died in 1752, leaving a widow and ten children, among whom were three sons who became printers. It is the oldest of these three sons, Thomas, born at New London August 25, 1735, baptized September 7, about whom our interest now centers. He was a little over sixteen years of age at the time of his father's death.

Isaiah Thomas, in his "History of Printing," says that Thomas Green was instructed in printing by his uncle. This may be true; but as his uncle Nathaniel (probably) had no printing office of his own, his uncle Timothy was printing in Boston until 1752, and his uncle John had no printing office of his own until a few months before his death in 1757, it is likely that the instruction was received in the office of his grandfather, Timothy. And the actual instructor may have been his grandfather, his father, or any of his three uncles.

It seems probable that the changes in the ownership and management of the printing office which followed as a consequence of the death in 1757 of his grandfather caused Thomas to leave New London and take up his trade of printing in New Haven. Here he entered the employ of James Parker & Company. Parker himself remaining in New York; the firm was represented in New Haven by his partner, John Holt, who was postmaster as well as printer. In 1760 it became necessary for Holt to remove to New York to aid Parker in the work there, and the press and postoffice at New Haven were left in charge of Thomas Green—the printing continuing to be done in the name of Parker & Company "at the postoffice."

In the issue of June 21, 1760, of the *Connecticut Gazette*, is the following notice:

"The printer of this paper being about to remove to New York, desires all persons whose accounts have been unpaid above the usual and limited time of credit, immediately to discharge them; else he shall be obliged to leave them in other hands to collect; and he hopes they will not be against allowing interest. The business will be carried on as usual by Mr. Thomas Green in New Haven."

It is unlikely that Green, then a young man of twenty-five, would have been placed in this responsible position if he had not already had experience in Parker's office, both as printer, newspaper editor, and postmaster; and it seems reasonable to suppose that he had been in Parker's employ for the two or three years since his uncle Timothy took over the printing office in New London. This supposition, however, is apparently negatived by Thomas' description of himself in a deed* dated September 11, 1759, as "of New London."

Thomas continued in the printing business in New Haven, representing the firm of Parker & Company, from 1760 until 1764. Besides the weekly issue of the *Connecticut Gazette*, Parker's newspaper, and the first established in Connecticut, there are some forty books and pamphlets and fifteen broadsides known to have been printed in New Haven during these years. Most of them bear Parker's imprint; but all were actually the work of Green. Mecom's work is of course not included in this summary.

In 1764 Parker & Company discontinued the printing business in New Haven. Isaiah Thomas says "they resigned the business to Benjamin Mecom." The previous year Mecom had been printing in New York City. He was a nephew of Benjamin Franklin, and was by him appointed postmaster at New Haven. Mecom's imprints at New Haven bear dates 1764 to 1767.

Both Parker and Mecom seem to have been particular to place their imprint on all publications issued by them. No New Haven publication during the years 1755 to 1767 inclusive has come to my notice that does not bear the name of one or the other of these printers, *with a single exception*.† This exception is the "Brief Narrative of the Proceedings . . . against Mr. White, Pastor of the first Church in Danbury," which has the imprint, "New-Haven: Printed in the Year 1764." Who printed this and why is the printer's name omitted? The question cannot be answered from the type,

* New London Land Records, vol. 16, p. 248.

† Also one printed in 1761 "for Sarah Diodate."

for both Parker and Mecom used similar type to what is used in this "Narrative." Nor do the ornaments used settle the query; for of the three used, two identical ones were used by Parker and two by Mecom. The style of printing is distinctly not that of Mecom, and the size of type used is not that commonly employed by him. The proceedings related in the "Narrative" end March 31, 1764, so that it could not have been printed earlier than April of that year. The *Connecticut Gazette*, which Thomas Green had printed in New Haven in the name of and for Parker & Company, was discontinued because of lack of encouragement* with the issue of April 17, 1764 (No. 471), and it is reasonable to presume that the work of Parker's press ceased at that time. In that case there would not have been time to prepare the copy and print the "Narrative" during the two and one-half weeks between the close of the proceedings there related and the shutting down of the work of the press. It is my belief, although I confess it incapable of proof, that this "Narrative" was printed by Thomas Green with the type and other materials of the Parker printing office, and that it is the first printing work done by him for himself, that is when not in the employ of another. The style of the printing of the "Narrative" closely follows that of Green's work while printing in Hartford; the type is the same as was used by him the following year; one of the three ornaments is identical with one used by him and the other two with two that appear upon a Green & Watson imprint of 1770. What more likely than that Green, contemplating setting up a printing office of his own, should have bought a part at least of the outfit of the Parker office, and before his removal of the materials to Hartford should have printed this "Narrative" in New Haven. A "Vindication" of the proceedings set forth in the "Narrative" was issued the same year and bore Mecom's imprint. If, as is stated by Isaiah Thomas, and as seems probable, Parker & Company "resigned the business"

* "As the encouragement for the continuation of this paper is so very small, the printers are determined to discontinue it after this week. They request all those who are indebted to make speedy payment."

of printing in New Haven to Mecom, who was located there as early as June, 1764,* Green, who had been in Parker's employ, may not have wished to appear as a rival printer at the very time when Mecom was setting up his press there. This would seem to be sufficient reason for his omitting his name from the imprint of any publication issued by him in New Haven at that time.

When Parker & Company, by whom he was employed, disposed of their printing business—"passed it over" as Thomas expresses it—to Benjamin Mecom, Green evidently determined to establish a business of his own and looked about for a fresh field in which to practice his craft. At the age of thirty-two, a printer since his boyhood and one of a family of printers, a married man with two children, no doubt he was ambitious to see his own name appear in the imprint placed upon his work. Hartford, although not the largest, was, by reason of its being one of the two capitals and a county seat, the most important town in the colony in which there was no printing office or which was not quickly and easily accessible to the offices in New London, New Haven or over the border in New York City. Here he determined to settle, and here he probably took up his abode with his family in the late summer of 1764.

In the autumn of 1764 we find Thomas Green located in Hartford and established in the printing business for himself and in his own name "at the Heart and Crown near the North-Meeting-House." Through the statement made by George Goodwin to John W. Barber in 1836, and the researches made in the town records by Albert L. Washburn, it is a pleasure to be able to make a definite and positive statement as to the location of this first printing office. It was on the west side of Main, then Queen Street, on the north corner of the cemetery, about where the south corner of the Waverly Building now stands; and it was situated up-stairs over the barber shop

* In its first issue by him, July 5, 1765, Mecom says: "A year is passed since the printer of this paper published proposals for reviving the *Connecticut Gazette*. It is needless to mention the reasons why it did not appear sooner."

of James Mookler. Possibly its proximity to the barber shop was looked upon as advantageous for the gathering of local news.

The passer-by of that day would have no difficulty in finding the office, from the sign of the "Heart and Crown" which doubtless hung near its door. Green's idea of a name and sign to distinguish and identify his place of business was not a new or unusual one at that period. It was common for inns to have a pictorial sign, and to be called by the name which the sign expressed—as "The Bunch of Grapes" in Hartford. William Jepson sold drugs at the sign of the "Unicorn and Mortar." Various other tradesmen, including printers also, had their distinctive signs. In London we find the signs of the Bible, the Angel, the Red Lyon, the Sun and Bible, the Looking Glass, and the Hand and Pen used by printers. In Boston we find the Bible and Heart on Cornhill; and what is more to the point, the Fleets, also located on Cornhill, for many years, dating both before and after this time, did their printing at the Heart and Crown, and used a cut containing these symbols on some of their printed works. From this sign, which he may have seen, Green no doubt obtained both the idea and the name for his own sign. Many of the early numbers of the newspaper which he established contain in the headline a cut showing a device which in all probability was copied from his sign.

This device is in the general form and style of a coat of arms. The shield, if it may be so called, is surrounded by rather elaborate scroll work, out of which spring small sprays of flowers and conventionalized leaf designs. On the shield is a heart surmounted by a crown; below the whole is a ribbon, and at the top in place of a crest stands a bird with wings extended bearing a folded letter in its beak.

Only the *Courant* and the two almanacs for 1765 bear the imprint of "near the North-Meeting-House," and it is doubtful if any others of his known publications were issued from that place.

In the *Courant* for May 13, 1765, No. 25, is an announcement by which: "The Publick are informed, that the Printing-

Office is removed, to the Store of Mr. James Church, opposite the Court-House, and next Door to Mr. Bull's Tavern."

This location was also up-stairs, on the west side of Main Street, opposite the present City Hall, and where the building of the State Bank now stands. Here the office continued until the second week in December, 1768, when it was removed to a building fitted up for the purpose "near the Great-Bridge," as the bridge on Main Street over the present Park river was then called. Here the office remained for nearly or quite half a century.

Undoubtedly Green's most notable work in Hartford was the establishing and editing of *The Connecticut Courant*, a newspaper which to-day is proud of its distinction as the oldest paper in America published continuously under the same name in the same town.

Its first issue, "Number 00," bears the date of Monday, October 29, 1764, and states that it "will, on due Encouragement be continued every Monday, beginning on Monday, the 19th of November next." It opens with the following prospectus:

"Of all the Arts which have been introduc'd amongst Mankind, for the civilizing Human-Nature, and rendering Life agreeable and happy, none appear of greater Advantage than that of Printing: for hereby the greatest Genius's of all Ages, and Nations, live and speak for the Benefit of future Generations—

"Was it not for the Press, we should be left almost intirely ignorant of all those noble Sentiments which the Antients were endow'd with.

"By this Art, Men are brought acquainted with each other, though never so remote, as to Age or Situation; it lays open to View, the Manners, Genius and Policy of all Nations and Countries and faithfully transmits them to Posterity.—But not to insist upon the Usefulness of this Art in general, which must be obvious to every One, whose Thoughts are the least extesive [extensive?].

"The Benefit of a Weekly Paper, must in particular have its Advantages, as it is the Channel which conveys the History of the present Times to every Part of the World.

"The Articles of News from the different Papers (which we shall receive every Saturday, from the neighboring Provinces) that shall appear to us, to be most authentic and interesting shall always be carefully inserted; and great Care will be taken to collect from Time to Time all domestic Occurrences, that are worthy the Notice of the Publick; for which, we shall always be obliged to any of our Correspondents, within whose Knowledge they may happen.

"The CONNECTICUT COURANT, (a Specimen of which, the Publick are now presented with), will, on due Encouragement be continued every Monday, beginning on Monday, the 19th of November, next: Which Encouragement we hope to deserve, by a constant Endeavour to render this Paper useful, and entertaining, not only as a Channel for News, but assisting to all Those who may have Occasion to make use of it as an Advertiser.

✂ "Subscriptions for this Paper, will be taken in at the Printing-Office, near the North-Meeting-House, in Hartford."

This prospectus is said on the authority of the late Charles J. Hoadly to have been written by Abraham Beach, at that time a resident of Hartford. Beach, who was born in 1740 and was graduated from Yale College in 1757 with a reputation for remarkable scholarship, was the son by a former husband of the wife of Dr. Jonathan Bull of Hartford. At the time this prospectus was written Beach had a store in Hartford, and the following year was collector of taxes there. Late in 1767 he left for England, where he was ordained a priest of the Episcopal communion, and returning to this country was active in the church in New Jersey and New York.

This first issue of the *Courant*, October 29, 1764, was of four pages in what was known as pot folio size. The greater part of its contents is made up of foreign news, some of it bearing date as early as July 10, and the latest September 5. There is also American news dated from New York and from Boston, October 25, and on earlier dates from Charleston, S. C., and Williamsburg, Va. The last column contains four paragraphs of Connecticut news, including one death in Hartford. Next comes an advertisement of Ellsworth's Almanack "to be sold by the Printer hereof," with the announcement: "Of whom also may be had, Blanks, Primers, Spelling-Books, Bibles, Watts' Psalms, Catechisms, Writing Paper, &c." And following this at the foot of the column is Abraham Beach's announcement that he "exchanges choice Saltertudas & Anguilla Salt for Flax-Seed, on the best Terms." If, as is believed, Beach wrote the prospectus contained in this issue, this announcement is no doubt the first example in Hartford of "dead head" newspaper advertising.

The *Courant*, under Green's editorship, compared very favorably with other newspapers of the period. As seems to have been expected at that time, a large portion of the paper was taken up with foreign news; and a smaller portion with the happenings in various parts of this country. There was also a goodly array of communications from those who were convinced that they had something to say upon a great variety of subjects; and there were numerous political contributions, some of which are of no little historical interest to-day. Considerable space was given to matters relating to the Stamp Act, which was the foremost topic of the day. And last, but far from least in interest, are the numerous advertisements.

The size of the paper varied from time to time; and occasionally the paper consisted of but one sheet, instead of the usual two. The subscription price of the *Courant* is given (May 2, 1768) as six shillings lawful money per year. And (on the same date) advertisements "of a moderate length" were "taken in and inserted at 3 sh. for 3 weeks, 6 d. for each week after and longer ones in proportion." The best file now existing for these early years is the one for which Judge Jedediah Strong of Litchfield was the subscriber, and which is now in the possession of the Connecticut Historical Society.

At this time "the Posts" bringing letters and papers from the outer world reached Hartford once a week, on Saturday; the two posts, one from New York and one from Boston, meeting there. That all might know of their arrival they were instructed to "wind their Horns" upon arrival at the post-office, and to do the same one-half hour before their departure. The postmaster was instructed to deliver on the following morning to persons living in the town "all Letters and Pacquets" not called for on the day they were received at the postoffice.

These posts were frequently delayed, presumably by storms or bad roads, much to the embarrassment of the printer who depended on the newspapers he received for a considerable part of the "news" in his paper—both that from foreign countries and from other colonial cities. Thus, the *Courant* of

Monday, December 24, 1764, notes, "The New York Post, not arrived, at the Publication of This Paper." And the issue next following, Monday, December 31, states, "As neither of the Posts are arrived, the Publication of this Paper will be deferred till To-Morrow"; and in the next column is a "Post-script," dated Tuesday, "VII o'clock Afternoon, the Posts not arrived."

In January, 1768, there appears to have been a re-routing of the posts. Under the new arrangement the post left Hartford on Tuesday, arriving at New London the following day; and set out from there on Thursday, bringing the New York and Boston mails, reaching Hartford on Friday. But after a two-months' trial of this, the old arrangement was reëstablished.

In addition to the government "post" there was a local "Post Rider" who delivered letters and newspapers in the near-by towns. In 1765 this service was performed by Joseph Bunce of Hartford, who advertises in May for his "dark bay mare," which has strayed away. She "trots and paces well," and if the old rhyme is to be believed was a worthy beast, for she had one white foot. No doubt the editor of the *Courant* was almost as anxious as the owner that she should be found, in order that his papers might be promptly delivered to out-of-town subscribers.

In addition to being a printer Green was also editor, publisher, bookseller and stationer "at the Heart and Crown"; likewise a kind of general bureau of information.

It is interesting to note that almost without exception, while in Hartford, Green made a distinction in the imprint placed on the works published by him and those which he merely printed for another. In the case of the *Courant* it was unnecessary to indicate that he was the publisher. Eleven of his issues state in the imprint that they are "printed and sold," that is published, by him. These are all advertised in the *Courant*.* There also appear the advertisements of two respect-

* All issues of the *Courant* between Oct. 14 and Dec. 30, 1765, where separate advertisements of Ames' and Ellsworth's Almanacks for the following year would probably be found, are missing; but the issue of Jan. 13, 1766, says: "To be sold at the Heart and Crown, Hartford: Ames, Hutchins, and Ellsworth's Almanacks, for the Year 1766."

ing whose imprints no data is at hand; of two (one of them his earliest work) which were only "printed" by him; and of one which was to be "Sold at the Printing office in Hartford," although probably printed *for* him in New London. No advertisements appear in the *Courant* of any of the other works, more than one-half the total number, printed by him in Hartford. Most of them bear the imprint "printed by Thomas Green," or "printed at the Heart and Crown."

In the *Courant* of September 16, 1765, Green has the following long advertisement which gives a good idea of the stock in his shop:

"To be sold, at the Heart and Crown, Opposite the State-House, in Hartford: Plain and gilt Bibles—Common Prayer Books, plain & gilt—Testaments—Dillworth's Spelling Books—Psalters—Death of Abel, neatly bound and gilt, Ditto, stitch'd—Tryal of Abraham—Watts's Psalms—Tate and Brady's Ditto—Penitential Cries—Royal Primmer—Reading, no Preaching—War, an Heroic Poem—Mayhew's Thanksgiving Sermons, Ditto, on Popish Idolitry—Winthrop's Voyage from Boston, to Newfoundland, to observe the Transit of Venus, June 1, 1761.—The Rights of the British Colonies—Mather's Dissertations, concerning the venerable Name of Jehovah—New-England's Prospect: Being a true, lively, and experimental Discription, of that Part of America, called New-England, by William Wood.—Small Histories, Plays, &c.—2, 3, 4, and 5 Quire Account-Books, Copy Books, Dutch Quills, and Pens—Slates—Wafers in Boxes—Red and black Sealing-Wax—Memorandum Books—Pewter and Led Ink-Stands—Leather Ink-Pots—Temple and common Spectacles, in Cases—Painted Ink-Chests—Holman's genuine Ink-Powder—Horn-Books—Writing-Paper, &c."

In addition to advertisements of books printed by him and to one or two long advertisements of a general stock of books which he offers for sale Green advertises the following books, printed elsewhere than in Hartford, as they were from time to time published:

Clap, Thomas. Essay on moral virtue. [New Haven.]

The Stamp act. [New London.]

Necessity of repealing the stamp-act. [Boston.]

Rights of the colonies to privileges of British subjects. [New York.]

Devotion, Ebenezer. Examiner examined. [New London.]

Leaming, Jeremiah. Defence of the Episcopal government of the church. [New York.]

Walter, Thomas. Grounds and rules of music.

The œconomy of human life, 7th ed.

Ingersol, Jared. Letters relating to the stamp act. [New Haven.]

The printer and his office formed a local intelligence bureau, as witness the following (quoted from advertisements in his newspaper) information regarding each and all of which could be obtained by "enquiring of the Printer hereof":

Found, a small bundle.

To be sold, a likely, healthy, good natured negro boy, about fifteen years old.

Wanted, an apprentice in a shop.

To be sold, a neat sley and harness.

Wanted, an apprentice to a black-smith.

Farm to let.

To be sold, a few pair of genteel London made stays.

Lost, a half johannes wrapp'd up in a piece of clean paper—one dollar reward.

Tobaccoist partner wanted.

Steers or heifers wanted to keep until next spring.

Green also offered for sale tickets in Faneuil-Hall lottery No. 5 and in Amenia lottery. In the issues for July 14, 1766, and in numerous later issues is the advertisement:

"Cash given for Rags, at the Printing-Office in Hartford, for the Use of the Norwich Paper Manufactory.—

"[The Inhabitants of this Colony are requested to consider the public Utility of this Undertaking, and collect and save as many clean Linnen Rags as possible.]"

As illustrating the time in which Green lived, perhaps one month's items from the account of "House Expenses" of a prosperous Hartford merchant may not be without interest. It is for August, 1762:

	£	s	d
3 Loaves Bread @ 8d		2	
Washing Womens hire for two Days & four Hours		3	2
2 Quarters Mutton 3f 1 Cask bisket 9f		12	
2 Loaves Bread		1	4
1 Load Wood		8	
2 lb Butter @ 10d		1	8
2 lb Chocolate @ 2f6 1½ lb butter @ 10d		6	3
1½ lb Candles @ 10d		1	3
1½ Butter @ 10 d 15 lb Beef [@] 4d		6	3
2 Loaves bread @ 8 d		1	4
1 Load Wood		6	0
½ Bushel pears		1	0
Squashes & Cucumbers		2	6

	£	s	d
¼ Cask wine drank from May to this day [Aug. 21st]	8	15	0
13½ lb Beef @ 2½ [d]		3	0
17 lb Tallow @ 7d		9	11
2 lb Candles @ 10d		1	8
1½ lb Butter @ 10d		1	3
flower Ground at Mill		1	6
20¾ lb Tallow @ 5d		9	10½
11 lb Beef @ 2½d		2	3
2 doz biskett @ 8d		1	4
2 lb Butter @ 10d		1	8
1 doz pigeous			9
	<hr/>		
The whole amounting to	13	0	11½

You will note that almost two-thirds of this amount is for the one item of wine drank during four months. Drinking was universal in these days; and no doubt both Thomas Green and his spouse took a little something for the stomach's sake. This same merchant built a "shop" in Hartford in 1765—we would to-day call it a store—and kept an itemized account of its cost. The total cost of building it, including stone, lime, sand, timber, boards, clapboards, shingles, cartage, nails, glass, hinges, locks, joiners' work and board of joiner amounted to £58-10-9½; and of this £3-2-2½ or more than four per cent was for rum—and rum then cost but four shillings per gallon. Tea at this time was selling at from 8 shillings to 10 shillings per pound.

Some writer, I cannot now recall who it was, has given a very striking description of the streets of Hartford about the middle of the eighteenth century. He states that they were totally unpaved and after heavy rains they were a veritable slough of despond. The mud became so deep that crossing them on foot at such times was almost impossible, except at certain places where large stones had been placed, on which one might pick his way from one side to the other. No wonder that pattens (shoes on stilts they might be called) were worn by the ladies of that period. But an effort, let us hope a successful one, was made to change this not long before Green came to Hartford. The General Assembly in May, 1760, granted a lottery, upon petition of a number of inhabitants, which

should net £270 for the purpose of repairing (Ellery says "to pave") the main streets of Hartford on the west side of the river. The most prominent men of the town were interested in and guaranteed the scheme. William Ellery bought thirty tickets at 12 shillings each, amounting to £18. On these he was so fortunate as to draw one prize, which after the usual ten per cent deduction netted him £22-10s.

There were very few public amusements in Hartford at this time. We may feel reasonably certain that Mr. Green attended the games of "bowl" or "cricket"—probably what was later called wicket—the following challenges for which were published in his paper. The first is in the issue of Monday, May 5, 1766:

"A Challenge is hereby given by the Subscribers, to Ashbel Steel, and John Barnard, with 18 young Gentlemen, South of the Great Bridge, in this Town, to play a Game at Bowl for a Dinner and Trimmings, with an equal Number, North of said Bridge on Friday next.

"WILLIAM PRATT,

"DANIEL OLCOTT.

N. B. If they accept the Challenge, they are desired to meet us at the Court-House, by 9 o'clock in the Morning."

A return game was indulged in a year later, again on the day after the annual election, as witness the following from the issue of May 11, 1767:

"Fifteen Young Men, on the South-Side the Great-Bridge, hereby challenge an equal Number on the North Side said Bridge, to play a Game of Cricket, the Day after the Election,* to meet about ix o'clock, Forenoon, in Cooper-Lane, then and there to agree on Terms & appoint proper Judges to see Fair-Play."

The result of this second game is shown by the following challenge which appears in the issue of June first:

"Whereas a Challenge was given by Fifteen Men South of the Great Bridge in Hartford, to an equal Number North of said Bridge, to play a Game at Cricket the Day after the last Election—the Public are hereby inform'd, that the Challenged beat the Challengers by a great Majority. And said North side hereby acquaint the South Side, that they are not

* May 15.

afraid to meet them with any Number they shall chuse, and give them not only the Liberty of picking their Men among themselves but also the best Players both in the West-Division and Weathersfield. Witness our Hands (in the Name of the whole Company)

“WILLIAM PRATT,

“NIELL McLEAN, JUN.”

In 1766 George Goodwin of Hartford, then a boy of nine years, entered Green's employ. The story is told that on his applying for work Green told him he was too small, but added “if you can bring a pail of water upstairs you may come.” This he proved his ability to do and was taken into the office. He remained with the *Courant* during practically the whole of his long life. He, with his two sons, became its owners in 1815; and when they sold it in 1836 it was stipulated that he should thereafter have the right to work in the office when he pleased, a privilege of which he often availed himself.

Ebenezer Watson, born in Bethlehem, Conn., in 1744, was in the employ of Green in Hartford. It is stated by Isaiah Thomas that Green taught him the printer's trade. If this be true he probably worked with Green in New Haven before a press was set up in Hartford. He may be said to have established himself in Hartford by his marriage on October 1, 1767, to Elizabeth, daughter of Richard Seymour. This was just at the time that Thomas Green and his brother Samuel were entering into partnership in the printing business in New Haven. And so, as Green contemplated removing to New Haven, he entered into a partnership in Hartford with Watson, under the firm name of Green & Watson. The terms of this partnership are not now known. It began about the middle of December, 1767, and is supposed to have continued until the middle of March, 1771, at which time Watson became the sole proprietor of the *Courant*. During the period of the partnership Watson is supposed to have had the entire management of the press; Green's interest being only a financial one, although his (Green's) name alone appeared on the *Courant* as its publisher up to (and including the issue of) April 18, 1768.

In 1766 we first find Samuel Green, the younger brother of Thomas, printing in New Haven. Two imprints of his of that year are known (one of them actually printed at New London), and two of the following year, 1767, one of them printed by him "for Roger Sherman." His printing office (during the latter year at least) was "at the Old State-House," which stood on the Green, and which had been no longer used for its original purpose since the building of a new State House in 1763. Very likely he also kept a small store for the sale of a few books, blanks, stationery, etc.

It seems to me very probable that Samuel's presence in New Haven as a printer was due to the enterprise and foresight of his brother Thomas, who may even have given a financial backing to the undertaking. For certainly Samuel could not have supported himself from the limited output of his press. Thomas knew New Haven and understood the possibilities of the place from a printer's point of view. He probably also knew Mecom (whom he left printing there), by reputation at least, as a good printer but a man of little business ability.

Foreseeing that Mecom would probably be unsuccessful, what more likely than that he should have established his brother Samuel in a printing office in New Haven, in order that no opportunity should be given for any other printer to enter the field there in the event of Mecom's removal or failure. And that was exactly the way it worked out, except that the Greens did not wait until the discontinuance of the *Connecticut Gazette*, Mecom's newspaper, with the issue of February 19, 1768, which probably marked the close of his career there as a printer. Yet the rival printers appear to have parted on the most friendly terms, for in the final issue of his paper, Mecom says:

"The printer of this paper now informs the public that he is preparing to remove from this place with his family: and that he chiefly depends on his debtors for something to pay the expense. Since he now discontinues this *Gazette*, it may not be improper to say that all persons may be supplied with a newspaper by Messrs. Thomas and Samuel Green, at the Old State House, where other printing work is done and books bound."

In October, 1767, Nelson says on the 23d, Thomas and Samuel Green, working in partnership, issued in New Haven the first number of a new newspaper established by them, *The Connecticut Journal and New Haven Post-Boy*. Its imprint was "Printed by Thomas & Samuel Green, at the Printing Office in the Old State-House," which imprint was soon changed to "near the College," although the location remained the same.

Apparently believing that the prospects for success in New Haven were brighter than in Hartford, Thomas soon began to arrange his Hartford business so that he could remove permanently to New Haven. He doubtless spent the most of his time there after the middle of October, 1767. His home in Hartford, perhaps during the entire period of his residence there, was on the corner of the present Central Row and Prospect Street, one of the most desirable locations in the town for residence, it would seem. Here he rented from Samuel Gilbert of Hebron the house and garden, bought by him (Gilbert) in July, 1765, for £400, which had been the residence of the late Dr. Rhoderick Morrison. This house, "lately occupied by Mr. Thomas Green," was advertised "to be sold, or let," February 8, 1768. He evidently removed with his family to New Haven during the winter of 1767-1768, probably about the beginning of February, 1768. Let us hope that they were not *en route* on the fourth during "that terrible storm of wind and snow, . . . the snow being very deep," which occurred then. We can be sure that Mrs. Green was not here to witness from her front windows the prisoner "brought to this town pinion'd" on February 12 and tried and found guilty the same day, probably in the State House just in front of her home. He was sentenced to "ten stripes on the naked body—which he very patiently received the day following." And it is not probable that she was here on the second when Thomas Baldwin of Meriden, found guilty of blasphemy, stood one hour in the pillory and received ten stripes on his naked body.

The following, which appeared in the *Courant*, is not without interest:

“NEW-HAVEN, April 16, 1768.

“The Situation of my Business at Hartford, having made my Return to this Place necessary, I earnestly request of all my Customers there, indebted for News-Papers, and on every other Account, to make immediate Payment, either in Cash, or Country Produce, to Mr. Ebenezer Watson, at the Printing-Office in Hartford, whose Receipt shall be a Discharge, for any payments made to him, on my Account.—And as my Connections in the Printing Business there, in some Measure, still subsists, I hope for the Continuation of the Public Favors.

“I take this Opportunity of returning my unfeigned Thanks, for the Kindnesses conferred on me, and my Family, by the Neighbourhood, in which we were so happy as to reside, while we liv'd in Hartford.

“THOMAS GREEN.”

Mention has already been made of the advertisement appearing in July, 1766, and in numerous later issues of the *Courant* offering cash for clean linen rags for the use of the paper mill in Norwich, and in one issue a long article appeared urging all families to save their rags for that purpose. The Norwich mill was established in 1766 by Christopher Leffingwell, and was the first paper mill in the Colony. The second paper mill was that belonging to Watson & Goodwin, publishers of the *Courant*, and was located in the present town of Manchester. It dates from just before the breaking out of the Revolution.

A third paper mill was established the following year, 1776, by our enterprising New Haven printers, Thomas and Samuel Green, on West river just outside of the town. For this purpose Joseph Munson and Lemuel Hotchkiss in April, 1776, sell to the two Greens and to Isaac Beers, Joel Gilbert and Samuel Austin, all of New Haven, one and a half acres of land on the river below the grist mill of Joseph Munson, and give them the right to erect a paper mill thereon and to turn the river out of its natural course. Three months later the mill was in process of construction, and paper was expected from it “after a few weeks.”

At the time of his residence in Hartford, Thomas appears to have been devoted to the cause of colonial liberty as represented by opposition to the Stamp Act. But later, as was true of many other Episcopalians, his sympathies were not with the American

cause, and he was spoken of as a Tory. This may be one reason why the number of issues from his press decreased noticeably during the years of the Revolution. Ezra Stiles, president of Yale College, makes the following entry under date of August 2, 1781:

“Sir Chan^s [Henry Channing, a graduate of that year] returned fr. Hartford, the Printer there has engaged to [print] the Commencem^t Theses, Catalogues, & Questiones Magistrales. The Press in New Haven (Tho. Green) is a Tory press & unobliging to College. This the Reason of sending abroad.”

The town of New Haven in December, 1773, finding that its two oldest books of town records had become so worn that it was needful they be rebound, voted that the selectmen and town clerk employ Mr. Green to bind the same and see what new alphabets are needful to be made to the “antient” book and cause the same to be made. I have seen but one other direct reference to either Thomas or Samuel as a binder; but it was true of practically every printer of those days that he was a bookbinder as well, and no doubt Thomas practiced both crafts as occasion required.

And here in New Haven the two brothers Thomas and Samuel continued in the business of printing, issuing books, pamphlets, almanacs, session laws, college publications, and a newspaper, until the death of Samuel in February, 1799. Thomas, the younger, was then taken into partnership with his father, and the business continued in the name of Thomas Green & Son until January, 1809, at which time the elder Thomas, then seventy-four years of age, appears to have retired. A little more than three years after his retirement from business, in the latter part of May [before the 26th], 1812, he died in New Haven at the age of 77. The notice of his death, published at the time, says of him: “He was a gentleman of peculiar suavity of manner, great benevolence, and universally esteemed; every house in New Haven was to him as a home.”

It is interesting to attempt an estimate of the publications issued by Green, even though the total may be presumed to be more or less inaccurate.

While he was managing the press in New Haven and printing for and in the name of Parker & Co., 1761 to 1764, there are fifty-four publications known. While printing in his own name in Hartford, 1764 to 1767, he may be credited with forty publications, although it must be confessed that his printing of two or three of these is somewhat of an assumption. In New Haven, from 1767 to 1799, the firm of Thomas and Samuel Green issued at least 271 publications; of these twenty-nine are broadsides and twenty-six laws. After the death of Samuel, Thomas Green & Son issued seven publications in 1799 and 1800, and an unknown number in the years following, until the retirement of Thomas. The total number here noted is 372; and so, allowing for the omission of some in making up the list and the entire loss of others, it is safe to estimate that the total number of publications in which Thomas Green had a part was nearly or quite 400.

Probably his best and most worthy work was the editing in succession of three newspapers. First, the *Connecticut Gazette* in New Haven, which he edited and printed for Parker & Co. Second, the *Connecticut Courant*, which he established, edited and printed in Hartford. Third, the *Connecticut Journal*, which he and his brother Samuel established, edited and printed in New Haven.

It is also worthy of note that from the time of his taking charge of the press for Parker & Co. in New Haven, until his retirement from business, not a year passed that he (or his firm) did not publish at least one almanack.

At the age of twenty-six Thomas married in New Haven on September 30, 1761, Desire Sanford, who was doubtless a resident of New Haven, the marriage being found on the records of the Congregational Church there. Her burial appears on the Episcopal Church records, October 13, 1775. Their first child, Anna, sometimes called Nancy, was born September 21, 1762. She married Amaziah Lucas, May 4, 1794. The second child, Lucy, was born March 24, 1764; "the amicable and ingenious Miss Lucy Green," President Stiles calls her. At the age of twenty-one she took the small-pox by inoculation

at the hospital a mile and a half from her home and died of the dread disease June 13, 1785. She was buried at ten o'clock in the evening of the following day in the usual burying place in the city. There was "a numerous funeral" of such as had had the small-pox. A broadside commemorating her was printed. It is entitled, "Elegiac Reflections on the Death of Miss Luey Green." It consists of 134 lines of poetry, printed in two columns, followed by an extract of twenty lines from the *New Haven Gazette*.

Their third child, Thomas, born at Hartford it is to be presumed, in 1765, was baptized August 17, 1766, in the (Episcopal) Church of the Holy Trinity at Middletown. He died April 22, 1825, aged 60. Mention is made of his wife Desire. A fourth child, probably an infant, was buried in the yard of the Center Church, Hartford, November 3, 1767.

Thomas married a second wife, Abigail, of whom no record has been found beyond her death on the Congregational Church records, September 20, 1781, at the age of thirty-seven; and the baptism on the Episcopal Church records, August 11, 1779, of their infant daughter, Desire, followed by her burial three days later.

For his third wife Thomas chose Abigail Miles and their marriage appears on the Episcopal Church records, March 21, 1782. On the same records the baptism of two children appear: Alfred, March 30, 1783, and William Samuel, December 16, 1786. Mrs. Green died February 24, 1814. In her will, dated February 21, "in the evening," and signed with her mark, she gives all her estate to her two daughters Sophia and Luey and makes her brother George Miles executor. While Thomas in his will, dated 1810, mentions only his wife Abigail and his children Thomas and Anna.

THE OLD NEW HAVEN BANK.

By THEODORE S. WOOLSEY, LL.D.

[Read May 19, 1913.]

This is the land of steady habits. *Si monumentum requiris, circumspice.* As we look about in the daily routine of our lives, our eyes and our thoughts tell us of an enduring past. We were schooled perhaps upon a foundation of 1660. Our college nurture dates from 1700. The churches in which we worship, the streets we tread, the very waning of the giant elms which shade them, are mysteriously alive with memories of things gone by. We think of the West as progressive and the West glories in the term. It concentrates upon the present because it has no past. As it says of itself, it has no background. But does it not miss something? The stability of habit, the continuity of right and simple living, the conservatism of thought which tests and studies the new before swallowing it whole. We too, recall our judges, but only to honor their memories.

It is to an institution which can almost be called ancient that I ask your attention this evening, the New Haven Bank, our oldest bank, and so steady in its habit of paying dividends that since early in 1797 it has never missed a year.

The year 1792 is the date of its incorporation, by the General Assembly, at its October session, under the "stille" President, Directors and Company of the New Haven Bank, on petition of David Austin, Isaac Beers and Elias Shipman. It was not until 1795, however, that the bank opened for business, owing partly to a delay in placing the stock, partly perhaps to the epidemics of scarlet and yellow fever which raised the deaths in New Haven from fifty-one in 1792 to 180

in 1794 and 155 in 1795. This delay enabled two other state banks to get under way, in Hartford and in New London, which were chartered no earlier. 1792 was a prolific year in bank establishment in the United States, no less than ten having been thus founded, and nine being already in existence, according to the *London Times* of January 12, 1805.

What was the New Haven of 1792 like, and what commercial needs had it which a bank could satisfy? It had a population in 1787, according to the *Connecticut Journal*, of 3,820: in 1798, white males 1,529; females 1,827; blacks 225; a little less than ten years before. The elms were just planting. An average of seventy vessels in foreign trade entered and cleared annually. It had registered shipping of 7,250 tons. It had three shipyards, which built many vessels. In 1794, its Chamber of Commerce was established, and a little later a Marine Insurance Company with \$50,000 capital. Two-thirds of its foreign trade was with the West Indies. The coastwise trade was also important, e. g. in 1791 a sailing packet plied twice a week to New York. To serve local distribution and foreign commerce alike, this bank was founded, and its first president was also Collector of Customs for this district. By the Act of Incorporation The New Haven Bank was given a capital stock of \$100,000 or 500 shares of \$200 each, with the proviso that no person, copartnership, or body politic should own more than sixty shares. The voting privileges of the shares were curiously curtailed as follows: the holder of one or two shares had one vote; if he owned ten shares he had a vote for every two of them; if thirty shares, a vote for every four; if, however one person's holding was in excess of thirty shares he had but one vote for every six. This limitation led to the anomaly that the owner of twenty-eight shares had seven votes, while the owner of thirty-six shares had but six.

A statement of debts and of surplus was to be made to the stockholders every two years. The bank was forbidden to trade in anything except bills of exchange, gold and silver bullion, goods pledged for money lent which was not redeemed in due time, lastly in lands, taken for debts previously contracted.

Interest upon loans was limited to 6 per cent. The directors were to be nine in number.

As has been intimated, there was difficulty in placing the \$100,000 of capital stock and by a supplementary Act of October, 1795, this was changed to not less than \$50,000 with privilege of increase as deemed expedient up to \$100,000. The new capitalization also gave each share a vote, "any law to the contrary notwithstanding." Upon this more generous, one-share-one-vote basis of representation, a stock subscription was opened December 9, 1795, at the house of Ebenezer Parmelee and 400 shares were taken. Thus the bank started with a capital of \$80,000. Here are a few of the first stockholders, including the larger ones, names not unfamiliar to our ears.

David Austin	30
William Harriman	30
Eli Whitney	20
John Nicoll	20
Samuel Wm. Johnson	10
Elizur Goodrich	8
Pierpont Edwards	4
Simeon Baldwin	3
David Daggett	2
Isaac & Kneeland Townsend	2
William Lyon	2
Dyer White	1

Five per cent of the subscription was to be paid at once, twenty per cent in sixty days; twenty-five per cent in six months; the balance six months later.

The first stockholders' meeting was held at Parmelee's house, December 22, 1795, and the following were elected directors: "David Austin, Isaac Beers, Elias Shipman, Elizur Goodrich, Joseph Drake, Timothy Phelps, John Nicoll, Thaddeus Beecher, Stephen Alling."

At the first meeting of the directors, on the same day, by a vote of eight out of nine (you notice his modesty) David Austin was chosen president, and William Lyon, cashier, at a salary of \$500.

From a MS. sketch of David Austin by Mrs. Edward C. Beecher, in possession of the bank, I extract a few details.

He was born in 1732, thus being sixty-three when chosen president. He had neither business nor profession, but was a man of property, leaving an estate of over \$30,000. He was a deacon in the North Church for forty-three years, an alderman under Mayor Roger Sherman, member of various important committees, and Collector of Customs from 1793 until his death in 1801. He lived on the southeast corner of Church and Crown Streets. His daughter Rebecca married John, eldest son of Hon. Roger Sherman.

William Lyon, our first cashier, born 1748, ancestor of the Bennetts and of Prof. William Lyon Phelps, was town-born if any one ever was, being descended from Governor Eaton through his "son and daughter Jones." He was fitted for college but prevented from entering by his father's failure. A member of the Governor's Foot Guards, he marched to Cambridge on the Lexington alarm. Later he became captain of the 2d Company and was appointed colonel of a regiment in 1795 by the General Assembly. He was a widely read man, an antiquarian and historian of repute, exact in his performance of duty, and abhorred extravagance, e. g. he helped build the Methodist Church on the northwest corner of the Green because it was so plain. His portrait hangs in our directors' room.

With the officers determined upon, the next step was to prepare for operation. This was done through committees. One was directed "to obtain information and prepare a draft of the necessary rules and regulations for the management of the business and affairs of the bank." Another was charged "to procure the mould and box and water letters and paper for the making of all bills; also the necessary plates and such stationery, account books and money scales as the business of the bank will require." A third committee was to select a site and report upon the best mode of constructing a vault or vaults. These preparations were not so elaborate as they seem. The banking rooms were leased from the cashier's own house on the north side of Chapel Street between Orange and State Streets, at twelve pounds a year. The cost of fitting up the rooms was eleven pounds, nine shillings and eleven pence, but

the fittings were to be bank property. The vault was to be a chest, of wrought iron if possible, otherwise of cast iron, three feet in length. Plates were ordered for bills of the denominations of one, two, five, ten, twenty, thirty, fifty, one hundred dollars. Sixty thousand dollars in bills was printed off these plates by Amos Doolittle, under supervision, and the cashier prepared deposit books, and six quires of cheques. One wonders if these original cheques and the bank bills bore the familiar "beehive" symbol. The earliest example of the "beehive" I have found is dated 1811. Late in February, 1796, discounting of notes and other business began under the following rules and regulations:

"The Bank shall be open every day in the year except Sundays, Christmas Day, Good Friday, the Fourth day of July, Commencement in Yale College, public fasts and Thanksgivings, and Saturdays in the afternoon." The hours of business were ten to one and three to five, but changed a few months later to nine to twelve and two to four. Notes desiring discount had to be submitted to the cashier by letter, and executed in the city of New Haven; moreover drawer or endorser must be resident in New Haven.

The discounting of notes was permitted only on Tuesdays and Fridays, for no longer than thirty days, plus three days grace. There was no collection charge, or charge on cheques. February 22d, the cashier's bond of \$20,000 was accepted, he was authorized to enter on the duties of his office, and the bank began its career. There is little to record of its first year. After a few months the cashier's salary was increased to \$750, which shows prosperity, but on the other hand, payments on the stock were slow and the General Assembly was appealed to for leave to postpone the instalment due early the next year. This, however, did not prevent dividends, eight per cent being declared for the year ending February 24, 1797. At the annual stockholders' meeting in July, 1797, the statement showed a dividend earned, \$100 to be applied to initial expenses and no bad debts or counterfeit money. Austin was again chosen president. In February, 1798, after declaring another

four per cent on the stock, at the request of the cashier, a committee of audit was appointed to inspect books, money and securities, and this was regularly done thereafter. The directors met twice a week on what were called discount evenings. In July, 1799, a new president, Isaac Beers, came in. The cashier was also allowed an extra \$250 for clerk hire, from which we may infer that business was increasing.

Isaac Beers, our second president, holding office for fourteen eventful years in our country's history, was the proprietor of what even then bore the name of Apothecaries Hall.

The old records give less information than one could wish as to the business methods of those days. Only here and there does an entry or a note depart from the usual routine and then its motive is not always clear. Take, for instance, a vote of January 16, 1800, "that the cashier return Deacon Austin the National and New York Bills offered by him this day as a deposit and that he take no bill of any bank as a deposit, New Haven excepted, but in payments he may receive them." Were New York bills refused from distrust of their soundness or from dislike of their distance from a redemption point? And if the latter, why should they be accepted for payments and not for deposits, or why should not a transportation charge be added? Cases of mutilated or false bills were occasional and were equitably dealt with. Thus, in May, 1800, it was voted to pay two dollars to one of the Atwaters who produced "a bill with nearly one half wanting which he declared was burnt by accident." Enos Tuttle of Hamden was voted five dollars, "he having declared that a bill of that value was nearly consumed by fire accidentally and produced the remainder to the satisfaction of the Board." A few years later Gen. David Smith came before the Board and "produced affidavits respecting a counterfeit eagle." He got good money back and an extra dollar for expenses. Later still equity became liberality, for it was voted "to pay Dr. Eneas Monson, Jr., 12.⁵⁰ on account of a counterfeit fifty dollar bill in the hand of David Thompson which said Thompson supposes he received from the bank four or five years ago."

And as another example of easy-going ways, notice the vote of January 15, 1801, "that the cashier pay the drafts of Mrs. Salter during the absence of her husband for any or all the money he has deposited in bank." One wonders whether Mr. Salter was pleased when he came back, but doubtless the directors knew what was fitting. They could even afford to be generous. Regular dividends of four per cent, or \$8 per share, were paid each six months; \$1,000 surplus was reported in June, 1800; the next January came an extra of two per cent; by July the surplus was still larger and four and a half per cent was declared in December, "being nine dollars on each share for the profits of six months." I may remark here that it was not the policy of the bank until 1865, so far as I can discover, to accumulate a surplus fund against an occasional loss, without which to-day banking would be thought unsound indeed. Every other year or so, the profits accumulated were merged in the dividend fund and distributed. If now a loss was made it was charged on the debit side under the head of profit and loss, to be gradually extinguished by application of profits.

The valuation and redemption of state bank bills, a hundred years ago, tried the soul of a cashier. They were promises to pay by a maker of doubtful repute and payable at a distance. Transportation was slow and costly. Here is a vote of December, 1800, in illustration: "That \$15,000 in western bills be delivered by the cashier to Colonel Joseph Drake to be by him sent to Mr. John Nicoll in New York and to be exchanged for specie at the Banks and remitted to this Bank by the Packets in sums not exceeding \$5,000 at a time—to be at the risque of the Bank." The narrow sphere of a country bank made necessary by transportation difficulties and intensified by the incoherence of the state banking systems is a feature of the financial history of the country, and our bank's records from time to time reveal this. Its New York collecting agent in 1802 was the branch of the United States Bank, and New York funds were favorably regarded. Thus the new stock issued in 1805 might be paid for in "New Haven bank bills,

in gold or silver, in United States bills except the Charleston branch, in New York bills and such as are current in that city." In 1809, on the other hand, it was determined "not to receive bills of Norwich and New London banks after January 1st next." But in 1814, having become the depository of "the United States Customs, internal revenue and direct tax" our bank announced that it would receive such "in specie, bills of any of the banks of the city of New York or of this State, and exchequer bills."

There was also a disinclination, even more marked, to collect notes for any but certain favored neighbors. Thus it was voted in 1808, taking into consideration the inconveniences resulting from the collection of notes for the Bridgeport Bank, not to receive any such thereafter.

And again the next year, in more general terms, "that the Custom House bonds, notes of the Insurance Company and notes from the banks of this State that are *East* of this bank be received for collection as heretofore and that all other notes be refused."

Another bank note difficulty, which appeared as early as 1802, lay in the prevalence of counterfeiting, which in the simple design, printing and paper stock of the bills of those days was presumably easy. For David Ruggles of Massachusetts was voted a gratuity of \$50 "on account of his expense and trouble in detecting and bringing to justice a number of villains concerned in counterfeiting the Bills of this and other Banks."

Evidently the banks now springing up united in protecting their interests as is shown in this vote of four years later: "Whereas Elisha Wood and Jno Hotchkiss who were active in bringing to justice the company of counterfeiters of bank notes in this town have received the reward granted by the State in such cases and also the sum of \$500 from the Manhattan Bank. And inasmuch as there is a third person whose name for sufficient reasons must be concealed, who has acted under the orders of this board in discovering the aforesaid villainy and giving information, who has yet received no recompense; voted, that the donation of \$100 received from the Cheshire Bank at

Keene which was to be disposed of at the discretion of this board be paid to the said Third person and also that \$50, a donation from this bank be given to the same man."

More than forty years later came another epidemic of counterfeiting, shown by the following votes: "Spurious \$10 notes of the bank having appeared, received through the Phoenix Bank of Hartford and the Suffolk Bank of Boston, voted to charge same to these banks and inform them of the fact: also to destroy the old plates and obtain new." And 1849, voted "to expend \$500 if necessary in prosecution of W. E. Brockway and others for counterfeiting the notes of this Institution."

But we must turn back to early days again. On January 25, 1802, the following regulations were adopted to make the labors of the cashier less burdensome:

1. "No business shall be done out of bank hours except with a Director, the Collector of Customs or his deputy, admittance at the Bank door being refused to all others.

2. No "accommodation notes shall be offered for persons who neglect to apply for them."

3. "No apology shall be made for Notes returned not accepted."

4. The "Cashier shall neither write notes nor furnish stamps for any persons doing business at the Bank."

5. "It is not the duty of the Cashier personally to call upon those who do not pay their Notes when due."

7. "Checks shall be put in some convenient place and a half quire given gratis to customers."

8. Inkstands pens and ink shall be provided.

10. The Cashier shall furnish brass or copper weights "sufficient to weigh at one Draught" 4000 dollars in gold.

14. The "Cashier shall be less particular in the inspection of dollars, even at the expense of losing a few dollars in the course of a year."

15. Bank books shall be made of good paper and be covered with leather.

16. "The specie allotted each day for checks and bank bills shall be paid without comment and all unnecessary conversation and argument be avoided."

17. "Fifty dollars additional shall be paid for clerk help."

What a vista of primitive usage these regulations open up. Nevertheless things were going swimmingly. In 1802 nine per cent was paid in dividends and an extra of two per cent cleaned up the accumulated profits of the last two years. More-

over, the State became a stockholder in a small way, using the proceeds of bonds repaid it by the general government.

Yet further funds were needed, so at the end of 1803 the stockholders voted to increase the capital by \$40,000, owing to "the increase of trade in the city and vicinity of New Haven," holders to have the right to subscribe for fifty per cent of their holdings. And again in 1805, the capital stock was doubled "by adding six hundred shares of \$200 each at a premium of \$5, which premium was paid back together with an extra of \$5.⁵⁰ per share the very next year." The paid in capital was now \$240,000.

The salary of the cashier was raised to \$800, and again to \$1,000; his son William Lyon, Jr., was made clerk at \$500, and an additional clerk, Fitch, was employed at \$400.

Isaac Beers was still president, and the other directors elected on a general ticket, July, 1806, were: Joseph Drake, Abraham Bishop, Frederick Hunt, John Nicoll, Abraham Bradley, Elias Shipman, Ebenezer Huggins, Aeneas Monson, Jr.; only four having been on the original board.

In January, 1807, there was another extra of one dollar, and in July the cashier informed the stockholders' meeting that "all the profits that had been made up to this time were divided" and that only one note remained unpaid in the bank of those that were run out, yet in 1808 undivided profits of nearly \$1,000 appear.

Under the stimulus of such prosperity it is not surprising that the bank was not content with a rented house. It seems to have changed its location once to the house next door, although the records do not show it, but in May, 1809, a special stockholders' meeting voted "that it is expedient to build a new banking house," and that the directors be "requested to receive proposals from such persons as have lots for sale." To offer full facilities and to prevent undue competition is sound banking policy and that same month a committee went to the General Assembly to oppose a petition for a bank in Derby.

After various votes on the site of the banking house, the matter came to a head at the annual meeting in 1809, when the

committee reported "that we prefer the two following proposals : first of Thaddens Beecher for a lot eastward of the house of John Miles, fronting 30 ft. on Chapel St. and extending north-westerly into the square, 60 feet, at \$1500 :

"Second: of Abraham Bradley 3rd for a lot at the corner of Chapel and Orange Streets (25 ft. on Chapel St. and 60 ft. on Orange St. at \$1900: with a covenant on the part of said Bradley that if a building shall be erected in his lifetime adjoining northwest of the bank it shall be fireproof, and we respectfully submit to the choice of the stockholders the above proposals."

The stockholders chose the second of the two lots and ordered a banking house erected, the purchase money to be "charged to the capital stock of the bank," and August 7, 1809, the directors voted "that the new banking house is to be 44 ft. long, built with brick with stone caps and stools for the windows." On this site the bank has stood ever since. Two years later came the final stock increase to \$500,000, to be paid by instalments of \$100,000 annually under direction of the General Assembly and on terms to subscribers similar to those of the Hartford Bank. This has been taken slowly, for 101 years later a small part of the increase remains unissued.

In 1812, having carried through the new banking house and new stock issue, Isaac Beers declined reëlection after fourteen years of service and Æneas Monson reigned in his stead. William Lyon still held office, though on a new and curious salary arrangement, of four per cent of the dividends paid if said dividends were not less than six per cent, which was a possible \$1,600 if eight per cent was declared on the full authorized capitalization. He was then getting a thousand. It was an ingenious profit-sharing scheme.

This is a convenient moment, at the outbreak of war with England, and at the change of presidents, to ask the cause of the great prosperity of these fifteen years. It was due, I think, to our neutral attitude in the great continental wars. France tried in vain to entangle the United States in the struggle. England, by Jay's Treaty, in 1794, laid the foundation for our com-

mercial advance. Both states by their decrees and orders in council, their spoliation and impressment, their exaggeration of blockade, their varied and countless attacks upon our trade did their best to kill it. But there were no other constant neutrals: in spite of all the restrictions the logic of the position was in our favor and our carrying trade increased by leaps and bounds. Profits, as well as risks, were great. The maritime ports must have profited. And though after 1815 our internal development continued, our ocean commerce declined. Even in 1830 its tonnage was not equal to that of this golden period.

I quote a few statistics from Atwater's History in this connection, to illustrate both the risk and the growth of our foreign trade during the wars. In 1794, eleven New Haven ships were on trial for violation of edicts in British, and eight in French colonial ports. In 1800 New Haven shipping registered over 11,000 tons.

Ten New Haven ships caught seals on the Galapagos, traded them for produce at Canton, and brought back tea, silks and spices. One ship paid \$35,000 in duty. Another in 1803 had a cargo of pepper worth \$100,000. In 1809, one hundred foreign bound vessels sailed from this port, and there were thirty-two houses in the foreign trade.

Dr. Æneas Monson proved perhaps the ablest of our presidents, though he fell upon trying times. He had graduated at Yale in 1780; had practiced as a physician, had traded and speculated; had insured cargoes, engaged in whaling ventures, dealt in real estate; yet throughout this varied financial career, says Dr. Bronson, "for financial ability, sound discretion and shrewd practical sense no man in New Haven had a better reputation." He lived at the northeast corner of Elm and York Streets. He headed our bank for nineteen years.

What were the customary bank investments of these early days? A few hints appear in the minutes. Our bank bought \$50,000 worth of stock of the City Bank of New York in 1815; it took \$10,000 of the New York City seven per cent loan; and the same amount of United States seven per cent stock; it petitioned the Legislature for liberty to subscribe to United

States Bank stock; it lent money on real estate; in 1819 it lent money on Bank of America stock at 85; it lent 15,436 Spanish dollars (now in City Bank, New York) to Benjamin Huntington at eight per cent, this being a special deposit; it owned manufacturing stock; it lent money to the Episcopal Church; and finally, alas, it lent money to the Farmington Canal, but of this later.

When William Lyon's account as cashier was closed and turned over to Henry R. Pyncheon in 1814 (of whom we have an oil portrait), we have a statement of assets showing the nature of its cash balance which is interesting:

Gold of America, England, Spain & Portugal	\$15,240.25
Silver in dollars and parts of dollars	29,759.75
Dollars in Hartford bank	8,000.00
Specie in use	891.27
	<hr/>
Total	\$53,891.27

Of the liabilities I mention

Bank Bills in Vault	\$118,000.00
Bank Bills in Use	1,595.75
Post Notes	301,353.00

The banking house was valued in 1815 at \$10,988.

It is noteworthy that the only apparent effect of the war of 1812 upon the bank was to increase its dividends, which rose to five per cent for the half year ending in June, 1814. So, likewise, the only noticeable effect of the Civil War, save for the suspension of specie payments, seems to have been an increase in dividends, $4\frac{1}{2}$, $4\frac{1}{2} + 1$ (1862), $4\frac{1}{2} + 1\frac{1}{2}$, for three half years, free of Government tax. But the investments of so patriotic an institution in 1862 were entirely in Government, State and Town war loans.

A feature of our early banking usage not yet touched upon, but constantly recurring in the records, was the destruction of bank bills by a committee of directors. The paper was flimsy and the printing poor, very little use was enough to deface them and they were held as they came in and burned by the tens of thousands. There may have been a change of engraved

form to account for the burning of \$278,235 on January 5, 1816.

One other matter needs explanation and then we must turn to graver things.

At a meeting of the directors, held on the evening of February 19, 1821, it was "resolved that a piece published in the *Register* of the 17th intitled 'Old Federal Bank and Public Opinion—A Dialogue,' is in the opinion of this Board a very indecent and improper publication, replete with misrepresentations and unfounded insinuations, calculated to deceive the public and injurious to the interests of this Institution." Let us gratify a natural curiosity by consulting the files of that date.

The communication is marked "continued" but I do not find part one. It is too long for reproduction. The gist of it was a charge couched in homely and jocosé dialogue, that our bank had loaned a third of its funds to a Wall Street broker at less than six per cent and without security, thus depriving an earlier borrower at six per cent who gave security. The plain implication was that the directors divided with the favored broker: "went snacks with him" being the language used.

It was said also that the bank speculated in the stocks of other banks contrary to its charter, and was in fear lest the Assembly should in consequence take its charter away. And finally came the charge that the bank discriminated vs. Republicans in the matter of accommodation; altogether a nasty article, half political in its bias as the sneer at the Old Federal Bank in the caption shows. No wonder the directors passed resolutions. To me, I confess, the name Old Federal Bank used ninety years ago as a term of reproach gives our institution an added savour.

And now we come to certain crises in our bank's history, local or national, the Eagle Bank failure, the episode of the Farmington Canal, and the Panic of 1837.

The Eagle Bank had been founded in 1811; it had an apparently prosperous existence of fourteen years. A stone

banking house on the corner of Chapel and Church Streets was in process of erection for it, when out of a clear sky came the smash. As it turned out, the officers of the bank had loaned on bad or at least on unrealizable security, largely to one firm, the Hinsdales of Middletown, its entire capital, its deposits and its circulation.

There were features which made this Eagle Bank failure a serious catastrophe. Its president, George Hoadly, was also Mayor of the city; the State owned \$30,000 of its stock; after some delay one of the Hinsdales was put in jail on a criminal charge; the bank in Derby also suspended and discredit was brought upon the other financial institutions of the State, so that the New York banks voted to receive no State bank bills except our own and those of the Bridgeport Bank.

A committee, Judge Baldwin, Roger Sherman and Henry Dennison, was asked to aid the Eagle Directors in an examination and statement of their condition.

The liabilities were \$2,140,000; capital stock, \$623,000; notes for circulation, \$430,000; post notes, \$730,000. The assets included doubtful or bad loans, \$1,650,000; cash on hand, \$39,000. And a report the following year only emphasized the completeness of the disaster.

Our bank records do not show any action, but the *Columbian Register* of six weeks or so after the failure (November 12, 1825) has this bit of news: "We understand the vault of the Eagle Bank was attached on the part of the New Haven Bank a few days ago. The contents, however, had been principally removed and the amount obtained was not much."

By this time Eagle bills, at first taken by tradespeople on a basis of mere temporary difficulty, had sunk to 30-40 cents on the dollar. A million and a half of the working capital of the city was wiped out and depression followed, which all local interests must have felt. Our bank's direct loss by the Eagle failure was only \$13,586, however, and was made up by August, 1827. The high and low of deposits for 1825, the year of the failure, was \$114,000 and \$50,000.

Before the railway era, the interior towns of the State—like the little hill cities of Italy in the Cinque Cento—had an

importance as distributing trade centers which was relatively large. Thus the plan to connect Farmington and New Haven by canal was regarded much as railway connection between Worcester and Boston is to-day. And when the Mechanics Bank was founded and its stock offered, specifically to help the Canal along, with a subscription of \$200,000, the process was aided by such statements as this of March 29, 1825, in the *Register*: "The Canal promises incalculable advantages to the cities of New Haven and New York, as well as to the section of the country through which it is to pass." The Farmington Canal vision, however, was larger and more glorious than this. It foresaw an extension to the Connecticut valley, which was realized; it carried the waterway up the Connecticut to our northern boundary; it dreamed of a Canadian canal from the St. Lawrence southward to meet it, thus making the Great Lakes its feeder. No wonder then that a writer in the *Register* of May 14, 1825, assured his public that "with this magnificent adjunct gratuitously annexed to the Farmington Canal, not even conjecture itself can rationally assign limits to its business or to the profits of the Co."

This is not the time for a history of the Farmington Canal. But it is necessary to my narrative to emphasize the fact that local pride and local interest united in the completion and the maintenance of the enterprise.

In 1829, the city subscribed for \$100,000 of stock. In 1832, the City Bank was incorporated in aid of the canal and subscribed \$100,000. It was opened to Farmington in 1828; to Westfield in 1829, and to Northampton in 1835, Henry Farnam being chief engineer.

But the Connecticut River Company, with legislative influence, was hostile; the trade never rose above sixteen or seventeen boats a day; the cost of maintenance was high with freshets frequent, and then the railway era set in. So that the canal was always a losing venture; it never earned its upkeep, let alone interest and dividends, even after the reorganization and merger of the two concerns, the canal to Farmington and its extension to Northampton in 1836.

Again, in 1839, New Haven offered \$100,000 aid, but gave less, \$20,000, and thereafter \$3,000 a year for use of the canal water and power, for there was a city mill run by it. In 1846 the backers of the canal gave in and substituted for it the plan and charter of the railway which was to follow its course, on a towpath so far as might be.

In this long and losing venture our bank aided and suffered. I may add that it squirmed a little also. Its loans to the Canal Company by or in 1833 were \$40,000, and it offered to take sixty-five cents on the dollar for them. At the reorganization of 1836, the New Haven Bank refused to turn its claim into the new stock but offered a release for \$10,000, being twenty-five cents on the dollar. This offer, so far as appears, was in vain, and I fear the \$40,000 was a total loss. So that we, too, bled but died not, for six per cent dividends in 1835 were maintained.

Then came not merely a local but a national disaster, the Panic of 1837. The causes of this panic given in President Van Buren's message were "over action in all departments of business." In point of fact there were wild speculation in western lands, over-trading, unwarranted extension of credits, unproductive improvements like our Farmington Canal and other similar causes. Mercantile failures became numerous, prices fell (e. g. of cotton from 17 to 10; of slaves from 1200 to 300), foreign loans were called, banks suspended specie payments universally, and great distress resulted. Our bank was evidently hard hit with the rest. Following many assignments of its borrowers, it was forced to give time—eighteen months to two years—and its July dividend was passed, though the last and the coming January was paid, so that no year of our life has been barren.

The New York banks suspended specie payments May 10, 1837, New Haven, Hartford, Providence, Philadelphia, and Baltimore next day, Boston the day after. And this lasted a little more than six months. For on November 16, 1837, our records read, "At the meeting of the Board this evening, a communication having been received from a committee of

banks in New York, notifying a convention in that City on the 27th instant, to take into consideration the resumption of specie payments, it was voted that the President be requested to attend said Convention as a Delegate from this Institution and that if called upon to state the condition of this Bank—or if a convenient opportunity offer—that he state to the Convention that we are prepared to resume whenever a general resumption shall be agreed upon.” And, accordingly, January 15, 1838, specie resumption was ordered.

A faint echo of that troubled year is heard in another vote of our board, July 15, 1839, “that the rent of the room occupied by the New Haven Savings Bank be remitted for one year and that the rent for the second year be \$75.”

Almost twenty-three years later, at the breaking out of Civil War, came another suspension of specie payments, rather more lasting, but that is later than the limit proposed for this narrative of The Old New Haven Bank.

It is worthy of mention that so far as the deposits, the dividends or the records of the bank show, its earning capacity was scarcely affected by disasters and panics either local or national. After the war the average of deposits dropped.

Even the Panic of 1873 had no marked effect.

There remain a few details of a more personal sort as our story closes.

In 1831, in the midst of the canal trouble, Dr. Æneas Monson resigned the presidency.

“Thirty-one years this present month completes the routine of my services in the New Haven Bank during which time I have been an active agent in its concerns. I feel an interest in the success and prosperity of the Institution but have arrived to that period of life which seeks repose and invites retirement. I hereby signify to you my resignation and decline all future service in the New Haven Bank. I bid you an affectionate and lasting farewell.”

In view of this touching farewell to business cares, it is worthy of notice that Dr. Monson became president of the Mechanics Bank the next year, and of the City Bank in 1837.

The reply of the directors emphasizes Monson's "prudence, skill, integrity and industry."

The next year William Lyon resigned, also, after more than thirty years' service as teller. And we recall gratefully, also, Amos Townsend, Jr., who came into the bank in October, 1825, and served it fifty-four years, and Ezra Stiles Hubbard, who died in 1861 after keeping its books for thirty-four years. Our late president, Wilbur F. Day, had forty-nine years of service, thirty-seven as president. Mr. Couch was in the bank thirty-seven years, and Mr. Mix, our present cashier, has been with us thirty-nine years, and is a young man still.

Is it not proper to say, then, as my final word that the keynote of this ancient bank has been that of honorable service to the community, and that the spirit of *noblesse oblige* has animated its employees from president to youngest clerk for these eventful hundred and seventeen years, during which our dear land has climbed from its cradle to the seats of the mighty.

THE NEW HAVEN OF TWO HUNDRED YEARS AGO.

By FRANKLIN B. DEXTER, LITT.D.

[Read December 15, 1913.]

Among the most substantial and worthy citizens of this town two hundred years ago, then known to everybody, but now as universally forgotten, was Capt. Francis Browne, a namesake of his grandfather, who was one of the seven original settlers at Quinnipiac in 1637, and who took up his permanent abode on East Water Street, facing the harbor. There Captain Browne was born in 1679, and died in 1741. Though an only surviving son (of Samuel and Mercy Tuttle Browne), he had a large family connection, which was expanded by his marriage into another still wider circle—his wife being a daughter of Judge John Alling. Francis Browne united with the New Haven church, probably in 1715, as his wife had done before her marriage. His piety was shown by his gift to the church of a silver tankard, which is still used in a modified form.

His oldest son was graduated at the college in 1728, and left numerous descendants; but the line of representatives of Francis and Hannah Browne, with which we are more familiar, trace their descent from the only daughter of the household, Mabel, who married Daniel Trowbridge, also a Yale graduate, and is the ancestress of the Trowbridge families who have been and are so prominent in this community.

Francis Browne, a skilled seaman, was commander and part owner of a sloop called the *Speedwell*, and for many years did a prosperous business by plying between New Haven and Boston, carrying from this port consignments of grain, pork, beef, tow cloth, and other products of the farm and of the loom, and

bringing back their value in merchandise bought for his customers in Boston shops.

The day-book in which he kept the record of twenty-five such voyages, between 1707 and 1716, has been lately given to the University Library, and has suggested the present paper. His patrons included about two hundred men and women of prominence in New Haven and its suburbs (the present East Haven, West Haven, Woodbridge, North Haven and Hamden), with perhaps twenty of the leading inhabitants of Derby, and smaller numbers in Wallingford, Stamford, Stratford, Middletown, Woodbury and Killingworth. Occasionally the vessel had to be piloted up "Darby River," as the Housatonic was then also called, to take in freight, and quite regularly stops were made in New London and elsewhere on the route; once at least a detour was made to New York City. I note that the skipper always describes his course as down to Boston and up to New Haven.

I have mentioned the general nature of the articles exported from New Haven. Wheat and flour, Indian corn and rye were the usual crops, with a few oats; there were large amounts of pork and bacon, beef in much smaller quantities, and a good deal of spring butter; also occasional lots of peas and beans, but no other vegetables (the potato was still unknown here); honey, beeswax, and bayberry wax or tallow; hazel nuts, butternuts, and chestnuts; once or twice a basket of eggs, and equally rarely a bag of mustard seed and a bushel of oysters. The last, by the way, sold for a shilling, but we must remember that the prices of that date need to be nearly doubled to correspond to money values of our day. We do not know the sloop's tonnage, but the cargo on any voyage did not usually exceed more than 1,600 bushels of grain. I may add that in the later years the exports increased in variety, the first shipments being almost entirely of wheat and butter.

Flax and wool were also furnished to a large extent, both in bulk and manufactured, with the coarser linen and worsted cloths, especially tow cloth, sail cloth, and shoe thread.

Barrel and hogshead staves and lumber (in boards) were also occasional exports; but these were, after 1714, by order of the Colony government, subject to a special prohibitory duty.

Another large item which New Haven contributed consisted of furs, specified in detail as wolf, bear, fox, raccoon, mink, otter, marten, beaver, and cat, that is wild-cat, skins.

A study of the names of Captain Browne's consignors is a good introduction to the figures prominent in New Haven life two hundred years ago.

I have spoken of the captain and his large circle of kindred. Among these the most important was his father-in-law, John Alling, who had conspicuously served the public for many years as deputy in the General Assembly, one of the governor's council, and judge of the probate and county courts, and held for fifteen years the office of treasurer of the Collegiate School in Saybrook.

He was originally a blacksmith, and lived, I think, on Church Street, near the site of the Bijou Theater. As recorder of the town for over twenty years, his bold, regular handwriting is a joy to all who consult the records for that period.

Captain Browne's list of "Father Alling's" commissions includes many items significant of the simple scale of living demanded here at that date for an elderly official personage, of solid financial standing.

He buys, for instance, in 1707, a silver spoon, costing 13/3, the next year a pair of silver shoe buckles, and later pays for mending a silver chain—doubtless for his wife; other single purchases are a silk handkerchief, a quire of paper, a small Bible, an ivory comb, and in 1713, in striking contrast to all his other purchases, one real luxury, a brass kettle, costing £3.13.9.

The various sons and daughters of his family were also frequent patrons of the *Speedwell*. I need not exemplify further than how "Sister Whitehead" orders a black gauze fan on one voyage, and on another a small pair of shears and a jack knife, or a silk gauze handkerchief, or a pound of whalebone (unusual extreme of fashion), or 500 pins; how

"Sister Susanna," an ancestress of the present White brothers, invests in a pair of shoe buckles or a pair of gloves; and "Sister Sarah Alling," afterwards Mrs. Mansfield, when a young woman of twenty-two, sends on four pounds and a half of beeswax and a couple of bushels of hazelnuts, from which she gets a pound in silver for pocket money, a fragment of which is invested six months later in one wine glass.

To the captain's credit be it said that in the case of his numerous relations and relations-in-law, as well as in the case of other specially favored or respected friends, like his pastor, his custom of charging freight on the goods sent from here and a commission on purchases was generally intermitted. In ordinary cases his commission varied, but was usually, I think, about five per cent.

It was the natural result of the Alling connection that Captain Browne was sometimes employed to purchase supplies for the Collegiate School, which later became Yale College, and of which, as has been said, Judge Alling was the treasurer, while the New Haven minister was the most influential member of its board of trustees; and so these records help us to a few hints of the requirements of that feeble community on Saybrook Point, numbering perhaps from a dozen to twenty members, and devoted to plain living, if not also to high thinking. It may be significant of popular usage that Captain Browne's entries sometimes call the institution "the college," instead of by its strict title, "the Collegiate School."

On the first voyage of the *Speedwell* of which we have record, in the spring of 1707, just after Rector Pierson's death, the sloop took on at New Haven, on account of the Collegiate School, fifty bushels of wheat and about half as much rye, the value of which was mainly returned to Treasurer Alling in cash, the sole item of merchandise being a couple of casks of green, that is, not fully matured wine, costing about four pounds. In the fall another quarter-cask of green wine was needed, and at the same time twenty yards of material for a set of curtains (bed curtains, I suppose), with a set of brass drops or rings, a pewter basin, a pound of alum, a pound of

nutmegs, and seventeen yards of silk crape. The last item, which might to the uninitiated imply a new dress for the house-keeper, was doubtless meant for gowns for the two resident tutors.

In the following spring the amount remitted went (*horresco referens*) for a hogshead of rum, costing £12.16.6. On the next voyage the proceeds of 180 bushels of corn and fifteen bushels of rye were mainly paid in cash to Mr. John Dixwell of Boston, doubtless in settlement of accounts which he had contracted for the school; other trifling purchases for use in the modest establishment at Saybrook were two and one-quarter yards of blue calico,—the first recorded instance of the traditional Yale color,—a hair sieve, a brass skillet, a steel candlestick, and an ounce of lace thread. Business for the school on later voyages consisted mainly in providing by the sale of grain for payments to other agents in Boston besides Dixwell.

But Captain Browne had higher patronage still; the colony government itself appears on one occasion in his accounts. This was in September, 1711, just after Governor Saltonstall and his council, of whom John Alling was one, in session in New Haven, had taken part in equipping a futile expedition under Admiral Walker against Quebec; and a couple of barrels of poor beef, presumably the refuse of the outfit, were entrusted to the skipper of the *Speedwell* for the Boston market; the proceeds, £2.14, were invested on the colony account in "hats," if I read aright the blurred entry.

The first citizen of New Haven in this decade was the Rev. James Pierpont, an ancestor of our friend and secretary, Mr. Blake, and our vice president, Mr. Whitney, of Presidents Woolsey and Dwight, of Aaron Burr and Pierpont Morgan, and countless other notable persons, the pastor of the only church in town (until that in East Haven was gathered in 1711), whose life closed in 1714 in the parsonage on the public library lot on Elm Street. His refined and gentle countenance is familiar to us in the only portrait which is preserved of any Connecticut minister of that generation. He was a liberal patron of Captain Browne's facilities for trade, and it may be

of interest to note some of the household supplies which he was prompted to import. In 1707, at a cost of £1.3.10, he acquired two pounds of white sugar, two of raisins, two wine glasses, a pound of allspice, a piece of tape, an ounce of treacle (doubtless for medicinal use), one of mithridate (a panacea for all ailments), a little saffron, half an ounce of mace, a yard and a half of ribbon, and 1,000 pins.

In 1708 the good minister laid in a barrel of green wine, a tobacco box, and a dozen pipes, which last supply was so nearly exhausted seven months later, that another dozen had to be ordered. In 1711, a horn book was purchased, for thrip-pence, from which no doubt his youngest daughter, then fifteen months old, who became the wife of Jonathan Edwards, was destined to learn her letters. In 1712 four gallons of rum were added to the parson's storeroom. In 1713 two looking glasses were among his acquisitions; also three boys' hats of felt, for his three eldest sons, aged from 14 to 9; also "12 Sermons," copies I suppose of that sermon which he had preached in Boston during a notable sojourn there in 1711, when his portrait was painted, and which had been printed under Cotton Mather's direction.

The most expensive items among his purchases (besides the wine) were materials for clothes; twice, it would appear, within six brief years, he had new broadcloth suits, and twice a new preacher's gown of silk crape; while Mrs. Pierpont and her children were equally amply provided for.

The families of Mr. Pierpont's predecessors are also represented in these lists, by the venerable widow of John Davenport's only son (a sister of Rector Pierson), and her children; and by Samuel and Nicholas Street, grandsons of the second New Haven pastor. The elder of these brothers, both active business men in Wallingford, was the progenitor of many well-known New Haven citizens, among them Abraham Bishop, Augustus R. Street, and of the living Mr. Justus Street Hotchkiss.

Of Governor Eaton, the civil leader of the colony, the one descendant whose name I am sure of in this record is his granddaughter, the widow Sarah Morrison, who in 1707

invested the proceeds of three pounds of old pewter in a couple of wine-glasses, a beaker (or goblet), and a pint of wine.

Of the Yale family, who were a part of the Eaton household, and who otherwise deserve special notice, the only representative on these pages is Nathaniel Yale of North Haven, a first cousin of Elihu Yale, and a Deputy to the General Assembly.

There are also grandchildren of Deputy Governor Goodyear and of Deputy Governor Gilbert.

A step below the chief magistracy and the ministry in dignity were the deacons of the church; and Abraham Bradley and John Punderson, then in office, are of this company. There is nothing special about their commissions, except that Deacon Punderson, living on the south side of Chapel Street, on York, seems to have been more than usually inclined to lay in a good stock of wine; Deacon Bradley was also prominent in civil life as for years one of the deputies to the General Court.

It is fair, perhaps, to name with these, four others who subsequently attained the rank of deacon,—Isaac Dickerman, John Punderson, Junior, John Munson, and Jonathan Mansfield. Two of these, Deacons Punderson and Mansfield, married sisters of Mrs. Browne, and availed themselves pretty constantly of Captain Browne's services.

"Brother Punderson," by trade a cooper, occasionally barter hogshead staves for articles of merchandise; he was also a small store-keeper, importing jackknives and inkhorns and ivory combs and alchemy spoons by the dozen, and molasses by the hundred gallons. Alchemy spoons, it may be noted, were the customary inexpensive substitutes for silver spoons, of baser metallic composition, imitating gold in color.

"Brother Mansfield," who lived on the site of the new county court house, was an ancestor of the most of the bearers of that name among us, and it may emphasize for us his environment to find on his record of purchases in 1708 an account book and a sermon book, that is, a volume of sermons, and to trace at the same date some employment of his, under his father-in-law, Treasurer Alling, in the conduct of the money matters of the Collegiate School.

The next minister ordained within the ancient limits of the town after Mr. Pierpont, was Jacob Hemingway, whose nearly seven years of informal pastoral employment in his native village at the iron works, or East Haven, were followed by his ordination there in October, 1711. His need for Captain Browne's agency first appears in 1709, when he equips himself with material for a black broadcloth coat and with an expensive castor hat, presumably made of rabbit's fur, and costing one pound; besides other scattered purchases, in 1711 he orders a thousand eight-penny nails, implying perhaps that he was engaged in enlarging or repairing the parsonage, preparatory to his marriage.

The other learned professions were more slowly recruited. In 1708 for the first time regulations were framed by the General Assembly for the admission of attorneys to the bar, and the first person thus admitted, for this county, in the following October, was Jeremiah Osborne, already for years a deputy to the General Court, and a justice of the peace and quorum. As his wife was an aunt of Mrs. Browne, he naturally made use of Browne's agency. Among his errands were the purchase of a pair of silver buckles and clasps in 1707, and of eight metal (probably brass) buttons and a tankard in 1708. I regret to say that our only lawyer died insolvent in 1713, and that he had no successor during the period of our survey.

So far as we know there was in these years no regular practitioner of medicine in New Haven except Warham Mather, who would in any case deserve mention here as a leading citizen. A Harvard graduate, and first cousin of Cotton Mather, he had served for some twenty years as a preacher in various localities, before settling in New Haven about 1705. Here he held honorable rank as a justice of the peace and quorum, and eventually succeeded John Alling as judge of the probate court. Like many of the bright intellects of that day, he had added the study of medicine to his clerical training, for on the rude map of New Haven in 1724 his name, "W. Mather, Physician" is affixed to the old Davenport house, on the site of the Presbyterian church on Elm Street, which he occupied as the inheritance of his wife, a daughter

of John Davenport, Jr. He sends by Captain Browne continually for physic, and for drugs from the apothecary's, to large amounts. Moreover, in 1711 he is credited, besides his wheat and rye and money, with three shillings, eight pence, for "physic at home," which means clearly that Captain Browne had employed him, to some extent at least, as his family physician and was thus paying a debt. The remaining incident of note in Mr. Mather's accounts in Captain Browne's day-book is that in 1710 he indulged in ordering a knife and fork. Now knives were a necessity, but forks came into use in New England very slowly, after 1700, and there is but one other mention of them in these records. Judge Mather's name is memorable also on account of the inventory of his estate in our probate records, with a list of his theological library, mainly inherited from distinguished relatives, and of unparalleled length and minuteness.

I may add that I suppose it is not a mere coincidence that the physician next preceding Mather in New Haven, Nathaniel Wade, a native of Massachusetts, was the husband of another of John Davenport's granddaughters, a sister of Mrs. Mather and of a former wife of Mr. Pierpont. Mrs. Mather, I presume, after Wade had left, about 1700, took her sister's place in the care of the aged Madam Davenport, and Mather, perhaps as a makeshift, succeeded to the abandoned medical practice of Dr. Wade.

Next to these professional men should be counted the rector of the Hopkins Grammar School, who was for all this period Samuel Cooke, a college graduate, who married a New Haven girl, Anne Trowbridge, in 1708, and was ordained over the Stratfield, now Bridgeport, church in 1716. His youthful promise gained for him for several of these years election as a deputy to the General Assembly. His purchases through Captain Browne seem to have been mainly for his wife's wardrobe, and were probably paid for with her money, not from the meager stipend of the rector.

One of his classmates whose name is also here is the Rev. Samuel Whittelsey, pastor in Wallingford and father of a future pastor of New Haven. He was ordained in 1710, and

in 1711 sent to Boston for the items needed for a country parsonage—among them camlet for a suit of clothes and a pair of worsted stockings for himself; Scotch cloth (a thin dress stuff) and a mourning veil for his mother, he being still a bachelor; a pair of money scales; and (a unique order) six wash-balls, equivalent, I take it, to our cakes of soap.

With these graduates may be mentioned also the Rev. Joseph Moss, jr., a Harvard bachelor and Yale master of arts, a native of New Haven and first cousin of Mrs. Browne, who became the minister of Derby in 1707. We trace his progress in these pages by his purchase of 6,000 eight-penny nails in June, 1707, probably for house repairs or enlargement; and marvel at his temperance in ordering a single pint of wine therewith for refreshment. A year later he is able to afford the customary broadcloth coat and crape gown of his vocation. In 1710 he buys a large Bible, and an expensive record book, a barrel of gunpowder, 200 pounds of shot, and half a grindstone—the other half being credited to a parishioner. In 1711 we detect his growing prosperity by his indulgence in a brass kettle costing £5.3 and twenty-four glass bottles, at six pence each, a glass inkhorn (an unusual luxury), and a trunk with drawers; and by 1712 he rises to the extravagance of six gallons of madeira. Twice during these years he buys a book, his selections being Henry Care's "English Liberties," a digest of documents with ample commentary, and a small book called "The Clerk's Guide," both volumes useful in his capacity as town clerk and general public counsellor.

A few other prominent citizens, besides those already specified, had served, or were serving during these years, as deputies to the General Assembly. Of these one of the oldest was Capt. John Bassett, among whose significant purchases are a rapier in 1710, two gold rings in 1711, two more in 1712, and a valuable pair of silver shoe buckles in 1713. Another long-time deputy was Col. Joseph Whiting, of Hartford birth, whose name still lives in Whiting Street, which marks at its entrance into State the site of his former dwelling. It must have been a house abounding in hospitality, as the owner's first

recorded payment to Captain Browne was for six dozen wine glasses, at six shillings apiece. Jared Ingersoll, the stamp agent, married one of his daughters, and the Rev. Chauncey Whittelsey of the First church a second. Another of these ancient office-bearers was the Joseph Moss whose wife was an aunt of Mrs. Browne.

Perhaps also I should mention in this connection two of the East Haven patrons of Captain Browne, Thomas Goodsell and John Russell, who had been sent by their neighbors to the General Assembly after East Haven was granted village and church privileges, but who had no right to the representative function, and on the remonstrance of the mother town were debarred from further service, as East Haven was not then legally a separate body politic.

Among other leading citizens of somewhat ample means, and of the leisured though not the professional class, was John Hodson, or Hudson, who died in 1711, in his forty-fifth year. Young though he was, he appears in Captain Browne's record as acquiring a periwig, which cost him fifteen shillings, the year before his death. His house, I think, was on the west side of State Street, between Chapel and Crown.

Another leading citizen who had dealings with Captain Browne, though partly retired by age, was John Prout, a sea captain, of English birth, who lived on State Street, opposite Water Street, where his name is preserved in the narrow, crooked alley called Prout Street. His only son was a graduate of the Collegiate School in 1708.

Still another of the wealthier magnates of that generation was Mr. Thomas Trowbridge, third of that name, with his domicile on Meadow Street to the north of the armory. The house is still standing, in the rear of other buildings, greatly changed, and with a mistaken legend on its front, implying that it dates from 1642 (instead of 1684). With this exception no house of 200 years ago is now or has been for many years, extant.

Another marked group with claims to distinction may be found among the "honorable women . . . not a few," who made more or less regular purchases through Captain Browne.

There were, for instance, Mrs. Dixwell, the venerable relict of the regicide, on the garden of whose home lot this building stands, and who lies buried in the city Green; the widow, Elizabeth Gaskell, a great-aunt of Roger Sherman; Mrs. Elizabeth Maltby, by a later marriage mother of Judge Abraham Davenport, the hero of the "Dark Day"; and Mrs. Lydia Rosewell, the wealthy widow of John Alling's predecessor as treasurer of the Collegiate School, whose mansion occupied the northwest corner of Meadow and Water Streets, and one of whose daughters became in later years Captain Browne's second wife. Among Mrs. Rosewell's descendants was a former active member of this society, Hon. Lynde Harrison.

On the earliest extant map of New Haven, that of 1724, while the occupations of many householders are given, only one person is described as a "merchant"; and probably at the time of which I am speaking there were very few general stores in the town, though I realize that Captain Browne's recorded transactions give us only a partial view of the situation. As far as his pages show, the largest dealer was Jonathan Atwater, an ancestor of the late Wilbur F. Day and the late E. Hayes Trowbridge, who lived on the west side of College Street, north of Crown, and whose transactions with Boston as here shown were of far larger volume than those of any other citizen. He seems, also, to have been part owner of the sloop; and I surmise that this relation may have led both Browne and Atwater to some extent into general trading as a profitable pursuit.

At any rate we find Jonathan Atwater debited with numerous entries such as these, which could hardly have been meant on the scale of living of that day for the consumption of his own household: in 1708, three dozen jackknives, two dozen thorn-hafted knives, three dozen combs, and 600 gallons of rum; in 1711, 60,000 nails, 15 scythes, two dozen large scissors, 300 flints, six pounds of pepper, and a dozen primers; and in 1713, three dozen more primers, at threepence apiece, and 1,000 pounds of sugar. As an example of his mode of payment, he is credited on the voyage of these last purchases with bulky items like 42 barrels of pork, which sold for £157, and over 400 pounds of bread, bringing about £5.

There is also evidence in their accounts that Jonathan Atwater's nephew, Joshua Atwater, an ancestor of many of the Hotchkiss and Townsend families of the present day, and Samuel Smith of West Haven were part owners of the *Speedwell*; the former seems also to have been one of the ship's crew on some voyages.

Besides Jonathan Atwater and Captain Browne himself these pages intimate that Richard Hall also, who lived (I think) on State Street, opposite George, did some business as a general trader. How else can be explained such wholesale exports from Boston as a dozen jackknives at a time, repeatedly, half a dozen hour-glasses, half a dozen catechisms, half a dozen pounds of alum, and half a dozen bottles of elixir?

There were also one or two merchants in Derby who were frequent customers. John Weed, for example, imported all kinds of needles and pins by the hundred and the thousand, basins and porringers by the dozen, and other goods in like proportion.

One index of the standing of our colonists is seen in the friendships which these entries reveal with Boston people. In a large number of accounts, for instance, there is evidence of the most intimate friendly and business connections with John Dixwell, jr., the only son of the New Haven regicide, and a leading gold and silversmith. Again we find repeated proofs of familiar relations with Mrs. Sarah Knight, the lively school mistress, to whose pen we owe a well-known record of travel from her home in Boston to New York in 1704. In 1713 Captain Browne delivered to her, free of charge, a barrel of pork and two bushels of wheat, as a present from Mrs. Gaskell, a Massachusetts woman by birth, who sent also on the same occasion similar gifts to other friends, in one case including a basket of eggs.

And similarly Madam Hannah Trowbridge, the widow of Thomas the second, sends the same Madam Knight in 1707 a bag of shoe thread and a couple of bushels of wheat.

A long list might be made of Boston merchants of old familiar names, headed by the Huguenot, "Andrew Funnell,"

uncle of the munificent donor of Faneuil market, with whom the New Haven planters were in constant intercourse.

One special class of commercial correspondents of Captain Browne should be noticed, though I am not entirely able to explain their standing. I refer to Boston merchants, who were certainly never resident here, but who appear to have had considerable dealings by this channel with the New Haven market. Thus, Andrew Belcher, a wealthy provincial councilor of Massachusetts, father of a future royal governor, was one of Browne's chief customers, exporting from here very large quantities of the regular staples, for which he received part pay in money and part in such common necessities or luxuries as green wine, rum, molasses, salt, and powder and shot, which he sent back to New Haven. Among these ventures of his for sale here there is but one of a unique sort, that of 2,000 shingles, or shindels, as the name was then. Details are, however, wanting as to the agency through which these staples were gathered for him and others like him for transmission to Boston, and through which the realized proceeds were distributed here.

Mention has been incidentally made of many importations which New Haven households owed to Captain Browne's enterprise, but it may be of interest thus to trace something of the progress of comfort and comparative luxury in such a community.

The ordinary table supplies which were not the products of the native fields and gardens and stockyards formed a major part of each cargo, being chiefly sugar, molasses, salt, and various kinds of spices and liquors; the wines were sometimes direct imports from Fayal, on which Captain Browne paid the freight and the duties. Of what might be called luxuries of diet I recall only salad oil, salt mackerel, figs, raisins, and currants. (Tea and coffee, it should be remembered, were not then known here.) Tobacco was indulged in to a moderate extent, as repeated items of tobacco pipes, boxes, and tongs testify; an occasional entry such as "fifty canes" refers, I suppose, to this usage, the weed being supplied in slender sticks or canes.

Utensils and requirements for the household, the farm, and the sailing vessel formed another bulky item. Among the things most frequently necessary, which craftsmen of the neighborhood could not furnish, were iron and steel bars, powder and shot, oakum, tar, nails, knives of all sorts, scissors, razors, sheep-shears, scythes, grindstones and rubstones (the equivalent of whetstones), fishhooks, pots and kettles, pans and basins, platters and dishes of pewter and earthenware, and implements for weaving and for navigation. Glass and lead, evidently for windows, are mentioned but once.

Every householder with pretensions to comfortable living had to supply himself from outside with warming pans for his beds, and with pewter platters and mugs and one or two wine glasses for his table; pewter instead of wooden plates and tankards were almost equally necessary, and alchemy spoons of unhealthy brass or copper alloy, while one or two glass tumblers and one or two silver spoons marked a slightly higher style of living. Once or twice a silver cup is ordered through Captain Browne, but the richer citizens preferred probably to deal directly with Mr. Dixwell and others of his trade, rather than trust another's selection. The most expensive single household utensil was the big brass kettle, the height apparently of universal ambition.

Ordinary benches, stools, beds and tables were put together by the village joiners, but occasionally half a dozen chairs would be imported; also the more elaborate needs in heating and cooking apparatus, as tongs, shovels, bellows, and chafing dishes.

Rugs are scantily mentioned, and carpets unknown. I note, however, in the town records for 1715 that the term "carpet" is affixed as a marginal reading to the entry of the generosity of Jonathan Atwater in "freely offering to the town a cloth to be serviceable at funerals," presumably as a pall, though called a carpet. Clocks and watches do not appear, but hour-glass and half-hour glasses are in frequent demand. Looking glasses are also regular articles of commerce. Lanterns and candlesticks had constantly to be got, and occasionally a tin

lamp; the former were mainly equipped with candles of home manufacture, though "white amber," that is spermaceti, and whale oil and blubber were also imported, the latter not so much for lamplight as for use in curing leather, one of the infant industries of the town.

These pages instruct us also in the dress of the clients for whom Captain Browne bargained. New Haven, to be sure, had its tailors and dressmakers, but they carried no stock of materials, and a large vocabulary of fabrics then in vogue might be compiled from these entries. Sailcloth, bed-ticking and bunting had, of course, other uses, and linsey-woolsey, though also for clothing, appears mainly in demand for bed-curtains.

For coarse, heavy clothes there were stuff, frieze, fustian, buckram, drugget, cantaloon, twist, serge, sagathy and kersey; and finer grades in broadcloth, camlet, calamanco, russel, and tammy. The most coveted manufactures of fine linen were cambric, garlits, holland, and kenting, and of the coarser linens, dowlas and osnaburgs. Besides these were calicos and muslins, Scotch cloth (a cheap sort of lawn), and shalloon for linings. Of silks there were the heavier and coarser grograms and poplins, ordinary black silk for gowns, the glossy lutestring, the thin light alamode (the favorite summer wear), crape for mourning and for the clergy, and damask and plush for persons of extra style. The luxuriance allowed in men's dress appears in the item of buttons, which were regularly ordered with the material for coats and waistcoats at the rate of three or four dozen for each garment.

Hats for men and boys, of felt, beaver and castor were called for in great numbers. What were brought for women's head-gear I do not so clearly make out, except "silk caps," which were doubtless hoods. In one case only, a hairbrush was ordered.

Gloves of all sorts, sometimes of wash-leather, were frequent articles of commerce, occasionally also "half-handed gloves" or mitts, and mittens. The "worsted stockings" which often appear as purchased in Boston were not I suppose knitted, for those could be had at home, but sewn together of cloth.

Handkerchiefs were among the commonest articles of merchandise, especially of silk, and of the inferior silk or cotton material known as romal. In one case Captain Browne charges himself with three neckcloths. Shoes were commonly well enough made by local cobblers, but a few of better style were imported, and one constant item was women's wooden heels. It was the decree of fashion that high heels be worn, and the wooden constructions in the Boston market were so cheap as to be attractive, but wore out so fast that they had to be ordered by the dozen, or even by the half-dozen dozen.

A pair of spectacles was quite often needed, and Captain Browne could be trusted to suit the eyes of each customer; occasionally a cane, or a sword and belt, or a periwig was also left to his judgment.

Of personal ornaments and embellishments of apparel but few appear. Gold rings are two or three times purchased; silver shoe-buckles and clasps with considerable frequency, and more rarely silver chains, shirt buttons, lockets (or lockers), and even whistles are mentioned. Strings of beads often appear; and coral is in some way, I do not quite understand why, a very popular acquisition. Silver thimbles are occasionally mentioned, but cheaper thimbles, not especially described, were probably of brass. Fans, often specified as of gauze, ivory, cane, or leather, were favorite demands of Captain Browne's female patrons.

A good deal of his time must have been spent in waiting on the apothecary, for a remarkable assortment of drugs and physic appears in his ledger. Among the commonest remedies the following, at least, should be included—saffron, spirit of hartshorn, aniseed, licorice, rhubarb, linseed oil, blistering salve, treacle, mithridate, alum, brimstone, jalap, salammoniac, senna, diapalm (a favorite plaster), cochee pills, and spirits of turpentine. The formidable enumeration might be much lengthened, but this is enough to provoke a reminiscence of the atrocious couplet in *Hudibras* decrying those

"Stored with deletery med'cines
Which whosoever took is dead since."

Any light on the attitude of New Haven people towards books and learning two hundred years ago is of interest; but very little is to be gathered from this source. Browne himself, though he sent one son to college, was not a devotee of literature. In the list of purchases for his own use are several Bibles and for the use of his children hornbooks and primers; and finally in 1716, when his oldest child was in his eleventh year, he buys "A Accidence," which perhaps marks the first steps of this boy in his college training.

The *Speedwell* in these voyages brought to this port some forty copies of the Bible to as many private families—several copies containing also the metrical version of the Psalms by Sternhold and Hopkins with music, besides copies of this version separately. More than half a dozen times too, there is record of Bibles sent back by Captain Browne to Boston for rebinding. Bibles of all sizes are described, from one great Bible, probably designed for pulpit use; and Captain Browne once imports for his own use a "painted Bible," which may mean one with colored plates.

Hornbooks and primers are ordered many times; an arithmetic more than once; and once what is summarily described as a "military book."

Other literary ventures for New Haven and vicinity include a copy of that staunch Presbyterian, John Flavel's "Husbandry Spiritualized," bought in 1711 for Jacob Johnson of Wallingford, an ancestor of the late Hon. Frederick J. Kingsbury; "The Mariner's Compass," a manual of navigation, ordered by Moses Mansfield, himself a veteran sailor, in 1713; a curious, not very high-toned miscellany, called "Wit's Cabinet, a Companion for Gentlemen and Ladies," affording instruction in the interpretation of dreams, in palmistry, and the concoction of cosmetics, together with a collection of songs—consigned in 1708 to John Beach of Wallingford. In the same year Stephen Munson, a learned blacksmith for his day, who lived on the northwest corner of Grove and State Streets, and is said to have been an ancestor of Thurlow Weed, became the owner of an edition of the "Pilgrim's Progress" and of a

compilation called "The Experienced Secretary," besides a "Psalm Book."

His older brother, Theophilus Munson, a gunsmith and locksmith of College Street, near the south end of Woolsey Hall, in 1711 with astonishing foresight bought a Latin dictionary for seventeen shillings—though his son Daniel, who was graduated at Yale in 1726, was then only two years old and can scarcely have been expected to begin his classical training at that age or through that vehicle. But however this may have been, when Samuel Mix, who lived on the Battell Chapel site, is credited in the same year with "3 Latin books," we may feel sure that they were destined for the use of his oldest son, a boy of eleven, who was graduated nine years later.

I said just now that our captain was not a devotee of literature; and a fortunate result of this is that he used in his accounts a system of phonetic spelling, so complete that we can almost universally tell just how he pronounced the names of every person and thing that he dealt with. In general his practice leans toward economy, as for instance in reducing Goodyear to five letters, Gudyar, and Cooke to three, Cuk, and checkered (describing a lining) to six, chekrd.

Of course in most cases the result is altogether natural. We find thus that Derby was to Captain Browne Darby, just as the cis-Atlantic namesake of the English Hertford had already become Hartford; and just as he wrote sarmons for sermons, and sarge for serge, so to him Sherman was usually Sharman. But the unexpected thing is that he persists in this particular vowel-change in unaccented syllables in his common vocabulary to a remarkable extent; I content myself with only an example or two of what is a constant practice; thus Mather is written Mathar, primer, primar, and even father, brother and sister, fathar, brothar and sistar.

Similar changes with other vowels are shown in Thorp always becoming Tharp, and the Christian name Dorcas becoming Darkis. The converse of this change is traceable in the name of a family, of the nieces and nephew of Mr. Pierpont, who came hither from Boston early in the 18th century, the

Haywards, as we should call them, but always known then as Ha(r)wards, and later, after the *y* had been discarded in the spelling, Howards.

Other vagaries in the pronunciation of family names are such as Balding for Baldwin, Hodson for Hudson, Person for Pierson (as Perse in our own day for Pierce), Belshar for Belcher, Punshard for Punchard, Stodder for Stoddard, and Orsburn for Osborn.

Other common words which appear in Captain Browne's manuscript with the mispronunciations which we now think vulgar, such as hankereher or handkechif, ornery, leftenant, jiner for joiner, and Giney for Jenny, need not detain us; nor need reasons for raisins, which was still considered proper, I believe, within living memory. On the other hand, in the only reference on these pages to the institution of domestic slavery, a record of money paid to the negro of the Rev. Joseph Moss, the spelling is faithful to the correct sound.

This incidental mention of slavery calls up the sole reference in these pages to another of the ordinary social conditions of life, in the expenditure of upward of £16 on securing and bringing from Boston in 1713, a "Jarsey boy" to be apprenticed to Samuel Riggs, a wealthy merchant of Derby.

In a desultory way I have thus attempted to make a prosaic account book tell something of our predecessors of 200 years ago, and their way of living, but I have left myself little space, even if I had the power, to construct a satisfactory picture of the plantation as a whole. We must remember primarily that the settled part of the town extended only from York and Grove Streets to the water; and that the whole region between York and Church was comparatively sparsely peopled, since the business center was on the waterside and its tributary streets, especially State Street. The plantation had still so much the character of a village that the streets had no distinctive names, but each one is likely to be described in deeds and wills of the period as "the town street."

The central green was the common rendezvous, where the townsmen drilled for military service, where the entire com-

munity gathered in one house for worship, and where in the same house the General Assembly of the Colony and the County Court held their regular sessions, as we may all learn fully from Mr. Blake's delightful book.

The inhabitants formed a simple, homogeneous society, with few distinctions and few pleasures. Captain Browne observes carefully in his record the usual early gradations of dignity. Military officers are punctiliously mentioned by title, and the designation of "Mr.," which was at an earlier period so sparingly used, is apparently still limited to persons of special civil and family desert. The corresponding term "Mistress" is reserved for married women—an inferior social standing being indicated in only two cases by the term "Goody"; single women are mentioned without title.

The population of the compact portion of the town I find it hard to estimate; but I doubt if it was much over 700. In 1707, when these accounts begin, just seventy years had passed since the advance guard of the first settlers had arrived here; and their generation had already disappeared, the last male survivor, as I suppose, being Deacon William Peck, who died in 1694; but his widow lived on until 1717, and the widow of Matthew Gilbert, one of the original seven pillars of the church, lived until 1706.

In 1715, just before the termination of Captain Browne's record, Joseph Noyes of Stonington was called to succeed Mr. Pierpont as the minister of the town; and this decided the removal of the college to New Haven. Rival towns were contending for it, and when young Noyes accepted the call here, this threw the weight of the influence of his father and uncle, two of the most influential trustees, into the scale in favor of New Haven.

The definite settlement of the college here in October, 1716, created a new local center of activity, with immediate and permanent changes in the vicinity of the college buildings, all of which resulted in the development of a different life in the town, with intellectual interests and aspirations before unknown.

In the New Haven of our story, before it was spoiled or improved, whichever you choose to consider it, by the introduction of the college, intercourse with the outside world was maintained by post as well as by water. A post-boy rode regularly between New York and Boston, and vessels like the *Speedwell* were not permitted to carry letters except for delivery in port directly to the postmaster. Some half dozen times in Captain Browne's day-book we find charges to customers for postal dues which he has paid, usually for a single letter, varying from six pence to a shilling, and in one case, that of the Rev. Mr. Moss of Derby, he settles an account amounting to £1.4.6.

By water there was important commerce with the West Indies, besides doubtless other common carriers than our friend, Captain Browne; but it may be that no record as complete as his is still extant; and until one is made public, and annotated by some future and more skilful investigator, I venture to hope that these scattered notes may serve to illustrate our early domestic commerce, as well as to revive the memory of one of its worthiest promoters.

INSCRIPTIONS
ON
TOMBSTONES IN NEW HAVEN,
ERECTED PRIOR TO 1800.

A copy of these inscriptions, so far as legible, was printed (with annotations) in Volume III of the *Papers* of this Society, in 1882. Recently a transcript of a portion of these inscriptions, made in 1851, has been found; and as this includes some copies of stones which had disappeared before 1882, it has been thought desirable to publish these, with some corrections for the previous list and for the annotations.

These corrections are numbered to correspond to the former list; the new inscriptions are numbered in continuation.

FRANKLIN B. DEXTER.

March, 1914.

CORRECTIONS.

23. Roger Alling died Apr., 1759.
28. Should be in heavy type, as from the Crypt.
82. Elisha, son of David Austin, died Aug. 6, 1771, aged 17 months; Ebenezer Elisha died Apr. 5, 1773, aged 14 months.
86. Son of Elias and Eunice, of Durham, baptized Feb., 1751/2.
142. Daughter of Jonathan and Sarah (Beach) Nichols, of Stratford, b. May 26, 1716. He next married, Jan. 20, 1765, Abigail.
149. Samuel Bishop, Sr., was deacon 1st Church, 1717-48; Samuel, Jr., deacon 1st Church, 1756-71.
154. Daughter of Nathaniel and Mary (Todd) Heaton, b. June 14, 1712.
161. The father d. 1779.
163. The stone commemorated a first wife. A second wife, also Mary, b. Dec. 15, 1704, was dau. of D. Goodrich, etc.
172. He died Oct. 12, 1718; deacon from about 1685.
182. In her 8th, not 38th year.
190. Died 1739.
194. Amelia d. Dec. 31; dau. of Phebe, dau. of Dr. Zophar Platt, of Huntington, L. I.
199. Dau. of John Alling (No. 16).
206. Olive Brown was sister, not daughter, of 197.
231. Married in Boston, Dec. 14, 1714, wid. of David Cutler.
257. Son of David.
258. Dau. of Dugald and Sarah Mackenzie, of Fairfield.
281. He d. 1676.
294. Should be in plain type. Son of William and Elizabeth (Brent).
342. Dau. of Richard and Hannah (Easton) Miles (No. 568); b. March 19, 1707; wid. of 907.
362. Add to stone:
Lamented. She died of the small pox at Cheshire, February y^e 19th A. D. 1782 & in the 36th year of her Age.
370. Dau. of 744 and 745; b. Dec. 26, 1695.
373. Grandson of Nos. 72, 73; d. 1774.
383. Died Oct. 21, 1796. The mother was daughter of Joseph and Patience (Sperry) Mix.
398. Mary L. Hillhouse d. 1822.
412. Died 1689.
427. Son of No. 425.
437. Died Dec. 29.
438. Son of John and Experience, who was a sister of Rev. James Pierpont (No. 691).
456. Dau. of Samuel and Meletiah (Bradford).
457. Dau. of Abraham and Elizabeth (Glover) Dickerman, and widow of Michael Todd. His 3d wf. was widow of Wm. Stevens, of Marblehead, Mass.
465. Died 1794.

477. Dau. of Janna and Dorothy (Griswold) Hand, of East Guilford; b. Sept. 5, 1725.
478. Dau. of Orchard and Mary (Foote) Guy, of Branford; b. Dec. 5, 1738; m. Samuel Huggins, July 3, 1760.
494. Aged 74 years.
498. Died 1780.
516. Son of Augustus and Bathsheba (Eliot), of Newport, R. I.
535. The will quoted is the will of Ebenezer, Jr.
540. Aged 63.
568. Dau. of Joseph Easton, of E. Hartford.
571. Son of Lieut. Richard and Hannah (Easton), (No. 568); b. Aug. 4, 1701.
572. Dau. of Rev. John and Sarah (Rosewell) Woodward (No. 940).
578. Died March 8.
600. Dau. of John and Hannah (Tuttle) Pantry, of Hartford; d. March, 1724.
601. Son of 599 and 600.
623. Benj. Munson living 1796; son of Nos. 636 and 637.
632. Born Hollingsworth, of Milford.
635. Died 1759.
637. Dau. of Nos. 586 and 587.
641. For MAO^r read MAG^r.
707. Died July 25, 1740.
709. For Barrott read Barrett.
741. Son of Isaac and Jemima (Sage), of Wethersfield: b. Dec. 10, 1748. His wid. m. Maj. Jonathan Heart, of Berlin, May 7, 1778. He d. Nov. 4, 1790, and she m., Aug., 1797, Rev. Dr. Cyprian Strong, of Chatham, who d. Nov. 17, 1811. She d. in North Haven, Feb. 15, 1815.
750. Dau. of Col. Nicholas and Mercy (Tillinghast) Power.
764. Dau. of Samuel and Rebecca (Bunnell) Burwell; b. May 13, 1692.
778. Died 1794.
781. Died 1773.
791. First married Hezekiah Howe, who d. Apr., 1776.
803. Merit Tappen d. 1794, aged 3 years.
805. Dau. of Samuel and Rebecca (Browne) Clark; b. March , 1710.
828. Son of Samuel and Mary (Bradley); b. March 14, 1686/7.
864. Thankful Trowbridge b. 1755.
887. Married Catharine, dau. of Capt. Isaac and Catharine (Baldwin) Miles, b. 1755, d. May 26, 1837.
889. James G., not C., Wallace.
906. Dau. of Nos. 16 and 17; b. Sept. 14, 1680; d. March, 1759.
910. Born Sept. 22, 1722.
926. A more probable conjecture is that these initials stand for Elizabeth Wakeman, wf. of John, and dau. of William Hopkins, of Bewdley, England.

ADDITIONS.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>952 Here lies y^e Body
of M^{rs} Dinah
Attwater y^e Wife -
of M^r James Attw-
ater Who Died
Dec^r y^e 29, 1739
in y^e 38 Year</p> <hr style="width: 10%; margin: 10px auto;"/> | <p>956 Mary Carpent^r
Daughter of M^r
Anthony &
M^{rs} Abigail
Carpenter
who died N[ov.]
12th A. D. 17[60]
Her</p> <hr style="width: 10%; margin: 10px auto;"/> |
| <p>953 Susana
Daughter of M^r
Ebenezer & M^{rs}
Susana Basset
died Oct^{br} 29th
A. D. 1763 in her
10th year</p> <hr style="width: 10%; margin: 10px auto;"/> | <p>957 In Memory of Elijah
Crane Son of Elijah &
Mary Crane who de
parted this Life August
29th 1795 in the 9th Year
of his age</p> <hr style="width: 10%; margin: 10px auto;"/> |
| <p>954 Jesse y^e
Son of M^r
Abner & M^{rs}
Abigail Brad-
ley died
August y^e 6th
1739 aged 2
Years</p> <hr style="width: 10%; margin: 10px auto;"/> | <p>958 - - - - -
- - - - -
wife of
Samuel Farnes
who Died March
4 170⁹ Aged 58
- - -</p> <hr style="width: 10%; margin: 10px auto;"/> |
| <p>955 Hannah y^e
Daughter of
M^r Timothy
& M^{rs} Hannah
Browne died
decem^r y^e 13th
1747 Aged
4 Months</p> | <p>959 Nathanael Son of
Mr. Nathanael & Mrs.
Mary Fitch born Feb - -
11th 1771 & died 22^d of y^e same
William Son of y^e above
Parents Born April 28
1772 & died Octo^{br} 8, 177 - -</p> |

⁹⁵² Dau. of No. 761; wf. of No. 45.

⁹⁵³ Ebenezer Bassett m. Susanna, daughter of John and Susanna White (Nos. 894, 895); dau. b. Apr. 3, 1754.

⁹⁵⁴ Son of Nos. 167 and 168.

⁹⁵⁵ Dau. of No. 210.

⁹⁵⁶ Dau. of Nos. 232 and 233.

⁹⁵⁹ Sons of No. 324 and of Mary, dau. of Nos. 808 and 809.

960 In Memory of
M^{rs} Mary Hine
widow of M^r
Alexander Hine
at Woodbridge who
died October 25th
1790 in the 90th
Year of her age.

961 In Memory of
Lieut^t
Richard Miles
who died July
y^e 5th A. D. 1756
in the 86th year
of His Age.
All living must,
Return to Dust.

962 Here lies y^e Bod^y
of Rebeckah Osb
orn Daughter to M^r
Jeremiah & M^{rs}
Elisabeth Osborn
who Died Augst
y^e 27th 1738 in y^e
- - - - -

963 Mary y^e
Daughter
of M^r John
& Esther
Potter di-
ed Feb^{ry}
28th 1740
Aged 3
Years

Thomas y^e
Son of M^r
John & Es-
ther Potter
died March
13th 1740
Aged 7
Years

964 In Memory of
Lieutenant
Daniel Sperry
who died April 24th
1750 in His 86th
Year

965 Deborah
Wife of Daniel
Sperry who
Died Dec^r 16: 1711
Aged 39 Years

966 Rachel
Daughter of
M^r Joshua
& M^{rs} Amy
Sperry
died Nov^{br} 8th
1748 in Her 3^d
- -

967 In Memory of
Mrs. Elizabeth
Tallmadge
Daut^r of Mr.
Robert & Mrs.
Abigail Tallm
adge who died
De^{ther} 11 1768 In her
52d Year

⁹⁶⁰ He d. in Milford, 1767.

⁹⁶¹ Son of John and Elizabeth (Harriman); b. March 21, 1671/2.

⁹⁶² Dau. of No. 656.

⁹⁶³ Thomas, s. of John and Esther (Lines), b. June 15, 1733; Mary, b. March 2, 1737.

⁹⁶⁴ Son of Richard and Dennis; m. Deborah (No. 965); and next Sarah, dau. of William and Sarah (Thomas) Wilmot (No. 927), and wid. of Thomas Hotchkiss, b. March 8, 1663, d. July , 1732.

⁹⁶⁵ Dau. of Joseph and Sarah (Alling) Peck, b. July 31, 1672; wife of

⁹⁶⁴.

⁹⁶⁶ Born Apr. 11, 1746.

⁹⁶⁷ Born Nov. 4, 1717.

968

[William]
Son of Mr
Daniel
Tallmadge
died April
21 1741
Aged 10
Days

[Thomas
Son of Mr
Dani] el
Tallmadge
died June
ye 30th 1740
Aged 10
Days

who died August
27th 1795 aged 3 Years
and 4 Months

971

Elizabeth
Wife of Mr.
John Winston
Died Feb^r 21 171[1]
Aged 56 Years

969

Mr
Benjamin
Thomas

972

John
ye Son of Mr
John & Mrs
Desire Woo
din died
Sep^{br} ye 21
1742 Aged 6
Years

970 In Memory of Sarah
Chamberlain Ward
Daughter of Ambrose
& Rebecca Ward

⁹⁶⁸ Sons of Daniel and Mary (Thompson).

⁹⁷¹ Dau. of Stephen and Anna (Gregson) Daniel; b. Oct. 1, 1755; wf. of No. 931.

⁹⁷² Son of John and Desire (Cooper), b. March 14, 1736.

INDEX TO VOLUME VIII.

- Abbott, Jacob, 30.
Adams, Rev. Eliphalet, 210.
Adams, John, 15, 143, 144.
Adams, Pygan, 210.
Adgate, William, 209.
Aird, David, 207.
Allen, Ethan, 256, 265.
Allen, Joel, 207.
Allen, John, 96, 172.
Allen, John (silversmith), 190.
Alling, John, 329, 331-333, 335, 336, 340.
Alling, Stephen, 312.
Allyn, Henry, 259.
Almost Forgotten New Haven Institution, 20.
Anderson, John, 267.
Andrew, Rev. Samuel, 179.
Andrews, Ethan Allen, 20, 22, 24, 27-30, 33.
Andrews, Mrs. E. A., 30, 34.
Andrews, Rev. Samuel, 208.
Andros, Edmund, 96, 97, 174, 176, 177.
Anthony, George S., 279, 280.
Appleton, Samuel, 171.
Arnold, Benedict, 134, 266.
Arnold, Welcome, 14.
Ashburton, Lord, 5.
Atwater, Jeremiah, 192, 193.
Atwater, Jonathan, 340, 341, 343.
Atwater, Joshua, 341.
Augur, Hezekiah, 232.
Austin, David, 310, 312-315.
Austin, Ebenezer, 205.
Austin, Rebecca, 313.
Austin, Samuel, 306.
Babeock, Sidney, 232.
Bacon, Leonard, 23, 58, 59, 62, 80, 100, 193, 242.
Baldwin, Rev. Ebenezer, 100.
Baldwin, Lewis F., 178.
Baldwin, Richard, 167.
Baldwin, Simeon E., 1, 82, 249.
Ball, Stephen, 193.
Barber, John W., 135, 136, 140, 293.
Barnum, Rev. Caleb, 59.
Bassett, John, 338.
Bates, Albert C., 289.
Battle of Lake George, 109.
Baylies, Francis, 60.
Beach, Abraham, 296.
Beach, Miles, 203.
Beardsley, Rev. Wm. A., 132.
Beecher, Mrs. Edward C., 312.
Beecher, Thaddeus, 312, 320.
Beers, Henry A., 226.
Beers, Isaac, 306, 310, 315, 319, 320.
Belcher, Andrew, 342.
Belcher, Jonathan, 197.
Benjamin, John, 199.
Bickle, John, 274.
Bigelow, John, 261.
Bishop, Abraham, 23, 34, 319, 334.
Blackstone, William, 83.
Blake, Eli Whitney, birth and education, 36; beginning business, 37; contribution to *American Journal of Science*, 38-44; degree from Yale, 43; invention of "The Blake Crusher," 45; its value in the construction of roads, 49, 50; its use in mining, 51, 52; its relation to concrete, 53, 54; death, 57.
Blake, Henry T., 20, 36, 109, 333.
Blake, James Kingsley, 215.
Blake, John, 37.
Blake, Philos, 36, 37.
Blodgett, William, 208.
Bontecou, Timothy, 199.
Boyd, Peter, 206.
Bradford, Jeremiah, 191.
Bradford, William, 14, 171.

- Bradley, Abraham, 319, 320, 335.
 Bradley, Aner, 202.
 Bradley, Charles W., 106.
 Bradley, Phineas, 202.
 Bradstreet, Governor Simon, 176.
 Brainard, J. G. C., 225.
 Brearley, David, 14.
 Breslin, John, 279.
 Brewer, Charles, 207.
 British Prisoners of War in Hartford during the Revolution, 255.
 Bronson, Henry, 321.
 Bronson, Isaac, 211.
 Bronson, Josiah, 211.
 Brown, Mrs. Chauncey, 29.
 Brown, Governor Montfort, 257.
 Browne, Francis, 329, 331.
 Browne, Mrs. Francis, 338, 339.
 Browne, Hannah, 329.
 Browne, Mabel, 329.
 Browne, Samuel, 329.
 Buckingham, Mrs. John W., 178.
 Buckingham, Samuel, 193.
 Buckingham, William A., 174.
 Buel, Abel, 137, 199-202, 207.
 Bulkeley, Gershom, 96, 181.
 Bull, Caleb, 205.
 Bull Epaphras, 256, 259, 260, 269, 275.
 Bull, Jonathan, 296.
 Bull, Martin, 137, 213, 214.
 Bull, Ole, 236.
 Bunyan, John, 76, 77, 80.
 Burke, Edmund, 17, 282.
 Burke, Thomas Francis, 282, 284.
 Burnap, Daniel, 209.
 Burr, Aaron, 333.
 Burr, Thaddeus, 195.
 Butler, Benjamin F., 277.
 Butler, John, 14.
 Butler, Nicholas, 76.
 Butler, Zebulon, 14.
 Byrne, Jerome, 284.
 Calamy, Edmund, 72.
 Camden, Earl of, 6.
 Campbell's, Thomas, "Gertrude of Wyoming," 12.
 Canfield, Samuel, 207, 208.
 Capes, Rev. W. W., 56, 57.
 Carpenter, Joseph, 209.
 Cates, John, 193, 194.
 Champion, Mrs. Henry, 178.
 Champlin, John, 210.
 Channing, Henry, 307.
 Charles I, 1, 84, 90-92, 143, 166, 167.
 Charles II, 1, 64, 95, 164, 167, 174, 194, 248, 253.
 Chauncey, Nathaniel, 225.
 Chittenden, Ebenezer, 199, 200, 202.
 Chittenden, Thomas, 202.
 Christophers, Christopher, 190.
 Clap, President Thomas, 112, 131, 299.
 Clark, Abigail, 290.
 Clark, Daniel, 91.
 Clark, Samuel, 290.
 Clark, Sheldon, 219, 222.
 Cleveland, Grover, 209.
 Cleveland, William, 209.
 Coit, Thomas C., 210.
 Collier, Jennet, 260, 275.
 Cone, William R., 191.
 Coney, John, 187, 188.
 Congregationalist Separates of the XVIIIth Century in Connecticut, 151.
 Connecticut in Pennsylvania, 1.
Connecticut Journal and New Haven Post-Boy, first number of, 305.
 Cooke, Samuel, 337.
 Corydon, Johnny, 282, 284.
 Cotton, John, 160.
 Couch, Robert I, 328.
 Cowell, William, 187, 191.
 Cowles, Isaac, 21.
 Cowles, Lucy, 21.
 Cowles, Samuel, 21.
 Cromwell, Henry, 61.
 Cromwell, Oliver, 1, 60, 61, 64, 65, 194.
 Cromwell, Richard, 65.
 Crosswell, Rev. Harry, 22, 23.
 Curtis, George Munson, 181.
 Cutler, Richard, 202.
 Daggett, Elizabeth, 144, 145.
 Dana, Mrs. James D., 29.
 Davenport, Abraham, 340.
 Davenport, John, 56, 61, 65, 66, 73, 143, 163, 334, 337.
 Davie, John, 189, 190.

- Day, Jeremiah, 23, 29.
 Day, Stephen, 289.
 Day, Wilbur F., 328, 340.
 Deane, Silas, 255.
 Delehanty, John, 282.
 Dennison, Henry, 324.
 Deshon, Daniel, 197, 210.
 Desmond, Thomas, 279.
 Devoy, John, 279.
 Dexter, Franklin B., 20, 68, 329.
 Dexter, Henry Martyn, 68.
 Dickerman, Isaac, 335.
 Dieskau, Baron, 109, 114-116, 118, 119, 121-125.
 Dixwell, John, 166.
 Dixwell, John, Jr., 187, 188, 190, 333, 341, 343.
 Dixwell, Mrs. John, 340.
 Doolittle, A. B., 145.
 Doolittle, Abraham, 133.
 Doolittle, Ambrose, 133.
 Doolittle, Amos, birth and removal to New Haven, 133; first engravings, 134; story of how they were made, 135-137; map of Connecticut, 138; his part in the defence of New Haven, 139-141; "Displays" of U. S., 142-144; marriages, 145, 146; book-plate work, 147-149; death, 149; mentioned, 188, 203, 314.
 Doolittle, Eliakim, 146.
 Doolittle, John, 133.
 Doolittle, Martha Munson, 133.
 Doolittle, Phebe Tuttle, 146.
 Doolittle, Sally, 145.
 Doolittle, Samuel, 133.
 Doolittle, Silas, 133.
 Drake, Joseph, 312, 316, 319.
 Dummer, Jeremiah, 187, 188.
 Dutton, Rev. Samuel, 157.
 Dwight, Henry E., 21, 23, 225.
 Dwight, Sereno E., 21, 23.
 Dwight, Timothy, Senior, 22, 29, 112, 123, 201, 333.
 Dyer, Eliphalet, 4, 15.
 Earle, Ralph, 135, 136.
 Early Silver of Connecticut and its Makers, 181.
 Easton, James, 256.
 Eaton, Theophilus, 96, 163, 165, 166, 173, 196, 313, 334.
 Edward I., 82.
 Edwards, John, 190.
 Edwards, Jonathan, 143, 155, 334.
 Edwards, Pierpont, 312.
 Eldon, Lord, 99.
 Ellery, John, 191.
 Ellery, William, 302.
 Ellsworth, Governor W. W., 21.
 Emery, Rev. S. H., 59, 79.
 English, Henry Fowler, 166.
 Everett, Edward, 58, 226.
 Fairchild, Robert, 186, 199, 200, 202.
 Farnam, Henry, 36, 325.
 Fenians of the Long-ago Sixties, 277.
 Fenn, Benjamin, 168.
 Fenwick, George, 1, 87, 91, 92, 95, 97.
 Finley, Samuel, 158.
 Fisher, A. M., 225.
 Fiske, John, 162.
 Fitch, Eleazar T., 21, 23.
 Foote, Caroline Street, 29.
 Forbes, Rev. W. C., 229.
 Ford, George Hare, 162.
 Forgarty, John, 288.
 Fowler, William, 166, 168.
 Franklin, Benjamin, 257, 291.
 Franklin, William, 257.
 French, Christopher, 256, 259, 260, 262-268, 270, 272, 274, 275.
 French, Martin J., 283.
 French, Stiles, 28, 34.
 French, Truman, 34.
 Fundamental Orders and the Charter, 238.
 Funnell, Andrew, 341.
 Gage, General Thomas, 11, 263, 264.
 Gallaudet, Elisha, 137.
 Gardiner, John, 194, 211.
 Gaskell, Elizabeth, 340, 341.
 Gay, Fisher, 259.
 George III, 114, 140, 259, 262, 271.
 Gibbons, Austin, 282.
 Gibbs, Josiah W., 23.
 Gilbert, Joel, 306.
 Gilbert, Matthew, 335, 349.

- Gilbert, Samuel, 305.
 Gladstone, William, 278.
 Glover, Joseph, 289.
 Goff, John W., 279.
 Goffe, William, 65, 66, 73, 79, 166, 167.
 Gold, Nathan, 172.
 Goodrich, Chauncey A., 21, 23.
 Goodrich, Elizur, 149, 312.
 Goodsell, Thomas, 339.
 Goodwin, George, 293, 303.
 Goodyear, Stephen, 165, 335.
 Gorges, Ferdinando, 88, 94.
 Gorham, John, 203.
 Gorham, Miles, 203.
 Gould, Judge James, 36.
 Graves, John, 269, 273.
 Gray, John, 210.
 Gray, Samuel, 210.
 Green, Abigail, 309.
 Green, Bartholomew, 289.
 Green, John, 290.
 Green, Nathaniel, 290.
 Green, Samuel (son of Timothy), 289.
 Green, Samuel (brother of Thomas), 303-308.
 Green, Thomas, ancestry and birth, 289, 290; learned the printer's trade, 290; employed by Parker & Co., New Haven, 290, 291; removal to Hartford, 293; established *The Connecticut Courant*, 295; connection therewith, 295-303; returned to New Haven, 305; started a paper mill, 306; marriages and children, 308-309; death, 307.
 Green, Timothy, 289-291.
 Greenleaf, David, 209.
 Griffin, Cyrus, 14.
 Grignon, René, 197.
 Gurley, William, 210.
 Hale, John P., 277.
 Hall, Richard, 341.
 Hallam, John, 211.
 Halleck, Fitz-Greene, 230.
 Hamlin, Giles, 182.
 Hamlin, John, 101.
 Hammersley, Judge William, 245, 247, 250.
 Hampden, John, 1.
 Hancock, John, 139, 203.
 Hardy, J. G., 225.
 Harland, Thomas, 209.
 Harrison, Lynde, 340.
 Hart, Charles Henry, 142.
 Hart, Judah, 207, 209.
 Hart, Samuel, 238.
Hartford Courant, first issue of, 296.
 Hathaway, Henry C., 279, 280.
 Hawks, Rev. Francis L., 22, 23.
 Haynes, John, 90, 172, 260.
 Hearne, William, 286.
 Hemingway, Jacob, 336.
 Hempstead, Joshua, 210.
 Hendrick, Chief, or King, 109, 110, 114, 115, 117, 121.
 Hequemburg, Charles, 203.
 Herrick, Edward C., 232.
 Herron, Peter, 258, 274.
 Higginson, Rev. Francis, 94.
 Hilldrupp, Thomas, 205.
 Hillhouse, James A., 233.
 Hinman, David, 232.
 Hinman, Robinson S., 106.
 Hinman, Royal R., 105.
 Hitchcock, Eliakim, 133, 203.
 Hoadly, Charles J., 95, 98, 101, 106, 296.
 Hoadly, George, 324.
 Hoare, Elizabeth, 27.
 Hoare, Samuel, 27.
 Hodson (Hudson), John, 339.
 Holmes, Israel, 212.
 Holt, John, 290.
 Hooke, Anna, 56.
 Hooke, Ebenezer, 62, 63.
 Hooke, Elizabeth, 62.
 Hooke, John, 56, 62, 63, 65.
 Hooke, Mary, 62.
 Hooke, Walter, 62, 63.
 Hooke, Rev. William, birth and parentage, 56; education and orders in the Church of England, 57; emi-

- gration to New England, 57; settlement in Taunton, 58; removal to New Haven, 60, 61; returned to England, 61; children, 62, 63; Master of Savoy Hospital, 64; troubles incident to the death of Cromwell, 65; intercepted letter to Davenport, 66-73; effect of Five Mile Act, 74, 75; license under Proclamation of Indulgence, 76; Proclamation cancelled, 77; pastorate in Spitalsfield, 78; increasing infirmities, death, burial in Bunhill Fields, 79, 80.
- Hooker, Horace, 225.
- Hooker, Thomas, 90, 162, 163, 172, 238, 240-242.
- Hopkins, Edward, 92, 173.
- Hopkins, Jesse, 212.
- Hopkins, Joseph, 186, 212-214.
- Hopkins, Stephen, 186, 212.
- Hosmer, Titus, 101.
- Hotchkiss, Jonathan, 317.
- Hotchkiss, Justus S., 334.
- Hotchkiss, Lemuel, 306.
- Houston, William C., 14.
- Howe, John, 64.
- Hubbard, Ezra Stiles, 328.
- Huggins, Ebenezer, 319.
- Hull, John, 187, 189.
- Humfrey, John, 86.
- Humphrey, Jonathan, 259.
- Hunt, Frederick, 319.
- Huntington, Benjamin, 322.
- Huntington, Philip, 209.
- Huntington, Roswell, 209.
- Huntington, Samuel, 101.
- Hurd, Nathaniel, 137.
- Ingersoll, Jared, 7, 299, 339.
- Inscriptions on Tombstones, 351.
- Ives, Eli, 229.
- Jackson, Richard, 5, 201.
- Jay, John, 10.
- Jefferson, Thomas, 144.
- Jepson, William, 294.
- Jesse, David, 187.
- Jessop, William, 89.
- Jocelin, Simeon, 141.
- Johnson, Andrew, 277.
- Johnson, Edward, 62.
- Johnson, Guy, 4.
- Johnson, Isaac, 86.
- Johnson, Jacob, 346.
- Johnson, Rev. Samuel, 202.
- Johnson, General William, 109-122, 124, 125.
- Johnson, William Samuel, 15.
- Johannot, William, 207.
- Judd, William, 6.
- Kellogg, Ebenezer, 21.
- Kelly, Thomas, 281.
- Kensett, John Frederick, 145.
- Kensett, Thomas, 144.
- Kierstead, Cornelius, 197, 198.
- King, Joseph, 207.
- Kingsbury, Frederick J., 346.
- Kingsley, James L., 23.
- Kingsnorth, Henry, 189.
- Knight, Jonathan, 38.
- Knight, Joseph, 194.
- Knight, Madam Sarah, 190, 341.
- Langston, John, 76, 78, 79.
- Lawrence, Abbott, 56.
- Leaming, Jeremiah, 299.
- Lechford, Thomas, 86.
- Lee, General Charles, 264-266, 268.
- Leete, William, 166, 167, 172, 173.
- Leflingwell, Christopher, 306.
- Lockwood, James, 134.
- Lockyer, Nicholas, 64.
- Longfellow, Henry W., 236.
- Lord, Richard, 191.
- Loton, Richard, 76.
- Lovell, Jemmy, 261.
- Lucas, Amaziah, 308.
- Lyman, Phineas, 110-113, 120-129, 131.
- Lyman, Mrs. Phineas, 129.
- Lyon, William, 312, 313, 320, 322, 328.
- Lyon, William, Jr., 319.
- Lyon-Turner, G., 68, 73, 76.
- McCarthy, Patrick, 285.
- McDermott, Terence, 263, 266, 267, 271, 272.

- McKay, Samuel, 258, 266-269, 273.
 Mahar, James, 271, 272.
 Maltby, Elizabeth, 340.
 Manchester, Earl of, 86, 88, 89.
 Mann, Alexander, 207.
 Mansfield, Elisha H., 210.
 Mansfield, Jonathan, 335.
 Mansfield, Moses, 198.
 Mansfield, Sarah, 332.
 Mascal, Robert, 76.
 Mason, John, 164, 170.
 Mather, Cotton, 62, 334, 336.
 Mather, Increase, 65, 79.
 Mather, Richard, 57, 58.
 Mather, Rev. Samuel, 179.
 Mather, Warham, 336, 337.
 Mecom, Benjamin, 291-293, 304.
 Merriman, Marcus, 141, 203.
 Merriman, Samuel, 203.
 Merwin, Samuel, 23.
Microscope, The, and James Gates
 Percival, 215.
 Miles, Abigail, 309.
 Miles, George, 309.
 Miles, John, 320.
 Mix, Edward E., 328.
 Mix, Samuel, 347.
 Moland, Ensign Joseph, 272, 274.
 Monson, Aeneas, 315, 319, 321, 327,
 328.
 Morgan, Pierpont, 333.
 Morris, Luzon B., 106.
 Morrison, Norman, 205.
 Morrison, Rhoderick, 305.
 Morrison, Sarah, 334.
 Morse, Jedediah, 143.
 Morse, Samuel F. B., 21.
 Moss, Rev. Joseph, Jr., 338, 339.
 Munson, John, 335.
 Munson, Joseph, 306.
 Munson, Stephen, 346.
 Munson, Theophilus, 347.
 Napier, Robert D., 42.
 Negro Governors of Connecticut, 267.
 Newark, settlement of, 168.
 New Haven Bank, incorporation of,
 310, 311; some of first stockhold-
 ers, 312; selecting a site, 313;
 earliest example of "beehive" sym-
 bol, 314; business methods of those
 days, 315, 316; prevalence of coun-
 terfeiting, 317, 318; rules to
 lighten cashier's burdens, 318; in-
 crease of capital, 319; move to
 build new banking house, 319, 320;
 investments, 321; dividend record
 in Civil War, 322; Eagle Bank
 failure, 323, 324; Farmington
 Canal, 325, 326; Panic of 1837,
 326.
 New Haven of Two Hundred Years
 Ago, 329.
 Newman, Francis, 166.
 Nicoll, John, 312, 316, 319.
 North, Erasmus D., 232.
 Noyes, Benjamin, 233.
 Noyes, Rev. Joseph, 113, 349.
 Noyes, Samuel, 209.
 O'Brien, Eliza Maria, 36.
 O'Brien, Jeremiah, 277.
 O'Brien, Laurence, 277, 283.
 O'Brien, Michael, 282.
 O'Connor, John, 282.
 O'Donovan, William, 281, 287.
 Ogden, D. L., 225.
 Olcott, Daniel, 302.
 Old New Haven Bank, 310.
 O'Leary, Ellen, 281.
 O'Leary, Mary, 281.
 Olmsted, Denison, 23, 25.
 Olmsted, Frederick Law, 50.
 O'Mahony, John, 280, 281.
 Oneco, Chief, 171.
 O'Neil, John, 278.
 O'Reilly, John Boyle, 278, 279.
 "Osborn," or O'Brien, 283, 287.
 Osborne, Jeremiah, 336.
 O'Shaughnessy, Garrett, 281.
 Otis, James, 257.
 Otis, Jonathan, 206, 208.
 Paine, Abigail, 179.
 Paine, Elisha, 158.
 Paine, Rev. George Lyman, 179.
 Paine, Robert Treat, signer, 178.

- Paine, Robert Treat, philanthropist, 179.
 Paine, Rev. Thomas, 178.
 Paine, Thomas Treat, 179.
 Palmer, Rev. Charles Ray, 20, 56.
 Palmer, Ray, 29-31, 34.
 Parker, Rev. Edwin P., 151.
 Parker, James, 290-292, 308.
 Parkman, Francis, 117.
 Parks, Elisha, 270.
 Parmele, Samuel, 208, 209.
 Parmelee, Ebenezer, 312.
 Pavilion Hotel, 27.
 Payne, Benjamin, 272, 275.
 Peck, Timothy, 206.
 Peck, William, 349.
 Pelletreau, Elias, 212.
 Penn, William, 5, 8, 11.
 Percival, James Gates, birth and early education, 227; settlement in Hartford, 228; return to New Haven, 229; first contribution to *The Microscope*, 229; personal characteristics, 231-236; estimates of his poetry, 226; death, 236.
 Peters, Hugh, 64.
 Phelps, Timothy, 312.
 Phelps, William Lyon, 313.
 Pickett, Adam, 190.
 Pierpont, James, 333.
 Pierpont, John, 347, 349.
 Pierson, Abraham, 168, 332, 334.
 Pinchbeck, Chr., 208.
 Pitkin, William, 172.
 Poole, Elizabeth, 58, 60.
 Porter, Ebenezer, 141, 142.
 Porter, Isaac G., 28.
 Porter, Noah, 21.
 Porter, Sarah, 28.
 Potwine, John, 192, 198, 203.
 Pratt, Charles, 6.
 Pratt, William, 302, 303.
 Prince, Job, 197.
 Prout, John, 339.
 Prudden, Peter, 165.
 Punderson, John, 335.
 Putnam, Israel, 263.
 Pym, John, 1, 56.
 Pynchon, Henry R., 322.
 Pynchon, John, 270.
 Quintard, Pierre, 198.
 Read, Daniel, 141.
 Read, John, 253.
 Reed, Joseph, 14.
 Revere, Paul, 137, 187, 188.
 Reynolds, James, 279.
 Rich, Nathaniel, 87, 89.
 Rich, Robert, 87.
 Richardson, J. B., 279.
 Riggs, Samuel, 348.
 Robert Treat: Founder, etc., 162.
 Robertson, Mrs. John B., 29.
 Root, Jesse, 15, 272, 273, 275.
 Rosewell, Henry, 85.
 Rosewell, Lydia, 340.
 Rouse, William, 189.
 Ruggles, David, 317.
 Russell, John, 339.
 Russell, Talcott H., 20.
 Russell, William H., 20, 34.
 Russell, Mrs. W. H., 28.
 Ryan, John, 282.
 Saltonstall, Gurdon, 98, 143, 151, 163, 188, 190, 210, 333.
 Saltonstall, Richard, 71.
 Sanderson, Robert, 187.
 Sanford, Desire, 308.
 Sanford, Isaac, 203.
 Sargeant, Jacob, 206.
 Say and Seal, Lord, 85-89, 93, 173.
 Seabury, Bishop Samuel, 194.
 Seal of Connecticut, 82.
 Sergeant, Jonathan D., 15.
 Sewall, Samuel, 95.
 Seward, William H., 277, 278.
 Seymour, Elizabeth, 303.
 Seymour, Richard, 303.
 Sheldon, Bishop Gilbert, 65.
 Shelton & Kensett, 144.
 Shepard, Charles U., 28.
 Sheridan, Philip, 278.
 Sherman, John, 313.
 Sherman, Roger, 101, 304, 313, 324, 340.

- Shipman, Elias, 310, 319.
 Shipman, Nathaniel, 209.
 Short, Thomas, 289.
 Silliman, Benjamin, 23, 25, 233.
 Silliman, John, 192.
 Skene, Andrew P., 256, 261.
 Skene, Governor Philip, 259, 261-263,
 266, 267, 276.
 Smith, David, 315.
 Smith, Jacob, 258, 274.
 Smith, Captain John, 84.
 Smith, William, 7.
 Smyth, Newman, 62.
 Stanley, Nathan, 175.
 Stanley, William, 191.
 Steel, Ashbel, 302.
 Sterry, Peter, 63, 64.
 Steuben, Baron de, 143.
 Stiles, Ezra, 11, 59, 143, 175, 190,
 201, 307, 308.
 Stiles, Rev. Isaac, 113, 117.
 Stoddard, Solomon, 22.
 Stoughton, John, 68.
 Street, Augustus R., 334.
 Street, Rev. Nicholas, 58, 60, 334.
 Street, Samuel, 334.
 Strong, Jedediah, 297.
 Strong, Julia, 29.
 Stuart, Gilbert, 144.
 Sweeney, General Thomas, 278.
 Taleott, Matthew, 259.
 Tapp, Edmund, 166, 168, 178.
 Tapp, Jane, 166.
 Taylor, Nathaniel W., 23.
 Taylor, William, 147.
 Terry, Eli, 209.
 Thacher, Thomas, 24.
 Thomas, Isaiah, 290-292, 303.
 Thompson, David, 315.
 Thurlow, Edward, 5.
 Ticknor, George, 232.
 Tiley, James, 204.
 Tompkins, Edmund, 212.
 Townsend, Amos, Jr., 328.
 Townsend, J. S., 225.
 Tracy, Gurdon, 209.
 Treat, Eunice, 178.
 Treat, Katharine, 164.
 Treat, Richard, 164, 168.
 Treat, Robert, baptism, 164; settled
 in Milford, 165; marriage, 166;
 interest in the regicides, 167;
 moved to New Jersey, 168; re-
 turned to Milford, 169; military
 career, 169; fight with Indians, 170,
 171; chosen Deputy Governor, 172;
 contest with Andros over the
 Charter, 174-176; practical farmer,
 177; his house in Milford, 178;
 family, 178; death and inscription
 on tombstone, 179; memorial slab
 on Milford bridge, 180.
 Treat, Rev. Samuel, 178.
 Trott, John Proctor, 190, 211.
 Trott, John, 163.
 Trott, Jonathan, 211.
 Trott, Jonathan, Jr., 211.
 Trott, Richard, 163.
 Trowbridge, Anne, 337.
 Trowbridge, Daniel, 329.
 Trowbridge, E. Hayes, 340.
 Trowbridge, Francis B., 164.
 Trowbridge, Hannah, 341.
 Trowbridge, Joseph, 195.
 Trowbridge, Thomas, 163, 339, 341.
 Trowbridge, William P., 46.
 Trumbull, Benjamin, 7, 85, 86, 143,
 157.
 Trumbull, J. Hammond, 240, 241.
 Trumbull, Jonathan, 8, 100, 101, 174,
 255, 257, 260-262, 267.
 Tully, William, 28.
 Turner, James, 137.
 Turner, Stephen, 260.
 Tuthill, Cornelius, 225, 230.
 Tuttle, Ebenezer, 146.
 Tuttle, Enos, 315.
 Tuttle, Eunice Moss, 146.
 Tuttle, Mercy, 329.
 Tuttle, Phebe, 146.
 Van Buren, Martin, 326.
 Van Dyke, Peter, 192.
 Vaudreuil, Governor, 118, 125.
 Vernon, Samuel, 189.

- Viets, John, 274.
 Viets, Roger, 274.
 Wade, Nathaniel, 337.
 Wadsworth, James, 259.
 Wadsworth, Jeremiah, 275.
 Wadsworth, Samuel, 259, 275.
 Walker, George Leon, 161.
 Wallace, William, 262.
 Walsh, Nicholas, 287.
 Walter, Thomas, 299.
 Walworth, Daniel, 207.
 Ward, Billious, 208.
 Ward, James, 204, 206.
 Ward, Timothy, 206.
 Wareham, John, 163.
 Warner, Eli, 260.
 Warwick, Earl of, 1, 85, 87-90, 93.
 Washburn, Albert L., 293.
 Washington, George, 142, 143, 256,
 262-266, 270.
 Watson, Ebenezer, 303, 306.
 Webster, John, 173.
 Webster, Noah, 173, 231.
 Wedderburn, Alexander, 5.
 Weed, John, 341.
 Weed, Thurlow, 346.
 Welch, Nicholas, 281.
 Welles, Samuel, 252.
 Welles, Thomas, 173.
 Wells, Chloe, 21.
 Wells, Jona, 259.
 West, Benjamin, 135.
 Whalley, Edward, 61, 166, 167.
 Whalley, Frances, 61.
 Whalley, Jane, 61.
 Whalley, Richard, 61.
 Wheelock, Eleazar, 193.
 Whipple, William, 14.
 White, Dyer, 312.
 White, Rev. Ebenezer, 259, 291.
 White, Herbert H., 255.
 White, Jeremiah, 64.
 White, Oliver S., 20.
 Whitefield, George, 155, 156, 157.
 Whitelocke, Bulstrode, 89.
 Whitfield, Nathaniel, 73.
 Whiting, Charles, 209.
 Whiting, Joseph, 338.
 Whiting, Nathan, 110, 112, 115, 117,
 118, 123-125, 130, 131.
 Whitney, Eli, 36, 37, 202, 312.
 Whiton, James Milton, 21.
 Whittlesey, Chauncey, 339.
 Whittlesey, Rev. Samuel, 195, 337.
 Wickham, Joseph D., 225.
 Willecox, Alvan, 209.
 Williams, Colonel Ephraim, 115, 117,
 118.
 Williams, Ezekiel, 258-260, 273, 274.
 Williams, Bishop John, 194.
 Williams, Richard, 59, 60.
 Williams, Walter, 88, 89.
 Wilson, James, 14.
 Wilson, John, 58.
 Wilson, Samuel, 66-70.
 Winslow, Edward, 187.
 Winslow, Josiah, 171.
 Winthrop, Fitz-John, 176, 252.
 Winthrop, Francis B., 23.
 Winthrop, John, of Connecticut, 63,
 65, 66, 73, 87, 92, 143, 164, 167,
 168, 172, 173, 245, 248.
 Winthrop, John, of Massachusetts, 85,
 162, 163.
 Wolcott, Henry, 241.
 Wolcott, Roger, 98, 192, 198.
 Wood, Anthony, 57.
 Wood, Elisha, 317.
 Woodbridge, Abigail, 191.
 Woodbridge, Timothy, 191.
 Woodward, Antipas, 206.
 Woodward, Moses, 206.
 Woolsey, Theodore, 29.
 Woolsey, Theodore D., 333.
 Woolsey, Theodore S., 310.
 Wyllys, Governor George, 173.
 Wyoming, Battle of, 12.
 Yale, Asa, 260.
 Yale College, engraving of, by Doo-
 little, 145.
 Yale, Elihu, 335.
 Yale, Nathaniel, 335.
 Yeldall, Dr., 194.
 York, Duke of, 2, 6, 7, 114.

