Dupl'

Speech for Connecticut.

BEING AN

HISTORICAL ESTIMATE

OF THE STATE,

DELIVERED BEFORE

THE LEGISLATURE AND OTHER INVITED GUESTS,

AT THE

FESTIVAL OF THE NORMAL SCHOOL IN NEW BRITAIN, JUNE 4, 1851.

BY HORACE BUSHNELL.

PRINTED BY ORDER OF THE LEGISLATURE.

HARTFORD:
BOSWELL AND FAXON.
1851.

Speech for Connecticut.

BEING AN

HISTORICAL ESTIMATE

OF THE STATE,

DELIVERED BEFORE

THE LEGISLATURE AND OTHER INVITED GUESTS,

AT THE

FESTIVAL OF THE NORMAL SCHOOL IN NEW BRITAIN, JUNE 4, 1851.

BY HORACE BUSHNELL.

PRINTED BY ORDER OF THE LEGISLATURE.

HARTFORD:
BOSWELL AND FAXON.
1851.

NOTE.

The festival, in connection with which this discourse was delivered, celebrated the opening of the new building for the Normal School of Connecticut; a fine spacious structure, erected by the munificence of the citizens of New Britain, and presented, on this occasion, to the State.

SPEECH, &C.

Friends and Fellow Citizens:

The occasion which has brought us together celebrates another stage of advance in the cause of public education in our commonwealth. When I accepted the call to address you on this occasion, I designed to prepare a theme immediately related to the subject of popular education itself. But on more mature consideration, taking counsel also of others, I have concluded that, as the occasion belongs to the state, and as I am to speak to the Legislature of the state, I cannot do better than to make the state itself—its character and wants and prospects—the subject of my address. And I do it the more readily, because of the conviction I feel, and hope also to produce, that, if there be any state in the world, whose history itself is specially appropriate to a festival of popular education, that state is Connecticut.

It is a fact often remarked by the students of history, that all the states or nations, that have most impressed the world by their high civilization and their genius, have been small in territorial extent. If we ask for the reason, it is probably because society is sufficiently concentrated only in small communities, to produce the intensest development of mind and character. Hence it is not in the ancient Roman or Persian empires, but in little sterile Attica, territorially small in comparison even with Connecticut, that the chief lawgivers, philosophers, orators, poets of antiquity have their spring; sending out their unarmed thoughts to subdue and occupy the mind of the world, in the distant ages of time. So again, and probably for a similar

reason, it is not in the great kingdoms or empires of Western Europe, that the quickening powers of modern history have their birth; but in the Florentine Republic, in Flanders, and the free commercial cities, in Saxony, Holland, and England. Here is the birth place of modern art. Here it is that manufactures originate and flourish. Here it is that, having no territory at home, commerce builds its ships and sends them out to claim the seas for a territory. Here is the cradle of the Reformation. Here the free principles of government, that are running but not yet glorified, took their spring.

In view of facts like these, it is a great excellence of our confederated form of government, that it combines the advantages both of great and small communities. We have a common country, and yet we have many small countries; a vast republic that embosoms many small republics, each possessing a qualified sovereignty, each to have a character and make a history of its own. There is brought into play, in this manner, without infringing at all on the general unity of the republic, a more special and homelike feeling in the several states (sharpened by mutual comparison) which, as a tonic power in society, is necessary to the highest developments of character and civilization. Spreading out, in a vast republican empire that spans a continent, we are thus to be condensed into small communities, each distinctly and completely conscious of itself, and all acting as mutual stimulants to each other. Nor is any thing more to be desired, in this view, than that we preserve our distinct position as states, and embody as much of a state feeling as possible, about our several centers of public life and action. Let Virginia have her "cavaliers" and her "old dominion." Let Massachusetts be conscious always of Massachusetts, and let every man of her sons, in every grade and party, exult in the honors that crown her history. Let the Vermonter speak of his "Green Mountain state," with the sturdy pride of a mountaineer. Let the sons of Rhode Island exult in the history and spirit of their little fiery republic. This state feeling has an immense value, and the want of it is a want much to be deplored. I would even prefer to have this feeling developed so strongly as to create some friction between the citizens of the different states, rather than to have it deficient.

Pardon me if I suggest the conviction, that this feeling is not as decided and distinct, in our state, as it may be and ought to be. It is our misfortune that we hold a position midway between two capital cities; that of New England on one side, and the commercial capital of the nation on the other. To these we go as our market places. From these we get our fashions, our news, and too often our prejudices and opinions; or, what is worse, just that neutral state of both, which is created by the very incongruous mixture they produce. Meantime, it is a great misfortune that we have no capital of our own, or if any, a migratory capital. For public sentiment, in order to get firmness and become distinctly conscious, must have fixed objects about which it may embody itself. A capital which is here and there is neither here nor there. It is no capital, but a symbol rather of vagrancy, and probably of what is worse, of local jealousies which are too contemptible to be inspiring. Besides we are too little aware of our own noble history as a state. The historical writers of Massachusetts have been more numerous and better qualified than ours, and they have naturally seen the events of New England history, with the eyes of metropolitans. We have, as yet, nothing that can be called a just and spirited history of our state, and the mass of our citizens seem to suppose that we have no history worthy attention. It is only a dry record, they fancy, of puritanical severities, destitute of incident and too unheroic to support any generous emotions. Our sense of it is expressed in the single epithet "*the blue law state.*" Never were any people more miserably defrauded. Meantime we are continually sinking in relative power, as a member of the confederacy. Our public men no longer represent the fourth state in the Union, as in the Revolution, but the little, comparatively declining state of Connecticut. And the danger is that, as we sink, in the relative scale of numbers, the little enthusiasm left us will die out, as a spark on our altars, and we shall become as insignificant in the scale of moral, as of territorial consequence.

Accordingly it becomes a very interesting question to the people of our state, what shall we do to maintain a position of respect and power?—how shall we kindle and feed the true

fire of public feeling necessary to our character and our standing in the republic? If there be a citizen present, of any sect or party, who can see no interest in such a problem, to him I have nothing to say. The man who does not wish to love and honor the state, in which he and his children are born, has no heart in his bosom, and it is not in any words or arguments of mine, certainly, to give him what the sterility of his nature denies.

It will occur to you at once, in the problem raised, that what any people can be and ought to be, depends, in a principal degree, on what they have been. And so much is there in this principle, that scarcely any thing is necessary, as it seems to me, to exalt our public consciousness and set us forward in the path of honor, but simply to receive the true idea of our history and be kindled with a genuine inspiration derived from a just recollection of the past.

In this view it is, that I now propose to give you a sketch, or outline of our history; or perhaps I should rather say, an historic estimate of our standing as a member of the republic. In giving this outline, or estimate, I must deal, of course, with facts that are familiar to many; but we have a history of such transcendent beauty, freshened by so many inspiring and heroic incidents, that we should not easily tire under the recital, however familiar. Nothing should tire us but the mortifying fact, that as a people, we have not yet attained to the sense of our own public honors. Mr. Bancroft, the historian, thoroughly acquainted with the relative character and merit of the American States, not long ago said,—"There is no state in the Union, and I know not any in the world, in whose early history, if I were a citizen, I could find more of which to be proud, and less that I should wish to blot." My own conviction is that this early history, though not the most prominent, is really the most beautiful that was ever permitted to any state or people in the world.

In tracing its outline, I shall be obliged to make some reference to that of other states, but I will endeavor not to make the comparison odious. I must infringe, a little, in particular, on some of the claims of Massachusetts, and therefore I ought to say beforehand, that no one is more sensible than I to the historic

merit, or rejoices more heartily, in the proud eminence of that state, as one of the members of the republic—a member without which, indeed, the republic would want a necessary support of its character and felicity. It can the better afford to yield us, therefore, what is our own; or rather can the less afford to diminish our just honors, by claiming to itself what is quite unnecessary to its true pre-eminence of name and its metropolitan position as a state.

It may well be a subject of pride to our state that the original settlement of the Connecticut and New Haven colonies, afterwards called Connecticut, comprised an amount of character and talent so very remarkable.

There was Ludlow, said to have been the first lawyer of the colonies, assisting at the construction of the first written constitution originated in the new world; one that was the type of all that came after, even that of the Republic itself. Whether it was that he was too much of a lawyer to be a hearty Puritan, or had too much of the unhappy and refractory element in his temper to be comfortable any where, it is somewhat difficult to judge. But he became dissatisfied, removed to the Fairfield settlement, and afterwards to Virginia. The casual hints and traditions, left us of his character, impress the feeling that he was a very remarkable man, and excite in us the wish that a more adequate account of his somewhat irregular history had been preserved to us.

There was Haynes, also, the first Governor, a man of higher moral qualities, and different, though not perhaps inferior accomplishments. He was a gentleman of fortune, holding an elegant seat in Essex. But the American wilderness, with a right to his own religious convictions, he could easily prefer to the charms of affluence and refinement. Turning his back upon these, he came over to Boston. And it is a sufficient proof of his character and ability that, during his short stay there, he was elected Governor of the Massachusetts colony. In the new colony that came out afterwards to settle on the banks of the Connecticut, he was leader and father from the beginning. He was a man of great practical wisdom and per-

sonal address; liberal in his opinions, firm in his piety, a man every way fit to lay republican foundations.

Governor Hopkins, a rich Turkey merchant of London, was another of the founders; a man of less gravity though not inferior in the qualities of fortune, or personal excellence, and superior to all in his great munificence. By his bequest the Grammar schools of Hartford and New Haven, and the Professorship of Divinity in Harvard College, were founded. His talents are sufficiently evinced by the fact that, returning on a visit to his estate and his friends in England, he was detained there by an unexpected promotion from Cromwell to be Commissioner of the Navy and Admiralty.

Governor Winthrop, or as he is commonly called, the younger Winthrop, was the most accomplished scholar and gentleman of New England. Educated to society, liberalized in his views by foreign travel, which in that day was a more remarkable distinction than it is at present, he was qualified by his manners and address thus cultivated, to shine as a courtier in the highest circles of influence. A sufficient proof of his power in this way, may be found in the fact that the Connecticut charter was obtained by him; an instrument so republican, so singularly liberal in its terms, that it has greatly puzzled the historians to guess by what means any king could have been induced to give it, and especially to give it to a Puritan.

John Mason, the soldier, I will speak of in another place, only observing here that he was trained to arms under Lord Fairfax, in Holland, and gave so high a proof of his valor and capacity, both there and here, that he was solicited by Cromwell to return to England, and occupy the high post of Major General in his army.

Thomas Hooker, another of the founders, and first minister of the Hartford colony, was distinguished as a graduate and fellow of Cambridge University, and more as a minister and preacher of the established church. He was called the Luther of New England, for the reason, I suppose, that the sturdy emphasis and thunder tone of his style resembled him to the great Reformer. Whenever he visited Boston, after his removal to Connecticut, crowds rushed to hear him as the great preacher of the colonies. As a specimen of physical humanity, if we may

trust the descriptions given of his person, he was one of the most remarkable of men; uniting the greatest beauty of countenance with a heighth and breadth of frame almost gigantic. The works he has left, more voluminous and various than those of any other of the New England founders, are his monument.

John Davenport, of the New Haven colony, was a different, though by no means, inferior man. He was a son of the mayor of Coventry, a student and afterwards Bachelor of Divinity at Oxford University. Settled as the incumbent of St. Stephen's Church, in London, he exerted great influence and power among the clergy of the metropolis. His effect lay more exclusively than Hooker's, in the rigid, argumentative vigor of his opinions. Probably no other, unless perhaps we except John Cotton, impressed himself more deeply on the churches of New England.

Governor Eaton, of the New Haven colony, had become rich by his great and judicious operations, as a merchant in the trade of the Baltic. Attracting, in this way, the attention of the court, he was honored as the King's Ambassador at the court of Denmark; evidence sufficiently clear of the high estimation in which he was held, and also of his talents and character—a character not diminished by the noble virtues and the high capacities, revealed in his long and beautifully paternal administration, as a Christian ruler here.

Desborough, the New Haven colony soldier, afterwards returned to England and held the office of Major General in Cromwell's army, a fact which sufficiently exhibits him.

Such were nine of the original founders of Connecticut. What one of them has left a blot on his character, or that of the state? What one of them ever failed to fill his place? And that, if I am right, is the truest evidence of merit; not the renown which place and circumstance may give to a far inferior merit, or which vain ambition, rioting for place, may be able to achieve. Is it not a most singular felicity, that our little state, planted in a remote wilderness, should have had, among its founders, nine master spirits and leaders, so highly accomplished, so worthy to be reverenced for their talents and their virtues?

I have spoken of the civil constitution of the Hartford or Connecticut colony. Virginia began her experiment under martial law. The emigrants in the Mayflower are sometimes spoken of as having adopted a civil constitution before the landing at Plymouth; but it will be found that the brief document called by that name, is only a "covenant to be a body politic," not a proper constitution. The Massachusetts or Boston colony had the charter of a trading company, under cover of which, transferred to the emigrants, they maintained a civil organization. It was reserved to the infant colony on the Connecticut, only three years after the settlement, to model the first properly American constitution—a work in which the framers were permitted to give body and shape, for the first time, to the genuine republican idea, that dwelt as an actuating force, or inmost sense, in all the New England colonies. The trading-company governor and assistants of the Massachusetts colony, having emigrated bodily, and brought over the company charter with them, had been constrained to allow some modifications, by which their relation as directors of a stock subscription were transformed into a more properly civil and popular relation. In this manner, the government was gradually becoming a genuine elective republic, according to our sense of the term. The progress made was wholly in the direction taken by the framers of the Connecticut constitution; though, as yet, they had matured no such result. At the very time when our constitution was framed, they were endeavoring, in Massachusetts, to comfort the "hereditary gentlemen" by erecting them into a kind of American House of Lords, called the "Standing Council for Life." The deputies might be chosen from the colony at large, and were not required to be inhabitants of the town by which they were chosen. The freemen were required to be members of the church, and all the officers stood on the theocratic, or church basis, in the same way. They were also debating, at this time, the civil admissibility or propriety of dropping one governor and choosing another; Cotton and many of the principal men insisting that the office was a virtual freehold, or vested right. Holding these points in view, how evident is the distinctness and the proper originality of the Connecticut constitution. It organizes

a government elective, annually, in all the departments. It ordains that no person shall be chosen governor for two successive years. It requires the deputies to be inhabitants and representatives of the towns where they are chosen. The elective franchise is not limited to members of the church, but conditioned simply on admission to the rights of an elector by a major vote of the town. In short, this constitution, the first one written out, as a complete frame of civil order, in the new world, embodies all the essential features of the constitutions of our states, and of the Republic itself, as they exist at the present day. It is the free representative plan, which now distinguishes our country in the eyes of the world.

"Nearly two centuries have elapsed," says Mr. Bancroft, "the world has been made wiser by various experience, political institutions have become the theme on which the most powerful and cultivated minds have been employed, dynasties of kings have been dethroned, recalled, dethroned again, and so many constitutions have been framed or reformed, stifled or subverted, that memory may despair of a complete catalogue; but the people of Connecticut have found no reason to deviate essentially from the government established by their fathers. History has ever celebrated the commanders of armies, on which victory has been entailed, the heroes who have won laurels in scenes of carnage and rapine. Has it no place for the founders of states—the wise legislators who struck the rock in the wilderness, and the waters of liberty gushed forth in copious and perennial fountains? They who judge of men, by their influence on public happiness, and by the services they render to the human race, will never cease to honor the memory of Hooker and Haynes."

Had Mr. Bancroft included, with the names of Hooker and Haynes, that also of Ludlow, placing it first in the list, I suspect that his very handsome and just tribute of honor would have found its mark more exactly. We know that Mr. Ludlow on two several occasions after this, was appointed by the Legislature to draft a code of laws for the state, and there is much reason, in that fact, to suppose that he drew the Constitution itself. His impracticable, refractory temper set him on, farther as many suppose, in the direction of democracy, than any

other of the distinguished men of the emigration ; and they very naturally imagine, for this reason, that they see his hand, in particular, in the new Constitution framed.

I must not omit to mention, what is specially remarkable in this document, that no mention whatever is made in it, either of king or Parliament, or the least intimation given of allegiance to the mother country. On the contrary, an oath of allegiance is required directly to the state. And it is expressly declared that in the "General Court," as organized, shall exist "the SUPREME POWER of the Commonwealth."

The precedence we had thus gained, in the matter of constitutional history, I am happy to add, was honorably maintained afterwards, in the formation of the Constitution of the Republic itself; for it is a fact, which those who are wont to sneer at the blueness and legislative incapacity of our state, may be challenged also to remember, that Connecticut took the lead in proposing and, by the high abilities and the strenuous exertions of Ellsworth and Sherman, finally carried that distinction of the Constitution of the United States, which is most fundamental and peculiar to it as a frame of civil government, and which now is just beginning, as never before, to fix the attention and attract the admiration of the world. I speak here of the federative element, by which so many sovereign states are kept in distinct activity, while included under a higher sovereignty. When the Convention were assembled that framed the Constition of the Republic, they were met, at the threshold, by a very important question, viz :—Whether the Constitution to be framed should be the Constitution of a 'Nation' or of a 'Confederacy of states.' Mr. Calhoun gave the true history of the struggle, in his speech before the Senate of the United States, Feb. 12th, 1847. "The three states, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Virginia," he said, "were the largest and were actively and strenuously in favor of a 'National' government. The two leading spirits were Mr. Hamilton of New York, probably the author of the resolution, and Mr. Madison of Virginia. In the early stages of the Convention, there was a majority in favor of a 'National' government. But in this stage there were but eleven states in the Convention. In process of time, New Hampshire came in, a very great

addition to the federal side, which now became predominant. It is owing mainly to the states of Connecticut and New Jersey that we have a 'Federal' instead of a 'National' government—the best government instead of the worst and most intolerable on earth. Who are the men of these states to whom we are indebted for this admirable government? I will name them—their names ought to be engraven on brass and live forever. They were Chief Justice Ellsworth, Roger Sherman, and Judge Patterson of New Jersey. The other states farther South were blind—they did not see the future. But to the coolness and sagacity of these three men, aided by a few others, not so prominent, we owe the present Constitution."

Such is the tribute paid to Connecticut by one of the greatest of American statesmen. To have claimed this honor to ourselves might have been offensive. To receive it, when it is tendered, is no more than a duty. Here then we are in 1850, thirty-one states, skirting two oceans, still one republic, under one tribunal of justice, under one federal Constitution, which we boast as a frame of order that will some time shelter the rights and accommodate the manifold interests of 200,000,000 of people—the greatest achievement of legislative wisdom in the modern history of the world—and for Connecticut, who came as near being the author of these noble appointments as she could, and do it by the votes of other states—for her the principal honor and reward of many is a shrug of derision, and the sneer that calls her the blue law state!

Since I am speaking here of our agency in the matter of laws and constitutions, let me go a little farther, and show you with what justice our laws can be made, as they so commonly are, a subject of derision. The derisive epithet, by which we are so often distinguished, was given us by the tory renegade, Peters, who, while better men were fighting the battles of their country, was skulking in London, and getting his bread there, by the lies he could produce against Connecticut. The mendacity of his character and writings has been a thousand times exposed, and the very laws that he published, as the "blue," shown to be forgeries invented by himself; and yet there are many, I am sorry to say, who do not soberly believe that

wooden nutmegs were ever manufactured in Connecticut, who nevertheless accept the blue law fiction as the real fact of history. They do not understand, as they properly might, that the two greatest dishonors that ever befel Connecticut, are the giving birth to Benedict Arnold and the Reverend Samuel Peters—unless it be a third that she has given birth to so many who, denouncing one, are yet ready to believe and follow the other.

There is no state in the civilized world whose laws, headed by the noble Constitution of the Hartford Colony, are more simple and righteous; none where the redress of wrongs is less expensive, or less cumbered by tedious and useless technicalities. It is even doubtful whether the new code of practice in New York, which is just now attracting so much attention abroad, requires to be named as an exception. The first law Reports, published in the United States, were Kirby's Connecticut Reports. The first law school of the nation was the celebrated school of Judge Reeve, at Litchfield, a school which gave the first impulse to law as a science in our country. Chief Justice Ellsworth, Judges Smith, Gould, Kent, Walworth, and I know not how many others most distinguished in legal science in our country, were sons of Connecticut. Judge Ellsworth was chairman of the committee of Congress that prepared the Judiciary Act, by which the Supreme Court of the Nation was organized; and it will be found that some of the provisions of that Act that are most peculiar, are copied verbatim from the statutes of Connecticut. The practice of the Supreme Court is often said to resemble the practice of Connecticut more than that of any other state. And, what is more, the form of the Supreme Court itself, as a tribunal of law, chancery, admiralty and criminal jurisdiction, comprised in one, is copied from the laws of Massachusetts and Connecticut.

It is true indeed, reverting to the earlier laws of the commonwealth, that we find severities enacted against the Baptists and Quakers, precisely as in Virginia, New York, and Massachusetts. How far these laws were executed in Connecticut, or under what conditions, I will not undertake to say, but they seem to have been aimed only at a class of fanatics, who made it a point of duty to violate the religious convictions of every

body else ; bringing their logs of wood to chop on the church steps on Sunday, and their spinning wheels to spin by the door, and walking the streets in the questionable grace of nudity, to testify against the sins of the people. In 1708, the English Quakers petitioned the government against these laws, when Governor Saltonstall wrote over in reply, to Sir Henry Ashurst, as follows,—"I may observe, from the matter of their objections, that they have a further reach than to obtain liberty for their own persuasion, as they pretend ; (for many of the laws they object against concern them no more than if they were Turks or Jews,) for as there never was, that I know of, for this twenty years that I have resided in this government, any one Quaker, or other person, that suffered upon the account of his different persuasion, in religious matters, from the body of this people, so neither is there any of the society of Quakers any where in this government, unless one family or two, on the line between us and New York ; which yet I am not certain of."

Episcopacy was tolerated here by a public act, when, as yet, there were not seventy families in the state of that denomination—at the very time too, when there were two Presbyterian clergymen lying in prison, at New York, for the crime of preaching a sermon and baptising a child. After several months they obtained their release, by paying a fine of £500 sterling. Forty years later, Dr. Rogers, a Presbyterian clergyman, was deterred, by threats of a similar penalty, from preaching in Virginia. The whole system of tithes was there in force, as stiff as in Ireland now. Fees for marrying, churching and burying were established by law. In 1618, a law was passed in Virginia, requiring every person to attend church on Sundays and church holidays, on penalty of "lying neck and heels," as it was called, for one night, and being held to labor as a slave, by the colony, for the week following. Eleven years after, this penalty was changed, to a fine of one pound of tobacco, "to be paid to the minister." These facts I cite, not to bring reproach on other states, but simply to show that religious intolerance was the manner of the times. If, in the New Haven colony, it is a reproach that only members of the church were permitted to vote, the same was true, under the English constitution, even down to within our memory. There is no

sufficient evidence that any person was ever executed for witchcraft in this state, though there were several trials, and one or two convictions; which the Governor and Council contrived, I believe, in one way or another, to release. Governor Winthrop professed sincere scruples about the crime itself. How it was in Massachusetts is sufficiently known to us all. An execution for this crime took place in Switzerland, in 1760; at Wurtzberg in Germany, in 1749; also, in Scotland, in 1722. And, as late as 1716, a poor woman, and her daughter only nine years old, were publicly hanged in England, for selling their souls to the devil, and for raising a storm by the conjuration of pulling off their stockings. The English statute against witchcraft stood unrepealed, even down to 1736.

I confess I was never able to see why so heavy a share of the odium of this kind of legislation should fall on the state of Connecticut; whose only reproach, in the matter, is that she was not farther in advance of the civilized world, by another half century. If the citizens of other states are able sometimes to amuse themselves at our expense, we certainly are not required to add to their amusement by an over sensitive resentment. But if any son or citizen of Connecticut is willing to accept and appropriate as characteristic of its history, the slang epithet which perpetuates a tory lie and forgery, then I have only to say that we have just so much reason to be ashamed of the state—on his account. He is either raw enough to be taken by a very low imposture, or base enough in feeling to enjoy a sneer at his mother's honor.

We have some right, I think, to another kind of distinction, which we have never asserted; that namely of being the colony most distinctively independent in our character and proceedings, in the times of the colonial history, previous to the revolution. We were able to be so, in part, from our more retired and sheltered position, and partly also because of the very peculiar terms of our charter. Massachusetts, Virginia, New York, Pennsylvania, all the other states, with the exception of Rhode Island, were obliged by their charters, or the vacation of their charters, to accept a chief executive, or governor, appointed by the crown. These royal governors had a negative

upon the laws. They personated the king, maintaining a kind of court pomp and majesty, overawing the people, thwarting their legislation, wielding a legal control, in right of the king, over the whole military force, much as at the present day in Canada. But the charter obtained for Connecticut, by the singular address of Winthrop, allowed us to choose our own governor and exercise all the functions of civil order. And so we grew up, as a people, unawed by the trappings of royalty, a race of simple, self-governing republicans.

For three little towns, on the Connecticut, to declare independence of the mother country, we can easily see would have been the part of madness—probably they had not so much as a thought of it—and yet they had a something, a wish, an instinct, call it what you will, which could write itself properly out, in their constitution, only in the words, "Supreme Power." And I see not how these words, formally asserting the sovereignty of their General Court, escaped chastisement; unless it was that they found a shelter for the crime, in their remoteness, and the obscurity of their position. In this view, there was a kind of sublimity in the sturdy growth of their sheltered and silent state. They had no theories of democracy to assert. They put on no brave airs for liberty. But they loved their conscience and their religion, and in just the same degree, loved not to be meddled with. In this habit their children grew up. Their very intelligence became an eye of jealousy, and they acknowledged the right of the king, much as when we acknowledge the lightning—by lifting a rod to carry it off! But when the king came down upon them, in some act of authority or royal interference that touched the security of their principles or their position, then it was as if the Great Being, who had "ordained whatsoever comes to pass," had ordained that some things should not come to pass.

On as many as four several occasions, during the colonial history, they set themselves in open conflict with the king's authority, and triumphed by their determination. First in the case of the regicide Judges, secreted at New Haven; when Davenport took for his text—"Make thy shadow as night in the midst of noon, hide the outcasts, bewray not him that wandereth." The king's officers were active in the search; but, for

some reason, the noon was as the night, and their victims could not be found. Massachusetts expostulated with the refractory people of New Haven, representing how much they would endanger all the colonies, if they did not hasten to address His Majesty in some proper excuse, to which they replied that they were ignorant of the form!

Again, by rallying a force at New London, when Sir Edmund Andross landed there, to proclaim the new patent of the Duke of York, and take possession of the town—silencing him in the act, and compelling him to return to his ships.

A third time, when this same officer came on to Hartford, to vacate the charter—a passage of history commemorated by the noble oak, whose gnarled trunk and limbs still remain, to represent the crabbed independence of the men, who would not yield their rights to the royal mandate. May the old oak live forever!

And yet a fourth time, by asserting and vindicating, what is the essential attribute of political independence, viz. the control and sovereignty of their own military force. Governor Fletcher came on to Hartford, from New York, to demand the control of the militia in the king's name; and when he insisted on reading the proclamation, he was drummed into silence by command of Wadsworth, the chief officer. When the drummer slacked, the word was, "Drum I say;" and to the Governor, "Stop, Sir, or I will make the sun shine through you in an instant." He withdrew,—the point was carried, and the control of the military was retained. After that, when Pitt, at the height of his power, wanted troops from Connecticut, he sent the request of a levy to the Legislature, not a military order.

It is not my design, as you have seen, to represent, in these facts of history, that we had consciously and purposely set up for independence; but only that we had so much of the self-governing spirit in us, nourished by the scope of our charter, and sheltered by our more retired position, that we took our independence before we knew it, and had the reality before we made the claim.

In Massachusetts, the metropolitan colony, which had a more open relation to the mother country, the spirit of independence

was checked continually by considerations of prudence and, at Boston especially, by the presence of the king and a kind of court influence maintained by the royal governors. Accordingly the Rev. Daniel Barber, who went on with the Connecticut troops to Boston, at the first outbreak of the Revolution, says,—"In our march through Connecticut, the inhabitants seemed to view us with joy and gladness, but when we came into Massachusetts and advanced nearer to Boston, the inhabitants, where we stopped, seemed to have no better opinion of us than if we had been a banditti of rogues and thieves; which mortified our feelings, and drew from us expressions of angry resentment"—a fact in which we see, what could not be otherwise, that the people nearest to the court influence in the metropolis, were many of them infected with a spirit opposite to the cause of the colonies. But here in the rear ground, and a little removed from observation, it was far otherwise. Here the sturdy spirit found room to grow and embody itself, unrestrained by authority, uncorrupted by mixtures of opposing influence. How necessary this sound rear-work of independence and homogenous feeling, in Connecticut, may have been to the confidence and the finally decisive action of the men, who immediately confronted the royal supremacy in Massachusetts, we may never know. Suffice it to say that the causes of public events most prominent, are not always the most real and effective.

It is noticeable, also, that we went into the revolution under peculiar advantages. We were not obliged to fall into civil disorganization by ejecting a royal governor, in the manner of other colonies. Our state was full organized, under a chief magistracy of her own, having command of her own military force, ready to move, without loosing a pin in her political fabric. One of the royal governors ejected was even sent to Connecticut for safe keeping. We had kept up our fire in the rear, making every hamlet and village ring with defiance, and erecting our poles of liberty on every hill, during the very important interval between the passage of the Boston port bill and the stamp act. And so fierce and universal was the spirit of resistance here, that, while the stamps were carried into all the other

states, no officer of the crown dared undertake the sale of them in Connecticut.

The forwardness of our state in the matter of independence, is sufficiently evinced by the fact that our Legislature passed a bill, on the 14th of June previous to the memorable 4th of July, instructing her delegates to urge an immediate declaration of independence. Nor did she sign that declaration by the hands only of her own delegates. Two of her descendents in New Jersey and one in Georgia, are among the names enrolled in that honored instrument. Georgia withheld herself, at first, from the Revolution. But there was a little Puritan settlement at Midway, in that state, in which, as a physician and a man of public influence, resided Doctor Hall, a native of Wallingford, and a graduate of Yale College. These Midway Puritans were resolved to have their part in the Revolution, at all hazards. They made choice of Doctor Hall and sent him on to the Congress as their delegate. He signed the declaration and, the next year, Georgia came forward and took her place, led into the Revolution by the hand of Connecticut. Is it then too much to affirm, in view of all these facts, that if any state in the union deserves to be called the Independent State, Connecticut may safely challenge that honor.

I must also speak of the military honors of our history. Martial distinctions are not the highest, and yet there is a kind of military glory that can never fade; that, I mean, which is gained in the defence of justice and liberty, as distinguished from the idle bravery of chivalry, and the rapacious violence of conquest.

It is abundantly clear, as a fact of history, that our two colonies meant, in their public relations with the Indian tribes, to fulfil the exactest terms of justice and good neighborhood. Still it happened, doubtless, as it always will in such cases, that individuals, instigated by a spirit of mischief or insolence, or by the cupidity of gain, trepassed on their rights, not seldom, in acts of bitter outrage. Such wrongs could not be absolutely prevented, and, by reason of a diversity of language and the separate, wild habit of the Indians, could not be effectually investigated or redressed. Exasperated, in this manner, they of

course would take their revenge in acts of violence and blood; and then it would be necessary to arm the public force against them, for the public protection. It is very easy to theorize in this matter, and say how it should be, but this issue, much as we deplore it, could not well be avoided.

It is affirmed and, by many, believed that the Pequods had been instigated in this manner, to the thirty murders perpetrated in their incursions on the river settlements, during the winter and spring of 1637. Be it so, the colony must still be defended. Every settlement is filled with consternation. They set their watch by night, and tend their signal flag by day to give notice of enemies. The Pequods have been described to them as one of the most numerous and powerful of the Indian tribes. They imagine them dwelling in the deep woods, guessing how powerful they may be, and at what hour the foe may burst upon their settlement, here or there, in the fury of savage war. What they dread, in the power of their enemy, so long and wearily, they, of course, magnify. It is no time now for such points of casuistry as entertain us. The hour has come, a decisive blow must be struck; for the danger and the dread are no longer supportable.

It had also been ascertained that the Pequods were endeavoring to enlist all the other tribes, in a common cause against the colonies. Massachusetts, accordingly, had agreed to join the expedition against them, but at what point the junction would be made could not be settled beforehand. With his ninety men, a full half the able bodied men of the colony, Capt. Mason descended the river to Saybrook, passed round to the Narragansett Bay, and, falling in there with a small party of Massachusetts men returning from Block Island, made his landing. His inferior officers, when he opened his plan, proposing to march directly into the Pequod country, waiting for no junction with the Massachusetts troops, strenuously opposed him. They were to pierce an unknown country and meet an unknown enemy. What could assure this little band of men against extermination, fighting in the woods with a fierce nation of savages? But the chaplain led them to God for direction, and they yielded their dissent. And here, in the stand of Mason, is, in fact, the battle and the victory; for they came upon the

great fort of the enemy, after a rapid march, and took it so completely by surprise, that what was to be a battle became only a conflagration and a massacre. The glory is not here, but in the celerity of movement and the peremptory military decision that brought them here. They are too few in number to make prisoners of their enemy, and another body of the tribe, whose number is unknown, are near at hand. Accordingly their work must be short and decisive—a work they make it of extermination. We look on the scene with sadness and with mixtures of revolted feeling; but we are none the less able to see, in this exploit of Mason, with his ninety men, why Cromwell wanted him for a Major General in his army. He understands, we perceive, as thoroughly as Napoleon, that celerity and decision are sometimes necessary elements of success, and even of safety. This kind of generalship too requires a great deal more of nerve and military courage often, than the fighting of a hard contested battle.

This reduction of the Pequods is remarkable as being the first proper military expedition, or trial of arms in New England. If they had been wronged, we pity them. If not, still we pity them. In any view, the colony has done what it could not avoid, and the long agony of their fear is over. Their wives and children can sleep in peace.

Mason returned with his little Puritan legion to Hartford, having lost in the encounter but a single man, the guns of the fort at Saybrook booming out through the forests, in a salute of victory, as he passed, and was immediately complimented, by the Legislature, in the appointment of general-in-chief to the colony. Hooker was designated to deliver him his commission, in presence of the assembled people.

Here is a scene for the painter of some future day—I see it even now before me. In the distance and behind the huts of Hartford, waves the signal flag by which the town watch is to give notice of enemies. In the foreground, stands the tall, swart form of the soldier in his armor; and before him, in sacred apostolic beauty, the majestic Hooker. Haynes and Hopkins, with the Legislature and the hardy, toil-worn settlers and their wives and daughters, are gathered round them in close order, gazing, with moistened eyes, at the hand which lifts

the open commission to God, and listening to the fervent prayer that the God of Israel will endue his servant, as heretofore, with courage and counsel to lead them in the days of their future peril. True there is nothing classic in this scene. This is no crown bestowed at the Olympic games, or at a Roman triumph, and yet there is a severe, primitive sublimity in the picture, that will sometime be invested with feelings of the deepest reverence. Has not the time already come, when the people of Connecticut will gladly testify that reverence, by a monument that shall make the beautiful valley of the Yantic, where Mason sleeps, as beautifully historic, and be a mark to the eye from one of the most ancient and loveliest, as well as most populous, towns of our ancient commonwealth?

The conduct of our state, in two other chapters of history of a later date, displays a moral dignity, as well as military firmness, of which we have the highest reason to be proud. The Dutch governor of New York, it was ascertained, had entered into an alliance with the savages, to make war upon the English colonies. The commissioners of these colonies, already united in a federal compact with each other, had voted a levy of troops for the defence, and assessed the number to be raised by each. The Hartford and New Haven colonies were prompt and indefatigable in their exertions, as their own more immediate exposure required. Plymouth was ready and kept her faith, but Massachusetts tempted, for once, to an act of perfidy, most sadly contrasted with her noble history, refused; leaving the Connecticut colonies cruelly exposed to the whole force of the enemy. The condition of our people was one of distressing excitement. Every hour, for a whole half year, it was expected that the invasion would begin. Forts were erected, a frigate was manned, night and day were spent in watching; till, at length, the victory of the English over the Dutch fleet at sea put an end to the danger; only leaving the two colonies of Connecticut overwhelmed by enormous expenses incurred for their defence. The indignation was universal. And when the commissioners were assembled again, at their annual meeting, our commissioners magnanimously refused to sit with those from Massachusetts, without some atonement for their ignominious breach of faith and duty.

Then came the turn of Massachusetts. King Philip, as he was called, had rallied all the savage tribes of New England, for a last, desperate effort to expel and exterminate the colonies, The havoc was dreadful—whole towns swept away by the nightly incursions of the savages, wives and children massacred, companies of troops surprised and butchered, all the frontier settlements of Massachusetts smoking in blood and conflagration. It was the dark day of the colonies, and, for a time, it really seemed that they must be exterminated. Then it was that Connecticut proved her fidelity, sending out five companies of troops to the aid of Massachusetts. And the combined troops marched together, in a cold snowy day, fifteen miles through the forests, fought in the deep snow one of the bloodiest battles on record, and then marched back, carrying their wounded with them, to encamp in the open air. The attack was upon the great fort of the Narragansets, and was led by the Massachusetts troops, in a spirit of valor worthy of success. Unable, however, to force the entrance, they were obliged, after suffering greatly from the enemy, to fall back. The Connecticut troops were then brought up, and we may judge of their determination by the fact, that nearly one-third of their number fell in the assault, and that, out of their five captains, three were killed on the spot, and a fourth died of his wounds afterwards. The assault was carried. The second winter, four companies of rangers, raised in New London county, were sent out, by turns, to scour the Narragansett country, and harrass the enemy by a continual desultory warfare. Finally, the tide was turned, and the capture of Philip ended the struggle. Thus nobly did Connecticut repay the injustice and wrong of her sister colony.

We can hardly imagine it, but there was seldom a year in the early history of our state, now so quiet and remote from the turmoils of war, when she was not marching her troops, one way or another, to defend her own, or more commonly some neighboring settlement—to Albany, to Brookfield, to Springfield, to the Narragansett country, to Schenectady, to Crown Point, to Louisburg, to Canada—issuing bills of credit, levying, all the while, enormous taxes, and maintaining a warlike activity scarcely surpassed by Lacedemon itself. There was never a

spark of chivalry in her leaders, and yet there was never a coward among them. Their courage had the Christian stamp, it was practical and related to duty; always exerted for some object of defence and safety. They knew nothing of fighting without an object, and when they had one, they went to the work bravely, simply because it was sound economy to fight well! We are accustomed to speak of the wars of the revolution, but these earlier wars, so little remembered, were far more adventurous and required a much stouter endurance.

When combined with the British forces, our troops were, of course, commanded in chief by British leaders, and these were generally incompetent to the kind of warfare necessary in this country. Scarcely ever did they lose a battle or suffer a defeat in these wars, in which our provincial captains did not first protest against their plan. Sometimes the Parliament were constrained to compliment our troops, but more generally, if some exploit was carried by the prowess of a colonial captain, as in the case of Lyman, the hero of Crown Point, his superior was knighted and he forgotten. In the last French war, under Pitt, when a large part of her little territory was yet a wilderness, Connecticut raised and kept in the field, at her own expense, for three successive years, 5,000 men; so great was her endurance and her zeal against the common enemy. It was here that Putnam and Worcester took their lessons of exercise in the military art, and practiced their courage for a more serious and eventful struggle.

This eventful struggle came; finding no state readier to act a worthy and heroic part in it. As early as September, 1774, the false rumor of an outbreak in Boston had set the whole military force of the colony in motion—a sign, before the time, of what was to be done when the time arrived. In April of 1775, before the battle of Lexington and before the Revolution could be generally regarded as an ascertained fact, a circle of sagacious, patriotic men, assembled in Hartford, perceiving the immense advantage that would accrue to the cause, from the capture and possession of the Northern fortresses that commanded Lake Champlain, Ticonderoga and Crown Point, embarked in a scheme, to seize them, by a surprise of the British garrisons. They had a secret understanding with Governor

Trumbull, and drew their funds from the public treasury, by a note under the joint signature of their names, eleven in number. The enterprise was committed to Ethan Allen and Seth Warner, both natives of Roxbury, now residing in Vermont. A few men were sent on from Connecticut, forty or fifty more were collected in Berkshire county, in Massachusetts, and the remainder were enlisted in Vermont. The enterprise was successful. More than two hundred cannon were captured—the same that were afterwards dragged across the mountains to Boston, and employed by Washington in the seige and final expulsion of Lord Howe. When the commander, of Ticonderoga, inquired by what authority the surrender was demanded, Allen's reply was—" In the name of the Great Jehovah and the Continental Congress." That he had no authority from the Continental Congress, save what had come to him through the Great Jehovah, is certainly very clear; hence, I suppose, the form of his answer.

It appears that Benedict Arnold, who was in Boston about this time, obtained a commission from the committee of safety there, authorising him to conduct, in their behalf, a similar undertaking. But finding himself anticipated, when he reached Vermont, he was obliged to waive his right of command and took his place, as a volunteer, under Allen. Some of the Massachusetts historians, who have claimed the credit of this exploit, in behalf of their state, are clearly seen, therefore, to have trespassed on the honors of Connecticut. Connecticut projected and executed the movement. The treasury of Connecticut footed the bills. The prisoners were brought to Connecticut and quartered at West Hartford.

The surrender of these fortresses took place on the 10th of May. Meantime, on the 18th of April, and before the capture was consummated, the news of the battles of Concord and Lexington had arrived, and resistance to the mother country was seen to be openly begun. Putnam left his plow in the furrow, not remaining, it is even said, to unyoke his oxen, and flew to the field of action. The troops of the state poured after him, to be gathered under his command. The battle of Bunker Hill soon followed.

It is remarkable that the question, who commanded in this

very celebrated battle, has never yet been settled. The Massachusetts historians have generally maintained that Prescott was the commander; and some of them have even gone so far as not to recognise the presence of Putnam in it. The more candid and moderate have generally admitted his presence in the field and the valuable service rendered, by his inspiriting and heroic conduct. Prescott, they say, commanded in the trenches, and Putnam was engaged outside of the trenches, in the open field and about the other hill by which the redoubt was overlooked or commanded; doing what he could for the success of the day, but only in virtue of the commission he had from his own personal enthusiasm. As regards any chief command over the whole field of operations, they suppose there probably was none, alleging that the army was really not organized, and no scale of proper military precedence established.

As respects this latter point, which at first view might seem to be true, they are certainly in a mistake. For Putnam had been expressly ordered, by our Legislature, to put himself under the chief command of Massachusetts; as the conditions of the case evidently required. He was serving, therefore, as an integral part of the military force of Massachusetts. Neither was he or Prescott, or Warren, the general-in-chief of the army, so raw in the practice of arms as not to know that, being on the ground as a general of brigade, the scale of military precedence made him, *ipso facto*, principal in command over the colonel of a regiment.

To the same conclusion we are brought, by a careful review of all the facts pertaining to the battle itself. There appears to be sufficient evidence that General Putnam, after his successful encounter sometimes called the battle of Chelsea, which took place on the 27th of May previous, and by which he had produced some stir of sensation in the army, became more impatient of a state of inaction than ever, and proposed himself, in the council of war, that they should take up this advanced position on Bunker Hill. Prescott was in favor of the movement, but, Gen. Ward and others, including even Gen. Warren a member of the Council of Safety, were opposed; regarding the attempt as being too hazardous in itself, and one that would endanger the main position at Cambridge. Besides, what proba-

bly had quite as much influence, they distrusted the spirit of the troops, still raw in discipline; doubting whether they would come to the point of an open, pitched battle with the king and stand their ground. They had the same feeling that Washington had, when he enquired, after the battle—"Could they stand fire?" and when the answer was given, replied—"the cause is safe!" Putnam believed they would stand fire before hand, urging the necessity of action to bring out the spirit that was in them and confirm it. Give them a good breast-work on the hill, he said, laughingly, and they will hold it. "They are not afraid of their heads, though very much afraid of their legs; if you cover these they will fight forever." Warren, who was pacing the room, paused over a chair, and said, "Almost thou persuadest me, Putnam. Still, I think the project rash; but if you undertake it, ['*you*,' observe] you will not be surprised to find me at your side." Finally, ascertaining that Gen. Gage was about to do the very thing proposed, their hesitation was brought to an end.

It was supposed, in the council, that "two thousand men" would be required to effect and maintain the proposed occupation. Accordingly we are to understand that, when only a thousand were detailed, under Col. Prescott, to occupy the hill and open the entrenchments on the night of the 16th, it was expected that other troops were to be sent forward under a more general command, when they were wanted. And beyond a question this command was to be in Putnam, the chief mover of the enterprise. Accordingly we see that Putnam went over with the detachment, under Prescott, and assisted in directing where the entrenchment should be opened, viz: on the lower summit, or part of Bunker Hill, nearest to the city, afterwards called Breed's Hill; in the understanding that the higher eminence should be taken afterward, when required, and entrenchments opened there. Putnam returned that night to Cambridge, and was back in the early dawn of the morning, as a responsible officer should be, to see the condition of the works. At ten o'clock, he was in the field again. And as soon as it became evident that there was to be an assault upon the works, he ordered on the Connecticut troops, by the consent of General Ward, and was there, on the field, at the beginning of the en-

gagement. Leaving Prescott, of course, to his position, which he had simply to maintain, we see him directing the detachments to their places; beginning entrenchments on the other summit; rebuking and rallying the timid; seizing on a cannon, which it was said, could not be loaded, and loading and firing it himself; maintaining the left wing which Lord Howe was constantly endeavoring to carry, and the yielding of which would, at any moment, have ended the struggle of Prescott on the hill; saving also, by his firmness here, the retreat of Prescott from being only a slaughter or a capture; last in the retreat himself, trying to rally for a stand upon the other hill, and only not endeavoring to maintain the post alone; then withdrawing and, of his own counsel, mounting Prospect Hill with the Connecticut forces, opening his entrenchments there in the night, and holding it as a position between the enemy and Cambridge; a movement by which he probably saved the town and the public stores of the army; for when the enemy saw his works there the next morning, they had no courage left to try a second day, against a position so admirably chosen—a position in which he was afterwards installed, by Washington, to maintain the honors of the centre of the army.

There was little reason, as we have seen, for Putnam to be multiplying orders to Prescott; the only thing to be done was to enable Prescott, if possible, to hold his position. But it is in evidence that he did order away the entrenching tools, against the judgment of Prescott; also that, when Warren came upon the ground, he went to Putnam, as the officer of direction, to ask where he should go to serve as a volunteer, and that Putnam sent him to the redoubt, to the aid of Prescott; also that the same order, in regard to firing, occasioned by the shortness of their ammunition, was given every where on the field, as well out of the redoubt as in it, and that Putnam said himself that he gave the order.

It is very easy to see, regarding this statement of facts, how Prescott should often have been spoken of as being the chief in command in this battle, and even how he should have thought himself to be; for he had the redoubt in charge at the beginning, and maintained the internal command of it. He came under a higher command, only by silent rules of military prece-

dence, when other forces were upon the ground; of which he would hardly take note himself, so little was he interfered with. Putnam had work enough without, in the open field, and was very sure that Prescott would do his part within. It is only a little remarkable that Col. Prescott, when questioned by Mr. Adams, at Philadelphia, in regard to the battle, does not even name Gen. Putnam, as having been upon the ground at all; and apparently had not ascertained, two months after the battle, whether the Connecticut militia, sent out by himself, under Knowlton, to hold a position against the enemy's right, had obeyed his orders or had run away. And it is even the more remarkable, that this body of men, assisted by the brave Capt. Chester of Wethersfield, and others whom Putnam was rallying to their support during the whole engagement, had been able, by raising an extempore breast work of fence and new-mown grass, and defending it with Spartan fidelity, to save him all the while from being flanked and cut to pieces. For upon just this point Lord Howe was rolling his columns, with the greatest emphasis of assault, resting his main hope of success on turning the position so gallantly defended, and gaining, in this manner, the other summit of the hill, which, if he had been able to do, Prescott and his regiment would have been, from that moment, prisoners of war. In this view, it is a total mistake to look upon the defence of the redoubt, brilliant as it was and prominent to the eye, as the battle of Bunker Hill. The place of extempore counsel and varying fortune, the hinge of the day, was really, not there, but in the open field; and especially in moving, there, raw bodies of troops, with any such effect as to maintain the critical point of the engagement.

The testimony of authorities, in respect to the question of the chief command, you will understand is various and contradictory, as it naturally would be. And yet the contradiction is rather verbal than real; for as Prescott held the redoubt, in the manner described, it would be very natural, taking a more restricted view of the field, to speak of him as chief in command; though the facts already recited, show most clearly, that Col. Sweet gave the true testimony, when he said that Col. Prescott "was ordered to proceed to Charlestown, Gen. Putnam having the principal direction and superintendence of the expe-

dition concerning it." This too was the testimony of Putnam himself, as Rev. Josiah Whitney testifies, in a note to the funeral sermon preached at Putnam's death. He says, "The detachment was first put under the command of Gen. Putnam. With it he took possession of the hill, and ordered the battle from the beginning to the end." Does any one imagine that Gen. Putnam was a man to assert claims of honor that belonged to others? Far more likely was he, in the generosity of his nature, to give up such as were properly his own.

The testimony of the old Courant, commenting on the battle, shortly after, corresponds. "In the list of heroes it is needless to expatiate on the character and bravery of Major Gen. Putnam, whose capacity to *form and execute* great designs, is known through Europe, and whose undaunted courage and martial abilities have raised him to an incredible height, in the esteem and friendship of his American brethren; it is sufficient to say, that he seems to be inspired by God Almighty with a military genius." Col. Humphrey, writing his Life of Putnam at Mount Vernon, under the eye of Washington, and Botta, who derives his facts from original sources, agree in representing Putnam as the chief in command.

Moreover, Washington, when he came upon the field only a few days after the battle, with commissions from the Congress appointing four Major Generals, immediately delivered Putnam his commission, placing him second in command to himself, and reserved the three others for the further consideration of Congress; though Putnam's commission, placing him above two very talented officers of the state, superior in rank to himself, had created more complaint than either of the others. Why this remarkable deference to Putnam, unless he has been the chief actuating spirit in some great success? Why this signal honor on Gen. Putnam, when the eyes of the army and of the public at large, in the flush of enthusiasm that follows the late battle, are centered on another—who, I believe, was never afterwards promoted?

I have seen too, within a very few days, an original engraving of Gen. Putnam, published in England three months after the battle, which has at the foot these words,—"Major Gen. Putnam, of the Connecticut forces, and Commander in Chief of

the engagement on Buncker's Hill, near Boston. Published, as the Act directs, by C. Shepherd, 9th Sept. 1775." That he had the chief command here assigned him I firmly believe; which if he has lost, it has been at least three months subsequent to the battle; and by means that often discolor the truth of history. The occupation of the hill, I believe, was emphatically Putnam's measure; and one that truly represents the man. How can we think otherwise? See him in the council, the march, the beginning of the entrenchment, the fight itself; present every where, directing, cheering on the men, *rallying all the force he can to keep the difficult point of the field;* last in the retreat, issuing grimmed with smoke and gunpowder, and seizing, with his force, another hill, there to entrench again and wait the fortune of another day. Do this, I say, and there is but one conclusion for us to receive. Our conviction will be clear that, if the monument on Bunker Hill is a worthy testimony for Massachusetts, it testifies as much also for Connecticut; and I hope our Connecticut eyes will be pardoned, if we see it tapering off into a top-stone, that represents the little town of Pomfret!

I have dwelt the more at length on this question, because we seem to have lost our rights here, in a transaction that in one view stands at the head of our American history; and yet more because of the good it will do us to reclaim our rights. I suppose it may well enough be doubted whether Putnam was the ablest of all great commanders; whether, in fact, he was the general to head what would be called, in history, a great military campaign. He was a man of action, inspiration, adventure, and he made men feel as he felt. "You seem to have the faculty, Sir," said Washington, "of infusing your own spirit." Nothing was more truly distinctive of the man. His value lay in the immense volume of impulse or martial enthusiasm there was in him, and in the fact that his time was always *now.* And the country wanted impulse to break silence, and make its first trial with the British arms. He was the man, above all others in the colonies, to give that impulse. A more cautious man, probably would not have advised to such an attempt; possibly a wise man would not; but Putnam, whose impetuous soul had only a feeble connection with prudence, or with mere science,

was the man to say, "let us have the fight first, and settle the wisdom of it afterwards." Possibly there is a higher kind of generalship; but, I know not how it is, when I see how much depended for our country, at that time, on a real beginning of action, I am ready for once, to accept impulse as the truest counsel, and the fire of martial passion as being only the inspired form of prudence.

I cannot give you the details of our military transactions in the Revolution. I can only name a few facts, that will suffice to indicate the spirit and devotion of our people. Connecticut was the second state in the Union as regards the amount of military force contributed to the common cause. She had twenty-five regiments of militia and of these, it is said, that twenty-two full regiments were in actual service, out of the state, at one and the same time, and that the most busy and pressing season of the year; leaving the women at home to hoe their fields and assist the boys and old men in gathering the harvests. And such a class of material has seldom been gathered into an army. When Trumbull sent on fourteen regiments to Washington, at New York, he described them as "regiments of substantial farmers." And General Root, as a friend of mine remembers, declared that, in his brigade alone, there came out seven ministers, as captains of their own congregations. Among their leaders was Colonel Knowlton, than whom there was not a more gallant officer, or one more respected by the commander-in-chief in the army of the Revolution. And when he fell, in the disastrous day at Harlaem, with so many hundreds of the sons of Connecticut, Washington evinced his affliction for the loss of this favorite officer, as being the loss most deplorable of all that befell the cause, on that losing day. Among the leaders, too, were Parsons, and Spencer, and Wooster, and Wolcott, and Ledyard, and, last of all, but not least worthy to be named, though to name him should never be necessary before a Connecticut audience, that mournful flower of patriotism, the young scholar of Coventry; he whom no service could daunt that Washington desired, and who, when he was called to die an ignominious death, nobly said to his enemies and executioners, that "his only regret was that he had but one life to give for his country."

But I must not omit to speak of our venerable Governor, the patriotic Trumbull, under whom we acted our part in this eventful struggle. He was one of those patient, true-minded men, that hold an even hand of authority in stormy times, and suffer nothing to fall out of place either by excess or defect of service—to whom Washington could say, "I cannot sufficiently express my thanks, not only for your constant and ready compliance with every request of mine, but for your prudent forecast, in ordering matters, so that your force has been collected and put in motion as soon as it has been demanded." And yet there like to have been a fatal breach between them, at the beginning of the war. The British ships in the sound were threatening to land on our coast, and Trumbull requested that a part of the troops he was raising might remain to guard our own soil. No request, apparently, could be more reasonable. Washington refused and ordered them all to Boston. Trumbull wrote him a most pungent letter; adding, however, like a true patriot, who sees the necessity of subordination to all power and effect, that he will comply; "for it is plain that such jealousies indulged, however just, will destroy the cause." Noble answer! worthy to be recorded, as a rebuke to faction, while the republic lasts! Washington immediately explained, the misunderstanding was healed, and from that time forth he leaned upon Trumbull as one of his chief supports; confident always of this, that he could calculate on marching the whole state bodily just where he pleased.

Neither let us forget, in this connection, what appears to be sufficiently authenticated, that our Trumbull is no other than the world-renowned Brother Jonathan, accepted as the soubriquet of the United States of America. Our Connecticut Jonathan was to Washington what the scripture Jonathan was to David, a true friend, a counsellor and stay of confidence—Washington's brother. When he wanted honest counsel and wise, he would say, "let us consult brother Jonathan;" and then afterwards, partly from habit and partly in playfulness of phrase, he would say the same when referring any matter to the Congress,—"let us consult Brother Jonathan." And so it fell out rightly, that as Washington was called the Father of his Country, so he named the fine boy, the nation, after his brother

Jonathan—a good, solid, scripture name, which as our sons and daughters of the coming time may speak it, any where between the two oceans, let them remember honest, old Connecticut and the faithful and true brother she gave to Washington!

Considering the very intimate historic connection of our Revolution with the influence of the clergy, their active instigation to it and their constant, powerful co-operation in it, the transition we make in passing from our military history to that of the pulpit, is by no means violent. Only in speaking of our great men here and our theologic standing generally, I must speak in the briefest manner. No mean distinction is it to say that the renowned theologian, preacher and philosopher, Jonathan Edwards, was a native of Connecticut, and a graduate of Yale College. And though the more active part of his life was spent in Massachusetts, he retained his affinities, more especially, with the churches and ministers of Connecticut. I need not say that there is no American name of higher repute, not only among the divines, but also among the metaphysicians both of this country and of Europe. Dr. Dwight was born in Massachusetts but educated here, and here was the scene of his life. Besides these, having our Hooker, and Davenport, and Bellamy, and Smalley, and by a less exclusive property, our Hopkins and Emmons, and Griffin, all sons of Connecticut, we have abundant reason, I think, to be satisfied with our high eminence in the department of theological literature and pulpit effect.

As regards our poets I will only detain you to say that, while I am far from thinking that every thing which beats time in verse is poetry, it is yet something that we have our Trumbull, and Hillhouse, and Brainard, and Percival, and Pierpont, and Halleck, who, not to speak of others closer to our acquaintance, have written what can never perish, while wit may enliven men's hearts, or music and the sense of beauty remain.

Including, next, in our inventory, mechanical inventions, I may say that the great improvements in cotton machinery,

by Gilbert Brewster, justify the title sometimes given him of the Arkwright of our country.

The cotton gin of Whitney, is a machine that, by itself, has doubled the productive power, and so the value of the Southern half of our country. If the inventor had been paid for his invention, and not defrauded of his rights by a conspiracy too strong for the laws, the interest of his money would redeem all the fugitives that cross the line of free labor, as long as there is such a line to cross.

The first two printing presses patented in the United States, were from Hartford.

Joshua Fitch of Connecticut, has the distinguished honor of producing the first steam boat that ever moved upon the waters of the world. He was unfortunate in his character, though a man of genius and high enthusiasm. Failing of the means necessary to complete his experiments, and universally derided by the public, he persisted in the confidence that steam was to be the great agent of river navigation in the world, and gave it, as a last request, that " his body might be buried on the banks of the Ohio, where his rest would be soothed by the blowing of the steam and the splash of the waters."

It is not as generally known, I believe, that the first steam locomotive, ever constructed, was run in the streets of Hartford. The inventor was Doctor Kinsley, a man whose history was strikingly similar to that of Fitch. The late Theodore Dwight, known to many in this audience, lent him the money with which he made his experiments. He succeeded in part, but fell through into bankruptcy, at the end, still persisting that steam was to be the agent of the land travel of the world. His experiments were made between the years '97 and '9, previous to the introduction of rails as the guides and supports of motion.

It now remains to speak of the rank we have held, in the matter of education, and the power we have exerted by that means, in the republic. It is remarkable that a very large share of the colleges in our nation draw their lineage, not from Harvard, most distinguished in the fruits of elegant literature, but from Yale. This is true of Dartmouth, Princeton, Wil-

liams, Middlebury, Hamilton, Western Reserve, Jacksonville, and Athens University in Georgia. These institutions were some of them planned in Connecticut, others of them moved, or in some principal degree manned, by the graduates of Yale College and sons of Connecticut. Dr. Johnson of Stratford, a graduate of Yale and afterwards of Oxford, was the principal originator and first President also of Columbia College, New York. I find in the office of our Secretary of State, a petition to our Legislature from the Trustees of Princeton College, asking leave to draw a lottery here for the benefit of their institution, such leave being denied them by their own state. They aver in their petition, that "it would be a happy means of establishing and perpetuating a desirable harmony between the two institutions, Yale and Princeton, which it will be the care of your petitioners to promote and preserve." Leave was granted; for it was the manner of our state to seize every opportunity in every place, for the assistance of learning. I may also add that Mr. Crary, to whose active exertions in behalf of education the school system and the State University of Michigan are mainly due, is a son of Connecticut and a graduate of Trinity College.

Our system of common schools, originated by a public statute, which is one of the very first statutes passed by the colonial Legislature and faithfully maintained, down to within the past twenty years, was till then acknowledged to be far in advance of that of any other state. The founding of our school fund, too, was an act generally regarded and spoken of with admiration every where, as characteristic of the state.

And now, if you will see what force there is in education, what precedence it gives and preponderance of weight, even to a small and otherwise insignificant state, you have only to see what Connecticut has effected through the medium of her older college and her once comparatively vigorous system of common schools.

I have spoken of the numerous colleges dotting the map of the republic, which are seen to be more or less directly offshoots of Yale. If you ask what parts of the republic were settled principally by emigrations from Connecticut, they are the Eastern part of Long Island, the Northern half of New Jersey,

the Western sections of Massachusetts and Vermont, Middle and Western New York, the Susquehanna valley in Pennsylvania, and the Western Reserve territory in Ohio—just those portions of our country, more recently settled, as you will perceive, that are most distinguished for industry, thrift, intelligence, good morals and character.

Again, if you enter into the legislative bodies of other states west of us, and ask who are the members, you will find the sons of Connecticut among them in a large proportion of numbers compared with those of any other state. In the convention, for example, that revised the Constitution of New York in 1821, it was found that, out of one hundred and twenty-six members, thirty-two were natives of Connecticut, not including those who were born of a Connecticut parentage in that state. Of the sons of Massachusetts, which according to the ratio of population, ought to had about seventy, there were only nine. If you add to the thirty-two natives of Connecticut, in that body, her descendants born in New York, and those who came in through Vermont, New Jersey, and other states, it is altogether probable that they would be found to compose a majority of the body; presenting the very interesting fact that Connecticut is found sitting there, to make a Constitution for the great state of New York. I found on inquiry, four or five winters ago, that the New York Legislature contained fifteen natives of Connecticut, while of Massachusetts there were only nine; though, according to her ratio of numbers, there should have been about forty. So also in the Ohio Legislature of 1838–9, there were found in the lower house of seventy-four members, twelve from Connecticut, two from Massachusetts, two from Vermont.

If we repair to the Halls of the American Congress, we shall there discover what Connecticut is doing on a still larger scale of comparison. The late Hon. James Hillhouse, when he was in Congress, ascertained that forty-seven of the members, or about one-fifth of the whole number in both Houses, were native born sons of Connecticut. Mr. Calhoun assured one of our Representatives, when upon the floor of the House with him, that he had seen the time, when the natives of Connecticut, together with all the graduates of Yale College there collected, wanted only five of being a majority of that body. I took some

pains in the winter, I think, of '43, to ascertain how the composition of the Congress stood at that time. There could not, of course be as many native citizens of Connecticut among the members, as in the days of Mr. Hillhouse; but including native citizens and descendants born out of the state, I found exactly his number, forty-seven. Of the New York representation, sixteen or two-fifths were sons or descendants, in the male line, of Connecticut.

Saying nothing of descendants born out of the state, there were at that time, eighteen native born sons of Connecticut in the Congress. According to the Blue Book, Massachusetts had seventeen; when taken in the proportion of numbers she should have had forty-two. New Hampshire should have had eighteen also, but had only seven; Vermont eighteen, but had only four; Louisiana eighteen, but had only two; New Jersey twenty-one, but had only nine. I see no way to account for these facts, especially when the comparison is taken between Connecticut and Massachusetts, unless it be that, prior to a time quite recent, our school system was farther advanced and the education imparted to our youth more universal and more perfect.

How beautiful is the attitude of our little state, when seen through the medium of facts like these. Unable to carry weight by numbers, she is seen marching out her sons to conquer other posts of influence and represent her honor in other fields of action. Which, if she continues to do, if she takes the past simply as a beginning and returns to that beginning with a fixed determination to make it simply the germ of a higher and more perfect culture, there need scarcely be a limit to the power she may exert, as a member of the republic. The smallness of our territory is an advantage even, as regards the highest form of social development and the most abundant fruits of genius. Our state under a skillful and sufficient agriculture with a proper improvement of our water falls, is capable of sustaining a million of people, in a condition of competence and social ornament; and that is a number as large as any state government can manage with the highest effect. No part of our country between the two oceans is susceptible of greater external beauty. What now looks rough and forbidding in our jagged hill-sides and our raw beginnings of culture, will be soft-

ened, in the future landscape, to an ornamental rock-work, skirted by fertility; pressing out in the cheeks of the green dells, where the farm-houses are nested; bursting up through the waving slopes of the meadows, and walling the horizon about with wooded hills of rock and pastured summits. We have pure transparent waters, a clear bell-toned atmosphere and, with all, a robust, healthy minded stock of people; uncorrupted by luxury, unhumiliated by superstition, sharpened by good necessities, industrious in their habits, simple in their manners and tastes, rigid in their morals and principles; combining, in short, all the higher possibilities of character and genius, in a degree that will seldom be exceeded in any people of the world. These are the mines, the golden *placers* of Connecticut. Turning now to these as our principal hope for the future, let us endeavor, with a fixed and resolute concentration of our public aim, to keep the creative school-house in action, and raise our institutions of learning to the highest pitch of excellence.

I am far from thinking that our schools have ever been as low, or inefficient as many have supposed; the facts I have recited clearly show the contrary. And yet they certainly are not worthy of our high advantages, or the age of improvement in which we live. Therefore I rejoice that our lethargy is now finally broken, and that we are fairly embarked in an organized plan for the raising of our schools to a pitch of culture and perfection, worthy of our former precedence.

I remember with fresh interest, to-day, how my talented friend, who has most reason of all to rejoice in the festivities of this occasion, consulted with me, as many as thirteen years ago, in regard to his plans of life; raising, in particular, the question whether he should give himself wholly and finally up to the cause of public schools. I knew his motives, the growing distaste he had for political life, in which he was already embarked with prospects of success, and the desire he felt to occupy some field more immediately and simply beneficent. He made his choice; and now, after encountering years of untoward hindrance here, winning golden opinions meantime from every other state in the republic, and from ministers of education in almost every nation of the old world, by his thoroughly practical understanding of all that pertains to the subject; after

raising also into vigorous action the school system of another state, and setting it forward in a tide of progress, he returns to the scene of his beginnings and permits us here to congratulate both him and ourselves, in the prospect that his original choice and purpose are finally to be fulfilled. He has our confidence; we are to have his ripe experience; and the work now fairly begun is to go on, I trust, by the common consent of us all, till the schools of our state are placed on a footing of the highest possible energy and perfection.

To exhibit the kind of expectation we are to set before Connecticut as a state, let me give you the picture of a little obscure parish in Litchfield county; and I hope you will pardon me if I do it, as I must, with a degree of personal satisfaction; for it is not any very bad vice in a son to be satisfied with his parentage. This little parish is made up of the corners of three towns, and the ragged ends and corners of twice as many mountains and stony sided hills. But this rough, wild region, bears a race of healthy minded, healthy bodied, industrious and religious people, They love to educate their sons and God gives them their reward. Out of this little, obscure nook among the mountains have come forth two presidents of colleges, the two that a few years ago presided, at the same time, over the two institutions, Yale and Washington, or Trinity. Besides these they have furnished a secretary of state for the commonwealth, during a quarter of a century or more. Also a member of congress. Also a distinguished professor. And besides these a greater number of lawyers, physicians, preachers and teachers, both male and female, than I am now able to enumerate. Probably some of you have never so much as heard the name of this little bye-place on the map of Connecticut, generally it is not on the maps at all, but how many cities are there of 20,000 inhabitants in our country, that have not exerted one-half the influence on mankind. The power of this little parish, it is not too much to say, is felt in every part of our great nation. Recognised, of course, it is not; but still it is felt.

This, now, is the kind of power in which Connecticut is to have her name and greatness. This, in small, is what Connecticut should be. She is to find her first and noblest interest, apart from religion, in the full and perfect education of her sons