






EX LIBRIS



STUDIES IN HISTORY ECONOMICS AND PUBLIC LAW.

vol. 72

EDITED BY
THE FACULTY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

brown

VOLUME SEVENTY-TWO

New York
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., AGENTS
LONDON: P. S. KING & SON, LTD.

1916

H31
.C7
J. 972

W. E. COOK
LIBRARY STAFF

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. AMERICAN MEN OF LETTERS: THEIR NATURE AND NURTURE — <i>Edwin Leavitt Clarke, Ph. D.</i>	1
2. THE TARIFF PROBLEM IN CHINA— <i>Chin Chu, Ph. D.</i>	171
3. THE MARKETING OF PERISHABLE FOOD PRODUCTS— <i>A. B. Adams, A. M.</i>	363



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

1

AMERICAN MEN OF LETTERS

Their Nature and Nurture

STUDIES IN HISTORY, ECONOMICS AND PUBLIC LAW

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Volume LXXII]

[Number 1

Whole Number 168

AMERICAN MEN OF LETTERS

Their Nature and Nurture

BY

EDWIN LEAVITT CLARKE, Ph.D.

*Assistant Professor of Economics and Sociology, Hamilton College
Sometime University Fellow, Columbia University*



New York
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., AGENTS
LONDON: P. S. KING & SON, LTD.

1916

COPYRIGHT, 1916

BY

EDWIN LEAVITT CLARKE

To

MY FATHER AND MOTHER

**TO WHOM I OWE THE NATURE AND NURTURE
WHICH MADE THIS STUDY POSSIBLE**



PREFACE

THE plan of this dissertation was conceived in 1911, as a result of reading the fascinating pages of Professor Lester F. Ward's *Applied Sociology*. Ward's work was based on an inductive study of the nature and nurture of French men of letters, Alfred Odin's *Genèse des Grands Hommes*. Ward had been profoundly impressed by Odin's work. In the *Applied Sociology* he suggested the desirability of making other inductive studies which should be modeled after Odin's, and applied to many nations and fields of activity.

When this study was undertaken, the author believed that the opinions advanced in Ward's work were in every way justified by the evidence. Results attained in his own work, however, have convinced him that nurture is not predominant over nature to the extent that Ward supposed. Nevertheless he still agrees that Ward's plea for the socialization of opportunity is quite warranted. If this study in any way strengthens the case for the extension of opportunity to any who are at present denied their birth-right, he will feel that the work has served its purpose.

In conclusion, acknowledgments are due; first, to the many authors and relatives of authors who courteously answered the questionnaire sent to them; second, to teachers in Columbia and colleagues in Hamilton College who reviewed the statistical aspects of the work, and finally, to Dr. Alvan A. Tenney of Columbia University, for his constructive criticism and generous advice.

E. L. C.

JANUARY, 1916.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	7
LIST OF TABLES	II

CHAPTER I

THEORIES OF NATURE AND NURTURE

The Theory of Galton	13
The Theory of Ward	15
The Theory of the Importance of Both Nature and Nurture	17

CHAPTER II

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

General Statement of Method	20
Odin's Definition of Men of Letters	21
Definition of American Men of Letters	22
Odin's Method of Compiling a Roll of Men of Letters	24
Method of Compiling a Roll of Men of Letters for the Present Study	27
Classification of Men of Letters According to Prominence	31
Collection of Data.	32

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Method of Analysis	34
Thesis of the Present Study	35
Influence of the Environment	37
The Rise and Decline of American Letters	37
Social Environment.	40
Geographic Environment	49
Local Environment.	61
Educational Environment.	66
Economic Environment	71
Environment as Indicated by Occupation of Parents of Men of Letters.	73

	PAGE
Environment as Indicated by the Occupation of Men of Letters Themselves	76
Environment as Indicated by Early Religious Training.	80
Environment as Indicated by Birth-rank.	82
Criticism of the Theory of Galton	84
Criticism of the Theory of Ward.	90
Influence of Heredity	91

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	95
-----------------------------------	----

APPENDIX A

LITERARY FAMILIES.	103
----------------------------	-----

APPENDIX B

BIOGRAPHICAL TABLES	107
-------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX C

AMERICAN MEN OF LETTERS, CLASSIFIED BY CONJUGAL CONDITION, BY PERIOD OF BIRTH, AND BY MEDIAN NUMBER OF CHILDREN BORN TO THEM	164
--	-----

APPENDIX D

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF AMERICAN MEN OF LETTERS WITH DATE OF BIRTH	165
---	-----

LIST OF TABLES

	<small>PAGE</small>
I. Number of American Literati Born Prior to 1851, Classified by Period of Birth	38
II. Absolute and Relative Numbers of American Literati of White Race, Born within the Present Territorial Limits of Continental United States Prior to 1851, Classified by Period of Birth	39
III. American Literati Classified by Sex and by Rank, by Period of Birth	42
IV. American Literati Classified by Field of Chief Activity and Period of Birth	43
V. American Literary Women, Classified by Field of Chief Activity and Period of Birth	45
VI. American Literati Classified as of One, Two, or Three or More Fields of Activity, by Period of Birth.	46
VII. American Literati Classified by Field of Chief Activity and Region of Birth	47
VIII. American Literati Classified by Sex and by Rank, by State or Province of Birth, Together with the Relative Fecundity in Literati of Each State or Province.	50
IX. American Literati Classified by Rank, by Region of Birth.	53
X. American Literati Classified as of One, Two, or Three or More Fields of Activity, by Region of Birth	54
XI. American Literati Classified by State of Birth and Period of Birth	55
XII. Relative Literary Productivity of the Several Groups of States	57
XIII. American Literati Classified by Rank and by Character of Birth-place (State Capital, Chief City of State, County Seat, and Other Places)	60
XIV. Absolute and Relative Numbers of Literary Persons Born in Important Cities.	63
XV. Education Received by American Literati, Classified According to Field of Chief Activity.	67
XVI. Education Received by American Male Literati, Classified by Period of Birth	69

	PAGE
XVII. Education Received by American Women of Letters, Classified by Period of Birth	69
XVIII. Education Received by American Literati, Classified by Sex and by One or More than One Field of Activity	70
XIX. Early Economic Environment of American Literati	72
XX. Occupations of the Fathers of American Literati	74
XXI. Occupational Distribution of American Male Literati . .	77
XXII. Occupational Distribution of American Male Literati, Classified by Period of Birth	78
XXIII. Occupational Distribution of American Literary Women.	79
XXIV. Early Religious Training of American Literati, Classified by Region of Birth	80
XXV. American Literati Classified According to Size of Family and Birth-rank	82
XXVI. A. Per cent Distribution of American Literati Born in the United States, Classified According to the Na- tionality Strain of Their Origin, as Indicated by Surnames.	88
B. Per cent Distribution of the White Population of the United States (1790), Classified According to the Na- tionality Strain of Their Origin, as Indicated by Sur- names.	88
XXVII. Literary Relatives of American Literati, Classified Ac- cording to Degree of Relationship	93

CHAPTER I

THEORIES OF NATURE AND NURTURE

THIS monograph summarizes a study of the nature and nurture of American men of letters. The task attempted was to isolate for investigation the chief factors in each of these influences, to throw some light on the importance of each in the development of men of letters, and to show the bearing of the facts discovered on some of the chief theories of nature and nurture.

Sir Francis Galton makes a very satisfactory statement of the meaning of the terms nature and nurture when he says:

The phrase "nature and nurture" is a convenient jingle of words, for it separates under two distinct heads the innumerable elements of which personality is composed. Nature is all that a man brings with himself into the world; nurture is every influence from without that affects him after his birth. The distinction is clear: the one produces the infant such as it actually is, including its latent faculties of growth of body and mind; the other affords the environment amidst which the growth takes place, by which natural tendencies may be strengthened or thwarted, or wholly new ones implanted. Neither of these terms implies any theory; natural gifts may or may not be hereditary; nurture does not especially consist of food, clothing, education or tradition, but it includes all these and similar influences whether known or unknown.¹

¹ Francis Galton, *English Men of Science: Their Nature and Nurture* (London, 1874), p. 12.

Throughout this study the terms nature and nurture are used in the sense of Galton's definition.

There are three important theories of nature and nurture on which impinge the facts presented in this study. These theories are briefly summarized in the following paragraphs.

Galton states clearly the position of those who hold that nature is stronger than nurture. His opinion can be presented fairly by brief quotations from his classic work, *Hereditary Genius*.¹ His first proposition is stated in the opening sentence of the volume, as follows: "I propose to show in this book that a man's natural abilities are derived by inheritance, under exactly the same limitations as are the form and physical features of the whole organic world." In the second place Galton argues for the preponderant influence of nature over nurture, saying:

I believe, and shall do my best to show, that, if the "eminent" men of any period had been changelings when babies, a very fair proportion of those who survived and retained their health up to fifty years of age, would, notwithstanding their altered circumstances, have equally risen to eminence.²

A little later Galton says:

I have endeavored to show in respect to literary and artistic eminence—

1. The men who are gifted with high abilities . . . easily rise through all the obstacles caused by inferiority of social rank.

2. Countries where there are fewer hindrances than in England, to a poor man rising in life, produce a much larger proportion of persons of culture, but not of what I call eminent men.

¹ Francis Galton, *Hereditary Genius* (London, 1869).

² *Ibid.*, p. 38.

3. Men who are largely aided by social advantages, are unable to achieve eminence, unless they are endowed with high natural gifts.¹

Finally, Galton seeks to show that the great differences in the achievement of nations are due almost solely to differences in the innate ability of their citizens. Nowhere does he express this idea in a single sentence, but it is discussed at length in a chapter on "The Comparative Worth of Different Races."² There Galton contrasts whites with negroes and ancient Greeks with modern Englishmen, arguing in each case that superior achievement is due almost entirely to superior natural ability.

These brief quotations and statements serve to present the most important part of Galton's theory, namely, that irrespective of environmental conditions, innate ability accounts chiefly for the appearance of leaders in nations and for the superiority of one nation over another.

In diametrical opposition to this point of view stands the theory championed by Professor Lester F. Ward. He believes that a favorable environment accounts almost entirely for the appearance of genius.³ To use his own words:

. . . So far as the native capacity, the potential quality, the "promise and potency" of a higher life are concerned, those swarming spawning millions, the bottom layer of society, the proletariat, the working classes, the "hewers of wood and drawers of water," nay, even the denizens of the slums . . . all these are by nature the peers of the boasted "aristocracy of brains" that now dominates society and looks

¹ Francis Galton, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-43.

² *Ibid.*, ch. xx.

³ Lester F. Ward, *Applied Sociology* (Boston, 1906).

down upon them, and the equals in all but privilege of the most enlightened teachers of eugenics.¹

Again Ward says:

The amount of visible genius has never exceeded one-tenth of 1 per cent, but it is proved that at least two hundred times as much exists and might be brought out. This would raise it to 20 per cent. But when we recognize the many forms that genius takes we cannot escape the conclusion that some measure of genius exists in nearly everyone. All this genius is scattered somewhat uniformly through the whole mass of the population.²

Finally Ward remarks:

It turns out, then, that after all the discussion of heredity, and the hopes hung upon the idea of utilizing it in the interest of race improvement, it is a fixed quantity which no human power can change, while the environment, which Galton affected to despise, is not only easily modified, but is in reality the only thing that is modified in the process of artificial selection, which is the essential principle of eugenics itself. All the improvement that can be brought about through any of the applications of that art must be the result of nurture, and cannot be due to any change in nature, since nature is incapable of change.³

Ward's theory is thus, apparently, in irreconcilable opposition to that of Galton. Ward seems to hold that improved nurture is the only means of improving the race, which is worthy of consideration, while Galton seems to hold that only improvement of the blood of the nation can permanently advance society.

¹ "Eugenics, Euthenics and Eudemics," *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. xviii, p. 754.

² *Ibid.*, p. 744.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 749-750.

In marked contrast to these two extreme views stands the opinion of more moderate sociologists, who hold a third theory that both nature and nurture are important. As Professor Charles H. Cooley says:

Nothing is more futile than general discussions of the relative importance of heredity and environment. It is much like the case of matter *versus* mind; both are indispensable to every phase of life, and neither can exist apart from the other: they are coördinate in importance and incommensurable in nature. One might as well ask whether the soil or the seed predominates in the formation of a tree, as whether nature does more for us than nurture.¹

¹ Charles Horton Cooley, *Social Organization* (New York, 1909), p. 316.

Professor Edward L. Thorndike admirably clarifies the whole subject when he says:

It is impossible at present to estimate with security the relative shares of original nature, due to sex, race, ancestry and accidental variation, and of the environment, physical and social, in causing the differences found in men. One can only learn the facts, and interpret them with as little bias as possible, and try to secure more facts. . . . Many of the false inferences about nature *versus* nurture are due to neglect of the obvious facts: that if the environments are alike with respect to a trait, the differences in respect to it are due entirely to original nature; that if the original natures are alike with respect to a trait, the differences are due entirely to differences in training; and that the problem of relative shares, where both are effective, includes all the separate problems of each kind of environment acting with each kind of nature. Any one estimate for all cases would be absurd.

Many disagreements spring from a confusion of what may be called absolute achievement with what may be called relative achievement. A man may move a long way from zero, and nevertheless be lower down than before in comparison with other men: absolute gain may be relative loss. One thinker may attribute differences in achievement almost wholly to nurture, while another holds nature to be nearly supreme, though both thinkers possess just the same data, if the former is thinking of absolute and the latter of relative achievement. . . . The influences of environment are differential, the product varying not only in accord with the environmental force itself, but in accord with the original nature upon which it operates. Edward L. Thorndike, *Educational Psychology, Briefer Course* (New York, 1914), pp. 397-398.

Cooley further presents his position in the form of a simile, as follows:

Suppose that one were following a river through a valley, and from time to time measuring its breadth, depth and current with a view to finding out how much water passed through its channel. Suppose he found that while in some places the river flowed with a swift and ample current, in others it dwindled to a mere brook and even disappeared altogether, only to break out in full volume further down. Would he not be led to conclude that where little or no water appeared upon the surface the bulk of it must find its way through underground channels, or percolate invisibly through the sand? Would not this supposition amount almost to certainty if it could be shown that the nature of the rock was such as to make the existence of underground channels extremely probable, and if in some cases they were positively known to exist? I do not see that the inference is any less inevitable in the case before us. We know that a race has once produced a large amount of natural genius in a short time, just as we know that the river has a large volume in some places. We see, also, that the number of eminent men seems to dwindle and disappear; but we have good reason to think that social conditions can cause genius to remain hidden, just as we have good reason to think that a river may find its way through an underground channel. Must we not conclude, in the one case as in the other, that what is not seen does not cease to be, that genius is present though fame is not?¹

Of the three theories of nature and nurture outlined in the foregoing pages, the last one is generally accepted by contemporary sociologists. Most of them agree with the eugenist that his theory of racial improvement contains

¹ Charles H. Cooley, "Genius, Fame, and the Comparison of Races," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. ix, pp. 317-358.

a valuable element of truth. Likewise they agree with the eugenist when he says that it is possible vastly to improve a people by ameliorating its environment. Selecting elements from the theory of each party, they hold that both nature and nurture are important, that neither alone can adequately explain the appearance of genius. It is this theory which the facts presented in Chapter III of this study seem to support, and which will be maintained in the discussion which is to follow.

CHAPTER II

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

IN beginning the present investigation, the first step necessary was to frame such a conception of men of letters as to permit somewhat detailed study of the various influences of nature and nurture. By classifying men of letters in groups, formed according to the nature and importance of their work, it became possible to consider the effect of the various influences upon the members of each of these groups. By this method investigation could be made to discover whether supposedly potent influences had the same effect in all groups, or whether the contrary was the case. The supposed effect of the various influences could thus be at least partially verified or disproved.

A roll of one thousand men of letters was first obtained by procedure as objective as the nature of the case permitted. Concerning each of these men all reasonably accessible facts were collected which it was believed would throw light on the influence of nature and nurture in their lives.¹ These facts were classified under appropriate heads and then tabulated in such a way as to show the effect of each influence upon the various classes of men. The tables are presented in Chapter III. Their significance is there discussed, and the way in which the facts presented impinge on the three theories of nature and nurture is indicated. The final chapter presents a summary of the facts thus organized.

¹ All the data on which the study was based are given in Appendix B.
20 [20]

At the outset of the study the term men of letters had to be clearly defined. All definitions of the term must be more or less arbitrary. It was found, however, that Professor Alfred Odin, who had made a similar study of French literary people, had framed a reasonably adequate definition of the expression.¹ The fact that his definition seemed to have proved satisfactory for the purposes of his investigation was also a strong argument for employing the same definition in the present study. Moreover, adoption of Odin's definition would make possible a fair and accurate comparison of his conclusions with those to be obtained in this study. For these reasons, it was decided to adopt Odin's definition. It is as follows:

By men of letters we mean authors whose writings are of general interest, and all those, relatively few in number, who, without having written themselves, have none the less contributed directly and in an appreciable degree to the development of literature.²

Odin classified all literati under twelve heads, as follows:

1. pat. (patrons). This group includes patrons, founders and directors of schools, theatres, societies and literary salons, bibliophiles; in a word, all those who, without entering one of the three following groups, have helped in the development of literature by other methods than writing.

2. lib. (librarians). Librarians, printers, calligraphers and all those who have aided in similar fashion in the dissemination of literary works.

3. act. (actors). Dramatic artists of all kinds, including

¹ A. Odin, *Genèse des Grands Hommes, Gens de Lettres Français Modernes* (Paris, 1895). The present study is in many ways modeled after that of Odin, and generous acknowledgment must be made of extensive use of his method of procedure.

² *Ibid.*, p. 310.

those singers who have especially distinguished themselves by their acting.

4. or. (orators).

5. pub. (publicists). Authors of polemic or propagandic writings.

6. narr. (narrators). All those who, without marked polemic, artistic or scientific bias, relate facts or describe objects which they have seen close at hand; that is to say, most memoirists, chroniclers, authors of letters or descriptions of voyages, as well as many historians, geographers, economists, *etc.*

7. erud. (erudite). Authors of scholarly researches based on literary documents, biographers, most historians and philologists, a part of the theologians, jurisconsults, *etc.*, as well as authors of translations themselves destined especially for the erudite.

8. pop. (popularizers). All authors who serve as intermediaries between specialists and the general public, that is to say, in addition to popularizers in the narrow sense, authors of translations, school manuals, and, in general, of any work of instruction or popular edification.

9. spec. (speculative). Those whose writings possess primarily an abstract character; philosophers in the narrow sense, many moralists, estheticians, educators, sociologists, theologians, jurisconsults, *etc.*

10. pr. (prose writers). All those who write in prose with the chief purpose of entertaining the reader, or to obtain certain artistic effects, such as novelists, feuilletonists, letter writers *à la Balzac*, a large part of the critics, as well as most of those who are called simply writers or literary people.

11. p. (poets).

12. dram. (dramatists).¹

This classification developed a general conception of men of letters. For the purposes of the present study it next

¹ A. Odin, *op. cit.*, pp. 356 *et seq.*

became necessary to adopt a definition and develop a general conception applicable to American conditions. The complete definition finally adopted was: American men of letters are men of letters, within the meaning of Odin's terms, both men and women, born and brought up within the present borders of continental United States and Canada, in homes and schools where English was spoken, who did their work in the English language.¹ This definition was still somewhat arbitrary, but a more liberal one would have been subject to the criticism of admitting to the roll literati who were not born and brought up in an essentially American environment, a fatal defect in a study of American authors.²

There have been many thousand American men of letters as defined above. Obviously only a portion of them could be studied. The most important were naturally to be preferred, for data concerning them were found to be much more abundant than in the case of minor literati. The compilation of a roll of their names presented a problem

¹ To avoid monotony the terms men of letters, literati, literary persons, authors, and writers, are hereafter used as synonyms.

² A litterateur might of course be foreign born and yet be essentially American, because of having lived in an American environment from infancy. Desirable as it would have been to include such literati in the study, there were counter considerations which made the attempt seem inadvisable. It would have been necessary to decide at what age a person must come to this country in order to be brought up in an American environment. No age could have been chosen which would not be arbitrary. On the other hand, it would have been impossible to decide in the case of each foreign-born litterateur whether he was brought up in an essentially American environment. The remedy for the exclusion of the foreign-born would therefore have been worse than the evil to be cured.

The number of writers thus excluded is so small as to be negligible. The reader will probably miss only the names of Audubon, Hamilton and Parton. More recent names were automatically excluded by the fact that no authors born after 1850 have been included in this study.

of considerable difficulty. In the interests of equity all writers of the same degree of importance had to be included in the list, all others had to be rejected. No ready-made roll satisfied this condition. Authors of biographical dictionaries do not agree in their lists. They appear to include and reject names of minor importance in the most arbitrary manner. Many mediocre writers are included by some compilers and excluded by others, while various men of obvious merit are by some compilers omitted entirely. This failing in ready-made lists was found to be particularly serious, since minor authors who are treated in such an arbitrary manner constitute the vast majority of all men of letters. To avoid this source of weakness, inherent in any ready-made roll, there was but one method of procedure; the investigator had to make a list for himself, using a method as scientific and as little arbitrary as was possible.¹

In the preparation of a scientific list certain general conditions had to be satisfied.

1. The data had to be collected according to an indisputably objective method, quite independent of the personality of the investigator.
2. The relative number of facts collected had to be large enough to be representative.
3. The absolute number had to be large enough to permit significant statistical work.
4. The subject under investigation had to be fairly familiar to the investigator.
5. As far as possible, the investigation had to be based on well-known men, so that the material used could be verified by any one who might desire to do so.²

¹ A. Odin, *op. cit.*, pp. 358 *et seq.*

² *Ibid.*, pp. 291 *et seq.*

Only the first of these conditions presented a real problem. In its solution the method used by Odin was followed exactly. A statement of this method is therefore necessary at this point. Says Odin :

The importance of a book necessarily corresponds . . . to the success of the work. Consequently we must include in our list all men of letters whose success with the public is beyond question, and who are assured of not falling into oblivion by this very success. The only question is to know what is the most authentic criterion of success. We possess a criterion for men of letters which is relatively easy to ascertain, and whose value cannot be contested. It is simply the diffusion of their works.¹

This diffusion has two aspects, that of time and that of degree. Some authors enjoy very great popularity for a short period, but soon sink into comparative obscurity. Others enjoy a more modest but lasting popularity. Public esteem may be greater or less in degree. In time it may be more or less enduring. Whatever its extent in either respect, the facts are always readily determinable. Hence the appreciation of the relative importance of men of letters usually presents little difficulty. As a result of the method employed the slightest good faith on the part of a student suffices for the attainment of a high degree of objectivity. An investigator almost never has to estimate the success of a work. If his sources are at all abundant, as they have to be in a study of this kind, they answer the question themselves.²

Odin states in detail the exact standards by which he measured the importance of men of letters as follows:

¹ A. Odin, *op. cit.*, p. 362.

² *Ibid.*, p. 363.

The most significant and at the same time the most explicit are; the number of editions and reprints; the number and success of translations, allowance being made as far as possible for the personality of the translator; finally, the number of imitations, adaptations, plagiarisms, *etc.* These are the most certain tests of the success which a work may have had.¹

Odin also mentions other less important supplementary tests. For example:

Works which perhaps do not appear important in themselves, but which have caused keen argument, or which have become known abroad, cannot be entirely insignificant. Sometimes the very fecundity of certain authors is a proof of their success. This is the case, for instance, when a poor author writes to gain his livelihood.²

In addition there are many very subsidiary criteria which Odin used only rarely, such as the frequency of mention or quotation, or the eulogies of well-known critics, supported by reasons.

Even when such objective criteria are used, it is obvious that there must often be resort to personal judgment. An example, taken from Odin, of circumstances necessitating personal judgment will sufficiently illustrate this point.

Reprints, for instance, are far from always signifying the same thing. They are quite frequently due to fortuitous causes, absolutely independent of the merit of the work and of the interest which it arouses in the public. Now it is a descendant of the author who re-edits his works through filial reverence, . . . now we see some work, disdained by contemporaries and unknown to posterity, suddenly acquire importance in the eyes of certain specialists, for a reason absolutely foreign to its literary value. The same is true of the

¹ A. Odin, *op. cit.*, p. 364.

² *Ibid.*, p. 365.

number of editions, which has only very relative significance. A single new edition of a large and costly work may sometimes signify as much as many editions in other cases. Fortunately it is almost always easy to determine the true significance of the different tests, for the simple reason that they serve as checks to each other.¹

Odin's foregoing criteria apply only in part to the first four categories of men of letters. With respect to patrons, librarians, actors and orators he used other tests.

The speeches of orators are indeed frequently printed; but it is well known that the reception which the public reserves for the printed address does not always correspond to the popularity of the orator. . . . For the other three categories even this test is lacking. I have therefore been obliged in all these cases to restrict myself to the tests which were only subsidiary for the other groups. As for orators and actors, I have considered first of all the impression which they have produced on contemporaries, as it has been reported by witnesses worthy of trust. Here I hardly risk deceiving myself, for it is at least as easy to judge impartially of the success attained by an orator or actor as to appreciate exactly the popularity which a written work has enjoyed. I have had more difficulty in deciding which of the "patrons" and "librarians" had a right to appear on the list. For these two groups information was not always as abundant and explicit as could be desired. Thus it may be that I have erroneously omitted more than one person who was really important. Nevertheless, I have reason to suppose that the number of these omissions cannot be considerable.²

Following Odin's method as closely as possible, the investigator began his compilation of a list of American men of letters. Five encyclopedias of biography and literature were carefully studied. These were:

¹ A. Odin, *op. cit.*, p. 365.

² *Ibid.*, p. 366.

- A Critical Dictionary of English Literature and British and American Authors*, S. Austin Allibone (Philadelphia, 1882).
- Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography* (New York, 1887).
- A Supplement to Allibone's Critical Dictionary of English Literature and British and American Authors*, John Foster Kirk (Philadelphia, 1891).
- Lamb's Biographical Dictionary of the United States* (Boston, 1900).
- The National Cyclopaedia of American Biography* (New York, 1898).

These five works were selected as constituting the most recent and exhaustive compilations concerning American letters and biography. The volumes of Allibone and Kirk contained practically no biographical notices, but simply the names of authors, titles of books written, and the number of editions and translations of each. These works were especially useful in determining the diffusion of a work in time and space. The other three encyclopedias were typical biographical dictionaries. Their use was essential in determining the importance of literati who did not write, as well as in estimating the popularity of authors who wrote after 1891, when Kirk's volumes appeared.

It soon became apparent that the different sources were not equally reliable. The works of Appleton and Lamb seemed satisfactory in every way. Their articles were dignified and moderate in tone, and their statements were apparently always justified by the sources on which they were based. On the other hand, the *National Encyclopedia* often seemed extravagant in its praise of an author, devoting more space to writers of doubtful merit than to other men of established reputation. Consequently it was frequently

deemed necessary to discount its assertions to some extent. The volumes by Allibone and Kirk seemed quite reliable as regards statements of the nature and amount of work done by an author. Librarians consider them to be standard works.

In all cases of doubt as to whether an author was sufficiently important to be admitted to the list, additional works were consulted. The most important of these were:

A Dictionary of American Authors, Oscar Fay Adams
(Boston and New York, 1905).

An American Anthology, Edmund Clarence Stedman
(Boston and New York, 1900).

Chamber's Cyclopaedia of English Literature (Philadelphia, 1904).

The Cyclopaedia of American Literature, Evert A. and
George L. Duyckinck (Philadelphia, 1881).

Who's Who in America (Chicago, various dates).

In spite of the deficiencies of these sources, it is believed that collectively they furnished an adequate criterion of the importance of American men of letters.

The name of each litterateur mentioned in the foregoing volumes, who seemed to have any claim to a place on the roll, was put on a numbered card. On the card was also written the name of the class or classes of literary activity in which the author appeared to have made a significant record. When a man of letters had distinguished himself in several fields he was noted as belonging in all of them, though later in the statistical summaries he was counted only in that one in which he had achieved the greatest distinction. On the card was also recorded a list of important books written, including a statement of reprints, new editions, and translations, as well as any other facts which seemed to warrant the inclusion of the author in the ranks of American literati.

In the consideration of the names of candidates for the roll, the alphabetical order was followed. This method not only expedited the work, but served to prevent the intrusion of any possible bias in favor of a particular time or place. Dates and places of birth were not noted till the final list had been completed.

It seemed best to admit to the roll only persons born prior to the year 1851. There were two reasons for this restriction. The biographies of writers born after 1850 were found to be few and incomplete. Moreover, it seemed unfair to pass judgment on an author before it was certain that he had achieved his maximum literary reputation. For most of the younger writers such a decision could not be made. On the other hand, it appeared that few writers who had attained the age of sixty-four¹ would be likely to alter their status in the literary world to any important degree. Hence it seemed quite safe to consider as candidates for the list all authors born before 1851.

None of the chief sources used were published after 1900. Inasmuch, however, as no eligible author who was little known before 1900 subsequently sprang into prominence, it seems probable that these sources included the names of all persons who were sufficiently important at the time of the compilation of the roll (1914) to deserve a place on the roll of the thousand foremost American men of letters born prior to 1851.

The first preliminary survey gave a total of nearly thirteen hundred names. This entire roll was carefully scrutinized a second time, and the sources again consulted. It was then apparent that some authors had been included

¹ The list was compiled in 1914. Inasmuch as the latest reference works were consulted, including *Who's Who in America* for 1914-1915, it seems probable that the true rank of each living author was determined with adequate accuracy.

previously who did not fully measure up to the standard required for admission to the list. The names of authors whose importance seemed doubtful were carefully indicated. A third revision, not less thorough than the others, determined with a considerable degree of certainty what names were to be included in the final roll. Attention naturally centered on names of doubtful importance. To avoid all possibility of bias, however, every name, whether doubtful or not, was carefully considered a fourth time. The final list was found to contain one thousand and six names.

The investigator had made no conscious attempt to obtain exactly one thousand names. He had no idea whether he would have nine hundred or eleven hundred names in the final list. Inasmuch, however, as the number obtained was so near one thousand, it seemed desirable to reduce the list to that number to facilitate calculations. The names of five authors of children's stories were finally selected for elimination, because judged to be the least important on the roll. They were found only in Kirk's work, the least important of the sources used. It would have been useless to retain them, for no biographical facts about the authors were available. The other name eliminated was that of a man who never put pen to paper as an author, but who dictated an account of King Philip's war, a narrative valued solely for its historical significance. Since this man was the only person on the list who did that kind of literary work, it seemed reasonable that he should be the sixth person to be dropped from the roll, particularly as there were apparently no other authors who could be considered less important.

The facts noted during the compilation of the list of names facilitated division of the literati, during these surveys, into two classes, those of major and those of minor

importance. This division made it possible to determine whether the more prominent writers were born in circumstances different in kind or in degree from those in which mediocre authors appeared.¹

This division was made in accordance with the degree of success which men of letters had achieved, measured, as before, by the diffusion of their works in time and space.²

The more prominent authors formed the smaller of the two groups. For convenience its members are hereafter designated as men of talent. The minor literati who constituted the other group are called men of merit.³

Men of talent were classified as follows: (1) authors whose works had been translated into foreign languages;⁴ (2) those writers whose works were very widely read in other English-speaking countries during their lifetime; (3) writers whose works were read extensively after their death;⁵ and (4) those literary patrons, librarians, actors, and orators whose reputation endured after their decease.

After the final roll had been determined, the desired facts

¹ Cf. Odin, *op. cit.*, pp. 374 *et seq.*

² Cf. *supra*, p. 25.

³ In making this classification foreign works were consulted, especially *Meyers Grosses Conversations-Lexicon* (Leipzig and Vienna, 1906), and *La Grand Encyclopédie* (Paris, no date). This was done in order to discover to what extent the works of the more important American authors were read and esteemed abroad.

⁴ Exception was made of authors of works of missionary or temperance propaganda, writers of text-books on non-literary subjects, explorers who owed their success as authors chiefly to their subjects, authors of works of special interest to a foreign people because dealing with some phase of their national life or history, and authors whose residence abroad apparently caused the translation of their works.

⁵ From this category were omitted those authors whose works were valued chiefly as historical sources, and authors of posthumous works which enjoyed only ordinary success.

bearing upon the nature and nurture of each person on the list were collected. A questionnaire sent to living authors and to the immediate relatives of others met with an unexpectedly cordial reception. One hundred and seventy-five schedules were returned, more than seventy per cent of those sent out. Biographies furnished abundant information in regard to perhaps fifteen per cent of the thousand literati. Facts about the others were gathered from encyclopedias, magazine articles, and various scattered sources. Many facts could not be discovered, but those collected were sufficiently numerous to be representative, and to serve as the basis of significant statistical calculations.¹

When all available facts concerning each author had been collected and recorded on the individual cards, the process of analyzing the data was begun. It was then a simple matter to isolate for consideration any recorded fact, by means of sorting the cards. The results of this analysis and interpretation constitute the subject-matter of the next chapter.

¹ In the absence of reason for believing that the facts collected are biased, there is no statistical error in proceeding to draw inferences from samples chosen by any unprejudiced method. Cf. A. L. Bowley, *An Elementary Manual of Statistics* (London, 1910).

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

THIS study, as has been stated in the preface, was originally undertaken with the intention of making an investigation exactly parallel to that of Odin. The plan was to discover, with respect to American men of letters, whether Odin's contention that nature is much more important than nurture was sustained. It was the belief and hope of the author that the data collected would lend themselves to such interpretation, and thereby be in harmony with Professor Ward's argument for the preponderant influence of environment over heredity, as presented in his interesting work, *Applied Sociology*.¹ As the work progressed, however, and as the tables on heredity were prepared, it became evident that, in order to reveal the whole truth, methods of manipulating the data which were not used by Odin would have to be employed. Hence it became necessary to scrutinize from as many angles as possible the data which had been collected, instead of simply following the method of analysis which Odin had used.² Tables were therefore prepared to present the data from many points of view. Sometimes a table was made simply to present facts in a convenient summary. More frequently, however, one was pre-

¹ Lester F. Ward, *Applied Sociology* (Boston, 1906).

² As a result of this modification of the plan of study, a few tables are introduced in the following pages which are quite unlike any presented by Odin. In the main, however, his method of analysis was closely followed.

pared in the hope that it would throw some light on the particular phase of the subject under investigation. The first table prepared, showing the absolute number of literati born in each decade, is an instance of the first type. This summary was naturally followed by a study of the relative number of men of letters born in each decade. As it was found that the number fluctuated, a search was made for an explanation of the variation. Again, it appeared that certain families and environments had produced unusual numbers of authors. This discovery led to the preparation of many additional tables, which, it was thought, might possibly make clear the reason for the facts observed. Some of these tables were later discarded because they appeared to have no particular significance. The others are presented and discussed in the following pages. Those presented were not originally prepared in the order in which they now stand. They are given in this sequence simply because this seems to be the manner of presentation best adapted to bring out the conclusions which resulted from studying the data in as unbiased a manner as possible.

The conclusion to which a consideration of the tables seemed to lead is introduced here in the form of a thesis. It is not an arbitrary dogma to be defended at any cost, nor is it the theory which the investigator expected to find the data sustaining when he began his work. Rather is it a gradually developed conclusion which he felt obliged to accept as the result of his study. The arbitrary form of presentation is therefore used simply for the sake of definiteness and brevity. This thesis is as follows.

In all ranks of American society there have been found men and women of literary ability. Much of this ability has been found in members of the same families, but it has been the monopoly of neither a select group of families nor of a particular nationality strain. This latent ability has

been brought to light by favorable environmental influences, of which there are two distinct kinds. One kind may be called education, or training, and includes those influences of home and school which are particularly potent during childhood and youth. The other kind includes all the remaining elements of environment, especially the ideals and customs of the group in the midst of which one lives. Possession of even the best advantages at home and in school has made possible the development of great authors only when supplemented by this second factor of environment. In short, men of letters have appeared chiefly when the society of their time has appreciated and demanded literature. Without such incentive to write, persons with natural literary ability and adequate training have tended to turn their efforts in other directions.

This thesis can be put in the form of a simile, nature being likened to seed and nurture to ground. A combination of either good ground and poor seed or poor ground and good seed will produce a better crop than when poor seed is sown on poor ground. No good crop is ever produced, however, without the use of both good seed and good ground. In like manner gifted children who lack opportunity, and dull children who possess every opportunity, achieve far more than dull children who lack favorable conditions of environment. Genius, however, is usually produced only by a favorable combination of innate ability and the two factors of environment mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

This thesis is of course only one form of the statement that both nature and nurture are of importance in the development of genius. It is in harmony with the opinions of those sociologists of whom Professor Cooley was quoted as representative in Chapter I.

Now that the thesis has been stated and the method of

investigation has been made plain, the data on which the study is based can be presented and discussed. The apparent influence of various environmental conditions which seem to have affected the authors studied will first be considered. Reason will next be given for a belief that certain phenomena, explained in this study in terms of nurture, cannot possibly be interpreted chiefly in terms of natural ability, as Galton supposed. To this extent it will be shown that the results of the study harmonize with the opinions of Ward. Finally, however, evidence will be submitted for a belief that nurture alone cannot explain the development of American literati, as Ward believed, and an argument will be made so far in support of Galton's contention as to hold that original nature is at least an important factor in the development of genius. Thus it will be shown that apparently the theories of both Galton and Ward are partially right and partially wrong, and that a combination of the two theories, as in the thesis stated above, seems best to accord with the facts as observed.

There are nine important environmental conditions which will be considered. They are as follows: (1) social environment, by which is meant the ideals and customs of a group at any given time and place, (2) geographic environment, (3) local environment, (4) education, (5) economic condition of parents, (6) occupation of father, (7) occupation of the literati themselves, (8) early religious training, and (9) birth-rank in the family of brothers and sisters.

Before these forces of nurture can be considered, however, it is necessary to present a few facts about the history of American letters to serve as a background for the discussion which is to follow. These facts are presented in Tables I and II.

It appears in Table I that the number of literati born increased very rapidly from the time of the American Revo-

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF 1000 AMERICAN LITERATI BORN PRIOR TO 1851, BY PERIOD OF BIRTH¹

Period	Before 1701	1701-10	1711-20	1721-30	1731-40	1741-50	1751-60	1761-70	1771-80	1781-90	1791-1800	1801-10	1811-20	1821-30	1831-40	1841-50
Number.....	6	4	3	7	8	8	18	14	34	49	103	122	178	140	169	137

lution till about 1820. After that time the absolute number declined, though not at a uniform rate. The full significance of the change is brought out in Table II, which shows the relative number of men of letters born in each decade.

From Table II it appears that before 1771 there were born on the average in each decade ten literary people per million of white population. This number gradually increased until, during the years 1791-1800, there were produced twenty-three authors per million. This birth-rate remained practically constant during the two succeeding decades. Then there was an abrupt change. In the period 1821-30 the relative number of men of letters born was less than sixty per cent of what it had been in the previous decade. This decline continued steadily, till in the last decade recorded the relative number of literati born was less than thirty per cent of the number born in the period of maximum fecundity.²

¹ There are two colored literati on the roll. They are included in all studies except those summarized in Tables II, VIII, and XIV, where some ratio of white literati to white population is considered. The fact of this exclusion is in each case plainly indicated in discussion of the table.

² It must be born in mind that, in all probability, the period of maximum literary productivity of an author is normally between forty and sixty years after his birth. Thus the literary birth-rate indicates roughly the amount of literary activity a half-century later.

TABLE II

ABSOLUTE AND RELATIVE NUMBERS OF AMERICAN LITERATI OF WHITE RACE, BORN WITHIN THE PRESENT TERRITORIAL LIMITS OF CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES PRIOR TO 1851, CLASSIFIED BY PERIOD OF BIRTH¹

Period of birth	Absolute number	White population of the period in thousands ²	Number of literati per million of white population
Before 1771	68	6,735 ³	10
1771-80.....	34	2,249	15
1781-90.....	49	3,170	15
1791-1800.....	101	4,305	23
1801-10.....	118	5,861	20
1811-20.....	176	7,866	22
1821-30.....	138	10,522	13
1831-40.....	163	14,191	11
1841-50.....	133	19,375	7
Total.	980	74,274	13

¹ The eighteen Canadian writers can not be considered in this table, as there was no adequate census of Canada before 1850 on which to base comparisons. The two men of African descent are also omitted.

² For the period since 1790 the figures are taken from the decennial census of the United States. *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 1909. Table 20. For the period prior to 1790 the figures are based on estimates in or derived from *A Century of Population Growth in the United States*. Bureau of Census (Washington, 1909). The very small population figures for mountain and pacific states are omitted to make this table comparable with Table XII. In estimating the white population for the colonial period it was assumed that, during the entire period prior to the first census, the colored population bore the same relation to the white population in each colony that it did in 1790. This assumption did not entirely accord with the facts, but data on which to base more accurate estimates were not available. As a result of this assumption the period before 1771 was credited with a slightly larger number of literati per million of population than it really deserved. It is extremely unlikely, however, that the error was large enough to change the index figure given for the period even as much as from ten to nine.

³ It will be noted that, with the exception of the period before 1771, the number of literati born in each decade was compared with the

The statistics in Tables I and II thus show that the literary activity of the American people has been far from uniform in amount. This fact requires explanation. It is apparently best explained, in accordance with the thesis maintained in this study, in terms of the social environment, the first of the nine environmental conditions which are to be considered. Authors of the first rank disappeared after the Civil War because their work seems to have been no longer appreciated.¹ In other words, the social environment had become relatively unfavorable to literary activity. The reason for this change seems to be as follows. During the Reconstruction period the temper of the American people was profoundly altered. It is true that before the War the spirit of commercialism was strong, but many people still had leisure which they devoted to serious reading. Later, when all values seemed to be expressed in terms of money, the nation had less time to devote to a seemingly impractical subject like literature. Professor Cooley admirably summarizes the argument for this theory when he says:

The real cause of literary and artistic weakness (in so far as it

white population of the United States at the end of that decade. Each white person in the United States was counted in the population of each decade at the end of which he was alive. To obtain comparable results the same procedure was adopted for the period prior to 1771. The population for each decade was estimated, and the number of literati born in the period was recorded. Since these figures were too small to be significant, it seemed best to combine the estimates for the entire colonial period. The number of literati born in the period before 1771 was of course found by adding the numbers born in each decade of the period. Likewise the estimated population for each decade was summed, to give a comparable population figure for the period. Only thus could significant figures be obtained.

¹ The marked fall in the birth rate of literati took place perhaps fifty years before the corresponding decline in literature. It began after 1820, and continued till the close of the period studied.

exists) I take to be chiefly the spiritual disorganization incident to a time of rather sudden transition. . . . No matter how gifted an individual may be, he is in no way apart from his time, but has to take that and make the best of it he can; the man of genius is in one point of view only a twig upon which a mature tendency bears its perfect fruit. . . . Any ripe development of productive power in literary or other art implies not merely capable individuals but the perfection of a social group, whose traditions and spirit the individual absorbs, and which floats him up to a point whence he can reach unique achievement. The unity of this group or type is spiritual, not necessarily local or temporal, and so may be difficult to trace, but its reality is as sure as the principle that man is a social being and cannot think sanely and steadfastly except in some sort of sympathy with his fellows. There must be others whom we can conceive as sharing, corroborating and enhancing our ideals, and to no one is such association more necessary than to the man of genius. . . . no doubt such questions afford ground for infinite debate, but the underlying principle that the thought of every man is one with that of a group, visible or invisible, is sure, I think, to prove sound; and if so it is indispensable that a great capacity should find access to a group whose ideals and standards are of a sort to make the most of it.¹

Among other significant facts in the history of American letters which seem to be explained in the light of this proposition better than by either the theory of Galton or of Ward there are seven which are particularly worthy of notice. The first appears in Table III. From this table it is evident that from colonial times to the period at which this study ended, there was a fairly steady decline in the proportion of literati of superior achievement, called men of talent. It seems probable that the same influences which

¹ Cooley, *Social Organization*, pp. 162 *et seq.*

caused fewer potential men of letters to devote themselves to authorship had an especially strong effect on men of exceptional ability. It is apparently reasonable to assume that men of genius are more dependent upon their environment than are others, for, as Cooley remarks: "being thinner-skinned, they are more suggestible, more perturbable, and

TABLE III

AMERICAN LITERATI CLASSIFIED BY SEX AND BY RANK, BY PERIOD OF BIRTH

Rank ¹	Before 1771	1771-80	1781-90	1791-1800	1801-10	1811-20	1821-30	1831-40	1841-50	Total
Men of merit	43	24	30	65	78	127	91	97	86	641
Men of talent	22	9	14	31	32	28	26	34	22	218
Women of merit	3	1	3	5	11	12	20	31	26	112
Women of talent	2	2	1	11	3	7	3	29
Total Men	65	33	44	96	110	155	117	131	108	859
Total Women	3	1	5	7	12	23	23	38	29	141
Women, per cent	4	3	10	7	10	13	16	22	21	14.1
Total merit	46	25	33	70	89	139	111	128	112	753
Total talent	22	9	16	33	33	39	29	41	25	247
Talent, per cent	32	26	33	32	27	22	21	24	18	24.7

peculiarly in need of the right sort of surroundings to keep their delicate machinery in fruitful action".² Presumably the best potential American authors, those endowed with the finest sensibilities, were the persons whose sensitive minds were most ready to give up the pursuit of letters when conditions became unfavorable. Thus the fact that the relative number of literati of talent began to decline

¹ For method of assignment of an individual to the rank, talent or merit, see p. 31.

² Cooley, *op. cit.*, p. 165.

while the absolute number of authors was still increasing, is probably to be explained on the ground that the men of superior ability were the first to sense the baneful influence of approaching philistinism.

The second of the seven noteworthy facts which seem best explained as due to changes in the social environment is presented in Table IV. This table shows that the decline

TABLE IV

AMERICAN LITERATI CLASSIFIED BY FIELD OF CHIEF ACTIVITY AND PERIOD OF BIRTH.¹

Chief Field of Activity ²	Before 1771	1771-80	1781-90	1791-1800	1801-10	1811-20	1821-30	1831-40	1841-50	Total
Patrons.....	5	2	3	10
Librarians.....	1	2	2	1	2	4	7	2	2	23
Actors.....	2	4	6	2	13	6	6	33
Orators.....	3	3	1	3	5	5	1	1	2	24
Publicists.....	10	4	6	2	8	15	11	10	5	71
Narrators.....	6	3	2	9	10	16	12	5	7	70
Erudite.....	13	5	12	13	15	30	22	32	15	157
Popularizers.....	17	9	14	38	40	38	32	35	26	249
Speculative.....	8	2	2	8	6	10	6	1	7	50
Prose writers.....	2	3	5	10	12	21	27	38	48	166
Poets.....	7	3	5	11	17	30	18	25	16	132
Dramatists.....	1	1	3	3	4	3	15	15
Total.....	68	34	49	103	122	178	140	169	137	1000

of American letters was not manifest in all kinds of literature. The number of authors diminished in nine of the twelve fields of literary activity under consideration, but the number of actors, dramatists, and prose writers did not

¹ In the compilation of this table each author was counted only in that field of activity in which he seemed to have attained the greatest distinction.

² The exact character of these classes is defined on pages 21-22.

decline during the last few decades studied.¹ The theory advanced above readily explains this apparent exception to the general tendency. Activity increased in the three kinds of work which were in harmony with the spirit of the time. This activity furnished what the people demanded. The environment being favorable, the number of literati in these three fields naturally tended to increase.

The third noteworthy fact, discovered from data not here presented, is that in these three fields in which activity was increasing, apparently because of greater popular interest, there was not a growing proportion of literati of talent compared with those of merit. It might seem that, according to the theory that when literature is in popular favor conditions stimulate the production of literary genius, an increase in the number of men of talent in these fields should have been expected. In reality, however, such an increase would not harmonize with that theory, while the decline in the ranks of men of talent observed is quite in accord with it. This paradox is explained as follows. In the first place, it must be remembered that, at the time when the authors born in the latter decades studied were writing, popular taste in fiction and the drama was not at all what it had been several decades previously. Even the attitude of the public toward the players had changed. People did not then have, as formerly, enduring interest in an actor. The desire of the public was for the recent. "Popular" books were lauded, and it was not fashionable to read books

¹ These facts were further verified by the results of another analysis in which the method of procedure served as a check to the one used in compiling Table IV. In this case each litterateur was counted once for every line of activity in which he had achieved distinction. Results differed so little from those noted in Table IV that it seemed needless duplication to print even the summaries. It is quite evident that literary activity declined at approximately the same rate as did the number of literati.

which had been tested by time. Popular taste was also provincial, rather than catholic. It did not care for literature which was universal in its appeal, but preferred that which dealt with matters of local and transient interest. This provincialism may well account for the small number of writers of talent in the later decades of the study. Authors of merit merely produced what the people would read. It was a poor literature which could not command a foreign audience, or even hold the attention of Americans for any length of time. In other words, popular taste had by its very nature made it increasingly difficult for a litterateur to win recognition as a man of talent, though comparatively easy for a man to attain the rank of a man of merit.

The fourth significant fact to be noted in connection with the theory under consideration is given in Table V, which contains an analysis of the fields of activity of literary women. The table shows that women did considerable

TABLE V

AMERICAN LITERARY WOMEN CLASSIFIED BY FIELD OF CHIEF ACTIVITY AND PERIOD OF BIRTH

Chief Field of Activity	Before 1771	1771-80	1781-90	1791-1800	1801-10	1811-20	1821-30	1831-40	1841-50	Total
Patrons	I	I
Librarians
Actors	I	I	I	2	3	7
Orators	1	1
Publicists	I	2	I	I	5
Narrators	I	2	I	I	5
Erudite	I	I	2	4
Popularizers	2	I	2	3	2	3	4	6	3	26
Speculative	I	I
Prose writers	2	I	3	10	8	17	20	61
Poets	I	I	4	6	7	9	2	30
Dramatists
Total.	3	I	5	7	12	23	23	38	29	141

work in popularizing, in poetry and in prose writing. These were the fields of literary activity which the public seemed to consider most appropriate for women. It is noteworthy that, during the last few decades considered, the number of literary women increased only in the fields of acting and prose writing, two of the three fields in which the number of men also increased.

The fifth of the series of facts best understood in the light of the theory of the influence of the social environment is given in Table VI. The authors are here classified, by period

TABLE VI

AMERICAN LITERATI CLASSIFIED AS OF ONE, TWO, OR THREE OR MORE FIELDS OF ACTIVITY, BY PERIOD OF BIRTH.¹

Period of birth	Of one field		Of two fields		Of three or more fields		Total absolute numbers
	Absolute number	Per cent of all literati born in the period	Absolute number	Per cent of all literati born in the period	Absolute number	Per cent of all literati born in the period	
Before 1771	53	78	9	13	6	9	68
1771-80.....	28	82	3	9	3	9	34
1781-90.....	34	69	12	24	3	6	49
1791-1800.....	79	77	20	19	4	4	103
1801-10.....	90	74	24	20	8	7	122
1811-20.....	131	74	36	20	11	6	178
1821-30.....	107	76	21	15	12	9	140
1831-40.....	119	70	43	25	7	4	169
1841-50.....	117	85	17	12	3	2	137
Total	758	75.8	185	18.5	57	5.7	1000

of birth, as of one, two, or three or more fields of activity. It appears that in the period 1841-50 there were relatively

¹ When the percentage figures in this table are added on horizontal lines the totals will not in every case equal 100 because of cumulative error. The inaccuracy, however, is slight.

far fewer literati of two or more fields than at any previous time in American history. This decline may have been either a temporary fluctuation or a real tendency due to the same influence which caused the decline in the number of men of letters in general. If it was the manifestation of a real tendency, it can perhaps be explained by the supposition that the more versatile potential literati found it easy to adapt themselves to unfavorable conditions, and were therefore the first to give up the pursuit of letters.

The sixth fact of this series is brought out in Table VII, which shows the field of chief activity of authors born in the various groups of states.¹ These figures speak for

TABLE VII

AMERICAN LITERATI CLASSIFIED BY FIELD OF CHIEF ACTIVITY AND REGION OF BIRTH

Field of chief activity ²	Canada	New England	Middle Atlantic	South Atlantic	East South Central	West South Central	East North Central	West North Central	Unknown	Total
Patrons.....	6	2	I	I	10
Librarians	14	6	2	I	23
Actors.....	2	10	13	5	I	I	I	33
Orators	13	3	7	I	24
Publicists	I	37	17	10	2	4	71
Narrators	25	32	6	I	6	70
Erudite	3	85	47	15	I	5	I	157
Popularizers	6	136	80	11	3	II	I	I	249
Speculative	2	30	12	3	3	50
Prose writers	3	69	54	21	3	2	13	I	166
Poets	I	61	40	17	4	8	I	132
Dramatists	I	10	2	I	I	15
Total	18	487	316	99	15	4	53	5	3	1000

¹ When a man of letters had distinguished himself in several fields he is noted in Appendix B as belonging in all of them. In these tables, however, he is counted only in that one in which he had achieved the greatest distinction.

² The exact character of these classes is defined on pages 21-22.

themselves. Calculations not given in the table show further that in all but one subject New England produced more literati, in proportion to population, than did any other group of states. The lead was particularly marked in the classes of patrons, librarians, publicists, and speculative writers. The Middle Atlantic states produced in absolute numbers more dramatists than all the other groups combined, and relatively more than any other single group. The absolute number of actors and narrators credited to them was also larger than that of any other group, though relatively New England had the lead. The South Atlantic states showed their greatest relative strength in the class of orators, where they ranked above the Middle Atlantic states, though still far below New England.¹

These differences are readily explained by the same principle which explained the decline, in the country as a whole, of all but three fields of letters.² No doubt the mark of approbation or ban of disapproval set by a group upon any particular form of literary activity has tremendous influence in stimulating or retarding activity of this sort. This fact may well explain the predominance of New England in the fields of patrons, librarians, publicists and speculative writers, fields which seem more characteristic of the Puritan than does the drama, in which the Middle Atlantic states held the lead.

Finally, in the seventh place, Table III shows a fact not mentioned when the table was previously discussed, namely, that the number of literary women increased fairly steadily from colonial times to the end of the period studied. Ap-

¹ These facts were still further confirmed by a separate analysis in which each litterateur was counted once for each field in which he had achieved distinction. The general results were so similar to those shown in Table VII that it seemed unnecessary to print them.

² Cf. *supra*, p. 40.

parently the chief explanation for this increase in the literary activity of women is to be found in the gradual removal of the ban so long placed upon feminine activity of any kind not intimately associated with the home, church or school. In other words, a changed social environment seems to have been the thing essential to the development of literary women. It is possible, however, that the diversion of masculine effort to non-literary fields also affected the situation to some extent.

This series of tables has brought forth three conclusions regarding the influence of the social environment. It appears, in the first place, that literati were chiefly developed in groups of states where the kind of literature which they produced was in high popular esteem (Table VII). In the second place, it seems that, in the country as a whole, authors appeared most frequently and showed the greatest skill and versatility when their contemporaries were in sympathy with their work (Tables I to VI). Finally, it seems apparent that a favorable environment was essential to the development of literary women (Table III). Thus all these conclusions seem to furnish substantial reasons for a belief in the great power of group ideals and customs, the social environment, over the development of American men of letters.

This ends the discussion of the subdivision, social environment. The next of the nine topics under the general subject, environment, is that of the influence of the geographic environment. Under this topic five tables will be presented. These show that, in proportion to population, different sections of the country varied greatly in the number, rank and versatility of their literary sons and daughters. Reason will be given, however, for believing that geographic environment was not of prime importance in the production of American literati, but was simply correlated with other factors of far greater significance.

TABLE VIII

AMERICAN LITERATI CLASSIFIED BY SEX AND BY RANK, BY STATE OR PROVINCE OF BIRTH, TOGETHER WITH THE RELATIVE FECUNDITY IN
LITERATI OF EACH STATE OR PROVINCE

Region of birth	Men		Women		Total		Total		Population base ³	Index
	Merit	Talent	Merit	Talent	Merit	Talent	Men	Women		
Nova Scotia	5	I	5	I	6	6	(1)
New Brunswick	4	4	4	4	(2)
Quebec.....	2	2	2	2	(1)
Ontario	3	2	I	4	2	5	I	6	(1)
Maine	35	8	8	3	43	11	43	11	54	2465
New Hampshire.....	33	8	3	2	36	10	41	5	46	1936
Vermont	17	10	I	18	10	27	I	28	1682
- Massachusetts.....	148	65	23	10	171	75	213	33	246	5637
Rhode Island.....	7	6	7	6	13	13	873
- Connecticut	67	19	10	4	77	23	86	14	100	2831
- New York	141	28	31	5	172	33	169	36	205	11126
New Jersey.....	16	10	16	10	26	26	2493
- Pennsylvania	48	26	10	I	58	27	74	I	85	9218
Delaware	2	I	3	2	I	3	480
Maryland	22	5	4	26	5	27	4	31	2695
District of Columbia	4	2	4	2	4	2	6	146
Virginia	20	7	2	22	7	27	2	29	5866
North Carolina.....	4	I	5	4	I	5	3548
South Carolina	7	3	2	9	3	10	2	12	1908
Georgia	9	2	2	11	2	11	2	13	1778
Alabama	I	I	I	I	1037
Mississippi	I	I	2	I	I	2	615
Kentucky	8	I	I	9	I	9	I	10	2923
Tennessee	I	I	2	I	I	2	2614
Louisiana	I	I	I	2	I	2	I	3	610
Arkansas	I	I	I	I	278	4
Ohio	15	6	5	2	20	8	21	7	28	5236
Indiana	7	5	I	8	5	12	I	13	2170
Illinois	2	2	2	2	4	4	1539
Michigan	5	5	5	5	652
Wisconsin	3	3	3	3	336
Missouri	2	2	I	3	2	4	I	5	1104
Unknown.....	I	I	I	2	I	2	I	3
Total.....	641	218	112	29	753	247	859	141	1000	⁴ 73796 ⁵ 13

¹ No figures can be given for Canada because population estimates are lacking.

² Includes one man of African descent.

³ The population base is derived by summing the figures indicating the white population for each decade from the founding of a state or

In the first of these tables (Table VIII), the authors are classified by state or province of birth, by sex and by rank. The most significant figures of this table appear under the column headed Index. This column contains for each state a figure indicating the average number of white literati, per million of white population, born in that state or colony prior to 1851. The figure was derived by summing the figures indicating the white population for each decade from the founding of that state or colony up to 1851. By this total, called population base, was divided the number of white literati born in the state or colony during the same period.¹ For instance, the sum of the estimated and enumerated decennial white population figures for Massachusetts,

colony up to 1851. In the table the figures of population base are given in thousands (*i. e.*, three naughts [ooo] are omitted in each case). In estimating the white population for the colonial period it was assumed that, during the entire period prior to the first census, the colored population bore the same relation to the white population that it did in 1790. While the assumption did not exactly accord with the facts, it seemed inadvisable to attempt to obtain greater accuracy. Better results would have been attained only at a labor cost out of all proportion to their value. As a result of the method used the states with a large colored population seem to have produced relatively more literati than should really be credited to them. The error, however, cannot be significant, for the total population of the colonial period was relatively small.

⁴ This total differs slightly from that of Table II because it excludes the population of several southern states which produced no literati before 1851.

⁵ This index (13) is based on a population total of 74,274 which includes the populations of several southern and western states the populations of which were enumerated in 1850 or earlier, but which had produced no literati and which, therefore, were not included in the separate categories of this table. The number of literati included in the calculations for this figure (13) was 980. Eighteen Canadian literati were omitted because of the lack of Canadian population estimates. The two men of African descent were also omitted. The three men of unknown region of birth were, however, included.

¹ The population figures are taken from census returns and estimates in or derived from *A Century of Population Growth in the United States*.

from 1620 to 1850 inclusive, calculated in each decade to the nearest thousand, was 5,637. When by this sum was divided 246, the number of white literati born in that state during the same period, an index number of 44 was obtained.

This procedure had the following justification. Plainly a figure derived by dividing the population of a state at the end of any decade, by the number of authors born in the state during that decade, would be an index of the relative productivity of literati by that state during the decade. Such figures could have been obtained, but because of the small numbers concerned their significance would have been slight. However, when the numbers of white literati born during each decade are summed, and the figures for the white population living at the end of each decade are also summed and expressed in millions, and when this former sum is divided by the latter, there results a figure which indicates the average productivity of literati by a state in each decade, per million of white population. This index number is chiefly significant as a measure of the relative literary fecundity of the different states.

The chief points brought out by the index numbers of this table are as follows:

(1) With the exception of Vermont and Rhode Island, all the New England states ranked higher than their nearest competitor, New York.

(2) Massachusetts and Connecticut stood far above the other New England states, and Massachusetts had a large lead over Connecticut.

(3) The District of Columbia ranked next to Massachusetts.

(4) The relative importance of the southern states was slight. Of all the states south of Mason and Dixon's line,

TABLE IX

AMERICAN LITERATI CLASSIFIED BY RANK BY REGION OF BIRTH

Region of birth ¹	Rank		Total	Talent per cent ²
	Merit	Talent		
Canada	15	3	18
New England	352	135	487	28
Middle Atlantic	246	70	316	22
South Atlantic	80	19	99	19
East South Central	14	1	15
West South Central	3	1	4
East North Central	38	15	53	28
West North Central	3	2	5
Unknown	2	1	3
Total	753	247	1000	24.7

Maryland alone had as high rank as the lowest of the New England and Middle Atlantic states.

(5) The states formed from the Northwest Territory on the whole ranked with the southern states, distinctly lower than those of the east.³

¹ New England—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut.

Middle Atlantic—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania.

South Atlantic—Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida.

East South Central—Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi.

West South Central—Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma.

East North Central—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin.

West North Central—Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas.

² Not given when very few persons are concerned, for the ratio would be spuriously accurate and therefore misleading.

³ Care must be used in drawing comparisons among states in cases where the recorded instances are too few to permit accurate statistical deductions.

Other investigators have discovered striking differences in the pro-

The second of the five tables considered under the subject of geographic environment (Table IX), shows the region of birth of literati, classified according to rank. It appears that the northern states have produced more persons of talent than have those of the south. The figures also show that both New England and the East North Central states produced unusually large proportions of literati of talent.

Standing by themselves, the foregoing figures might seem inconclusive. They are borne out, however, by results pre-

TABLE X

AMERICAN LITERATI CLASSIFIED AS OF ONE, TWO, OR THREE OR MORE FIELDS OF ACTIVITY, BY REGION OF BIRTH

Region of birth	One Field		Two fields		Three fields.		Total
	Number	Per cent of literati of the region ¹	Number	Per cent of literati of the region ¹	Number	Per cent of literati of the region ¹	
Canada	15	3	18
New England	356	73	95	20	36	7	487
Middle Atlantic	249	79	57	18	10	3	316
South Atlantic.....	77	78	16	16	6	6	99
East South Central	14	1	15
West South Central	4	4
East North Central	37	70	12	23	4	8	53
West North Central	3	2	5
Other.	3	3
Total.....	758	75.8	185	18.5	57	5.7	1000

duction of prominent citizens by different sections of the country. Cf. James McKeen Cattell, *American Men of Science* (New York, 1910); George R. Davies, "A Statistical Study in the Influence of Environment," *Quarterly Journal of the University of North Dakota*, vol. iv, no. 3; and Scott Nearing, "The Geographic Distribution of American Genius," *Popular Science Monthly*, vol. 85, p. 189.

¹ Not given when very few persons are concerned, for the ratio would be spuriously accurate and therefore misleading. The totals in these columns are based on the complete absolute figures.

TABLE XI

AMERICAN LITERATI CLASSIFIED BY STATE OF BIRTH AND PERIOD OF BIRTH

State of birth	Before 1700	1701-10	1711-20	1721-30	1731-40	1741-50	1751-60	1761-70	1771-80	1781-90	1791-1800	1801-10	1811-20	1821-30	1831-40	1841-50	Total
Canada	2	3	1	2	6	4	18		
Maine.....	6	13	13	3	7	12	54		
New Hampshire.....	2	6	5	9	5	8	6	4	46
Vermont.....	5	8	9	2	3	1	28	
Massachusetts.....	6	3	1	1	1	2	7	5	12	18	29	31	49	37	27	17	246
Rhode Island.....	1	1	1	3	3	1	2	1	13
Connecticut.....	..	1	1	3	2	2	4	3	5	11	18	6	15	10	10	9	100
New York.....	2	1	2	1	2	18	22	49	29	43	36	205	
New Jersey.....	1	1	1	2	2	3	1	5	2	4	4	4	26
Pennsylvania.....	3	3	2	2	5	5	6	9	11	17	19	3	85		
Delaware.....	1	2	3
Maryland.....	1	..	1	..	2	1	2	4	3	4	11	2	31	
District of Columbia.....	2	1	1	2	1	6	
Virginia.....	1	1	2	..	3	1	3	3	4	6	2	3	29	
North Carolina.....	1	1	1	1	1	5	
South Carolina.....	1	1	2	1	1	4	2	..	12
Georgia.....	3	2	3	2	3	13	
Alabama.....	1	..	1	..	1
Mississippi.....	1	1	..	2
Louisiana.....	1	1	1	3	
Arkansas.....	1	..	1	
Tennessee.....	2	2	
Kentucky.....	2	2	2	1	2	1	10		
Ohio.....	1	6	9	12	28		
Indiana.....	3	5	5	13		
Illinois.....	1	3	4		4	
Michigan.....	1	4	5		
Wisconsin.....	1	2	2	3		
Missouri.....	3	2	5		
Unknown.....	1	1	1	3		
Total	1000		

sented in the third of the tables on geographic environment (Table X). This table shows the region of birth of literati, classified as of one, two and three or more fields of activity. In this table, the New England and East North Central states again appear appreciably in the lead.¹

¹ An unpublished classification of literati by sex, according to the group of states in which they were born showed remarkable uniformity

In the fourth place, classification of men of letters by decade and state of birth (Table XI) shows plainly that the relative importance of the states was not constant. The full extent of the changes in the relative importance of the states in the production of men of talent is not apparent, however, till one considers the results of a further analysis which yielded the fifth and last of the tables on geographic environment, on the literary fecundity of each group of states in proportion to white population (Table XII). The decline in the number of literati made manifest in Table II is here shown (Table XII) to be no local phenomenon. During the latter decades studied there was a marked diminution in the relative number of men of letters born in every group of states which possessed enough authors to make figures significant. Table XII also shows that the center of American literary activity was slowly but surely shifting. In the decade 1841-50, New England was still supreme, but its lead had been appreciably reduced. The East North Central states showed the least relative decline in literary fecundity, a fact which may indicate that the future literary leadership of the country is to be theirs. When the history of the nation as a whole is considered, however, it seems that New England's predominance during the period studied was little short of marvelous. The group produced in proportion to population more than twice as many literati as did the Middle Atlantic states, and more than six times as many as did the South Atlantic group, or any of the other groups of states.

in the proportion credited to each. No group of states appeared to possess conditions particularly favorable to the development of literary talent in one sex, rather than in the other.

TABLE XII

RELATIVE LITERATI PRODUCTIVITY OF THE SEVERAL GROUPS OF STATES

Abbreviations: Pop., white population of the region at the end of the period, in thousands; Lit., white literati born in the region during the period; Ratio, number of literati born per million of white population living in the region at the end of the period.¹

Group of States	Before 1771	1771-80	1781-90	1791-1800	1801-10	1811-20	1821-30	1831-40	1841-50	Sum-mation and Total
New England.....	{ Pop .. 2,550 Lit .. 43 Ratio .. 17	730 20 27	991 36 36	1,214 64 53	1,451 70 48	1,638 94 57	1,934 61 32	2,212 55 25	2,704 44 16	15,424 487 32
Middle Atlantic.....	{ Pop .. 1,747 Lit .. 18 Ratio .. 10	638 8 13	908 9 10	1,338 27 20	1,933 32 17	2,610 65 25	3,484 48 14	4,407 66 15	5,772 43 7	22,837 316 14
South Atlantic.....	{ Pop .. 2,421 Lit .. 7 Ratio .. 3	844 6 7	1,178 4 3	1,426 8 6	1,593 13 8	1,787 11 6	2,117 19 9	2,329 19 8	2,819 11 4	16,514 98 6
East South Central ..	{ Pop .. 17 Lit Ratio	37	93 2 2	277 2 3	563 2 3	902 1 1	1,304 3 3	1,745 3 4	2,241 4	7,179 15 2
West South Central	{ Pop Lit Ratio 34 87 115 235 571 2	1,042 4 4
East North Central ..	{ Pop Lit Ratio 50 270 786 1,453 2,896 4,478 9,933	
West North Central ..	{ Pop Lit Ratio 17 56 115 367 790 1,345 5	
United States	{ Pop .. 6,735 Lit .. 68 Ratio .. 10	2,249 34 15	3,170 49 15	4,305 101 23	5,861 118 20	7,866 175 22	10,522 138 13	14,191 163 11	19,375 132 7	74,274 3,978 13

¹ The ratio was not calculated in the case of those states where both the population and the number of literati produced was very small, for such a ratio would be inaccurate and misleading.

² The population summation here given differs from that given in Table VIII because this figure includes the population of several southern and western states which produced no literati before 1851 and which, therefore, were not included in the earlier table.

³ This figure does not include eighteen Canadians, two white residents of the United States whose exact place of birth was unknown, and the two negroes, for one of whom the place of birth was also unknown.

All five tables which have been presented under the subject of geographic environment thus show this same fact, namely, that there were great differences in the literary productivity of different sections of the country during the entire period studied.

There are, of course, two possible ways in which the differing literary productivity of the several states can be explained, namely, in terms of nature or nurture. If one believes that nature is greatly predominant over nurture he may hold that this difference was due to the fact that the northern states were inhabited by persons of superior stock. If, on the other hand, he thinks that nurture is much more important than nature, he will explain the high literary fecundity of the north in terms of some environmental influence.

To prove the first of these theories it is necessary to prove two things, namely, that a great diversity of population elements was found in the several states, and that there also existed considerable differences of innate ability in the different population elements. There is no evidence that either of these conditions existed. In the first place, the relative numbers of persons of different nationalities found in the several states were fairly uniform in 1790, and it was not till after 1840 that large numbers of immigrants began to come to America and congregate in the north.¹ In the second place, it is still unproved, as will presently be shown, that the different nationality strains in the country varied widely in innate ability.² Hence it appears that some factor of the environment must be sought to explain the differing literary productivity of the different sections of the country.

¹ Cf. *A Century of Population Growth*. Diagram II, p. 118.

² Cf. *infra*, p. 89.

It might possibly be inferred from a certain degree of correlation between different kinds of geographic environment and different types of literary talent, brought out by Table VII, and also by the facts discussed in the last few pages, that geographic environment was causally related to the distribution of men of letters. A little study will show, however, that so far as correlation exists it was due chiefly to other factors. One might infer, perhaps, that the southern states were handicapped by heat, humidity and disease. This is probably true to a considerable extent. It is evident, however, that climatic conditions cannot be considered the predominant influence, because adjacent states possessing practically identical topographical and meteorological conditions varied widely in literary fecundity. Some other influence must be sought to explain why, for example, Alabama ranked far below Georgia, and Rhode Island below both Massachusetts and Connecticut, while the District of Columbia stood far above either Maryland or Virginia. Thus one is led to conclude that though no doubt geographic environment did play a part in the production of literary talent, it was far less important than other factors.¹

Density, also, might appear to have had an important influence, since, for example, the relatively crowded New England and Middle Atlantic states were relatively more productive of men of letters. A superficial examination of the census reports, however, shows that there was not a uniform relation between the two conditions. If there had been such a uniform relation, Rhode Island, for instance, would have headed the list of states, instead of ranking seventh, and Delaware would have been above Maine, New

¹ This conclusion is identical with that of Odin. He conceded that geographic environment has some influence in the production of men of letters, but considered that its influence is too small to be measured. Odin, *op. cit.*, pp. 439 *et seq.*

TABLE XIII

AMERICAN LITERATI CLASSIFIED BY RANK AND BY CHARACTER OF BIRTH PLACE (STATE CAPITAL, CHIEF CITY OF STATE, COUNTY SEAT, AND OTHER PLACES¹)

Abbreviations: M., merit; T., talent; To., total.

State or Province	Capital			Chief City			County Seat			All others			Total		
	M.	T.	To.	M.	T.	To.	M.	T.	To.	M.	T.	To.	M.	T.	To.
Nova Scotia	I	...	I	2	I	3	2	...	2	5	I	6
New Brunswick...	I	...	I	3	...	3	4	...	4	6
Quebec	I	...	I	I	...	I	2	...	2
Ontario.....	I	I	2	I	I	2	2	...	2	4	2	6
Maine	I	...	I	6	7	I3	4	I	5	32	3	35	43	II	54
New Hampshire..	I	...	I	5	2	7	3	I	4	27	7	34	36	IO	46
Vermont.....	4	3	7	14	7	21	18	IO	28
Massachusetts....	49	20	69	30	21	51	92	34	126	I7I	75	246
Rhode Island....	3	5	8	I	I	2	3	...	3	7	6	13
Connecticut.....	5	2	7	9	I	I0	I1	6	I7	52	14	66	77	23	100
New York	8	I	9	69	I5	84	29	3	32	66	14	80	I72	33	205
New Jersey.....	I	...	I	3	2	5	I2	8	20	16	IO	26
Pennsylvania.....	I	...	I	40	I7	57	5	2	7	I2	8	20	58	27	85
Delaware.....	I	...	I	I	...	I	I	...	I	3	...	3
Maryland.....	I	...	I	I5	I	I6	I	I	2	9	3	I2	26	5	31
District of Columbia	4	I	5	I	I	4	2
Virginia	2	...	2	6	I	7	14	6	20	22	7	29
North Carolina	3	...	3	2	...	2	5	...	5
South Carolina.....	I	...	I	5	2	7	I	...	I	2	I	3	9	3	12
Georgia	2	...	2	2	2	4	7	...	7	I1	2	I3
Alabama.....	I	...	I	I	...	I
Mississippi.....	I	...	I	I	2	...	2
Kentucky.....	I	...	I	4	...	4	4	I	5	9	I	I0
Tennessee.....	2	...	2	2	...	2
Louisiana.....	I	I	2	I	...	I	2	I	3
Arkansas.....	I	...	I	I	...	I
Ohio.....	9	2	I1	I1	6	I7	20	8	28
Indiana	I	...	I	3	3	6	4	2	6	8	5	I3
Illinois.....	2	2	4	2	2	4
Michigan.....	I	...	I	I	...	I	3	...	3	5	...	5
Wisconsin.....	I	...	I	2	...	2	3	...	3
Missouri.....	3	I	4	I	I	3	2	5
Unknown.....	2	I	3	2	I	3
Total.....	82	30	I12	I61	47	208	I30	53	I83	380	I17	497	753	247	1000

¹ Frequently a city was both the capital and chief city of a state, and both capitals and chief cities were usually county seats. When born in such a community, literati were credited to the capital rather than to the chief city, and to the chief city rather than to the county seat. The location of a few county seats changed during the period studied, but the result of the investigation can be affected only slightly by the fact that these changes were ignored. The list of capitals, chief cities and county seats used is that of 1850.

Hampshire and Vermont, instead of ranking far below them.¹

Nevertheless it may still seem as though density were in some way connected with literary fecundity. In order to investigate further the relation of the two phenomena, a separate study of various aspects of the local environment, the third of the nine environmental influences, was made (Tables XIII to XV). Table XIII shows the men of letters classified as born in a state or provincial capital, the chief city of a state or province, a county seat, or elsewhere. From this table it appears that the capitals produced 11.2 per cent of the literati, the chief cities 20.8 per cent more, and the county seats added another 18.3 per cent. Thus it may be said that half (50.3 per cent) of all American men of letters were born in places which were relatively metropolitan, even though their actual population may not have been large.

Further calculations showed that although, during the period studied, the capitals and chief cities of the several states had never contained over nine per cent of the total population of the United States, they had been the birthplace of approximately thirty-two per cent of the men of letters.² Thus it appears that in proportion to population cities have been very rich in men of letters.

¹ Cf. Ward, *Applied Sociology*, pp. 169 *et seq.*, and Davies, *loc. cit.*, p. 232.

² County seats were not included because their population figures were not readily available.

The population of 1850 for the cities under consideration was found by adding together their respective populations, as given in the *Compendium of the Seventh Census*, pp. 338 *et seq.* The total population for these cities constituted nine per cent of the total population of the United States. Since the urban population of the nation had increased from the founding of the Republic, this proportion was a maximum for the entire period considered. In this phase of the study the Can-

The results of a more detailed study of the influence of cities is given in Table XIV, which shows the literary fecundity of the fifty leading cities of the country in 1850, and of six other cities which produced five or more literati.¹

In this table the cities are arranged according to the size of their population base, a figure obtained by summing figures for the white population in each census year for the period 1781 to 1850 (Column I). Columns II and III give the number of literati of merit and of talent who were born in each city, and Column IV combines these two classes. Column V gives the number of literati born in each city between 1781 and 1850. This figure had to be used for comparative purposes, for population figures were available for this period only. Column VI, headed Index, contains a figure calculated by dividing the number of literati born in a city between 1781 and 1850 by the population base for that city. It indicates the relative literary fecundity of the city. Figures for cities having a population base of less than fifty [thousand] are not given, as they would be spuriously accurate and therefore misleading. Enough figures are given, however, to show significant differences among cities.²

adian literati were not considered, because population estimates for Canadian cities were lacking.

No correction was made for the influence of the colored population, which was overwhelmingly rural before 1850. If the study had been of white literati and white population only, the relative fecundity of the cities would appear somewhat smaller, but the general conclusion of the study would be the same.

¹ Actually only fifty cities appear on the list. Figures for the five which have since been annexed to Philadelphia and for the area which has been annexed to Brooklyn are combined with the figures for the annexing cities.

² It is worthy of note that most of the cities which produced relatively large numbers of authors were also relatively productive of men of talent.

TABLE XIV
ABSOLUTE AND RELATIVE NUMBERS OF LITERARY PERSONS BORN IN
IMPORTANT CITIES

City	Popula- tion Base ¹	Rank of literati		Total	1781- 1850	Index ⁴
		Merit	Talent			
New York.....	1346	69	15	84	80	59
Philadelphia.....	1038 ²	40	17	57	49	47
Baltimore.....	421	15	1	16	16	38
Boston.....	412	49	20	69	53	129
Brooklyn.....	274 ²	4	1	5	5	18
New Orleans.....	213 ³	1	1	2	2	9
Cincinnati.....	199
Albany.....	139	8	1	9	9	65
Providence.....	117	3	5	8	8	68
St. Louis.....	111	3	1	4	4	36
Pittsburgh.....	95	1	1	1	11
Salem.....	91	10	4	14	12	132
Charleston.....	80	5	2	7	7	88
Louisville.....	80	1	1	1	13
Troy.....	74	2	2	2	27
Newark.....	73
Washington.....	72	4	1	5	5	69
Buffalo.....	71	3	3	3	42
Rochester.....	67	1	1	2	2	30
New Haven.....	63	9	1	10	9	143
Portland.....	60	6	7	13	13	217
Richmond.....	60	2	2	2	33
Lowell.....	60	1	1	1	17
Charlestown.....	54	5	1	6	4	74
Hartford.....	53	5	2	7	7	132
New Bedford.....	53	1	1	1	19
Portsmouth.....	50	5	2	7	7	140
Newburyport.....	48	8	3	11	9
Roxbury.....	46	1	1	1
Lynn.....	43
Utica.....	42	2	2	2
Cambridge.....	40	5	4	9	9
Reading.....	39
Worcester.....	38	2	2	2
Norwich.....	36	3	2	5	4
San Francisco.....	35
Chicago.....	34
Allegheny.....	34	1	1	1
Norfolk.....	33	3	3	3
Detroit.....	33	1	1	1
Litchfield, Conn.....	29	3	2	5	5
Syracuse.....	29	1	1	1
Dorchester.....	28	3	2	5	4
Bangor.....	28	1	1	1
Columbus.....	26

¹ Cf. *supra*, p. 51. The figure for the population base was in each case derived by summing figures given for the population of a city,

TABLE XIV—*Concluded*

City	Popula- tion Base	Rank of literati		Total	1781- 1850	Index
		Merit	Talent			
Savannah	25	2	2	2
Cleveland.....	25	1	1	2	2
Milwaukee.....	21	1	1	1
Mobile.....	21
Hingham	20	3	2	5	5

by decades, correct to the nearest thousand. Most of these figures were found in the *Compendium of the Eleventh Census*, Section on Population, Table 4a. The base is given in thousands. Three zeros [000] are omitted in each case.

In the cases of Bangor, Portsmouth, Newburyport, Salem, Charlestown, Roxbury, Dorchester, Hingham, Norwich and Litchfield, the population figures were compiled from figures given in the reports of each decennial census. In a few cases the data were incomplete, and population estimates had to be made for Cambridge, 1830; Charlestown, 1790; Litchfield, 1790 and 1830; Norwich, 1790 and 1830; Hartford, 1790; New Haven, 1790; and Albany, 1810.

It would have been desirable to use figures for the white population only, but the colored population was not reported separately in the earlier censuses. A rough and partial correction was made for the colored population in cities south of Mason and Dixon's line and the Ohio River. It was assumed that the colored population had always constituted the same proportion of the population of these cities that it did in 1900. The appropriate figure was then subtracted from the total population in each decade, to obtain the figure given as the population base. Since the proportion of the colored population of these cities has tended to increase, the resulting figure is somewhat smaller than it should be in reality. The figure for the literary productivity of these cities is therefore correspondingly larger. In the case of the northern cities for which no correction for the colored population was made, the figure for the population base is of course somewhat too large, and the index is correspondingly small.

² In determining the population base of Philadelphia and Brooklyn, figures for areas which have since been annexed to them were included, and literati born in those areas were of course also credited to the annexing cities.

³ The population base of New Orleans contains no figures from censuses prior to 1810.

⁴ No index is given for cities having a population base of less than fifty, as it would be spuriously accurate and therefore misleading.

It appears from the table that some of the old cities of New England, such as Portland, Portsmouth, Newburyport, Salem, Boston, Cambridge, Hartford and New Haven, ranked very high. Other northern cities, such as Lowell, Lynn, Cincinnati, Newark, Brooklyn and Pittsburgh, ranked relatively low. Most of the southern cities also ranked low; Charleston seems to have been a notable exception.

How are these differences to be explained? Ward and Odin were of the opinion that the superior literary fecundity of cities in general is due to their superior educational advantages, and they explained differences among cities in the same way.¹

On the other hand, Professor Thorndike points out the danger of assuming that educational opportunities entirely account for the high rank of cities when he says: "That cities give birth to an undue proportion of great men does not in the least prove that city life made them great; it may prove that cities attract and retain great men, whose sons are thus city born."² It seems reasonable to believe that the theory suggested by Thorndike partially explains the differences existing among cities. For instance, the birthplace of those authors who were the sons of Yale and Harvard professors was obviously determined by the fact that New Haven and Cambridge had attracted their fathers. This theory may also explain the low rank of the industrial cities of the north, which contained little to attract persons of literary taste. Again, this theory seems to explain adequately the low rank of most southern cities, when it is remembered that the cities of the south were almost exclusively commercial centers, and that the leisure classes of the south were very fond of country life. Finally, the rank of

¹ Cf. *Applied Sociology*, ch. ix, and Odin, *op. cit.*, pp. 511 *et seq.*

² Edward L. Thorndike, "A Sociologist's Theory of Education," *The Bookman*, vol. xxiv, p. 290.

a small town may be profoundly affected by the influence of a single family of great ability, as was the case with Litchfield.

It is apparent, on the other hand, that cities which, before 1851, ranked high in men of letters, did possess superior educational opportunities, as Ward maintained. If not actually the seats of colleges, they were at any rate situated conveniently near them. In addition, they possessed an educational and literary tradition which must have been of no mean importance in stimulating the development of men of letters.

Data are not at present available to show which of the two factors mentioned above was of more importance in the development of literati in cities. Facts are available, however, which show the importance of education in the development of men of letters in general. It must be apparent to the most casual observer that the states which ranked highest in literary productivity were those which possessed greatest educational opportunities. Their literary fecundity cannot be explained on the theory that they were inhabited by persons of superior stock, for reasons to be noted on a subsequent page.¹ Some environmental influence has therefore to be credited with the differences observed, and educational opportunities are the most conspicuous and apparently significant factor in which the north and east differed from the south and west.² The influence of education, the fourth of the environmental factors to be considered, will now be indicated in Tables XV to XVIII.

¹ Cf. *infra*, p. 89.

² This is not the place for a discussion of why certain sections of the country furnished better educational opportunities than did others. Greater economic surplus, the superior energy of the northern people and the momentum of the Puritan educational tradition may, however, be suggested as among the more important reasons why some sections of the country were particularly liberal in their patronage of education.

TABLE XV

EDUCATION RECEIVED BY AMERICAN LITERATI, CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO FIELD OF CHIEF ACTIVITY

Abbreviations: G. S. P., partial grammar school course, or less; G. S., full grammar school course; H. S. P., partial high school course; H. S., full high school course; A. B. P., partial college course; A. B., full college course. The symbol means either the formal education stated, or its equivalent.

Field of chief activity	G. S. P.	G. S.	H. S. P.	H. S.	A. B. P.	A. B.	A. B., Per cent	Unknown	Total
Patrons	I	I	I	3	4	40	10
Librarians	4	5	2	I	9	39	2	23
Actors	3	8	2	2	I	2	6	15	33
Orators	I	I	3	2	2	15	63	24
Publicists	6	4	8	6	8	35	50	4	71
Narrators	3	3	11	12	13	24	34	4	70
Erudite	3	7	9	18	11	104	66	5	157
Popularizers	3	7	12	21	23	165	11	18	249
Speculative	I	3	1	2	I	41	82	1	50
Frose	4	12	17	44	18	52	31	19	166
Poets	5	8	12	21	17	54	41	15	132
Dramatists	2	I	3	3	I	7	5	15
Total.....	36	60	80	133	97	506	50.6	88	1000

Table XV shows the education received by American literati, classified by field of chief activity.¹ From this table it appears that, with the exception of the two classes, actors and dramatists, there were more literati in each group who received a full college course than there were literati who received any other amount of education.² It is obvious that

¹ In the following tables on education the equivalent of a given amount of formal training, when received during childhood and youth, is counted the same as that formal training.

² It is true that the facts were not available in the case of every author. The figures for the lower education groups would therefore probably be somewhat increased if the education received by all the literati studied were known. Presumably the majority of those authors whose education could not be learned received relatively little formal instruction, for education received by an individual is more likely to be recorded when ample than when scanty. The possible error can not be serious, however.

an actor's education does not need to be academic. The dramatist is also quite as likely to be well equipped by close relations with the stage as by working with books. The figures indicate that for all other classes of men of letters, however, higher education was a great aid in achieving success. Even poets, who are reputed to be born and not made, enjoyed at least a partial college course in more than half of the cases recorded.

Over fifty per cent of all the literati studied received a full college education. No figures are available for the number of college graduates in that part of the American people which was born before 1851. Certainly they did not number more than a few score thousand.¹ Since this comparatively small number of people produced more literati than the tens of millions of persons without a college degree, it is apparent that the man or woman with an academic education was several hundred times as likely to be a person who would achieve literary distinction as was the person without that training.²

Tables XVI and XVII show, by decades, the education received by literary men and women. It appears that, in spite of some fluctuation, the degree of education received by literary men remained on the whole constant. By decades, from fifty-three to sixty-nine per cent were college graduates. This relatively small fluctuation was accompanied by no consistent tendency for the proportion to increase or diminish. On the other hand, the degree of education received by women increased remarkably. While very few women born even as late as 1850 enjoyed a college education, the proportion who graduated from high schools in-

¹ In 1850 there were less than twenty-eight thousand students enrolled in the colleges of the United States. *Compendium of the Seventh Census*, table cxlv.

² Cf. Cattell, Davies, Odin, *op. cit.*

TABLE XVI

EDUCATION RECEIVED BY AMERICAN MALE LITERATI, CLASSIFIED BY PERIOD OF BIRTH

Period of birth	G. S. P.	G. S.	H. S. P.	H. S.	A. B. P.	A. B.	A. B., per cent	Unknown	Total
Before 1771 . . .	2	3	8	3	3	45	69	1	65
1771-80.	4	2	2	1	18	55	4	33	
1781-90.	6	3	5	3	29	66	3	44	
1791-1800.	6	5	5	10	56	58	10	96	
1801-10.	9	5	5	6	69	53	7	110	
1811-20.	6	5	23	19	87	56	10	155	
1821-30.	9	10	18	10	68	58	2	117	
1831-40.	10	7	16	13	70	53	8	131	
1841-50.	3	8	15	18	55	51	7	108	
Total.	54	54	87	83	497	58	52	859	
Total per cent.	6	6	10	10	58		6		

TABLE XVII

EDUCATION RECEIVED BY AMERICAN WOMEN OF LETTERS, CLASSIFIED BY PERIOD OF BIRTH

Period of birth	G. S. P.	G. S.	H. S. P.	H. S.	A. B. P.	A. B.	H. S., A. B. P. & A. B., per cent	Unknown	Total
Before 1771 . . .	3	1	1	1	1	1	20	1	3
1771-80.	2	3	3	1	1	1	29	1	5
1781-90.	2	2	2	4	3	2	25	3	7
1791-1800.	2	2	2	11	2	2	30	4	12
1801-10.	3	3	3	4	3	2	65	8	23
1811-20.	5	4	4	3	3	2	58	5	23
1821-30.	2	2	11	14	2	2	59	8	38
1831-40.	1	7	14	6	3	3	59	7	29
1841-50.	2	2	12	2	3	3	48	37	141
Total.	6	27	46	14	7	5	48	26	
Total per cent.	4	19	33	10	5				

creased from zero to about sixty per cent. This latter fact is of great significance. It was noted in the discussion of Table III that in all probability the chief reason for the in-

crease in the number of literary women was the improvement of the social environment. This improvement had another aspect besides the disappearance of the ban of disapproval which used to rest upon women who entered the field of letters. It included also the decline of the idea that women should not receive higher education. Since women promptly and successfully invaded the field of literature as soon as these two obstacles to their activity were removed, it seems evident that public approbation and education were necessary factors for the creation of American women of letters.

The education received by literary men and women of more than one field of activity is shown in Table XVIII.

TABLE XVIII

EDUCATION RECEIVED BY AMERICAN LITERATI, CLASSIFIED BY SEX AND BY ONE OR MORE THAN ONE FIELD OF ACTIVITY

	G. S. P.	G. S.	H. S. P.	H. S.	A. B. P.	A. B.	Unknown	Total	
Men....	One field..... Number...	26	44	35	76	61	362	43	647
	Per cent....	4	7	5	12	9	56	7	
	More than one field..... Number...	6	10	14	16	22	135	9	212
	Per cent....	3	5	7	8	10	64	4	(¹)
Women.	One field..... Number...	3	6	22	32	10	7	31	111
	Per cent....	3	5	20	29	9	6	28	
	More than one field..... Number...	1	5	14	4	6	30
	Per cent....	3	17	47	13	20	

This table shows that sixty-four per cent of the more versatile men were college graduates, as opposed to fifty-six per cent of the men of only one field of activity. The figures for women are still more significant. Sixty per cent of the women prominent in more than one field received at

¹ Does not total one hundred because of cumulative error.

least a high school education, and only forty-four per cent of the women of one field only, received that amount of schooling.¹

The four tables just discussed indicate that a good education was almost a prerequisite to literary success, even in fields where its influence has been considered of little account, and that it was also distinctly favorable to the development of literary skill and versatility.² After all, as Dr. Davies well says: "In unconventional America, if there were a shorter and easier way to fame than the way of higher education, energetic young men would have found it and beaten it into a highway."

The fifth of the environmental influences to be considered is that of the economic status of the parents of American literati (Table XIX). This table shows the proportion of men and women of letters born to parents in the various economic classes. Of the parents of writers whose economic status could be discovered, one hundred and twenty were poor and four hundred and ninety-two were not poor. The fact that many literati came from poor families seems conclusive evidence that poverty of parents is by no means evidence of lack of ability on the part of their children. Even if for the moment the sometimes untrue assumption is made that the poor are indigent because of lack of energy and ability, it by no means follows that all of their children are deficient in these qualities. Children are often unlike their parents, and sometimes are far superior to them. Since this is the case, and since the analysis of educational environment has shown that factor to be of great importance, it is reasonable to suppose that when the children of

¹ Figures derived by combining the percentages in the columns H. S., A. B. P., and A. B.

² This conclusion is exactly the same as that of Odin in regard to French men of letters. Odin, *op. cit.*, pp. 516 *et seq.*

TABLE XIX

EARLY ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT OF AMERICAN LITERATI

Economic Status of Parents	Number
Poor ¹	120
Not poor ¹	492
Intermediate ¹	415
Wealthy ¹	77
Unknown	388
Total	1000

the poor remain uneducated considerable innate ability may remain undeveloped. Genius may be hidden in the humblest environment.²

Another important factor is brought out by this same table (Table XIX). It is well known to the student of history that before 1851 a very large proportion of the population of the entire country was poor, in the special sense

¹ The literati who answered a questionnaire sent out, reported the economic status of parents as poor, intermediate, or wealthy. Of course a personal interpretation of the words determined the answer. It is probable, however, that the persons who replied had in mind somewhat similar criteria to those used in the more numerous cases when the evidence was drawn from literary sources, for they reported about the same proportion in each economic class as was found in the case of the others who could not testify on their own behalf.

In the cases in which data were drawn from literary material, parents were called poor when it was obvious that during childhood and youth the future litterateur was not free from economic anxiety. When it was quite plain that he was free from such anxiety his parents were classed as intermediate, in the absence of definite reason for calling them wealthy. The tests of wealth were varied. Usually a definite statement of the wealth of parents was necessary to admit one to the class, though occasionally such facts as the maintenance of many servants or the possession of several estates was considered adequate evidence.

Inasmuch as the line of division between the classes intermediate and wealthy was not clearly defined, the two groups were combined for comparative purposes into one class, not poor.

² Cf. A. C. Pigou, *Wealth and Welfare* (London, 1912), ch. iv.

in which the word is used here. Thus it seems evident that, during the period studied, families living in economic security produced far more than their due proportion of authors. This fact indicates that birth in a family above the poverty line was a great advantage to the candidate for literary honors. Presumably equally able but less fortunate men might have been able to make names for themselves, had their economic and social status enabled them to obtain a higher education.

This view is in harmony with Odin's conclusions. The results of his study show that French children brought up in economic security were from forty to fifty times as likely to become men of letters as were those brought up in poverty. Odin also found that, with very few exceptions, the authors brought up in poverty had enjoyed good educational advantages. In the few exceptional cases recorded, he showed that they had possessed special advantages which offset the lack of formal education.¹

The sixth environmental influence, closely related to educational opportunity, is indicated by the father's occupation.² The study of this subject was first made by decades, and a separate record was kept of the parentage of men and women. As this analysis gave no significant results, all the facts were combined in Table XX. In this table the largest group of men of letters about whom the facts could be obtained were children of farmers. Four other groups, the clergy, merchants, lawyers and physicians, furnished forty or more literary children. Over thirty were reported as the children of persons engaged in education (professors, teachers and educators). No other occupation produced a score.

¹ Odin, *op. cit.*, pp. 528 *et seq.*

² In a few cases the occupation of the guardian is substituted, because of the early death of the parents. (See Appendix B.)

TABLE XX
OCCUPATIONS OF THE FATHERS OF AMERICAN LITERATI¹

	Number	Total		Number	Total
<i>Professional</i>		328	<i>Commercial (cont'd)</i>		
Clergyman	112.5 ²		Manufacturer	9.5	
Lawyer.....	63.5		Shipmaster	9.0	
Physician	40.0		Bookseller	5.5	
Teacher	17.0		Government official	4.0	
Judge.....	14.0		Hotel proprietor	4.0	
Banker	12.5		Shipping	3.5	
Professor	9.5		Contractor	3.0	
Actor	7.0		Dealer in lumber land	2.0	
Author	6.0		Land owner	2.0	
Educator	6.0		Builder	1.5	
Journalist	6.0		Factory sup't	1.5	
Editor.....	4.5		Lumber merchant	1.5	
Army officer	3.5		Bank clerk	1.0	
Surveyor	3.5		Cotton factor	1.0	
Jurist	3.0		Real estate	1.0	
Naval officer	3.0		Insurance	1.0	
Scientist	2.0		Mine owner	1.0	
Surgeon	2.0		Nurseryman	1.0	
Architect	1.0		Provision dealer	1.0	
Artist	1.0		Quarry operator	1.0	
Botanist	1.0		Brewer5	
Civil engineer	1.0		Hatter5	
College treasurer	1.0		Mill owner5	
Druggist	1.0		Salesman5	
Gymnast	1.0		<i>Agricultural</i>		139
Missionary	1.0		Farmer	123.5	
Naturalist	1.0		Planter	15.5	
Prison warden	1.0		<i>Mechanical, Clerical and Unskilled</i>		48
Vocalist	1.0		Carpenter	6.0	
Lieut. Governor5		Tanner	6.0	
Postmaster General5		Blacksmith	4.0	
Scholar5		Mechanic	3.0	
<i>Commercial</i>		151	Miller	2.5	
Merchant	71.0				
Business	11.5				
Publisher	11.5				

¹ Cf. J. McKeen Cattell, "Families of American Men of Science," *Popular Science Monthly*, vol. 86, p. 507.

² When an individual was about equally engaged in two occupations, a half credit is given to each occupation.

TABLE XX—*Concluded*

	Number	Total		Number	Total
<i>Mechanical, Clerical and Unskilled (cont'd)</i>					
Book-binder	2.0		Watchmaker	1.0	
Brickmaker.....	1.5		Weaver	1.0	
Leather dresser	1.5		Confidential clerk5	
Wool carder	1.5		Hat maker.....	.5	
Baker	1.0		Marble cutter.....	.5	
Carter	1.0		Mason5	
Cooper.....	1.0		Miner5	
Engineer	1.0		Shoemaker5	
Lighthouse keeper.....	1.0		Soldier.....	.5	
Mariner	1.0		Tallow chandler.....	.5	
Pencil maker	1.0		Telegrapher5	
Printer.....	1.0		Trunk maker5	
Sail maker	1.0		<i>Unknown</i>		334
Ship builder	1.0		Grand total.....		1000
Ship chandler.....	1.0				
Shipwright.....	1.0				
Tailor	1.0				

From Table XX it is plain that the professional classes produced many times their proportionate number of literary persons. The business classes also produced more than their numbers alone would lead one to expect. On the other hand, the agricultural class furnished somewhat fewer literati than might have been expected from so large a body; while the class of mechanics, clerks, and laborers produced relatively very few men of letters.

It is apparent that birth into one of the so-called higher social classes gave the literary aspirant exceptional opportunity. In many cases the parents themselves were well educated, and simple association with them was an education in itself. At any rate, such birth secured a relatively easy entrance into educational and educated circles, and must have been of great advantage in beginning a literary career.

Odin studied the social position of parents of literati in

four other countries besides France. In every case the results were practically the same. Odin thus summarizes his findings:

As regards the social environment, we have seen that certain strata of the population have been much more fruitful than others in remarkable literary men. Confining ourselves to the five social strata—nobility, administration, liberal professions, bourgeoisie, working-men—we have ascertained that the literary fecundity of each of them was in inverse ratio to its numerical importance. What is especially striking is the prodigious superiority of the first three classes over the last two, and especially of the nobility over manual laborers, the first having had at least two hundred times as many chances as the second of producing men of talent.¹

Thus even if one grant that both the present study and that of Odin may be erroneous in some details, there is ample evidence for the conclusion that social position is an important factor in the development of literary talent.

Consideration of the seventh of the nine environmental conditions to be discussed, the occupations of literati themselves, affords further evidence of the advantage of education and social position in the competition for literary honors. Table XXI shows the authors classified by occupations. In the compilation of this table the nomenclature of encyclopedias and answers to questionnaires was followed as closely as possible. When an individual was apparently occupied about equally in two professions, each one was given a half credit. In very few cases was an author devoted to so many occupations as to make classification impossible. The table shows that American literati came from nearly one hundred occupations, but the predominance of a very few is striking. Four professions furnished over

¹ Odin, *op. cit.*, pp. 546-547.

TABLE XXI

OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF AMERICAN MALE LITERATI

	Number	Total		Number	Total
<i>Professional</i>		785.5 ¹	<i>Professional (cont'd)</i>		
Clergyman	188.5		Landscape architect	1.0	
Author	116.5		Literary critic	1.0	
Journalist	70.0		Naval chaplain	1.0	
Lawyer	61.0		Paleontologist	1.0	
Professor	44.0		Religious leader	1.0	
Educator	42.0		Statistician	1.0	
Editor	36.5		Sunday School worker	1.0	
Publicist	33.0		Temperance worker	1.0	
Actor	32.5		Vocalist	1.0	
Teacher	26.0		Archeologist5	
Librarian	13.5		Geographer5	
Historian	13.0		Poet5	
Physician	8.5		<i>Commercial</i>		55.0
Artist	8.0		Publisher	20.0	
Army officer	8.0		Merchant	10.0	
Diplomatist	6.0		Manufacturer	4.5	
Banker	5.5		Government official	4.0	
Jurist	5.0		Bank officer	3.5	
Naval officer	5.0		Business	2.5	
Judge	4.5		Printer	1.5	
Philanthropist	4.0		Bookseller	1.0	
Economist	3.5		Corporation officer	1.0	
Geologist	3.5		Financeer	1.0	
Lecturer	3.5		Horticulturist	1.0	
Dramatist	3.0		Promoter	1.0	
Evangelist	3.0		Shipmaster	1.0	
Mathematician	2.0		Theatre manager	1.0	
Musician	2.0		Type founder	1.0	
Naturalist	2.0		Engraver5	
Phrenologist	2.0		Trader5	
Bibliographer	1.5		<i>Mechanical, Clerical and Unskilled</i>		4.0
Chemist	1.5		Engineer	2.0	
Ethnologist	1.5		Leatherdresser	1.0	
Philologist	1.5		Pioneer	1.0	
Surgeon	1.5		<i>Agricultural</i>		.5
Antiquarian	1.0		Planter5	
Astronomer	1.0		<i>Many or Unknown</i>		14.0
Balladist	1.0		Grand total		859.0 ²
Biologist	1.0				
Botanist	1.0				
Clerk of court	1.0				
Conchologist	1.0				
Consul	1.0				
Dentist	1.0				
Explorer	1.0				
Head of tract society	1.0				
Humorist	1.0				

¹ When an individual was about equally engaged in two occupations a half credit is given to each occupation.

² The remaining 141 were women.

half of all American men of letters, and eleven occupations more than three-fourths. It also appears that the groups which furnished large delegations of literary persons were those whose members were on the whole well educated, and of high social rank in the community.

A study by decades of the more important occupations pursued by the literati also gives interesting results (Table XXII).

TABLE XXII

OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF AMERICAN MALE LITERATI, CLASSIFIED BY PERIOD OF BIRTH

Occupation	Before 1771	1771-80	1781-90	1791-1800	1801-10	1811-20	1821-30	1831-40	1841-50	Total
Clergyman	125.5	11	12.5	24	33.5	33	18.5	19.5	11	188.5
Author.....	6	2	5	6	6.5	27	19.5	19	25.5	116.5
Journalist	2	2	1	4.5	8	15	6.5	17	14	70
Lawyer	10.5	2	4	4.5	8.5	10.5	10.5	7	3.5	61
Professor5	1	1.5	3	9.5	5	8	7	8.5	44
Educator	1	.5	1.5	6.5	7	7	7	7	4.5	42
Editor	1	4.5	5.5	4	7.5	6	8	36.5	36.5
Publicist	6	4	3	4.5	7.5	3.5	1.5	2	1	33
Actor	2	6	6.5	1	13	4	32.5	32.5
Teacher	1	1.5	.5	7.5	2.5	2.5	4	1.5	5	26
Publisher.....	.5	1	1	2	6	4.5	3.5	1.5	20
Many or unknown	1	1	1	3	3	1	4	14
Librarian.....5	4.5	5.5	2.5	.5	13.5
Historian	3	4	3	2	1	13
Merchant	2	4	2	1	1	10
Other	9	9	8.5	18	13.5	22.5	16	25	17	138.5
Total.....	65	33	44	95	110	155	116	133	108	859

This table (XXII) shows that the clergy, a group larger than that of the professional authors themselves, and more prominent than any other three groups combined, declined in relative numbers after 1820. Publicists lost in relative

¹ In this table whenever a man of letters had two occupations of importance, an entry of .5 was made for each occupation.

importance after 1810. The law furnished a diminishing quota of literati after 1830. On the other hand, the relative importance of journalists and authors proper increased, though not to any remarkable extent. The number of persons engaged in the other two important classes, educators—including professors and teachers—and editors, remained practically constant.

It was to be expected that the clergy, lawyers and publicists would furnish the largest quotas of literati in the days when education was the privilege of the favored few. It was likewise to be expected that, as these groups lost their virtual monopoly of education, their relative prominence in the field of letters would decline proportionately.

TABLE XXIII
OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF AMERICAN LITERARY WOMEN

Occupation	Numbers	Occupation	Numbers
None specified.....	74	Lecturer	I
Author.....	48.5 ¹	Reformer	I
Actor	7	Religious leader.....	I
Educator	3	Teacher	I
Editor	3	Total.....	141
Philanthropist	1.5		

Since such has been the case, it is apparent that education and social position account in large part for the prominence of these occupation classes in the history of American letters.

The occupation of literary women was studied separately (Table XXIII). Perhaps the most significant fact shown in this table is the large proportion of women whose occupation could not be determined. They could not be classed as authors, for authorship was not a profession with them,

¹ Whenever a woman of letters had two occupations of importance, an entry of .5 was made for each occupation.

but they were nevertheless of importance in the field of letters. Presumably most of them were housewives, as ninety-five out of the one hundred and forty-one were married,¹ and a number of others are known to have been housekeepers for parents and other relatives.

TABLE XXIV

EARLY RELIGIOUS TRAINING OF AMERICAN LITERATI, CLASSIFIED BY REGION OF BIRTH²

Early Religious training	Canada	New England	Middle Atlantic	South Atlantic	East South Central	West South Central	East North Central	Total
Congregational.....	1	107	8	3	119 ³
Presbyterian.....	2	14	35	15	1	1	5	73 ³
Protestant Episcopal.....	2	15	25	8	1	1	53
Unitarian.....	39	8	2	49
Protestant, denomination unknown	1	16	15	4	1	3	40
Methodist Episcopal.....	1	7	12	7	2	7	36
Baptist.....	1	13	11	2	1	2	30
Friends.....	4	12 ⁴	3	1	20
Roman Catholic.....	6	6	3	1	16
Universalist.....	3	1	3	7
Dutch Reformed.....	5	6 ³
Lutheran.....	2	2	4
Jewish.....	1	1	2
Disciples.....	2	2
Moravian.....	1	1
Seventh-Day Baptist.....	1	1
Swedenborgian.....	1	1
Total.....	460

¹ Cf. Appendix C.

² An individual was credited to a denomination when there was in the sources a definite statement that he had been brought up in the faith of that denomination. Frequently it was obvious that a person had been trained as a Protestant, but the denomination could not be ascertained. In such cases he is recorded as Protestant, denomination not specified. It is unfortunate that information was unobtainable in more than half the cases studied.

³ Includes one author whose place of birth is unknown.⁴ Includes one Hicksite Friend.

The eighth of the environmental conditions to be considered is early religious training. The facts on this topic are given in Table XXIV. This table shows that in respect to absolute numbers the Congregational body stood far above its nearest competitor, the closely related Presbyterian church. If relative numbers are considered, however, the Unitarian body apparently had the greatest proportion of literary persons born within its ranks, and the Congregationalists, Friends and Universalists followed in order.¹ All four had a relatively large number of men of letters born to their members. On the other hand, Methodist Episcopal, Baptist and Roman Catholic families possessed relatively very few literati.

The fact that there were born within the ranks of some denominations relatively more men of letters than in others is of interest, but standing by itself it cannot be considered particularly significant. Odin found that, in proportion to the numbers in each religious division, many more French men of letters had been brought up as Protestants than as Catholics. He thought that there had been a number of reasons for this superiority, but believed the most important to be that, on the whole, Protestant children received superior educational opportunities because of the superior wealth of their parents. Possibly both economic and educational factors may serve to explain the differences discovered in America. It is a well known fact that, during the period studied, the Unitarians and Friends, for instance, were on the whole in comfortable circumstances, while the Roman Catholics were relatively poor. The result-

¹ It is impossible to make accurate comparisons, because there exists no certain knowledge of the strength of the various denominations during the period studied. Nevertheless it is beyond dispute that the Universalists, Unitarians, and Friends never rivaled the Congregationalists in numbers, and that the Congregationalists were few as compared with the Baptists and Methodists.

ing differences afford at least partial explanation of their differences in literary productivity. On the other hand it must not be forgotten that Protestants enjoyed greater freedom of thought than Roman Catholics. This factor may be only less important than poverty and lack of education. Data are not now available, however, on which to base studies which would indicate the relative importance of these various factors. At present one can

TABLE XXV

AMERICAN LITERATI CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO SIZE OF FAMILY AND BIRTH-RANK

Number of children in the family	Number of cases observed.	Per cent of literati to be expected in each rank, ac- cording to the law of chance.	Per cent re- ported as			Per cent of literati other than first, second, or last- born, to be ex- pected accord- ing to the law of chance	Per cent reported as other than first, second, or last born ¹
			first-born ¹	second- born ¹	last-born ¹		
2	15	50	60	40
3	17	33	47	41	12
4	15	25	33	13	20	25	33
5	31	20	29	13	26	40	32
6	29	17	28	28	17	50	29
7	22	14	18	14	32	57	36
8	15	12.5	33	27	7	62.5	33
9	18	11	6	22	11	67	61
10	12	10	8	8	16	70	67
11	12	9	8	8	33	73	50
12+	19	8	32	16	75+	53

simply conclude that without question religious training has played some part in the production of American men of letters.

The last of the nine environmental conditions to be considered is that of the birth-rank of American literati in the family of brothers and sisters. The study for the

¹ The percentages of reported cases when added on horizontal lines do not always total one hundred, because of cumulative error.

purpose of throwing some light on this subject was striking in its results, though the conclusions, based on two hundred and twenty-five cases, were not as certain as might be desired (Table XXV). In this table the men of letters born into families containing a given number of children were classified according to their rank in the group of their brothers and sisters. If their birth-rank were purely a matter of chance, in families of a given size there would be equal numbers of literary children in each rank, from first to last born. Thus, for example, in families of five children the normal probability is that each rank would contain twenty per cent of the total number. Actually it was found that of the literati born in such families nine were first-born, four second-born, four third-born, six fourth-born and eight fifth-born, or twenty-nine, thirteen, nineteen and twenty-six per cent respectively. Such a process of analysis was carried out for eleven sizes of family, from two up to "twelve and over". In only three of the eleven classes did the number of first-born fall below the number to be expected. In those three cases the number of families concerned was small, and chance fluctuation might well account for the result. Even so, the discrepancy between the actual results and the normal probability was not large. Likewise in only three of the eleven classes did the proportion of last born fall below the number to be expected. On the other hand, in six of the eleven cases the number of second born fell below the probability; and, in eight of nine cases considered, the class "third and later born, not including last-born," likewise fell below the normal probability.¹

¹ In addition to the literati who could be accurately ranked, there were records of literati in families of unknown size, of whom eight were first-born, seven second-born, and eleven born in all the other ranks combined. In twenty-one cases the author was an only child.

These results are based on an insufficient number of cases to be really significant, but it is noteworthy that they agree exactly with results obtained by Havelock Ellis in his study of British genius.¹ Since the results of these two studies are exactly the same in this respect, there seems to be considerable justification for the conclusion that the facts observed in these few cases are true in general, even though two mutually sustaining studies based on comparatively few cases cannot be considered positive proof of the relation observed.²

If one assumes that the facts observed are evidence of a universal condition, how is the phenomenon to be explained? It is difficult to imagine any way in which these facts can be explained on physiological grounds. On the other hand, the following hypothesis, based on environmental influence, seems at least reasonable. First-born and last-born children frequently enjoy greater educational opportunity than do their intermediate brothers and sisters. First-born often succeed in getting a start before adversity befalls the family, or before the expense of caring for an increasing family of young children becomes so great that it is necessary to curtail the education of some of the older children. On the other hand, the last born of a poor family may be favored because, as his older brothers and sisters become self-supporting, it becomes relatively easy for his parents to keep him in school.

With this topic is concluded the discussion of the nine environmental influences. Certain of Galton's propositions concerning the relation of nature and nurture remain to be considered.

¹ Havelock Ellis, *A Study of British Genius*, ch. iv.

² For an opposing view, cf. Karl Pearson, *On the Handicapping of the First Born* (London, 1914).

Although Galton's first proposition, that "a man's natural abilities are derived by inheritance, under exactly the same limitations as are the form and physical features of the whole organic world," does not meet with much criticism at the present time, his second proposition, that nature is of much greater influence than nurture, must here be questioned. According to this proposition, able men prove their worth by surmounting all obstacles which lie in their path. If the proposition were true, it would follow that American letters declined because the innate literary ability of the American people was diminishing, for if such ability had been present it would have been bound to make itself manifest. There are two reasons for believing, however, that Galton's proposition is not true. In the first place, it can be questioned simply on the basis of personal experience. To appreciate this fact one need only consider the matter of getting an education. Galton and men of his school argue that persons who obtain a good education do so simply because of unusual innate ability. They assert that the individual who is unable to find or make educational opportunity for himself thereby demonstrates his deficiency in natural ability. The weakness of this theory must be obvious to anyone who ever graduated from a public high school, and still more evident to one who has taught in such an institution. Brilliant and earnest students withdraw from school for financial reasons with disheartening frequency, while dull or indifferent sons and daughters of the economically secure continue to cumber the class-room. Thus many persons of mediocre ability enjoy the best schooling, while others of high ability never receive more than the rudiments of an education. There is, therefore little relation between intellectual ability and the acquisition of a high school education, to say nothing of an academic degree. Galton

and his followers are obviously in error in asserting that all persons of unusual natural ability succeed in acquiring a good education.¹

In the second place, the facts shown in Table III concerning the increased number of literary women are evidence against the Galtonian theory that nature is strongly predominant over nurture. In that table it was shown that during almost the entire period studied the number of literary women increased much more rapidly than did the number of men. During certain decades the number of women increased while the number of men was actually diminishing. This fact cannot well be explained by any theory of the extreme predominance of nature over nurture. Such interpretation would mean that the innate literary ability of women was increasing while that of men was diminishing, a proposition so unreasonable as to need no refutation. The case in hand seems to be obviously an instance of the power of environment in stimulating the development of literature. Since therefore, nurture could increase the number of literary women many fold, without any apparent change in their innate ability, it seems that nature cannot be predominant over nurture to the extent that Galton supposed.

Galton's third proposition, namely, that the people of various nationalities possess highly significant differences in natural ability, must also be questioned. In criticizing this proposition it seemed well to strengthen the argument by meeting Galton on his own ground, that is, by opposing his theory with the results of a study similar to the one on which he bases the foregoing proposition.²

¹ On page thirty-nine of *Hereditary Genius*, Galton admits that only persons of very unusual ability can overcome all obstacles, but since elsewhere he includes in his lists of supposed geniuses persons of very modest attainments, it would seem that the foregoing argument can properly be advanced against his position.

² Cf. *Hereditary Genius*, ch. xx.

There was therefore made a study of the literary productivity of the groups of different nationality strains, that is, nationality of ancestors as indicated by surnames, in the American people.¹

This method of determining nationality was recently used by the Bureau of the Census in reclassifying the population of the United States for the year 1790. In describing that process, a government statistician points out the limitations of such a study. It takes no account of the length of time which the bearers of the name may have been absent from the mother country. The ancestors of the bearers of an Irish or Dutch name may have arrived in the first shipload of immigrants who landed on the shores of Virginia, Manhattan or New England, so that the descendant enumerated possessed few or none of the peculiarities of the nationality indicated. On the other hand, the ancestors may have arrived in America but a few weeks prior to the birth of the litterateur under consideration. Although, therefore, such an analysis cannot be regarded as possessing the least value from the standpoint of modern classification by place of birth, it possesses great value as an indication of the proportions contributed by the various nationalities.²

Table XXVI shows the distribution of American literati born in the United States, classified by nationality of ancestors, as indicated by surnames.³

¹ The author is of course aware that such a study is of very limited value, for the reason that these so-called nationality strains are in reality highly complex groups of many ethnic stocks, and are very far from being true types. Nevertheless the conclusions reached have exactly the same degree of validity as have those of Galton concerning the same kind of blood groups. They may therefore be used to refute Galton's assertions.

² *A Century of Population Growth in the United States*, p. 116.

³ The chief reference works used in making this classification were

TABLE XXVI

A—PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF AMERICAN LITERATI BORN IN THE UNITED STATES, CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO THE NATIONALITY STRAIN OF THEIR ORIGIN, AS INDICATED BY SURNAMES.

B—PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF THE WHITE POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES (1790), CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO THE NATIONALITY STRAIN OF THEIR ORIGIN, AS INDICATED BY SURNAMES.¹

A Literati		B White population (1790)	
Nationality strain	Per cent	Nationality strain	Per cent
British	93.8	British	89.1
French.....	1.8	German	5.6
Irish.....	1.4	Dutch	2.5
German	1.3	Irish.....	1.9
Dutch	0.8	French.....	0.6
Spanish	0.3	All others.....	0.3
Colored	0.2		
Jewish	0.2	Total	100.0
Scandinavian	0.2		
Total	100.0		

For purposes of comparison the table also includes the analysis of nationality of the total white population of the United States in 1790. The estimate for this particular year is given because it is the only estimate of the kind ever made by the Bureau of the Census. It is probable that this distribution by nationality is fairly representative of that of the entire colonial period, and of the first half-century of the republic as well, for not until after 1840 did as many as one hundred thousand immigrants per annum come to our shores, and the aver-

The Romance of Names (London, 1914), by Ernest Weekley, and *Die deutschen Familien-namen* (Halle a. S., 1903), by Albert Heintze. The accuracy of the classification was increased by assistance received from colleagues in the departments of English and German in Hamilton College.

¹ *A Century of Population Growth in the United States*, table 48.

age number for the entire period considered is well under this figure.

It will be noted that the relative literary fecundity of the smaller groups varied considerably from the relative prominence of these groups in the population. Since the figures are so small, however, there is no reason for supposing that this variation was due to more than chance fluctuation. So far as the facts presented in this table are concerned, it may well be believed that nationality strains produced literati in proportion to their numbers, since, in the one large group in which the cases observed are sufficiently numerous to serve as the basis of reasonable generalization, namely, the British stock, it will be observed that the proportional contributions to the literary class and to the general population were practically the same. Thus it appears that literary persons were not the peculiar possessions of any one nationality strain, but were to be found in all strains, scattered throughout the entire population of the country.¹

Additional evidence of the truth of the foregoing proposition is found in Professor Cooley's effective rebuttal of Galton's argument that the ancient Greeks were abler than modern Englishmen, and that Hellenic superiority was due solely to superior stock. Cooley also met Galton on his own ground, showing that during the age of Elizabeth the supposedly inferior English people produced in proportion to the number of educated citizens, quite as many men of genius as did Athens during the age of Pericles.²

¹ Cf. Cattell, *Popular Science Monthly*, vol. 86, p. 505.

² Charles H. Cooley, "Genius, Fame, and the Comparison of Races," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. ix, pp. 317-358, especially pp. 338 *et seq.*

Again, after careful study of the several ethnic elements of the French population, Odin decided that no one of them possessed more innate literary ability than did any of the others.¹

Although ethnic stock and nationality strain are two distinct things, they are similar in that they both have to do with nature rather than nurture. Thus there is justification for saying that to a certain extent the similar results of these three independent studies are mutually sustaining. They all seem to indicate that ancestry is no test of natural ability, whether considered from the point of view of ethnic stock or nationality strain.² Thus it appears that neither Galton's second nor third propositions are established, and, so far as those propositions are concerned, the argument for the influence of the nine environmental factors considered remains valid.

From the foregoing facts and arguments it might possibly be inferred that, besides weakening Galton's position, the data collected concerning American authors are completely in harmony with Ward's theory that nature is of relatively slight importance. This inference would be legitimate if it were not that other facts not yet presented militate strongly against the latter's theory. It will be remembered that Ward says:

We cannot escape the conclusion that some measure of genius exists in nearly everyone. . . . Even the denizens of the slums . . . are by nature the peers of the boasted "aristocracy of brains" that now dominates society and looks down upon them, and the equals in all but privilege of the most

¹ Odin, *op. cit.*, pp. 464 *et seq.*

² Cf. Thorndike, *Educational Psychology*, vol. iii, ch. x, and articles by Boas, Thomas and Dewey in a *Source Book for Social Origins*, William I. Thomas (Chicago, 1909), pp. 143-186.

enlightened teachers of eugenics. . . . All this genius is scattered somewhat uniformly through the whole mass of the population.¹

There are three reasons why these propositions of Ward do not seem acceptable. In the first place, it does not appear to be proved that a good environment will make a genius of nearly everyone, as would be the case if, as Ward asserts, "some measure of genius exists in nearly everyone." Vast numbers of persons who enjoy every opportunity never rise beyond mediocrity. This fact seems so obvious so to need no futher comment.

In the second place, many persons achieve success when every environmental condition seems unfavorable. Apparently this fact indicates that some persons possess greater power of overcoming difficulties than do others. It appears, for instance, that ninety-six men and women, sixty-two of whom were writers, succeeded in achieving a reputation sufficient to gain a place on the roll of a thousand American literati, in spite of the fact that they enjoyed no more than the equivalent of a grammar school education (Tables XVI and XVII). When one remembers that a good formal education seems little less than a prerequisite to literary success, the importance of this fact will be realized. No doubt some of these ninety-six literati enjoyed special advantages which compensated for their apparent lack of education. At all events they must have possessed unusual innate ability which enabled them to overcome so great a handicap.

In the third place, there seems to be positive evidence, in facts about to be presented, that genius is not "scattered somewhat uniformly through the whole mass of the population," as Ward believed. The results of a

¹ Cf. *supra*, pp. 15, 16.

study to determine the number of literary relatives of authors seem to disprove this proposition quoted from Ward. Appendix A contains a list of families furnishing more than one member to the roll of literati, together with the name, degree of relationship, and date of birth of all authors belonging to each family. It is a notable list. Such family names as Adams, Abbot, Beecher, Edwards and Everett are conspicuous in the history of American letters. In all, sixty-eight families furnished one hundred and fifty-eight of the thousand men of letters.¹ There were many other less important members of these families who almost gained a place on the roll, but who did not quite measure up to the standard required. Besides these persons there were no doubt other relatives whose kinship was not discovered, for it must be remembered that the sources did not mention all desired facts, and they might well fail to state that a minor author was a nephew or cousin of some other writer of comparatively little importance. It is therefore safe to say that the figure indicating the amount of literary kinship is a minimum.²

The number of authors of each degree of relationship appears in Table XXVII. In each case the relationship given is that of the nearest relative who appears on the

¹ It is of interest to note in passing that exactly half of the related literati did at least a part of their work in the same fields, and half of them did their work in quite different fields.

² The figure is also much smaller than one which would indicate the total number of men of mark who were related to the thousand literati. It will be obvious to anyone who even casually inspects the roll of American literati (Appendix D), that many authors had relatives who were well known in fields other than literature. There is no simple and accurate way of estimating the number of these eminent non-literary relatives, but probably it is quite as large as that of the literary relatives. Cf. Odin, *op. cit.*, pp. 323 and 394.

TABLE XXVII

LITERARY RELATIVES OF AMERICAN LITERATI, CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO
DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP¹

Degree of relationship	Number	Degree of relationship	Number
Son	35	Cousin	2
Brother.....	16	Niece	2
Nephew	11	Grandnephew	1
Daughter	10	Great granddaughter	1
Sister	7	Great grandnephew	1
Grandson	4		

roll. There were only thirteen literati born per million of the general population, while forty-five literary sons and daughters were born in a group of one thousand men and women of letters. In other words, a population one thousand times as great as the group of authors considered produced less than a third as many literary children.

It is thus obvious that many related people do achieve prominence in the same field. What does the fact prove? Is it an argument for nature or nurture? How is one to know which is responsible for the appearance of a litterateur? To consider a concrete case, the reader may well ask, "Am I to conclude that Cotton Mather was a famous author because he inherited the talent of his father, Increase Mather? May not his start in letters have been due to the fact that he was brought up in the family of the foremost scholar of Massachusetts?" It is impossible to deny that the latter circumstance may indeed have been

¹ The total number of relationships recorded is somewhat more than half the total number of related literati, because of several cases in which one family possessed three or more writers. In each family the number of relationships recorded in the table is equal to the total number of relatives, minus one.

crucial. Presumably young Mather's home environment did exercise tremendous influence upon him. By itself, however, the most favorable environment could hardly have produced a Cotton Mather from any child whatsoever subjected to its influence. No doubt any normal child would have been benefited by being educated by Increase Mather, but plainly not all children would have been benefited to an equal degree. To say that a good environment will always produce genius is to assert the absurdity that x plus y will always produce z , no matter how y may vary. It is to shut one's eyes to all educational experience by denying the existence of innate individual differences, an axiom of biology and of psychology.¹ Since it appears, therefore, that persons with apparently every advantage are often less successful than others who seem to lack the most elementary opportunities, and since it appears that American literati tended to be developed in a few families, rather than somewhat uniformly through the whole mass of the population, it seems clear that one is hardly justified in asserting that environment alone accounted for the appearance of literary ability in all of the persons considered. For the foregoing reasons, therefore, Ward's proposition that the influence of nature is of very little significance does not seem to be valid.

All the facts on which this study is based have now been presented and discussed. The final chapter which follows is devoted to a summary of the evidence submitted and a statement of the conclusions which seem justified in the light of that evidence.

¹ Cf. Thorndike, *Educational Psychology*, vol. iii, chs. xiv and xvi.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

THIS chapter recapitulates the propositions discussed in the foregoing pages, and suggests conclusions which may reasonably be drawn from facts presented in the tables in Chapter III.

In Chapter I the salient points of three important theories of nature and nurture were considered : namely, Galton's theory of the extreme predominance of nature over nurture, Ward's theory of the supremacy of nurture over nature, and the more generally accepted intermediate theory which holds that both factors are important.

Chapter II was devoted to an explanation of the method by which a list of one thousand American men of letters was compiled for the basis of the present study. It contained a detailed description of Odin's method of procedure, and explained to what extent his work has been paralleled in this investigation.

In Chapter III data relevant to the problem of determining the relative importance of the nature and the nurture of American men of letters were considered. The influence of nine environmental conditions was first discussed. Of these the first was the social environment, that is, the ideals and customs of a group. It appeared that literature had been declining in public esteem during the latter decades studied, and that therefore potential authors were naturally inclined to turn their attention to other pursuits. Thus the influence of

the social environment seemed to explain satisfactorily the decline in the absolute and relative numbers of men of letters, noted as beginning about 1820 (Tables I and II). By the same principle was explained the fact that the number of literati of talent, who are "peculiarly in need of the right sort of surroundings to keep their delicate machinery in fruitful action," had also declined at the same time (Table III). It appeared, moreover, that in three of the twelve fields of literature considered the number of authors had not diminished, apparently because these fields seemed to retain their position in public favor (Tables IV and V). Again, the influence of the social environment explained why the number of literati of two or more fields of activity had diminished, on the ground that, being versatile, these authors found it relatively easy to adapt themselves to unfavorable conditions by giving up the pursuit of letters (Table VI). The same principle explained, also, why certain groups of states had been relatively more important than others in the production of certain kinds of literature (Table VII), namely, because these forms of literature had been especially esteemed by the people of those states. A final fact, that the number of literary women had increased rapidly during practically the entire period studied, was interpreted in terms of the social environment when it was realized that during this period society had been lifting the ban of disapproval which it had previously laid upon the literary activity of women (Table III). Thus the social environment was seen to have been one of the most potent influences affecting the development of American letters.

Geographic environment was the second of the environmental conditions discussed. It appeared from Table VIII that the relative literary productivity of the

states and provinces had varied widely. Tables IX and X showed that some regions had been particularly rich in literati of talent and of two or more fields of activity. Table XI indicated that the literary productivity of the states had fluctuated considerably from decade to decade. Finally, Table XII showed that the relative literary productivity of the groups of states, by decades, had been extremely varied. From none of these tables, however, was evidence forthcoming that geographic environment as such had played more than a very minor part in the development of American men of letters.

The third environmental condition studied was that of the local environment. It appeared from Table XIII that county seats and the capitals and chief cities of the states and provinces had been the birth-places of relatively large numbers of authors. Table XIV showed the number of men of letters born in important cities. It there appeared that the several cities had produced widely differing numbers of literati, in proportion to population. Two possible explanations of these facts were considered, Thorndike's suggestion that cities are inhabited by persons of superior natural ability, and Ward's theory that cities develop literati because of their superior educational opportunities. Reasons were given for a belief that both theories were necessary to explain the phenomenon.

Consideration of the education received by American men of letters, the fourth of the environmental conditions studied, revealed the fact that the majority of them had been college trained (Table XV). It also appeared that on the whole women had not been as well educated as men (Tables XVI and XVII), but that the education which they received had steadily improved during the period when they were becoming more prominent in the

world of letters. Table XVIII, also, showed that the authors of more than one field of activity had, in the main, been better educated than less versatile authors. Thus it appeared that education had been a very important factor in the development of American literature. Apparently Odin's belief that the educational opportunities found in cities largely account for the superior literary fecundity of centers of population was borne out by this study.

In Table XIX was considered the fifth of the environmental influences, that of the early economic condition of the authors. It was there shown that, in proportion to numbers, families in comfortable circumstances had produced more literary children than had families living in poverty.

Study of the sixth of the environmental influences, the father's occupation (Table XX), showed that birth into one of the so-called higher social classes had given the literary aspirant exceptional opportunity to acquire an education or otherwise equip himself for his career.

Consideration of the seventh influence, the occupations of the literati themselves, (Tables XXI and XXIII), showed that while the literary productivity of the different occupation-groups had varied greatly from decade to decade (Table XXII), a few occupation-groups whose members had possessed education and high social rank had been most productive of men of letters.

Early religious training, the eighth environmental influence, was considered in Table XXIV. It appeared that denominations distinguished by habits of independent thinking and by the wealth of their adherents, had had the largest numbers of authors born in their ranks.

The ninth and final environmental influence considered was the rank of literati in order of birth (Table XXV).

It appeared that an abnormally large number of authors had been either the first or last-born of their families. The fact was apparently best explained by the theory that the first and last-born enjoyed superior educational opportunities.

Facts bearing on Galton's propositions were next considered. It was seen that while Galton's first proposition that nature is important does not meet with much criticism at the present time, his second proposition, that nature is much more powerful than nurture, may well be questioned. In the first place, it was noted as a matter of common knowledge, that frequently persons obviously endowed with ability are unable to acquire the education necessary for success as an author. In the second place, it was observed that without a favorable environment much natural ability had remained latent, as was indicated by the sudden increase in the number of literary women when environmental conditions became favorable (Table V), an increase which could not possibly be attributed to any sudden change in the innate mental equipment of women. Finally, Galton's third proposition, that differences in the achievement of nations are to be explained chiefly in terms of natural ability, was questioned. It appeared that three independent studies, by the present investigator (Table XXVI), by Cooley, and by Odin, indicated that different nationality strains had developed approximately equal amounts of genius, in proportion to the number of educated persons in each group.

For the foregoing reasons it seemed clear that while the influence of heredity is an important factor in the development of genius, it is not of such predominant influence as to make nurture an almost negligible quantity, as Galton appears to have supposed.

Nevertheless, in spite of all the evidence of the great influence of environment, Ward's attractive theory that nature is a negligible quantity could not be accepted. In the first place, it was argued that not all persons whose environments are good succeed in rising beyond mediocrity. Again, it was noted that many persons do achieve success when environmental conditions are extremely unfavorable. Finally, it was pointed out that a very few families in the American population had produced literati out of all proportion to the number of their members (Table XXVII). It therefore seemed a reasonable deduction that considerable ability must be present in any individual whom the environment is to mould into a person of unusual attainments.

The data impinging on the three theories of nature and nurture have now been summarized. It appears that there have been three especially important factors in the development of American men of letters, a good heredity, furnishing stock capable of being developed, an education adequate to develop latent ability, and a social environment furnishing incentive to the naturally endowed and amply educated to turn their attention to literature. The other environmental influences discussed have also been important in so far as they facilitate the acquisition of an education and the development of interest in literary subjects.

It may seem strange to some readers that such seemingly extreme theories as those of Galton and Ward can be held by scientific men. The fact is readily explicable, however. Apparently both men were carried away by their enthusiasm for their theses. Each was desirous of convincing the world that human welfare could be furthered by improving the factor which he emphasized. In his eagerness to support his major proposition he as-

serted minor propositions which are untenable, and which were in contradiction to other propositions which he admitted. It can readily be shown that the chief contentions of Galton and Ward are reconcilable.

Galton certainly considered of prime importance the statement that "a man's natural abilities are derived by inheritance." This, however, is a proposition which Ward himself conceded to be sufficiently proved.¹ The two men were therefore agreed on this basic proposition.

Galton likewise admitted that heredity is not all-powerful when he said, "It is needless to insist that neither (nature nor nurture) is self-sufficient; the highest natural endowment may be starved by defective nurture."²

Moreover Galton admitted the importance of environment to such an extent as to satisfy Ward³ when he said, "I acknowledge freely the great power of education and social influences in developing the active powers of the mind, just as I acknowledge the effect of use in developing the muscles of the blacksmith's arm, and no further."⁴ Thus it appears that the two men were agreed on Ward's fundamental proposition of the influence of environment, as well as upon Galton's basic principle that "a man's natural abilities are derived by inheritance." Both men recognized that neither nature nor nurture alone can account for all human achievement.

It seems probable, therefore, that both Galton and Ward would agree with the final conclusion drawn from the data of this study, namely, that while without natural

¹ Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

² Galton, *English Men of Science* (London, 1874), p. 12. Cf. *op. cit.*, p. ix.

³ Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 247.

⁴ Galton, *Hereditary Genius*, p. 14.

ability no person achieves success, lack of opportunity may exercise an absolute veto on the aspirations for advancement of persons possessing such natural ability.

There is no rational ground for contention between the biologist and the sociologist. They are co-workers, not opponents. The biologist may well continue his study of heredity. The sociologist eagerly awaits reasoned conclusions on the subject of racial improvement through eugenics. Meanwhile the sociologist is justified in advocating, with all the force at his command, the extension of those fundamental American privileges, economic and social opportunity and education, by means of which all the innate ability which exists may be given the environment necessary for its maximum development.

APPENDIX A

LITERARY FAMILIES

THIS appendix consists of a list of families furnishing more than one member to the study; together with the names, degree of relationship, and date of birth of all literati belonging to each family. In each case the literati are classified under the name of the eldest person bearing the family name, and the degree of kinship is expressed with reference to him.

The literary relatives of any person in the study are to be found by looking in Appendix B opposite his name. If no name is found there, he had no relatives on the roll on which this study is based. If a name is found in the appropriate column, the collected family names will usually be found in this appendix under the name of the elder of the two. In case neither name is to be found at the head of a list of names in this appendix, it is because neither person is the earliest literary member of the family. The name of the first family representative is to be found by looking in Appendix B, under that of the elder of the two relatives known, and continuing the process till a name is found which heads a family list in this table.

ABBREVIATIONS: b., brother; c., cousin; d., daughter; gs., grandson; ggd., great-granddaughter; ggs., great-grandson; n., niece; nep., nephew; s., son; sis., sister.

Abbott J. 1803; b. Abbot J. S. C. 1805; s. Abbott L. 1835.
Adams J. 1735; s. Adams J. Q. 1767; gs. Adams C. F. 1807;
ggs. Adams C. F. 1835; ggs. Adams H. 1838; ggs. Adams
B. 1848.

Alcott A. B. 1799; c. Alcott W. A. 1798; d. Alcott L. M. 1832.

- Alexander A. 1772; s. Alexander J. W. 1804; s. Alexander J. A. 1809.
- Baird R. 1798; s. Baird C. W. 1828; s. Baird H. M. 1832.
- Ballou H. 1771; s. Ballou M. M. 1820.
- Bancroft A. 1755; s. Bancroft G. 1800.
- Beecher L. 1775; d. Stowe H. B. 1811; s. Beecher H. W. 1813.
- Cary A. 1820; sis. Cary P. 1824.
- Channing W. E. 1780; nep. Channing W. E. 1818.
- Colton C. 1789; b. Colton W. 1797.
- Cooke P. P. 1816; b. Cooke J. E. 1830.
- Cooper J. F. 1789; d. Cooper S. F. 1813.
- Dana R. H. 1787; s. Dana R. H. Jr. 1815.
- Davidson L. M. 1808; sis. Davidson M. M. 1823.
- DeLeon E. 1818; b. DeLeon T. C. 1839.
- Dix J. A. 1798; s. Dix M. 1827.
- Donnelly I. 1831; sis. Donnelly E. C. 1838.
- Drake J. R. 1795; gs. DeKay C. 1848.
- Drake S. G. 1798; s. Drake S. A. 1833.
- Edwards J. 1703; gs. Dwight T. 1752; ggds. Dwight B. W. 1816; ggd. Lippincott S. J. 1823; ggnep. Woolsey T. D. 1801; relatives of Woolsey T. D., nep. Winthrop T. 1828; n. Woolsey S. C. 1845.
- Eggleston E. 1837; b. Eggleston G. C. 1839.
- Everett A. H. 1790; b. Everett E. 1794; nep. Frothingham O. B. 1822; nep. Hale E. E. 1822.
- Fowler O. S. 1809; b. Fowler L. N. 1811.
- Furness W. H. 1802; d. Wister A. L. 1830; s. Furness H. H. 1833.
- Goodrich Chas. A. 1790; b. Goodrich S. G. 1793.
- Hall S. 1761; s. Hall J. H. 1793.
- Hawes J. 1789; n. Holmes M. J. 1834.
- Harper J. 1795; b. Harper F. 1806.
- Hawthorne N. 1804; s. Hawthorne J. 1846.
- Hayne R. Y. 1791; nep. Hayne P. H. 1830.
- Headley J. T. 1813; b. Headley P. C. 1819.
- Hodge C. 1797; s. Hodge A. A. 1823.
- Holmes A. 1763; s. Holmes O. W. 1809.

- Hopkins M. 1802; c. Hopkins S. 1807.
Hopkinson F. 1737; s. Hopkinson J. 1770.
Howe J. W. 1819; d. Richards L. E. 1850.
Irving W. 1783; nep. Irving T. 1809; nep. Irving J. T. 1812.
James H. 1811; s. James W. 1842; s. James H. 1843.
Jay W. 1789; s. Jay J. 1817.
Kip W. I. 1811; b. Kip L. 1826.
Kirkland C. M. S. 1801; s. Kirkland J. 1830.
Longfellow H. W. 1807; b. Longfellow S. 1819.
Lowell J. 1769; nep. Lowell J. 1799; gnep. Lowell J. R. 1819.
Mather I. 1639; s. Mather C. 1663.
Morse J. 1761; s. Morse S. E. 1794.
Norton A. 1786; s. Norton C. E. 1827.
Olney J. 1798; d. Kirk E. W. O. 1842.
Payson E. 1783; d. Prentiss E. P. 1818.
Pierpont J. 1785; gs. Morgan J. P. 1837.
Schmucker S. S. 1799; s. Smucker S. M. 1823.
Smith R. C. 1797; nep. Smith R. S. 1829.
Stevens H. 1819; b. Stevens B. F. 1833.
Stockton F. R. 1834; b. Stockton J. D. 1836.
Stone W. L. 1792; s. Stone W. L. Jr. 1835.
Story J. 1779; s. Story W. W. 1819.
Stuart M. 1780; d. Phelps E. S. 1815; gd. Ward E. S. P. 1844.
Train-G. F. 1829; sis. Whitney A. D. T. 1824.
Trumbull J. H. 1821; b. Trumbull H. C. 1830.
Tuckerman J. 1778; nep. Tuckerman H. T. 1813.
Ward C. O. 1831; b. Ward L. F. 1841.
Ware H. 1764; s. Ware H. Jr. 1794; s. Ware W. 1797.
Warner S. 1819; sis. Warner A. B. 1820.
Willard E. 1787; sis. Phelps A. H. 1793.
Willis N. P. 1806; sis. Parton S. P. W. 1811.
Winslow H. 1799; s. Winslow W. C. 1840.
Woods L. 1774; d. Baker H. N. W. 1815.
Woodworth S. 1785; nep. Woodworth F. C. 1812.

APPENDIX B

BIOGRAPHICAL TABLES

Appendix B contains all the facts on which the study was based, and other facts which were collected because of their interest, though not used in the study. A blank in any column indicates that information was lacking. From left to right the columns contain: the date of birth and of death of each litterateur; his name; occupation; fields of literary activity; place of birth and of death; degree of kinship to other literati; father's occupation; education; economic condition of parents during childhood and youth; early religious training; number of brothers and sisters in the family, including the litterateur himself; birth-rank among the brothers and sisters; conjugal condition; number of children.

The names are arranged chronologically. The date of birth of any individual can be found in Appendix D, where the names appear in alphabetical order.

Names of literati of talent as distinguished from those of merit are indicated by an asterisk (*). The names of literary women are printed in italics.

In a few cases a blank in the occupation column means that the man of letters had so many occupations that no one or two could be picked out as of particular importance. There was also considerable difficulty in determining the occupation of literary women. Very few could be classed as authors in the sense that they gained a livelihood by the pen. It is probable that the majority for whom no profession could be determined were housewives.

The fields of literary activity are indicated by the abbreviations devised by Odin.¹ They are:

¹ Cf. *supra*, p. 21.

pat., patron	erud., erudite
lib., librarian	pop., popularizer
act., actor	spec., speculative
or., orator	pr., prose writer
pub., publicist	p., poet
narr., narrator	dram., dramatist

When an author is mentioned as having achieved distinction in two or more fields, that field in which he achieved the more distinction is given first.

A dagger (†) opposite a word in the column for the father's occupation indicates that the occupation given is that of a guardian, not a parent.

Abbreviations used to indicate the degree of education received are: G.S.P., partial grammar school course; G.S., full grammar school course; H.S.P., partial high school course; H.S., full high school course; A.B.P., partial college course; A.B., full college course. The abbreviations mean either the formal education indicated, or its equivalent if received during childhood or youth.

In the column devoted to the economic status of the parents the meanings of the abbreviations are: P, poor; I, intermediate; W, wealthy.¹

The abbreviations indicating early religious training are:

Bapt., Baptist	Pres., Presbyterian
Cong., Congregational	Prot., Protestant, denomination
Disc., Disciples	unknown
D. R., Dutch Reformed	R. C., Roman Catholic
H. F., Hicksite Friend	S. D. B., Seventh Day Baptist
Luth., Lutheran	Swed., Swedenborgian
M. E., Methodist Episcopal	Unit., Unitarian
Morav., Moravian	Univ., Universalist
P. E., Protestant Episcopal	

The figure indicating the number of children in the family includes the litterateur himself. When a number followed by

¹ For a definition of these classes, cf. p. 72.

a plus sign appears, it means that the number given is a minimum. Thus 7+ signifies that there were at least seven brothers and sisters in the family under consideration. A similar plus sign in the column for the birth-rank of the litterateur means that he was seventh or later born.

A plus sign in the appropriate column indicates that the person under consideration was married, a minus sign that he never married.

A plus sign after the figure indicating the number of children born to the litterateur means that there was reason for supposing that there were other children, the number of whom could not be ascertained.

A few words and figures are marked by interrogation points, to indicate that their accuracy is subject to question.

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1639	1723	Mather I.	clergymen	pop.	Dorchester, Mass.
1640	1707	Willard S.	clergymen	pop.	Concord, Mass.
1663	1728	* Mather C.	clergymen	spec. erud. pop.	Boston, Mass.
1680	1753	Checkley J.	clergymen	pub.	Boston, Mass.
1687	1758	Prince T.	clergymen	erud.	Sandwich, Mass.
1688	1747	* Dickinson J.	clergymen	pop.	Hatfield, Mass.
1703	1758	* Edwards J.	clergymen	spec. pub. pop.	East Windsor, Conn.
1706	1748	Callender J.	clergymen	erud.	Boston, Mass.
1706	1790	* Franklin B.	{ journalist diplomatist	pop. narr. spec.	Boston, Mass.
1706	1780	Green J.	merchant	p.	Boston, Mass.
1711	1780	Hutchinson T.	publicist	erud.	Boston, Mass.
1719	1790	* Bellamy J.	clergymen	pop.	Cheshire, Conn.
1720	1804	Lennox C.		pop.	New York, N. Y.
1720	1772	* Woolman J.	{ tailor clergymen	narr.	Northampton, N. J.
1721	1803	* Hopkins S.	clergymen	spec.	Waterbury, Conn.
1724	1806	Backus I.	clergymen	erud.	Norwich, Conn.
1725	1783	Otis J.	lawyer	or.	West Barnstable, Mass.
1725	1797	Webster P.	merchant	spec. pub.	Lebanon, Conn.
1728	1793	Smith W.	lawyer	erud.	New York, N. Y.
1730	1789	Hutchins T.	army officer	narr.	Monmouth, N. J.
1732	1780	Carver J.	explorer	narr.	Canterbury, Conn. (?)
1732	1808	Dickinson J.	publicist	pub.	Talbot Co., Md.
1735	1826	Adams J.	{ lawyer publicist	pub.	Quincy, Mass.
1735	1820	Trumbull B.	clergymen	erud.	Hebron, Conn.
1736	1799	* Henry P.	publicist	or.	Studley, Va.
1737	1798	Duché J.	clergymen	pop.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1737	1791	Hopkinson F.	lawyer	pub.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1739	1823	Bartram J.	botanist	narr.	Kingsessing, Pa.
1743	1826	* Jefferson T.	publicist	pub. pat. narr. pop.	Albemarle Co., Va.
1744	1798	* Belknap J.	clergymen	erud.	Boston, Mass.
1745	1840	Emmons N.	clergymen	pop.	East Haddam, Conn.
1745	1826	* Murray L.	author	pop.	Swatara, Pa.
1747	1788	Filson J.	pioneer	narr.	East Fallowfield, Pa.
1749	1815	* Ramsay D.	physician	erud.	Dunmore, Pa.
1749	1831	Thomas I.	{ publisher journalist	lib.	Boston, Mass.
1750	1831	* Trumbull J.	lawyer	p. pub.	Watertown, Conn.
1751	1812	* Buckminster J.	clergymen	pop.	Rutland, Mass.
1751	1836	Madison J.	publicist	pop.	Port Conway, Va.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
Boston, Mass.	Son, C. Mather, 1663	clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.	6	6	+	10
Boston, Mass.		lawyer	A.B.	I	Cong.	17		+	20
Boston, Mass.	Father, I. Mather, 1639	clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.	10	1	+	15
Providence, R. I.			A.B.	W	P.E.	2		+	3
Boston, Mass.		merchant	A.B.		Cong.			+	4
Elizabethtown, N. J.			A.B.		Pres.			+	4
Princeton, N. J.	Grandson, T. Dwight, 1752	clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.	11	5	+	11
Newport, R. I.			A.B.	I	Bapt.			+	6
Philadelphia, Pa.	{ tallow- chandler	G.S.	P	Pres.	17	14		+	4
London, England.			A.B.						
Brompton, England.	merchant	A.B.	W						5
Bethlehem, Conn.	mine-owner	A.B.	W			11	5	+	7
London, England.	{ army-officer lieut.-gov.	H.S.P.	W						
York, England.	farmer	H.S.P.	I	Friend				+	
Newport, R. I.	farmer	A.B.		Prot.	4+			+	8
Andover, Mass.	farmer	G.S.		Cong.	5+			+	9
Philadelphia, Pa.	lawyer	A.B.	I		13	1		+	3
Quebec, P. Q.		A.B.							
Pittsburgh, Pa.		A.B.	W	Pres.	15			+	10
London, England.		G.S.							
Wilmington, Del.		H.S.P.	I					+	8
Quincy, Mass.	{ planter judge	A.B.P.	W	Friend	4+	2		+	
North Haven, Conn.	Son, J. Q. Adams, 1767	farmer	A.B.	I	Cong.	13	1	+	4
Bed Hill, Va.		A.B.							7
Philadelphia, Pa.	surveyor	H.S.P.	I	P.E.	9	2		+	16
Philadelphia, Pa.		A.B.	I	P.E.				+	5
Kingsessing, Pa.	Son, J. Hopkinson, 1770	lawyer	A.B.	I				+	5
Albemarle Co., Va.		botanist	H.S.P.	I	Friend	4	1+	-	
Boston, Mass.	planter	A.B.	W	P.E.	10	3		+	6
Franklin, Mass.	{ leather- dresser	A.B.			4+	1		+	5
Near York, England.	merchant								
—, O.	farmer	A.B.	I	Prot.	12	6		+	5
Charleston, S. C.	miller	H.S.P.	W	Friend	12	1		+	0
Worcester, Mass.	farmer	H.S.P.	I		4+	2		+	4
Detroit, Mich.	farmer	A.B.			2+			+	
Leadsboro, Vt.	clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.	9	4		+	12
Montpelier, Va.	planter	A.B.	I		12	1		+	0

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1751	1797	Winchester E.	clergyman	spec. pop.	Brookline, Mass.
1752	1817	* Dwight T.	educator	spec. narr. pop.	Northampton, Mass.
1752	1832	* Freneau P.	author	p.	New York, N. Y.
1752	1818	Graydon A.	lawyer	narr.	Bristol, Pa.
1752	1718	Humphreys D.	diplomatist	p.	Derby, Conn.
1754	1812	Barlow J.	author	p.	Redding, Conn.
1755		Adams H.	author	erud.	Medfield, Mass.
1755	1839	Bancroft A.	clergyman	pop.	Reading, Mass.
1755	1824	Coxe T.		pub.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1755	1835	Marshall J.	jurist	erud.	Germantown, Va.
1757	1818	Bingham C.	teacher	pop.	Salisbury, Conn.
1757	1826	Tyler R.	{ lawyer judge	pr. dram.	Boston, Mass.
1758	1808	* Ames F.	lawyer	or. pub.	Dedham, Mass.
1758	1843	* Webster N.	author	erud. pop.	West Hartford, Conn.
1758	1837	Worcester N.	clergyman	spec. pub.	Hollis, N. H.
1759	1825	* Weems M. L.	{ clergyman author	pop.	Anne Arundel Co., Md.
1761	1815	Alsop R.	author	p.	Middletown, Conn.
1761	1830	Hall S.		pop.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1761	1826	Morse J.	clergyman	pop.	Woodstock, Conn.
1763	1837	Holmes A.	clergyman	erud.	Woodstock, Conn.
1763	1847	* Kent J.	jurist	spec. erud.	Fredericksburg, N. Y.
1764	1845	Ware H.	{ clergyman professor	pub. spec.	Sherborn, Mass.
1766	1839	* Dunlap W.	{ artist author	dram.	Perth Amboy, N. J.
1767	1848	* Adams J. Q.	{ lawyer publicist	pub. or. narr.	Quincy, Mass.
1768	1812	Dennie J.	journalist	pr.	Boston, Mass.
1768	1842	Harris T. M.	clergyman	pop.	Charlestown, Mass.
1769	1840	Lowell J.	lawyer	pub.	Newburyport, Mass.
1769	1850	Miller S.	clergyman	erud.	Dover, Del.
1770	1842	Hopkinson J.	lawyer	p.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1770	1829	Mason J. M.	clergyman	pop.	New York, N. Y.
1771	1852	* Ballou H.	clergyman	pub.	Richmond, N. H.
1771	1810	* Brown C. B.	author	pr.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1771	1837	Fessenden T.	journalist	p.	Walpole, N. H.
1772	1851	* Alexander A.	{ clergyman teacher	pop.	Rockbridge Co., Va.
1772	1856	Dowse T.	leather-dresser	lib.	Charlestown, Mass.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i># Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
Hartford, Conn.									
New Haven, Conn.	Grandfather, J. Edwards, 1703	merchant	A.B.	I	Cong.			+	8
near Freehold, N. J.	planter	A.B.	W	Pres.	5	1	+	4	
Philadelphia, Pa.	merchant	H.S.	I	Prot.	4	1	+		
New Haven, Conn.	clergyman	A.B.		Cong.			+		
Yamisica, Poland.	farmer	A.B.	I	Cong.	10	10	+	0	
Brookline, Mass.	merchant	H.S.P.	P	Cong.	3	2	—		
Worcester, Mass.	Son, A. Bancroft, 1800	farmer	A.B.	I	Pres.			+	13
Philadelphia, Pa.	merchant	H.S.P.							
Philadelphia, Pa.	planter	H.S.	I	P.E.	15	1	+	1+	
Boston, Mass.		A.B.							
Brattleboro, Vt.			A.B.					+	1+
Dedham, Mass.	physician	A.B.	P		5	5	+	7	
New Haven, Conn.	farmer	A.B.	I	Prot.	5		+	7	
Brighton, Mass.	clergyman	H.S.P.	I	Cong.			+	10+	
Beaufort, S. C.	farmer	H.S.			19	15+?	+	7+	
Flatbush, N. Y.	merchant	H.S.			8	1	+		
Philadelphia, Pa.	Son, J. Hall, 1793	clergyman	H.S.P.	I	Pres.			+	11
New Haven, Conn.	Son, S. E. Morse, 1794	farmer	A.B.	P	Cong.	10	8	+	11
Cambridge, Mass.	Son, O. W. Holmes, 1809	physician	A.B.	I	Prot.			+	5
New York, N. Y.	lawyer	A.B.	I					+	4+
Cambridge, Mass.	Son, H. Ware Jr., 1794	farmer	A.B.	P		10	9	+	19
New York, N. Y.			G.S.P.			1	1	+	
Washington, D. C.	Father J. Adams, 1735	lawyer	A.B.	I	Unit.	4	1	+	11+
Philadelphia, Pa.			A.B.						
Dorchester, Mass.	teacher	A.B.	P	Cong.	3	1	+	8	
Boston, Mass.	Nephew, J. Lowell, 1799	lawyer	A.B.	W					
Princeton, N. J.	clergyman	A.B.	I	Pres.	9	8	+	3+	
Philadelphia, Pa.	Father, F. Hopkinson, 1737	lawyer	A.B.	I				+	1+
New York, N. Y.	clergyman	A.B.	I	Pres.	9		+	2+	
Somerville, Mass.	Son, M. M. Ballou, 1820	clergyman	H.S.P.	P	Bapt.	11	11	+	1+
Philadelphia, Pa.			H.S.	I	Friend	3+		+	4
Boston, Mass.	clergyman	A.B.	P	Cong.					
Princeton, N. J.	Son, J. A. Alexander, 1804	farmer	A.B.	W	Pres.	9	3	+	7
Cambridgeport, Mass.	{ leather- dresser	G.S.	P			8	7	—	

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1772	1834	Porter E.	{ clergyman educator	pop.	Cornwall, Conn.
1772	1864	Quincy J.	publicist	or.	Boston, Mass.
1772	1834	Wirt H.	publicist	pr. or. erud.	Bladensburg, Md.
1773	1838	Bowditch N.	mathematician	erud.	Salem, Mass.
1773	1833	Randolph J.	publicist	or.	Cawsons, Va.
1774	1850	Comly J.	author	pop.	—, Pa.
1774	1854	Woods L.	clergyman	pub. pop.	Princeton, Mass.
1775	1863	Beecher L.	clergyman	pub.	New Haven, Conn.
1775	1830	Hobart J. H.	clergyman	pop.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1777	1852	* Clay H.	publicist	or.	Hanover Co., Va.
1777	1839	Niles H.	journalist	pub.	Chester Co., Pa.
1777	1846	Pickering J.	lawyer	erud.	Salem, Mass.
1777	1850	Rich O.	{ consul bibliographer	lib.	Truro, Mass.
1778	1862	Bangs N.	clergyman	erud.	Stratford, Conn.
1778	1866	Jenks W.	clergyman	pop.	Newton, Mass.
1778	1840	Tuckerman J.	clergyman	pop.	Boston, Mass.
1779	1843	Allston W.	artist	p.	Brook Green Domain, S.C.
1779	1874	Benedict D.	clergyman	erud.	Norwalk, Conn.
1779	1860	* Paulding J. K.	gov't official	pr.	Great Nine Partners, N.Y.
1779	1813	Pike Z. M.	army-officer	narr.	Lamberton, N. J.
1779	1845	* Story J.	jurist	spec. erud.	Marblehead, Mass.
1779	1864	Town S.	teacher	pop.	Belchertown, Mass.
1779	1860	Watson J. F.	bank cashier	erud.	Burlington Co., N. J.
1780	1842	* Channing W. E.	clergyman	spec. or. pub. pop.	Newport, R. I.
1780	1840	Flint T.	clergyman	narr. pop.	Reading, Mass.
1780	1843	* Key F. S.	lawyer	p.	Frederick Co., Md.
1780	1865	Lee H. F.		pop.	Newburyport, Mass.
1780	1859	Rush R.	diplomatist	narr.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1780	1852	* Stuart M.	professor	pop. pub. erud.	Wilton, Conn.
1782	1858	Benton T. H.	publicist	narr. or. erud.	near Hillsborough, N. C.
1782	1850	* Calhoun J. C.	publicist	spec. or. pub.	Abbeville District, S. C.
1782	1852	* Webster D.	publicist	or.	Salisbury, N. H.
1783	1859	* Irving W.	author	pr. narr. erud.	New York, N. Y.
1783	1838	Knapp S. L.	lawyer	pop.	Newburyport, Mass.
1783	1827	* Payson E.	clergyman	pop.	Rindge, N. H.
1784	1868	Allen W.	educator	erud.	Pittsfield, Mass.
1784	1870	Hazard S.	merchant	erud.	Philadelphia, Pa.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
Andover, Mass.		judge	A.B.	I	Cong.	7	5	+	2+
Quincy, Mass.		lawyer	A.B.	W		1	1	+	3+
Washington, D. C.			H.S.	I	Prot.	6	6	+	2+
Boston, Mass.		cooper	G.S.P.	P	Unit.	7	4	+	6
Philadelphia, Pa.		planter	A.B.P.	W		2	2	+	
Ryberry, Pa.					Friend				
Andover, Mass.	Daughter, H. N. W. Baker, 1815	farmer	A.B.	P	Cong.	2+		+	9+
Brooklyn, N. Y.	Daughter, H. B. Stowe, 1811	blacksmith	A.B.	I	Cong.	3	1	+	13
Auburn, N. Y.		merchant	A.B.	I	P.E.	9	9	+	3+
Washington, D. C.		clergyman	G.S.P.		Bapt.	8	7	+	11
Wilmington, Del.								+	1+
Boston, Mass.		publicist	A.B.	P		5+		+	
London, England.								+	2+
New York, N. Y.		blacksmith	G.S.P.	I	P.E.	9		+	3+
Boston, Mass.			A.B.					+	1+
Havana, Cuba.	Nephew, H. T. Tuckerman, 1813	insurance	A.B.			2+		+	1+
Cambridge, Mass.		planter	A.B.	W	P.E.	3	2	+	
Pawtucket, R. I.		farmer	A.B.					+	12
Hyde Park, N. Y.			G.S.P.	P		9	8	+	2+
York, Ont.		army officer	G.S.P.					+	1
Cambridge, Mass.	Son, W. W. Story, 1819	surgeon	A.B.		Cong.	11	1	+	7
Greencastle, Ind.									
Germantown, Pa.		ship-owner	H.S.P.	P		2	2	+	7
Bennington, Vt.	Nephew, W. E. Channing, 1815	lawyer	A.B.		Cong.	10	3	+	4
Salem, Mass.			A.B.					+	1+
Baltimore, Md.		planter	A.B.	W	P.E.	2	1	+	11
Boston, Mass.		physician	A.B.	I				+	
Philadelphia, Pa.		physician	A.B.	W				+	1+
Andover, Mass.	Daughter, E. S. Phelps, 1815	farmer	A.B.					+	9
Washington, D. C.		lawyer	A.B.P.	W	P.E.	8	1	+	6
Washington, D. C.		surveyor	A.B.	I	Pres.	5	4	+	6+
Marshfield, Mass.		planter	A.B.					+	
Tarrytown, N. Y.	Nephew, T. Irving, 1809	farmer	A.B.	I	Prot.	10	9	+	5
Hopkinton, Mass.		merchant	H.S.P.	W	Pres.	11	11	-	
Portland, Me.			A.B.					+	
Northampton, Mass.	Daughter, E. P. Prentiss, 1818	clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.	5+		+	8
Philadelphia, Pa.		clergyman	A.B.					+	
		post-master-							
		general,							
		business		I				+	9

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1784	1873	Savage J.	banker	erud.	Boston, Mass.
1784	1859	Walsh R.	editor	pub.	Baltimore, Md.
1784	1865	* Worcester J. E.	author	erud. pop.	Bedford, N. H.
1785	1849	Appleton D.	publisher	lib.	Haverhill, Mass.
1785	1872	Cartwright P.	clergyman	narr.	Amherst Co., Va.
1785	1866	Pierpont J.	clergyman	p. pop.	Litchfield, Conn.
1785	1873	* Spring G.	clergyman	pop.	Newburyport, Mass.
1785	1848	* Wheaton II.	lawyer	erud.	Providence, R. I.
1785	1842	* Woodworth S.	journalist	p.	Scituate, Mass.
1786	1871	Coggeswell J. G.	{ teacher librarian	lib.	Ipswich, Mass.
1786	1851	Jarvis S. F.	clergyman	erud.	Middletown, Conn.
1786	1853	Norton A.	{ professor scholar	pub. erud.	Hingham, Mass.
1786	1867	Sargent L. M.	temperance worker	pub.	Boston, Mass.
1787	1858	Andrews E. A.	{ educator author	pop.	New Britain, Conn.
1787	1860	Clark T.		pop. erud.	Lancaster, Pa.
1787	1879	Dana R. H.	lawyer	pr. p.	Cambridge, Mass.
1787	1853	Edwards J.	clergyman	pub. pop.	Westhampton, Mass.
1787	1866?	Gordon T. F.	lawyer	erud.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1787	1866	Hale S.	clerk of court	pop.	Alstead, N. H.
1787	1858	Leslie E.		pr.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1787	1870	* Willard E.	educator	pop.	Berlin, Conn.
1788	1857	Blake J. L.	{ clergyman author	pop. erud.	Northwood, N. H.
1788	1879	Hale S. J.	author	pop. p.	Newport, N. H.
1788	1864	Marsh J.	clergyman	pop.	Weathersfield, Conn.
1789	1857	Colton C.	clergyman	pub.	Longmeadow, Mass.
1789	1858	* Comstock J. L.	physician	pop.	Lyme, Conn.
1789	1851	* Cooper J. F.	author	pr. erud.	Burlington, N. J.
1789	1838	Farmer J.	historian	erud.	Chelmsford, Mass.
1789	1869	Felt J. B.	historian	erud.	Salem, Mass.
1789	1865	Gould H. F.		p.	Lancaster, Mass.
1789	1867	Hawes J.	clergyman	pop.	Medway, Mass.
1789	1841	Hillhouse J. A.	author	p.	New Haven, Conn.
1789	1858	Jay W.	judge	pub.	New York, N. Y.
1789	1867	* Sedgwick C. M.	educator	pr. pop.	Stockbridge, Mass.
1789	1866	* Sparks J.	clergyman	erud. pop.	Willington, Conn.
1790	1847	* Everett A. H.	diplomatist	spec. erud. pr.	Boston, Mass.
1790	1868	* Force P.	historian	erud.	Passaic Falls, N. J.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
Boston, Mass.		† judge	A.B.	I		11		+	4
Paris, France.		merchant	A.B.		R.C.			+	1+
Cambridgeport, Mass.			A.B.					0	
New York, N. Y.								+	4+
near Pleasant Plains, Ill.		farmer	H.S.P.	P	M.E.	5+		+	
Medford, Mass.	Grandson, J. P. Morgan, 1835		A.B.		Cong.			+	
New York, N. Y.		clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.	11	3	+	1+
Dorchester, Mass.		merchant	A.B.	W				+	1+
New York, N. Y.	Nephew, F. C. Woodworth, 1812	farmer	H.S.P.	P		4	4	+	1+
Cambridge, Mass.			A.B.						
Middletown, Conn.		clergyman	A.B.	I	P.E.	3+	3+	+	6
Newport, R. I.	Son, C. E. Norton, 1827		A.B.	I	Cong.		Youngest	+	6
West Roxbury, Mass.		merchant	A.B.P.	W	Cong.	7	7	+	4
New Britain, Conn.		farmer	A.B.	I	Cong.	3		+	10
Philadelphia, Pa.			A.B.		R.C.				
Boston, Mass.	Son, R. H. Dana Jr., 1815	lawyer	A.B.	W	Unit.	6		+	4
Bath Alum Springs, Va.		farmer	A.B.	I	Cong.	7	3	+	7+
Beverly, N. J.			G.S.			14	3	+	
Somerville, Mass.		watchmaker	H.S.P.			5	1	—	1+
Gloucester, N. J.									
Troy, N. Y.	Sister, A. H. Phelps, 1793	farmer	H.S.P.	I		17	16	+	2+
Orange, N. J.		farmer	A.B.						
Philadelphia, Pa.			H.S.			2+		+	
Brooklyn, N. Y.		clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.			+	5
Savannah, Ga.	Brother, W. Colton, 1797	weaver	A.B.	I	Cong.	12			
Hartford, Conn.			G.S.						
Cooperstown, N. Y.	Daughter, S. F. Cooper, 1813	farmer	A.B.P.		P.E.	12	11	+	7
Concord, N. H.		farmer	G.S.		Prot.	3+	1	—	
Salem, Mass.			A.B.						
Newburyport, Mass.			2+					—	
Gilead, Conn.	Niece, M. J. Holmes, 1834		A.B.	P				+	1+
New Haven, Conn.			A.B.	I				+	
Bedford, N. Y.	Son, J. Jay, 1817	publicist	A.B.	W	P.E.	5	4	+	7
Roxbury, Mass.		lawyer	H.S.P.	W	Cong.	7	6	—	
Cambridge, Mass.		farmer	A.B.	P				+	4
Macao, China.	Brother, E. Everett, 1794	clergyman	G.S.	I	Cong.	2+			
Washington, D. C.			G.S.	I				+	2+

Born	Died	Name	Occupation	Literary Fields	Place of Birth
1790	1862	Goodrich Chas. A.	clergyman	pop.	Ridgefield, Conn.
1790	1860	Goodrich Chaun. A.	professor	pop.	New Haven, Conn.
1790	1867	* Halleck F. G.	bank clerk	p.	Gulfport, Conn.
1790	1861	Turner S. H.	clergyman	erud.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1791	1867	* Brown G.	teacher	pop. erud.	Providence, R. I.
1791	1883	* Cooper P.	manufacturer	pat.	New York, N. Y.
1791	1839	Hayne R. Y.	publicist	or.	St. Paul's Parish, S. C.
1791	1859	Olmsted D.	professor	pop.	East Hartford, Conn.
1791	1865	* Sigourney L. H.	author	pop. narr. pr. p.	Norwich, Conn.
1791	1875	Sprague C.	bank cashier	p.	Boston, Mass.
1791	1871	* Ticknor G.	{ professor author	erud.	Boston, Mass.
1792	1857	Birney J. G.	publicist	pub.	Danville, Ky.
1792	1875	Finney C. G.	clergyman	pop. pub.	Warren, Conn.
1792	1868	Mitchell S. A.	teacher	pop.	Bristol, Conn.
1792	1852	* Payne J. H.	dramatist	p. dram.	New York, N. Y.
1792	1868	Smith S.	journalist	pr.	Buckfield, Me.
1792	1844	Stone W. L.	journalist	erud.	New Paltz, N. Y.
1793	1863	Bailey R. W.	{ clergyman teacher	pop.	North Yarmouth, Me.
1793	1834	Bedell G. T.	clergyman	pop.	Staten Island, N. Y.
1793	1879	* Carey H. C.	economist	spec. pub.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1793	1860	* Goodrich S. G.	author	pop. pr.	Ridgefield, Conn.
1793	1863	Hall J.	judge	narr. pop. pr.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1793	1864	Hitchcock E.	educator	pop.	Deerfield, Mass.
1793	1876	Neal J.	lawyer	pr.	Portland, Me.
1793	1884	Phelps A. H.	teacher	pop.	Berlin, Conn.
1793	1864	* Schoolcraft H. R.	ethnologist	narr.	Watervliet, N. Y.
1794	1878	* Bryant W. C.	{ editor poet	p.	Cummington, Mass.
1794	1882	Dewey O.	clergyman	spec. pop.	Sheffield, Mass.
1794	1865	* Everett E.	publicist	or.	Dorchester, Mass.
1794	1888	Gilman C. H.		narr. p.	Boston, Mass.
1794	1880	Hallock W. A.	{ head of tract society	pop.	Plainfield, Mass.
1794	1861	Lewis A.	teacher	p.	Lynn, Mass.
1794	1871?	Morse S. E.	journalist	pop.	Charlestown, Mass.
1794	1867	Packard F. A.	editor	pop.	Marlboro, Mass.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
Hartford, Conn.	Brother, S. G. Goodrich, 1793		A.B.			2+			
New Haven, Conn.			A.B.					+	2+
Guilford, Conn.		merchant	G.S.	I	P.E.	2		—	
New York N. Y.		clergyman	A.B.	I	P.E.	8	8	+	2
Lynn, Mass.		teacher	A.B.P.	P	Friend				
New York, N. Y.		{ brewer hatter	G.S.P.	I				+	6
Asheville, N. C.	Nephew, P. H. Hayne, 1830		H.S.	I		14	5	+	
New Haven, Conn.		farmer	A.B.					+	2+
Hartford, Conn.			H.S.	I	Cong.	1	1	+	2
Boston, Mass.			H.S.P.					+	1+
Boston, Mass.		educator	A.B.	W	Cong.	1	1	+	4
Eagleswood, N. J.		{ manuf'turer banker	A.B.	W	P.E.	2	1	+	5+
Oberlin, O.		{ hotel proprietor	H.S.P.	I	Cong.	12		+	6
Philadelphia, Pa.									
Tunis, Africa.		teacher	A.B.P.	I	Prot.	9	6	—	
Patchogue, N. Y.			A.B.					+	
Saratoga Springs, N. Y.	Son, W. L. Stone Jr., 1835	clergyman	H.S.P.	P	Cong.			+	1+
Huntsville, Tex.			A.B.						
Baltimore, Md.		business	A.B.	P	P.E.	4	4	+	2
Philadelphia, Pa.		publisher	G.S.	I				+	
New York, N. Y.	Brother, Chas. A. Goodrich, 1790	clergyman		I	Cong.	10	6	+	
near Cincinnati, O.	Mother, S. Hall, 1761	{ U. S. marshall	H.S.P.	I	Pres.	11		+	5+
Amherst, Mass.		farmer	A.B.P.	I	Cong.			+	2+
Portland, Me.			G.S.		Friend	2+			
Baltimore, Md.	Sister, E. Willard, 1787	farmer	H.S.P.	I		17		+	2+
Washington, D. C.		{ factory supt.	A.B.P.	I				+	
New York, N. Y.		physician	A.B.P.	I	Pres.	7	2	+	2
Sneffield, Mass.		farmer	A.B.	I	Cong.	2+		+	1+
Boston, Mass.	Brother, A. H. Everett, 1790	clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.	2+	2+	+	7
Washington, D. C.		shipwright			P.E.	6		+	1
New York, N. Y.		clergyman	A.B.	P	Cong.			+	6
Lynn, Mass.			H.S.						
New York, N. Y.	Father, J. Morse, 1761	clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.	II			
Philadelphia, Pa.		clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.			+	2+

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1794	1863	* Robinson E.	{ professor scholar	erud. narr. pop.	Southington, Conn.
1794	1849	Tappan W. B.	{ Sunday-school worker	p.	Beverly, Mass.
1794	1843	* Ware H. Jr.	clergyman	pop.	Hingham, Mass.
1795?	1845	* Brooks M. G.		p.	Medford, Mass.
1795	1820	* Drake J. R.	physician	p.	New York, N. Y.
1795	1869	Harper J.	publisher	lib.	Newtown, N. Y.
1795	1870	Kennedy J. P.	publicist	pr.	Baltimore, Md.
1795	1869	Peabody G.	banker	pat.	Danvers, Mass.
1795	1856	Percival J. G.	geologist	p.	Berlin, Conn.
1795	1875	Sprague W. B.	clergyman	pop. erud.	Andover, Conn.
1795	1870	Stewart C. S.	clergyman	narr.	Flemington, N. J.
1795	1868	* Thompson D. P.	lawyer	pr.	Charlestown, Mass.
1796	1828	* Brainard J. G. C.	editor	p.	New London, Conn.
1796	1867	* Bulfinch T.	{ bank clerk business	pop.	Boston, Mass.
1796	1859	Bush G.	clergyman	spec. erud. pop.	Norwich, Vt.
1796	1872	* Catlin G.	artist	narr.	Wilkesbarre, Pa.
1796	1865	* Halliburton T. C.	judge	pr.	Winsor, N. S.
1796	1859	* Mann H.	educator	pop. pub.	Franklin, Mass.
1796	1881	* Palfrey J. G.	{ clergyman author	erud.	Boston, Mass.
1796	1859	* Prescott W. H.	historian	erud.	Salem, Mass.
1896	1865	* Wayland F.	{ clergyman educator	pop. spec.	New York, N. Y.
1797	1867	Antonio C.	teacher	pop.	New York, N. Y.
1797	1851	Colton W.	naval chaplain	narr.	Rutland, Vt.
1797	1878	Hodge C.	educator	pop. spec.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1797	1870	Littell E.	editor	pop.	Burlington, N. J.
1797	1849	Lyon M.	educator	pat.	Buckland, Mass.
1797	1863?	Richardson J.	author	pr.	near Niagara Falls, Ont.
1797	18—	Smith R. C.	teacher	pop.	Franklin, Conn.
1797	1852	Ware W.	clergyman	pr.	Hingham, Mass.
1797	1882	Weed T.	journalist	pub.	Cairo, N. Y.
1798	1859	Alcott W. A.	author	pop.	Walcott, Conn.
1798	1863	* Baird R.	clergyman	erud. pub.	Fayette Co., Pa.
1798	1885	Barber J. W.	historian	erud. pop.	Windsor, Conn.
1798	1870	* Barnes A.	clergyman	pop. erud.	Rome, N. Y.
1798	1842	Clarke McD.		p.	Bath, Me.

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1798	1879	Dix J. A.	{ army officer publicist	narr.	Boscawen, N. H.
1798	1875	Drake S. G.	bookseller	erud.	Pittsfield, N. H.
1798	1866	Hawks F. L.	clergyman	erud. pop.	Newberne, N. C.
1798	1888	Hickok L. P.	{ clergyman educator	spec.	Danbury, Conn.
1798	1868	Noyes G. R.	clergyman	erud.	Newburyport, Mass.
1798	1872	Olney J.	author	pop.	Union, Conn.
1798	1869	Parker R. G.	teacher	pop.	Boston, Mass.
1798	1866	* Roe A. S.	merchant	pr.	New York, N. Y.
1798	1854	Spencer I. S.	clergyman	pr. pop.	Rupert, Vt.
1798	1879	Tuthill L. C.	author	pop. pr.	New Haven, Conn.
1798	1877	Wilkes C.	naval officer	narr.	New York N. Y.
1799	1888	Alcott A. B.	teacher	spec.	Walcott, Conn.
1799	1856	* Choate R.	lawyer	or.	Ipswich, Mass.
1799	1877	French B. F.	historian	erud.	Richmond, Va.
1799	1836	Lowell J.	merchant	pat.	Boston, Mass.
1799	1873	* Mac Ilvaline C. P.	clergyman	pop.	Burlington, N. J.
1799	1879	* Malcom H.	{ clergyman educator	pop. narr.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1799	1841	Mellen G.	lawyer	p.	Biddeford, Me.
1799	1847	Peabody W. B. O.	clergyman	erud.	Exeter, N. H.
1799	1870	Placide H.	actor	act.	Charleston, S. C.
1799	1873	Schmucker S. S.	clergyman	pop.	Hagerstown, Md.
1799	1854	Smith R. P.	{ journalist author.	dram.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1799	1872	Upham T. C.	professor	spec. erud. pop. p.	Deerfield, N. H.
1799	1875	* Walker A.	{ merchant manufacturer	spec.	North Woodstock, Conn.
1799	1876	Waterbury J. B.	clergyman	pop.	New York, N. Y.
1799	1864	* Winslow H.	clergymen	pop.	Williston, Vt.
1800	1891	* Bancroft G.	historian	erud.	Worcester, Mass.
1800	1866	Burton W.	philanthropist	pop.	Wilton, N. H.
1800	1872	Colwell S.	{ lawyer merchant	spec.	Charlestown, Va.
1800	1876	Durbin J. P.	educator	narr.	Bourbon Co., Ky.
1800	1859	Frost J.	{ educator author	pop.	Kennebunk, Me.
1800	1871	Hackett J. H.	actor	act.	New York, N. Y.
1800	1856	Hentz C. L.		pr.	Lancaster, Mass.
1800	1880	Lenox J.	merchant	pat.	New York, N. Y.
1800	1889	Mahan A.	{ clergymen educator	pop. spec.	Vernon, N. Y.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
New York, N. Y.	Son, M. Dix, 1827	merchant	A.B.P.	I	Cong.	5	4	+	7
Boston, Mass.	Son, S. A. Drake, 1833	farmer	G.S.					+	2+
New York, N. Y.			A.B.	I	P.E.	9	2	+	8
Amherst, Mass.		farmer	A.B.	I				+	
Cambridge, Mass.			A.B.	P				+	
Stratford, Conn.	Daughter, E. W. O. Kirk, 1842	farmer	A.B.	P	Pres.	8		+	8
Windsor, Conn.		clergyman	A.B.	I	P.E.				
Brooklyn, N. Y.		farmer	H.S.					+	4
Princeton, N. J.			A.B.					+	1+
Washington, D. C.			H.S.P.					+	
Concord, Mass.	Daughter, L. M. Alcott, 1832	farmer	G.S.P.	I	P. E.	1+	1	+	5
Halifax, N. S.		farmer	A.B.	I	Pres.	6	4	+	5
New York, N. Y.			H.S.					+	
Bombay, India.	Uncle, J. Lowell, 1769	merchant	A.B.P.	W		4	1	+	2
Florence, Italy.		lawyer	A.B.	I				+	3+
Philadelphia, Pa.			A.B.P.					+	1+
New York, N. Y.		lawyer	A.B.						
Springfield, Mass.		judge	A.B.	I		2+		+	5
near Babylon, N. Y.		gymnast		I		5	1	+	0
Gettysburg, Pa.	Son, S. M. Smucker, 1823	clergyman	A.B.P.	I	Luth.			+	2+
Falls of Schuylkill, Pa.								+	2+
New York, N. Y.			A.B.			4+			
North Brookfield, Mass.		blacksmith	A.B.	P	Cong.	3		+	3
Brooklyn, N. Y.					A.B.				
Williston, Vt.	Son, W. C. Winslow, 1840		A.B.			3+			
Washington, D. C.	Father, A. Bancroft, 1755	clergyman	A.B.	I	Unit.	13	8	+	0
Salem, Mass.		farmer	A.B.						
Philadelphia, Pa.		farmer	A.B.					+	
New York, N. Y.		farmer	A.B.		M.E.	5	1	+	5
Philadelphia, Pa.			A.B.					+	
Jamaica, N. Y.			A.B.P.	I	Pres.	2		+	4
Marienna, Fla.		army-officer						+	3+
New York, N. Y.		merchant	A.B.	W	Pres.	1	1	-	
Eastbourne, England			A.B.						

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1800	1865	Potter A.	clergyman	pop.	La Grange, N. Y.
1800	1873	* Todd J.	clergyman	pop.	Rutland, Vt.
1800	1885	Tyng S. H.	clergyman	pop.	Newburyport, Mass.
1801	1843	Clark J. A.	clergyman	pop. narr.	Pittsfield, Mass.
1801	1888	Hazard R. G.	manufacturer	spec.	Peacedale, R. I.
1801	1880	Janney S. M.	clergyman	erud.	Loudon Co., Va.
1801	1864	Kirkland C. M. S.	author	narr.	New York, N. Y.
1801	1865	Lynch W. F.	naval officer	narr.	Norfolk, Va.
1801	1882	* Marsh G. P.	diplomatist	erud. pop.	Woodstock, Vt.
1801	1872	Seward W. H.	publicist	or.	Florida, N. Y.
1801	1834	Stone J. A.	actor	dram.	Concord, Mass.
1801	1889	Woolsey T. D.	educator	pop.	New York, N. Y.
1802	1859	Burnap G. W.	clergyman	pop.	Merrimack, N. H.
1802	1876	* Bushnell H.	clergyman	spec. pop.	Litchfield, Conn.
1802	1880	* Child L. M.		pub. pop. pr.	Medford, Mass.
1802	1869	Cleveland C. D.	professor	pop.	Salem, Mass.
1802	1891	Conant T. J.	professor	erud.	Brandon, Vt.
1802	1887	<i>Dix D. L.</i>	philanthropist	pop.	Hampden, Me.
1802	1896	Furness W. H.	clergyman	pop. pub.	Boston, Mass.
1802	1887	Hopkins M.	educator	pop.	Stockbridge, Mass.
1802	1877	Lewis T.	educator	pub.	Northumberland, N. Y.
1802	1867	* Morris G. P.	journalist	p.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1802	1887	Read H.	clergyman	pop.	Newfane, Vt.
1802	1875	Upham C. W.	{ clergyman publicist	erud.	St. John, N. B.
1803	1879	* Abbott J.	{ clergyman educator	pop. erud. pr.	Hallowell, Me.
1803	1854	Bird R. M.	{ physician clergyman	pr.	Newcastle, Del.
1803	1876	* Brownson O. A.	{ journalist author	spec. pub.	Stockbridge, Vt.
1803	1889	Calvert G. H.	author	p. pr.	Prince George Co., Md.
1803	1856	* Cushing L. S.	lawyer	erud.	Lunenburg, Mass.
1803	1882	* Emerson R. W.	{ clergyman author	spec. or. pub. p. pop. pr.	Boston, Mass.
1803	1885	Lunt G.	lawyer	p.	Newburyport, Mass.
1803	1878	<i>Mao Intosh M. J.</i>	author	pr.	Sunbury, Ga.
1803	1848	Mackenzie A. S.	naval officer	narr. erud.	New York, N. Y.
1803	1895	Morris J. G.	clergyman	pop.	York, Pa.
1803	1863	Newcomb H.	clergyman	pop.	Thetford, Vt.
1803	1869	Owen J. J.	professor	pop.	Colebrook, Conn.
1803	1878	Rupp I. D.	teacher	erud.	Cumberland Co., Pa.
1803	1877	Sabine L.	{ trader gov't official	erud.	New Lisbon, N. H.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
San Francisco, Cal.		farmer	A.B.		Friend	7+	7	+	7
Pittsfield, Mass.		physician	A.B.	P	Cong.	7	7	+	8+
Irvington, N. Y.			A.B.	W				+	2+
Philadelphia, Pa.			A.B.					+	9
Peacedale, R. I.		manuf'turer	G.S.	I	Friend	11	11	+	2
Loudon Co., Va.		{ farmer miller	H.S.P.		Friend	9		+	3+
New York, N. Y.	Son, J. Kirkland, 1830	publisher						+	2+
Baltimore, Md.									
Vallombrosa, Italy.		lawyer	A.B.		Cong.	6	2	+	2
Auburn, N. Y.		{ merchant physician	A.B.	W	Prot.	6	4	+	5
Philadelphia, Pa.									
New Haven, Conn.	Uncle, T. Dwight, 1752	merchant	A.B.	W	Pres.	7		+	11
Baltimore, Md.			A.B.						
Hartford, Conn.		{ farmer wool-carder	A.B.	I	Cong.	6	1	+	4+
Wayland, Mass.		baker	H.S.P.	I		6	6	+	
Philadelphia, Pa.		clergyman	A.B.	I					
Brooklyn, N. Y.		manuf'turer	A.B.	W	Bapt.	3	1	+	2+
Trenton, N. J.			G.S.	I					
Philadelphia, Pa.	Son, H. H. Furness, 1833		A.B.					+	4
Williamstown, Mass.	Cousin, S. Hopkins, 1807		A.B.	I	Cong.	3		+	10
Schenectady, N. Y.			A.B.			3+			
New York, N. Y.			G.S.					+	
Somerville, N. J.			A.B.						
Salem, Mass.		judge	A.B.	I		4		+	15
Farmington, Me.	Brother, J. S. C. Abbot, 1805	{ dealer in lumber lands	A.B.	I	Cong.	7	3	+	5
Philadelphia, Pa.			A.B.P.						
Detroit, Mich.		farmer	H.S.	P	Pres.	3+	3+	+	1+
Newport, R. I.		planter	A.B.						
Boston, Mass.		lawyer	A.B.P.	I					
Concord, Mass.		clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.	6	2	+	4
Boston, Mass.		merchant	A.B.	W					
Morristown, N. J.		lawyer	H.S.			3+		-	
Tarrytown, N. Y.		merchant	H.S.P.	I				+	2+
Lutherville, Md.		surgeon	A.B.			2+			
Brooklyn, N. Y.		farmer							
New York, N. Y.			A.B.						
Philadelphia, Pa.		farmer	G.S.						
Boston, Mass.		clergyman	G.S.	P	M.E.				

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1804	1859	Alexander J. W.	clergyman	pop.	Louisa Co., Va.
1804	1864	* Hawthorne N.	author	pr.	Salem, Mass.
1804	1885	Williams W. R.	clergyman	pop.	New York, N. Y.
1805	1877	* Abbot J. S. C.	clergyman	pop. erud.	Brunswick, Me.
1805	1876	Baker A. R.	clergyman	pop.	Franklin, Mass.
1805	1886	* Bartlett J. R.	publicist	pop. erud.	Providence, R. I.
1805	1863	Blake W. R.	actor	act.	Halifax, N. S.
1805	1879	* Garrison W. L.	journalist	pub.	Newburyport, Mass.
1805	1895	Gayarreé E. A.	{ publicist author	erud.	New Orleans, La.
1805	1866	Gould A. A.	conchologist	pop.	New Ipswich, N. H.
1805	1890	Hedge F. H.	clergyman	pop.	Cambridge, Mass.
1805	1879	<i>Martyn S. T.</i>		pr.	Hopkinton, N. H.
1805	1889	Sanders C. W.	lawyer	pop.	Newport, N. Y.
1805	1844	* Smith J.	{ religious leader	pub.	Sharon, Vt.
1805	1852	* Stephens J. L.	lawyer	narr.	Shrewsbury, N. J.
1805	1881	Tappan H. P.	{ clergyman educator	spec.	Rhinebeck, N. Y.
1805	1887	* Walker J. B.	clergyman	spec. pop.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1806	1878	Adams N.	clergyman	pub.	Salem, Mass.
1806	1863	<i>Embry E. C.</i>		p.	New York, N. Y.
1806	1872	* Forrest E.	actor	act.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1806	1877	Harper F.	publisher	lib.	Newtown, N. Y.
1806	1884	Hoffman C. F.	editor	narr. p.	New York, N. Y.
1806	1878	Hoyt R.	clergyman	p.	New York, N. Y.
1806	1853	Logan C. A.	actor	dram.	Baltimore, Md.
1806	1899	McLellan I.	lawyer	p.	Portland, Me.
1806	1870	* Simms W. G.	{ editor author	pr. p.	Charleston, S. C.
1806	1893	<i>Smith E. O.</i>		pr. p.	North Yarmouth, Me.
1806	1867	* Willis N. P.	editor	narr. pr. p.	Portland, Me.
1807	1886	Adams C. F.	{ lawyer publicist	erud.	Boston, Mass.
1807	1885	Alden J.	professor	pop.	Cairo, N. Y.
1807	1834	<i>Chandler E. M.</i>	author	p.	Centre, Del.
1807	1890	Cheever G. B.	clergyman	pop.	Hallowell, Me.
1807	1898	Fay T. S.	{ diplomatist author	pr.	New York, N. Y.
1807	1862	* Felton C. C.	educator	pop.	West Newbury, Mass.
1807	1865	* Hildreth R.	journallst	erud. pub.	Deerfield, Mass.
1807	1887	Hopkins S.	clergyman	erud.	Hadley, Mass.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
Red Sweet Spring, Va.	Father, A. Alexander, 1772	clergyman	A.B.	I	Pres.	7		+	6
Plymouth, N. H.	Son, J. Hawthorne, 1846	shipmaster	A.B.	I	Cong.	3	2	+	3
New York, N. Y.	Brother, J. Abbott, 1803	clergyman { dealer in lumber lands	A.B.	I	Cong.	7	4+	+	2
Fair Haven, Conn.		farmer	A.B. G.S.	I	Cong.	7		+	10
Dorchester, Mass.								+	6
Providence, R. I.								+	7
Boston, Mass.								+	7
New York, N. Y.		shipmaster	G.S.P.		Bapt.	5	4	+	7
New Orleans, La.			A.B.	W	R.C.				
Boston, Mass.		farmer teacher	A.B.	I	Prot.	8	2	+	10
Cambridge, Mass.		professor	A.B.	I	Unit.	8		+	4
New York, N. Y.		clergyman	H.S.P.	I	Pres.			+	7
New York, N. Y.		blacksmith	G.S.P.	P	Bapt.	11		+	3
Carthage, Ill.		farmer teacher	G.S.P.	P	Pres.	9		+	6
New York, N. Y.			A.B.						
Vevay, Switzerland.			A.B.	P				+	
Wheaton, Ill.		+ farmer	A.B. A.B.	P	Pres.	2	2	+	
Brooklyn, N. Y.		physician						+	
Philadelphia, Pa.		bank clerk	G.S.P.	P	Prot.	7	5	+	0
New York, N. Y.	Brother, J. Harper, 1795	farmer carpenter	G.S.P.	I	M.E.	6	6	+	1+
Harrisburg, Pa.		judge	A.B.P.	I		3+			
New York, N. Y.				H.S.					
near Wheeling, W. Va.				A.B.	R.C.			+	6
Greenport, N. Y.				A.B.					
Charleston, S. C.		merchant	G.S.	P		2	2	+	14
Hollywood, N. C.				H.S.				+	
Cornwall, N. Y.	Sister, S. P. W. Parton, 1811	editor	A.B.	I	Cong.	9	2	+	7
Boston, Mass.	Father, J. Q. Adams, 1767	lawyer publicist	A.B.	I	Unit.	3+	3+	+	7
New York, N. Y.				A.B.				+	
Tecumseh, Mich.		farmer	G.S.	I	Friend	3	3	-	
Englewood, N. J.		printer publisher	A.B.						
Berlin, Germany.				H.S.					
Chester, Pa.			A.B.	P		3+	1	+	
Florence, Italy.		clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.				
Northampton, Mass.	Cousin, M. Hopkins, 1802		A.B.						

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1807	1864	Kendall G. W.	journalist	narr.	Amherst, N. H.
1807	1882	* Longfellow H. W.	professor	p. pr.	Portland, Me.
1807	1847	Neal J. C.	journalist	pr.	Greenland, N. H.
1807	1893	Sawyer L. A.	clergymen	pop. erud.	Pinckney, N. Y.
1807	1892	* Whittier J. G.	journalist	p. pub.	Haverhill, Mass.
1808?	1867	* Aldridge I.	actor	act.	—, U. S.
1808	1892	Barrett B. F.	clergymen	pop.	Dresden, Me.
1808	1891	Beardsley E. E.	clergymen	erud.	Stepney, Conn.
1808	1880	Boardman H. A.	clergymen	pop.	Troy, N. Y.
1808	1825	<i>Davidson L. M.</i>		p.	Plattsburg, N. Y.
1808	1890	Day H. N.	educator	pop.	New Preston, Conn.
1808	1894	Gallagher W. D.	journalist	p.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1808	1860	Gray A.	professor	pop.	Townsend, Vt.
1808	1879	Hillard G. S.	lawyer	narr. pop.	Machias, Me.
1808	1887	Palmer R.	clergymen	p.	Little Compton, R. I.
1808	1850	* Prentiss S. S.	lawyer	or.	Portland, Me.
1808	1854	Reed H.	professor	pop.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1808	1880	* Ripley G.	literary critic	pop.	Greenfield, Mass.
1808	1895	* Smith S. F.	clergymen	p.	Boston, Mass.
1809	1860	Alexander J. A.	{ clergymen professor	erud. pop.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1809	1885	* Arthur T. S.	editor	pop.	near Newburgh, N. Y.
1809	1865	<i>Conant H. O. C.</i>		pop.	Danvers, Mass.
1809	1894	Edwards T.	clergymen	pop.	Hartford, Conn.
1809	1887	Fowler O. S.	phrenologist	pop.	Cohocton, N. Y.
1809	1894	* Holmes O. W.	{ physician author	p. pr.	Cambridge, Mass.
1809	1860	* Ingraham J. H.	educator	pr. pop.	Portland, Me.
1809	1880	Irving T.	teacher	erud.	New York, N. Y.
1809	1865	* Lincoln A.	publicist	or.	Hardin Co., Ky.
1809	1894	Lord J.	author	pop.	Portsmouth, N. H.
1809	1891	Pike A.	army officer	p.	Boston, Mass.
1809	1849	* Poe E. A.	editor	pr. p.	Boston, Mass.
1809	1877	Semmes R.	naval officer	narr.	Charles Co., Md.
1809	1859	Spooner S.	dentist	erud.	Brandon, Vt.
1809	1852	Wells A. B.	publicist	p.	St. Michael's, Md.
1809	1894	Winthrop R. C.	publicist	or.	Boston, Mass.
1810	1879	Burritt E.	publicist	pop. pub.	New Britain, Conn.
1810	1873	Clark L. G.	editor	pr. pop.	Otisco, N. Y.
1810	1888	* Clarke J. F.	clergymen	pop. erud. spec.	Hanover, N. H.
1810	1858	Conrad R. T.	lawyer	dram.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1810	1889	Gilbert J. G.	actor	act.	Boston, Mass.
1810	1881	Goulding F. R.	clergymen	pr.	Midway, Ga.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
			G.S.P.						
Oak Spring, Tex.									
Cambridge, Mass.	Brother, S. Longfellow, 1819	- lawyer	A.B.	W	Unit.	8	2	+	6
Philadelphia, Pa.		- clergyman			Cong.			+	3+
Whitesboro, N. Y.		- farmer	A.B.						
Hampton Falls, N. H.		- farmer	H.S.P.	I	Friend	4	2	-	
Lodez, Poland.			A.B.					+	
New Haven, Conn.		- farmer	A.B.	W					
Philadelphia, Pa.			A.B.						
Plattsburg, N. Y.	Sister, M. M. Davidson, 1823	- physician	H.S.P.	I	Prot.	3	1	-	
New Haven, Conn.			A.B.						
Louisville, Ky.			H.S.P.	I	Prot.	4	3	+	9
Brooklyn, N. Y.			A.B.						
Boston, Mass.			A.B.						
Newark, N. J.		- judge	A.B.	I	Cong.	7		+	10
near Natchez, Miss.		- shipmaster	A.B.	I	Cong.			+	4
At sea		- lawyer	A.B.	I		2+		+	
New York, N. Y.		- merchant	A.B.	I	Prot.	10	9	+	0
Boston, Mass.			A.B.					+	1+
Princeton, N. J.	Father, A. Alexander, 1772	- clergyman	A.B.	I	Pres.	7		-	
Philadelphia, Pa.			G.S.P.						
Brooklyn, N. Y.		- clergyman		I	Bapt.			+	2+
Detroit, Mich.	Great-grandfather, J. Edwards, 1703	- lawyer	A.B.	I	Pres.			+	2+
near Sharon, Conn.	Brother, L. N. Fowler, 1811		A.B.						
Boston, Mass.	Father, A. Holmes, 1763	- clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.	5	3	+	2
Holly Springs, Miss.			A.B.					+	1+
New York, N. Y.	Uncle, W. Irving, 1783								
Washington, D. C.		- carpenter	G.S.P.	P		3	2	+	4
Stamford, Conn.		- business	A.B.	I	Cong.			+	2
Washington, D. C.			A.B.P.						
Baltimore, Md.		- merchant	A.B.P.	W		3	2	+	0
Mobile, Ala.			A.B.					+	
Plainfield, N. J.			A.B.						
Louisville, Ky.		- mechanic						+	
Boston, Mass.		- merchant	A.B.	W	P.E.	14	14	+	6
New Britain, Conn.	{ farmer shoemaker	H.S.	I	Cong.	10	10	-		
Pierpont, N. Y.			G.S.						
Jamaica Plain, Mass.	physician	A.B.	I	Cong.	3+	3	+	2+	
Philadelphia, Pa.	publisher	H.S.P.	I						
Boston, Mass.			H.S.P.	I	Prot.			+	
Roswell, Ga.	clergyman	A.B.	I	Pres.				+	

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1810	1888	Gray A.	professor	pop.	Paris, N. Y.
1810	1877	Hart J. S.	professor	pop.	Stockbridge, Mass.
1810	1850	Ossoli M. S. F.		narr. pr.	Cambridge, Mass.
1810	1860	* Parker T.	clergyman	pub. or. pop. spec.	Lexington, Mass.
1810	1876	Sears E. H.	clergyman	p. pop.	Sandisfield, Mass.
1810	1892	Sears R.	author	pop.	St. John, N. B.
1810	1879	Smith M. H.	{ journalist clergyman	pub.	Portland, Me.
1810	1872	Spalding M. J.	clergyman	pub. erud. pop.	Rolling Fork, Ky.
1810	1864	Ticknor W. D.	publisher	llb.	Lebanon, N. H.
1810	1885?	Toombs R.	publicist	or.	Wilkes Co., Ga.
1811	1900	Barnard H.	educator	pub.	Hartford, Conn.
1811	1890	Bowen F.	professor	spec. erud. pop.	Charlestown, Mass.
1811	1887	Eliot W. G.	{ clergyman educator	pop.	New Bedford, Mass.
1811	1896	Fowler L. N.	phrenologist	pop.	Cohocton, N. Y.
1811	1897	Gordon W. R.	clergyman	spec. pub.	New York, N. Y.
1811	1872	* Greeley H.	journalist	pub. erud.	Amherst, N. H.
1811	1883	Greene G. W.	professor	erud.	East Greenwich, R. I.
1811	1882	James H.	author	spec.	Albany, N. Y.
1811	1877	Jones J. S.	{ actor physician	dram.	—, U. S.
1811	1893	Kip W. I.	clergyman	pop.	New York, N. Y.
1811	1850	Osgood F. S.		p.	Boston, Mass.
1811	1872	Parton S. P. W.		pr.	Portland, Me.
1811	1893	Peabody A. P.	clergyman	pop.	Beverly, Mass.
1811	1891	Pendleton J. M.	clergyman	pub. pop.	Spotsylvania Co., Va.
1811	1884	* Phillips W.	philanthropist	or. pub.	Boston, Mass.
1811	1892	Porter N.	{ clergyman educator	pop. spec.	Farmington, Conn.
1811	1896	* Stowe H. B.	author	pub. pr.	Litchfield, Conn.
1811	1882	Street A. B.	librarian	p.	Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
1811	1874	* Sumner C.	publicist	or. pub.	Boston, Mass.
1811	1891	Thomas J.	author	erud. pop.	Cayuga Co., N. Y.
1812	1894	* Curtis G. T.	lawyer	erud.	Watertown, Mass.
1812	—	Ditson G. L.	author	narr.	Westford, Mass.
1812	1880	Frothingham R.	journalist	erud.	Charlestown, Mass.
1812	1906	Irving J. T.	lawyer	narr.	New York, N. Y.
1812	1899	MacKeller T.	type-founder	p.	New York, N. Y.
1812	1895	Mayo W. S.	author	pr.	Ogdensburg, N. Y.
1812	1893	Murdoch J. E.	actor	act.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1812	1885	* Prime S. I.	editor	narr. pop.	Baliston, N. Y.
1812	1883	Stephens A. H.	publicist	pub. or.	near Crawfordsville, Ga.
1812	1901	Thompson A. C.	clergyman	pop.	Goshen, Conn.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
Cambridge, Mass.		farmer tanner	H.S. I			8	1	+	
Philadelphia, Pa.		farmer	A.B.	P	Pres.	3		+	1
At sea		lawyer	H.S.	I		7	1	+	1
Florence, Italy.		farmer	A.B.	P	Unit.	11	11	+	0
Weston, Mass.		farmer	A.B.	I	Cong.	4		+	4
Toronto, Ont.			G.S.	I	Cong.			+	
Brooklyn, N. Y.								+	7
Baltimore, Md.					R.C.			-	
Philadelphia, Pa.		farmer	G.S.	I	Bapt.	6	1	+	7
Washington, Ga.		planter	A.B.	I		6	5	+	3
Hartford, Conn.		farmer	A.B.	W				+	
Boston, Mass.			A.B.					+	3
Pass Christian, Miss.		merchant	A.B.	P	Unit.	7		+	1+
West Orange, N. J.	Brother, O. S. Fowler, 1809		A.B.			2+		+	
Manhasset, N. Y.			A.B.						
Pleasantville, N. Y.		farmer	G.S.	P	Cong.	7	3	+	7
East Greenwich, R. I.			A.B.P.						
Boston, Mass.	Son, W. James, 1842	real estate	A.B.	W	Pres.	12		+	5
Boston, Mass.			H.S.						
San Francisco, Cal.	Brother, L. Kip, 1826	banker	A.B.	W		2+		+	2+
Hingham, Mass.		merchant						+	3
Brooklyn, N. Y.	Brother, N. P. Willis, 1806	editor	H.S.	I	Cong.	9		+	3
Boston, Mass.		teacher	A.B.	I	Unit.				
			A.B.P.						
Boston, Mass.		judge	A.B.	W	Cong.	9	8	+	0
New Haven, Conn.		clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.	2+	2	+	3+
Hartford, Conn.	Father, L. Beecher, 1775	clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.	8	6	+	7
Albany, N. Y.		lawyer	H.S.	I				+	
Washington, D. C.		lawyer	A.B.	I		9	1	+	0
New York, N. Y.		engineer	A.B.	I		2+			
			A.B.						
			H.S.						
Charlestown, Mass.	Uncle, W. Irving, 1783		H.S.P.	I	Univ.			+	5
Philadelphia, Pa.		lawyer	A.B.		P.E.			+	1+
New York, N. Y.		naval officer	H.S.P.	P				+	
Cincinnati, O.			H.S.					+	
Manchester, Vt.		bookbinder							
Atlanta, Ga.		physician	A.B.	I	Pres.	4+		+	
		farmer	A.B.	W	Pres.	8	3	+	
			A.B.P.					-	

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1812	1888	Warren W.	actor	act.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1812	1885	Wells W. H.	educator	pop.	Tolland, Conn.
1812	1859	Woodworth F. C.	{ printer author	pop.	Colchester, Conn.
1813	1900	Bartol C. A.	clergyman	pop.	Freeport, Me.
1813	1887	* Beecher H. W.	clergyman	or. pub. pop.	Litchfield, Conn.
1813	1883	Brooks C. T.	clergyman	p.	Salem, Mass.
1813	1891	Coles A.	physician	p.	Scotch Plains, N. J.
1813	1894	<i>Cooper S. F.</i>	author	narr.	Scarsdale, N. Y.
1813	1892	Cranch C. P.	artist	p.	Alexandria, Va.
1813	1895	Dana J. D.	professor	pop.	Utica, N. Y.
1813	1889	Deane C.	merchant	erud.	Biddeford, Me.
1813	1861	Douglas S. A.	publicist	or.	Brandon, Vt.
1813	1842	Eaton C. H.	actor	act.	Boston, Mass.
1813	1893	Giles C.	clergyman	pop.	Charlemont, Mass.
1813	1897	Headley J. T.	author	erud. pop.	Walton, N. Y.
1813	1874	Hirst H. B.	lawyer	p.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1813	1882	Howe J. B.		pub.	Boston, Mass.
1813	1863	Judd S.	clergyman	pub.	Westhampton, Mass.
1813	1901	Kellogg E.	clergyman	pr.	Portland, Me.
1813	1891	Lossing B. J.	{ engraver author	erud.	Beekman, N. Y.
1813	1880	Sargent E.	author	pop. pr. p. dram.	Gloucester, Mass.
1813	1886	* Stephens A. S.	author	pr.	Derby, Conn.
1813	1871	* Tuckerman H. T.	author	narr. pr.	Boston, Mass.
1813	1880	* Very J.		p.	Salem, Mass.
1813	1905	Willson M.	author	pop.	West Stockbridge, Mass.
1814	1873	* Brodhead J. R.	historian	erud.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1814	1880	Chapin E. H.	clergyman	pop.	Union Village, N. Y.
1814	1900	Codman J.	shipmaster	narr.	Dorchester, Mass.
1814	1877	Davenport E. L.	actor	act.	Boston, Mass.
1814	1894	Ellis G. E.	clergyman	erud.	Boston, Mass.
1814	1888	Gay S. H.	journalist	erud.	Hingham, Mass.
1814	1877	Hosmer W. H. C.	{ lawyer gov't official	p.	Avon, N. Y.
1814	1856	<i>Hubbell M. S.</i>		pr.	Oxford, Conn.
1814	1886	Hudson H. N.	author	erud. pop.	Cornwall, Vt.
1814	1877	* Motley J. L.	historian	erud.	Dorchester, Mass.
1814	1872	Putnam G. P.	publisher	lib. pop.	Brunswick, Me.
1814	1890	Shillaber B. P.	{ editor author	pr.	Portsmouth, N. H.
1814	1882	Smith E. P.	jurist	spec.	New York, N. Y.
1814	1863	Yancey W. L.	{ journalist publicist	or.	Warren Co., Ga.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
Boston, Mass.		- actor	H.S.						
Chicago, Ill.									
At sea	Uncle, S. Woodworth, 1785		A.B.						
Boston, Mass.									
Brooklyn, N. Y.	Father, L. Beecher, 1775	- clergyman	A.B.	P	Pres.	13	9	+	5
Newport, R. I.			A.B.	I	Unit.	5	2	+	4+
near Monterey, Cal.		- journalist	H.S.	W	Bapt.			+	2
Cooperstown, N. Y.	Father, J. F. Cooper, 1789	- author		I	P.E.	7	2	-	
Cambridge, Mass.		- jurist	A.B.	I		2+		+	1+
New Haven, Conn.		- merchant	A.B.	I	Cong.		11	+	6
Cambridge, Mass.		- physician	H.S.	I	Unit.	2+		+	6
Chicago, Ill.		- farmer	H.S.P.	I		2	2	+	2
Pittsburgh, Pa.									
Philadelphia, Pa.			A.B.P.					+	
Newburgh, N. Y.	Brother, P. C. Headley, 1819	- clergyman	A.B.					+	
Philadelphia, Pa.		- merchant		I					
Lima, Ind.		- clergyman	A.B.			2+		+	
Augusta, Me.		- merchant	A.B.	I	Cong.	6	2	+	3
Dover Plains, N. Y.		- farmer	G.S.P.	P	Friend				
Boston, Mass.			A.B.P.			2+		+	
Newport, R. I.		- manuf'turer	H.S.	I				+	2+
New York, N. Y.	Uncle, J. Tuckerman, 1778		A.B.P.	W					
Salem, Mass.		- shipmaster	A.B.	P		6	1	-	
New York, N. Y.		- clergyman	A.B.	I	D.R.				
New York, N. Y.		- artist	H.S.	I	Cong.	3	1	+	3+
Boston, Mass.		- clergyman	A.B.P.	W	Cong.				
Canton, Pa.		- hotel-keeper	H.S.	P				+	7
Boston, Mass.	{ merchant shipowner	A.B.	I		11+				
New Brighton, N. Y.	{ lawyer	A.B.P.	I		3+	2			
Avon, N. Y.	{ lawyer	A.B.							
North Stonington, Conn.		- physician						+	
Cambridge, Mass.		- farmer	A.B.		Cong.	2+			
near Dorchester, Eng.		- merchant	A.B.			8	2	+	4
New York, N. Y.		- lawyer	G.S.	I	Bapt.	5	4	+	11
Chelsea, Mass.			G.S.P.						
Rochester, N. Y.			A.B.						
near Montgomery, Ala.		- lawyer	A.B.P.	P		2	1	+	

Born	Died	Name	Occupation	Literary Fields	Place of Birth
1815	1893	<i>Baker H. N. W.</i>		pr. pop.	Andover, Mass.
1815	1891	Barrows W.	clergyman	erud.	New Braintree, Mass.
1815	1882	* Dana R. H. Jr.	lawyer	narr.	Cambridge, Mass.
1815	1896	* Doresey A. H.	author	pr.	Georgetown, D. C.
1815	1852	Downing A. J.	horticulturist	pop.	Newburgh, N. Y.
1815	1890	Flagg E.	journalist	pr.	Wiscasset, Me.
1815	1873	Foster J. W.	geologist	pop.	Brimfield, Mass.
1815	1857	* Griswold R. W.	author	pop.	Benson, Vt.
1815	1891	Kidder D. P.	clergyman	narr.	Darlen, N. Y.
1815	1890	Lester C. E.	author	erud.	Griswold, Conn.
1815	1887	* Pettingill J. H.	clergyman	spec.	Manchester, Vt.
1815	1853	* Phelps E. S.		pr.	Andover, Mass.
1815	1877	Smith H. B.	clergyman	spec. pop.	Portland, Me.
1815	1897	Stevens A.	clergyman	erud.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1816	1889	* Allibone S. A.	business	erud. pop.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1816	1850	Cooke P. P.	lawyer	p.	Martensburg, Va.
1816	1876	<i>Cushman C. S.</i>	author		Boston, Mass.
			actress	act.	
			judge	erud.	New York, N. Y.
1816	1878	Duyckink E. A.	author	erud.	New York, N. Y.
1816	1889	Dwight B. W.	educator	erud.	New Haven, Conn.
1816	1861	Eastman C. G.	editor	p.	Fryeburg, Me.
1816	1881	Fields J. T.	publisher	narr. p. pr.	Portsmouth, N. H.
1816	1904	Godwin P.	journalist	pop.	Paterson, N. J.
1816	1841	<i>Hooper L.</i>		p.	Newburyport, Mass.
1816	1893	Howe H.	historian	erud.	New Haven, Conn.
1816	1868	Jewett C. C.	librarian	lib.	Lebanon, Me.
1816	1892	* Kimball R. B.	lawyer	pr. narr.	Plainfield, N. H.
1816	1886	Lippincott J. B.	publisher	lib.	Juliustown, N. J.
1816	1897	Proctor J.	actor	act.	Marlboro, Mass.
1816	1887	* Saxe J. G.	lawyer	p.	Highgate, Vt.
1816	1898	Spencer J. A.	clergyman	pop.	Hyde Park, N. Y.
1816	1877	<i>Warfield C. A.</i>	professor	pr.	Natchez, Miss.
				lib.	New Haven, Conn.
1817	1888	Barnes A. S.	publisher	erud.	Malden, N. Y.
1817	1891	Bigelow J.	journalist	pub. narr.	Talbot Co., Md.
1817	1895	Douglass F.	philanthropist	pub.	New York, N. Y.
1817	1894	Jay J.	lawyer	pr.	Eaton, N. Y.
1817	1854	<i>Judson E. C.</i>	author	pr. dram.	Port Chester, N. Y.
1817	1889	Mathews C.	author	narr. p.	Concord, Mass.
1817	1862	* Thoreau H. D.	author		

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
Brooklyn, N. Y.	Father, L. Woods, 1774	clergyman	A.B.P.	I	Cong.	9		+	6
			A.B.						
Rome, Italy.	Father, R. H. Dana, 1787	lawyer	A.B.	I	Unit.	4		+	6
Washington, D. C. near Yonkers, N. Y.		clergyman		I	Prot.			+	3+
Fairfax Co., Va.		nurseryman	H.S.	I		5	5	+	0
Chicago, Ill.			A.B.			2		+	
New York, N. Y.		clergyman	A.B.		Unit.			+	
Evanston, Ill.			A.B.					+	
Detroit, Mich.			A.B.P.						
New Haven, Conn.		clergyman	A.B.		M.E.			+	
Boston, Mass.	Father, M. Stuart, 1780	clergyman			Cong.	9		+	3
New York, N. Y.			A.B.	I		7+		+	3+
San José, Cal.		{ merchant sup't.	A.B.					+	
Lucerne, Switzerland.					P.E.			+	2+
Clark Co. Va.	Brother, J. E. Cooke, 1830	lawyer	A.B.	I				+	
Boston, Mass.		merchant	G.S.	P		5	1	-	
Sag Harbor, N. Y.		carpenter	G.S.	P	R.C.	2	1		
New York, N. Y.		publisher	A.B.	I	P.E.	2	1	-	2+
Clinton, N. Y.	Grandfather, T. Dwight, 1752	merchant	A.B.	I				+	
Montpelier, Vt.		clergyman	A.B.	P	M.E.	6		+	2
Boston, Mass.		shipmaster	H.S.	I	Unit.	2		+	
New York, N. Y.			A.B.	P	Pres.	5		+	8
Brooklyn, N. Y.		merchant	H.S.P.	I	P.E.	4+		-	
Columbus, O.		{ publisher book-seller	H.S.	P	Cong.	7	7	+	2+
Braintree, Mass.			A.B.						
New York, N. Y.		clergyman	A.B.			3+		+	5
Philadelphia, Pa.			A.B.					+	
Boston, Mass.			H.S.P.					+	
Albany, N. Y.			A.B.					+	1+
Passaic, N. J.		surveyor	A.B.	I					
near Louisville, Ky.			A.B.P.			2+		+	
Brooklyn, N. Y.		merchant	G.S.P.	I	Pres	5	-	+	10
Anacostia, D. C.		{ farmer merchant	A.B.	I	Pres.	5		+	8
New York, N. Y.	Father, W. Jay, 1789	judge	A.B.	W	P.E.	7		+	6
Hamilton, N. Y.			H.S.P.	P	Bapt.	6	5	+	1
New York, N. Y.			A.B.						
Concord, Mass.		pencil maker	A.B.	P	Cong.	4	3	-	

Born	Died	Name	Occupation	Literary Fields	Place of Birth
1817	1882	Tomes R.	{ physician author	erud.	New York, N. Y.
1818	1882	Bennett D. R. M.	editor	pub.	Springfield, N. Y.
1818	1907	Burr E.	clergyman	pop.	Green's Farms, Conn.
1818	1901	Channing W. E.	author	p.	Boston, Mass.
1818	1896	Coxe A. C.	clergyman	p. pub. pop.	Mendham, N. J.
1818	1869	Cozzens F. S.	merchant	pr.	New York, N. Y.
1818	1891	DeLeon E.	diplomatist	narr.	Columbia, S. C.
1818	1897	Drisler H.	professor	pop.	Staten Island, N. Y.
1818	1877	<i>Ellet E. F.</i>		pop. erud. pr.	Sodus Point, N. Y.
1818	1891	Hill T.	educator	spec.	New Brunswick, N. J.
1818	1888	Jarves J. J.		narr.	Boston, Mass.
1818	1852	Jenkins J. S.	{ editor lawyer	erud.	Albany, N. Y.
1818	1909	Mathews W.	author	pop.	Waterville, Me.
1818	1881	* Morgan L. H.	lawyer	erud.	Aurora, N. Y.
1818	1887	Peferson C. J.	publisher	pop.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1818	1878	* <i>Prentiss E. P.</i>	author	pop.	Portland, Me.
1818	1885	Shaw H. W.	author	pr.	Lanesborough, Mass.
1819	1884	Abbot E.	teacher	erud.	Jackson, Me.
1819	1898	Brooks N. C.	educator	erud.	Cecil Co., Md.
1819	1897	Dana C. A.	journalist	pub. pop.	Hinsdale, N. H.
1819	1892	Durrie D. S.	librarian	erud.	Albany, N. Y.
1819	1902	English T. D.	journalist	p.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1819	1903	Headley P. C.	author	pop.	Walton, N. Y.
1819	1881	* Holland J. G.	journalist	p. pub. erud. pop. pr.	Belchertown, Mass.
1819	1910	* <i>Howe J. W.</i>		pub. p.	New York, N. Y.
1819	1904	Huntington F. D.	clergyman	pop.	Hadley, Mass.
1819	1895	Lanman C.	librarian	narr. erud. pr.	Monroe, Mich.
1819	1892	* Longfellow S.	clergyman	p.	Portland, Me.
1819	1891	* Lowell J. R.	author	p. pub. pr.	Cambridge, Mass.
1819	1891	* Melville H.	author	pr. narr.	New York, N. Y.
1819	1892	Parsons T. W.	author	p.	Boston, Mass.
1819	1899	* <i>Southworth E. D. G. N.</i>	author	pr.	Washington, D. C.
1819	1886	* Stevens H.	bibliographer	erud.	Barnet, Vt.
1819	1895	Story W. W.	artist	p. narr.	Salem, Mass.
1819	1887	Taylor B. F.	journalist	pr. p.	Lowville, N. Y.
1819	1879	Thompson J. P.	clergyman	pop.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1819	1881	Wallace W. R.	lawyer	p.	Lexington, Ky.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
Brooklyn, N. Y.			A.B.						
New York, N. Y.			G.S.						
Concord, Mass.	Uncle, W. E. Channing, 1780	physician	A.B.P.	I				+	5
Clifton Springs, N. Y.		clergyman	A.B.	I	P.E.			+	
Brooklyn, N. Y.		merchant	H.S.	I				+	
New York, N. Y.	Brother, T. C. De Leon, 1839	physician	A.B.			6	2		
New York, N. Y.			A.B.						
New York, N. Y.		physician	H.S.P.	I				+	
Waltham, Mass.		tanner	A.B.	P	Unit.	9	9	+	2+
Terasp, Switzerland.			H.S.	W					
Syracuse, N. Y.	{ miller farmer		A.B.	I	P.E.	5		+	4
Rochester, N. Y.			A.B.					+	
Philadelphia, Pa.			A.B.					+	
Dorset, Vt.	Father, E. Payson, 1783	clergyman		Cong.	8			+	3
Monterey, Cal.			A.B.P.	W				+	2+
Cambridge, Mass.			A.B.			1+	1	+	
Philadelphia, Pa.			A.B.					+	
near Glen Cove, N. Y.			A.B.P.					+	
Madison, Wis.			H.S.						
			H.S.	I					
New York, N. Y.	Brother, J. T. Headley, 1813	clergyman	H.S.					+	4
Portsmouth, R. I.		wool-carder	H.S.	P	Cong.	6		+	3
Hadley, Mass.	Daughter, L. E. Richards, 1850	banker	H.S.	W	P.E.	7		+	6
Washington, D. C.		clergyman	A.B.	I	Unit.	11		+	7
Portland, Me.	Brother, H. W. Longfellow, 1807	lawyer	A.B.	W	Unit.	5		-	
Cambridge, Mass.	Uncle, J. Lowell, 1799	clergyman	A.B.	I	Unit.	5	5	+	1
New York, N. Y.		merchant			W			+	
Scituate, Mass.			H.S.						
Washington, D. C.		teacher	H.S.	I				+	2
South Hampstead, Eng.	Brother, B. F. Stevens, 1833	{ farmer inn-keeper	A.B.	I		11	2		
Valombrosa, Italy.	Father, J. Story, 1779	jurist	A.B.	I	Unit.	7		+	2+
Cleveland, O.		educator	A.B.	I	Bapt.			+	2
Berlin, Germany.		druggist	A.B.	I	Pres.	3+		+	6
New York, N. Y.			A.B.						

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1819	1885	* Warner S.	author	pr. pop.	New York, N. Y.
1819	1886	* Whipple E. P.	{ librarian author	pr.	Gloucester, Mass.
1819	1892	* Whitman W.	{ journalist author	p.	Huntington, N. Y.
1820	1898	Allen J. H.	clergymen	pop. erud.	Northboro, Mass.
1820	1895	Ballou M. M.	journalist	pop. narr.	Boston, Mass.
1820	1905	* Bartlett J.	publisher	pop.	Plymouth, Mass.
1820	1891	Botta A. C. L.		p. pop.	Bennington, Vt.
1820	1874	Bristed C. A.	author	narr.	New York, N. Y.
1820	1893	Brockett L. P.	author	pop.	Canton, Conn.
1820	1872	Brownell H. H.	teacher	p.	Providence, R. I.
1820	1871	* Cary A.	author	p. pr.	near Cincinnati, O.
1820	1898	Dabney R. L.	{ clergymen teacher	spec. narr. pop.	Louisa Co., Va.
1820	1899	Dawson J. W.	geologist	pub.	Pictou, N. S.
1820	—	Deems C. F.	clergymen	pop.	Baltimore, Md.
1820	1892	Gayler C.	dramatist	dram.	New York, N. Y.
1820	1896	Graves I. R.	clergymen	pub.	Chester, Vt.
1820	—	Hoplin J. M.	{ clergymen educator	narr. pop.	Providence, R. I.
1820	1885	Hough F. B.	physician	erud.	Martinsburg, N. Y.
1820	1903	Hovey A.	{ clergymen educator	spec. pop.	Greene, N. Y.
1820	1857	Kane E. K.	surgeon	narr.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1820	1881	Norton J. N.	clergymen	pop. erud.	Waterloo, N. Y.
1820	1867	O'Hara T.	journalist	p.	Danville, Ky.
1820	1890	Phelps A.	clergymen	pop.	West Brookfield, Mass.
1820	1887	Poore B. P.	journalist	erud.	Newburyport, Mass.
1820	1897	Preston M. J.		p.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1820	1869	Raymond H. J.	journalist	pub.	Lima, N. Y.
1820	1895	Root G. F.	musician	p.	Sheffield, Mass.
1820	1894	* Shedd W. G. T.	{ clergymen professor	spec. erud. pop.	Acton, Mass.
1820	1898	* Thayer W. M.	{ clergymen author	pop.	Franklin, Mass.
1820	1915	Van Allstyne F. J. C.	author	p.	South East, N. Y.
1820	1888	Wallack J. J. L.	actor	dram. act.	New York, N. Y.
1820		Warner A. B.	author	pop. pr.	New York, N. Y.
1821	1906	Anderson J. J.	teacher	pop.	New York, N. Y.
1821	1882	Chester J. L.	antiquarian	erud.	Norwich, Conn.
1821	1895	Coppee H.	educator	pop.	Savannah, Ga.
1821	1907	de Peyster J. W.	historian	erud.	New York, N. Y.
1821	1890	Dexter H. M.	{ editor clergymen	erud. pub.	Plympton, Mass.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
Highland Falls, N. Y.	Sister, A. B. Warner, 1820	lawyer	H.S.	I		2+		—	
Boston, Mass.			H.S.					+	
Camden, N. J.		carpenter	G.S.	I		9	2	—	
Cambridge, Mass.		clergyman	A.B.	I	Unit.			+	5
Cairo, Egypt.	Father, H. Ballou, 1771	clergyman	H.S.	I	Univ.			+	
New York, N. Y.			H.S.P.					+	
Washington, D. C.			H.S.					+	
Brooklyn, N. Y.		clergyman	A.B.	I	P.E.	1	1	+	
East Hartford, Conn.			A.B.P.					+	
New York, N. Y.	Sister, P. Cary, 1824	physician	A.B.					+	
Victoria, Tex.		physician	G.S.P.	P	Univ.	9	4	—	
Montreal, P. Q.		farmer	A.B.					+	6
New York, N. Y.		planter	A.B.	I	Pres.	6		+	
Brooklyn, N. Y.		bookdealer	A.B.	I	Pres.	2	1	+	3+
Memphis, Tenn.		clergyman	A.B.	I	M.E.			+	6
			G.S.						
			A.B.P.						
			A.B.						
Lowville, N. Y.		physician	A.B.						
		farmer	A.B.			2+			
Philadelphia, Pa.		farmer	A.B.						
Louisville, Ky.		lawyer	A.B.P.	I	Pres.	7	1	+	3
near Guerryton, Ala.		clergyman	A.B.	I		2+			
Bar Harbor, Me.		teacher	A.B.	I	R.C.	5+		—	
Washington, D. C.		clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.			+	7
			H.S.						
Baltimore, Md.	{ educator clergyman	A.B.	I	Pres.	8	1	+	2	
New York, N. Y.	farmer	A.B.	I	Pres.	6	1	+	7	
Barley Island, Me.	tanner	G.S.P.	P	Cong.	8		+	8	
New York, N. Y.			A.B.					+	
Franklin, Mass.			A.B.					+	2+
Bridgeport, Conn.		farmer	G.S.	I	M.E.	4		+	0
Stamford, Conn.						4	1	+	4
	Sister, S. Warner, 1819	lawyer				2+		—	
London, England.		grocer	A.B.						
South Bethlehem, Pa.			H.S.P.	I					
New York, N. Y.			A.B.						
New Bedford, Mass.		lawyer	A.B.	W		1	1	+	5
		clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.			+	4

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1821	1904	<i>Diaz A. M.</i>	author	pop.	Plymouth, Mass.
1821	1898	<i>Elliot S.</i>	educator	erud. pop.	Boston, Mass.
1821	1894	<i>Poole W. F.</i>	librarian	pop.	Salem, Mass.
1821	1871	<i>Scribner C.</i>	publisher	lib.	New York, N. Y.
1821	1888	* <i>Squier E. G.</i>	journalist	narr.	Bethlehem, N. Y.
1821	1902	<i>Taylor W.</i>	clergymen	narr.	Rockbridge Co., Va.
1821	1897	<i>Trumbull J. H.</i>	librarian	erud.	Stonington, Conn.
1821	1887	<i>Youmans E. L.</i>	{ editor lecturer teacher	pop.	Coeymans, N. Y.
1822	1897	* <i>Adams W. T.</i>		pr.	Medway, Mass.
1822	1894	<i>Barrow F. E.</i>		pr.	Charleston, S. C.
1822	1905	<i>Bennett E.</i>	author	pr.	Monson, Mass.
1822	1895	<i>Calkins N. A.</i>	educator	pop.	Gainesville, N. Y.
1822	1899	<i>Cuyler T. L.</i>	clergymen	pop.	Aurora, N. Y.
1822	1888	<i>Darley F. O. C.</i>	artist	lib.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1822	1881	<i>Durant H. F.</i>	lawyer	pat.	Hanover, N. H.
1822	1907	<i>Field H. M.</i>	editor	narr.	Stockbridge, Mass.
1822	1895	<i>Frothingham O. B.</i>	clergymen	pub. pop.	Boston, Mass.
1822	1889	<i>Gardiner F.</i>	clergymen	pop.	Gardiner, Me.
1822	1903	<i>Gilmore J. R.</i>	merchant	narr.	Boston, Mass.
1822	1885	<i>Grant U. S.</i>	{ army officer publicist	narr.	Point Pleasant, O.
1822	1909	* <i>Hale E. E.</i>	clergymen	pr. narr. pop.	Boston, Mass.
1822		<i>Harkness A.</i>	professor	pop.	Blackstone, Mass.
1822		<i>Hill W. H.</i>	{ clergymen educator	pop.	near Lebanon, Ky.
1822	1898	<i>Johnston R. M.</i>	{ educator lawyer	pr.	Hancock Co., Ga.
1822	1886	<i>Judson E. Z. C.</i>	author	pr.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1822		* <i>Mitchell D. G.</i>	author	pr. narr.	Norwich, Conn.
1822	1903	<i>Olmsted F. L.</i>	landscape architect	narr.	Hartford, Conn.
1822	1903	<i>Pope W. B.</i>	{ clergymen professor	spec. pop.	Horton, N. S.
1822	1872	* <i>Read T. B.</i>	artist	p.	Chester Co., Pa.
1822	1894	<i>Strong J.</i>	professor	erud.	New York, N. Y.
1822	1885	* <i>White R. G.</i>	{ editor gov't official	pop. narr. erud.	New York, N. Y.
1823	1909	<i>Angell G. T.</i>	editor	pub.	Southbridge, Mass.
1823	1890	* <i>Boker G. H.</i>	author	p. dram.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1823	1896	<i>Coffin C. C.</i>	{ journalist author	narr. pop.	Boscawen, N. H.
1823	1838	<i>Davidson M. M.</i>		p.	Plattsburg, N. Y.
1823	1884	<i>Duganne A. J. H.</i>	author	p.	Boston, Mass.
1823	1899	<i>Eaton D. B.</i>	lawyer	pub.	Hardwick, Vt.
1823	1896	<i>Eddy D. C.</i>	clergymen	narr.	Salem, Mass.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
Beverly Farms, Mass.			A.B.P.	I	P.E.	6	+	++	2
Evanston, Ill.		tanner	A.B.	I		3+	2+	++	3
Lucerne, Switzerland		merchant	A.B.	I				++	2+
Brooklyn, N. Y.		clergyman	H.S.P.	P	M.E.			+	
Palo Alto, Cal.		farmer	G.S.						
Hartford, Conn.	Brother, H. C. Trumbull, 1830		A.B.			3+		+	1+
New York, N. Y.			A.B.			3+			
Boston, Mass.		hotel-keeper	H.S.						
New York, N. Y.		farmer	H.S.P.					+	2
New York, N. Y.		farmer	H.S.					+	
Claymont, Del.		lawyer	A.B.	I	Pres.	1	1	+	5
Wellesley, Mass.		actor	G.S.						
Stockbridge, Mass.		lawyer	A.B.		Prot.			+	1
Boston, Mass.	Uncle, A. H. Everett, 1790	clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.	7	7	+	
Middletown, Conn.		business	A.B.	I	Unit.	3+	3	+	5
Glen Falls, N. Y.			H.S.					+	
near Saratoga, N. Y.		{ farmer tanner	A.B.			6	1	+	2+
	Uncle, A. H. Everett, 1790	journalist	A.B.	I		7		+	9
		farmer	A.B.		Bapt.			+	2
			A.B.		R.C.			—	
Baltimore, Md.		planter	A.B.	W	Bapt.	6	5+	+	1+
Stamford, N. Y.		lawyer	G.S.	I				+	
		clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.			+	
Waverly, Mass.		merchant	A.B.P.	I	Prot.	8	1	+	4
					A.B.				
New York, N. Y.		farmer	G.S.	P				+	1+
Round Lake, N. Y.			A.B.	P				+	6
New York, N. Y.		merchant	A.B.		Prot.			+	1+
Boston, Mass.		clergyman	A.B.	P	Bapt.	1	1	+	0
Philadelphia, Pa.		banker	A.B.	W					
Brookline, Mass.		farmer	H.S.P.	I		3+	3+	+	0
Saratoga, N. Y.	Sister, L. M. Davidson, 1808	physician		I	Prot.	3	3	—	
New York, N. Y.				H.S.					
New York, N. Y.				A.B.					+
Oak Bluffs, Mass.				A.B.P.					

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1823	1877	Fish H. C.	clergyman	pop.	Halifax, Vt.
1823	1911	* Higginson T. W.	author	pr. pub. pop. narr.	Cambridge, Mass.
1823	1886	Hodge A. A.	clergyman	spec. pop.	Princeton, N. J.
1823	1895	Houghton H. O.	publisher	lib.	Sutton, Vt.
1823	1904	Lippincott S. J.	author	pr. narr.	Pompey, N. Y.
1823	1893	Nell E. D.	{ clergyman educator	erud.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1823	1893	* Parkman F.	historian	erud. narr.	Boston, Mass.
1823	1904	* Seiss J. A.	clergyman	pop. spec.	Graceham, Md.
1823	1883	Smucker S. M.	{ lawyer author	pop.	New Market, Va.
1824	1899	Adams F. G.	librarian	lib.	Rodman, N. Y.
1824	1871	* Cary P.	author	p.	near Cincinnati, O.
1824	1889	Cox S. S.	publicist	narr.	Zanesville, O.
1824	1892	* Curtis G. W.	{ editor author	pub. narr. pr.	Providence, R. I.
1824	1863	King T. S.	clergyman	or. pop. pr.	New York, N. Y.
1824	1904	Kirk J. F.	author	pop. .	Frederickton, N. B.
1824	1893	Larcom L.	teacher	p.	Beverly, Mass.
1824	1903	Leland C. G.	{ journalist author	p. erud. pr.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1824	1880	Levits E. A. B. R.		p. dram.	near Baltimore, Md.
1824	1899	Moore C. J.		pr.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1824	1892	Shea J. D. G.	author	erud. pop.	New York, N. Y.
1824	1906	Whitney A. D. T.		pr.	Boston, Mass.
1824	1891	Winchell A.	{ educator geologist	pop.	North East, N. Y.
1825	1883	Baker W. M.	clergyman	pr.	Washington, D. C.
1825	1902	Butler W. A.	lawyer	p.	Albany, N. Y.
1825	1896	Child F. J.	professor	pop. erud.	Boston, Mass.
1825	1913	Dorr J. S. C.		p.	Charleston, S. C.
1825	1901	Fletcher J. C.	clergyman	narr.	Indianapolis, Ind.
1825	1901	Hall F.	philologist	erud.	Troy, N. Y.
1825	1909	* Lea H. C.	publisher	erud.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1825		Pike M. H. G.		pr.	Eastport, Me.
1825	1904	Shields C. W.	{ clergyman editor	spec.	New Albany, Ind.
1825	1908	Spoofford A. R.	librarian	lib.	Gilmanton, N. H.
1825	1903	* Stoddard R. H.		p.	Hingham, Mass.
1825	1878	* Taylor E.	author	narr. p. pr.	Kennett Square, Pa.
1826	1878	Bowles S.	journalist	pub. narr.	Springfield, Mass.
1826	1890	Brace C. L.	philanthropist	pub.	Litchfield, Conn.
1826	1891	Crosby H.	clergyman	pop.	New York, N. Y.
1826	1906	De Forest J. W.	author	pr.	Seymour, Conn.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
Newark, N. J.		clergyman	A.B.	I	Bapt.	12			4
Cambridge, Mass.		merchant	A.B.	I	Unit.	11			2
Princeton, N. J.	Father, C. Hodge, 1797	clergyman	A.B.	I	Pres.				
North Andover, Mass.	Great-grandfather, J. Edwards, 1703		A.B.			2+			
St. Paul, Minn.		physician	H.S.	I		11	10	+	1
Jamaica Plain, Mass.		physician	A.B.	I	Pres.	2+		+	5
Gettysburg, Pa.		clergyman	A.B.	W	Unit.	6	2	+	3
Philadelphia, Pa.	Father, S. S. Schmucker, 1799	farmer	A.B.P.	P	Morav.			+	
Topeka, Kans.		clergyman	A.B.	I	Luth.	2+			
Newport, R. I.	Sister, A. Cary, 1820	farmer	A.B.	I	Cong.	9		+	10
New York, N. Y.		farmer	G.S.P.	P	Univ.	9	6	-	
Livingston, N. Y.			A.B.					+	
San Francisco, Cal.		banker	H.S.P.	I	Unit.	5+	2	+	2+
Philadelphia, Pa.		clergyman	H.S.P.	P	Univ.			+	
Boston, Mass.		ship-owner	H.S.	I	P.E.	6		+	4
Florence, Italy.		ship-master	H.S.	P	Cong.	9	8	-	
London, England.		merchant	A.B.	I	P.E.	2+		+	
London, England.		planter	A.B.P.	W				+	
Elizabeth, N. J.		scientist	H.S.	I				+	3
	Brother, G. F. Train, 1829	teacher	A.B.	I	R.C.			+	
Ann Arbor, Mich.		ship-owner	H.S.	I		4+		+	
South Boston, Mass.			A.B.			2+		+	
Yonkers, N. Y.		clergyman	A.B.	I	Pres.			+	
Boston, Mass.		lawyer	A.B.					+	
	{ quarry-operator	sail-maker	A.B.					+	
				W		1	1	+	
								+	
								1+	
								3+	
								+	3
								+	2+
Newport, R. I.			A.B.					+	
Holderness, N. H.		clergyman	H.S.	I				+	1+
New York, N. Y.		ship-master	G.S.					+	
Berlin, Germany.		farmer	H.S.	P	Friend	10	4	+	1+
Springfield, Mass.		journalist	H.S.	I	Unit.	5	3	+	7
St. Moritz, Switzerland.			A.B.	I	Cong.	4		+	
New York, N. Y.		land-owner	A.B.	W				+	
			A.B.P.	I					

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1826	Denison M. A.	author	pr.	Cambridge, Mass.	
1826	1864 * Foster S. C.	balladist	p.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	
1826	1901 Kip L.	lawyer	pr.	New York, N. Y.	
1826	1881 Quackenbos G. P.	educator	pop.	New York, N. Y.	
1826	1903 Smith C. H.	{ lawyer planter	pr.	Lawrenceville, Ga.	
1826	1894 * Whitney W. D.	professor	erud. pop.	Northampton, Mass.	
1827	1905 Atkinson E.	corporation officer	pub.	Brookline, Mass.	
1827	Bascom J.	professor	pop.	Genoa, N. Y.	
1827	Bates S. P.	{ educator author	erud.	Mendon, Mass.	
1827	1879 Beers E. E.		p.	Goshen, N. Y.	
1827	1894 Cooke J. P.	chemist	pop.	Boston, Mass.	
1827	1866 * Cummins M. S.		pr.	Salem, Mass.	
1827	1908 Dix M.	clergyman	pop.	New York, N. Y.	
1827	1910 * Eddy M. B. G.	religious leader	spec. pub. pop.	Bow, N. H.	
1827	1909 Fisher G. P.	{ clergyman professor	spec. erud. pop.	Wrentham, Mass.	
1827	1887 Hope J. B.	lawyer	p.	Norfolk, Va.	
1827	1908 Norton C. E.	professor	erud. pop.	Cambridge, Mass.	
1827	Nott C. C.	lawyer	narr.	Schenectady, N. Y.	
1827	Robinson S. T. D.		pub.	Belchertown, Mass.	
1827	1910 * Rolfe W. J.	{ teacher author	pop.	Newburyport, Mass.	
1827	1916 * Trowbridge J. T.	author	pr. p.	Ogden, N. Y.	
1827	1910 Victor O. J.	{ editor author	pop.	Sandusky, O.	
1827	1905 * Wallace L.	lawyer	pr.	Brookville, Ind.	
1828	1887 Baird C. W.	clergyman	erud.	Princeton, N. J.	
1828	1898 Blackburn W. M.	{ clergyman educator	erud.	Carlisle, Pa.	
1828	Browne W. H.	{ author teacher	erud.	Baltimore, Md.	
1828	1890 Bunce O. B.	editor	pop. pr.	New York, N. Y.	
1828	1911 Corson H.	professor	pop.	Philadelphia, Pa.	
1828	1885 Drake F. S.		erud.	Northwood, N. H.	
1828	1909 Finley M.		pop. pr.	Chillicothe, O.	
1828	1863 Haven A. B.		pop.	Hudson, N. Y.	
1828	1909 McClure A. K.	journalist	pub.	Perry Co., Pa.	
1828	Moore F.	author	pop.	Concord, N. H.	
1828	1872 Pollard E. A.	journalist	erud.	Nelson Co., Va.	
1828	1904 Rankin J. E.	clergyman	p.	Thornton, N. H.	
1828	1898 * Wells D. A.	economist	pop. pub. spec.	Springfield, Mass.	

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
New York, N. Y.		merchant	H.S.P. A.B.P.	I		3+	3+	++	1
	Brother, W. I. Kip, 1811	banker	A.B.	W		2+			
New London, N. H.		physician	A.B.	I	D.R.	2		+	5
			A.B.					+	10
New Haven, Conn.		banker	A.B.	I	Cong.	7		+	6
Boston, Mass.			H.S.P.	I				+	7
Williamstown, Mass.		clergyman	A.B.	P	Cong.	5		+	5
Meadville, Pa.		{ farmer mill-owner	A.B.	I	Bapt.	6		+	7
Orange, N. J.								+	
Newport, R. I.		lawyer	A.B.			2	1	++	
Dorchester, Mass.		judge	H.S.					++	
	Father, J. A. Dix, 1798	publicist	A.B.						
Brookline, Mass.		farmer	H.S.	I	Cong.	6	6	+	1
			A.B.					+	4
Norfolk, Va.		land-owner	A.B.	W				++	
Cambridge, Mass.	Father, A. Norton, 1786	{ professor scholar	A.B.	I	Unit.	6	3	+	6
		professor	A.B.	I	Pres.	12		+	4
		lawyer	H.S.	I				+	
Oak Bluffs, Mass.		{ hatter trunk-maker	A.B.P.	P	Cong.	3		+	3
		farmer	H.S.P.	I	Pres.	10		+	5
								+	
Rye, N. Y.	Father, R. Baird, 1798	lawyer	A.B.P.	I				+	
		clergyman	A.B.	I	Pres.	8			
			A.B.					+	1
Baltimore, Md.		merchant	A.B.P.	I	M.E.	1	1	+	7
New York, N. Y.				H.S.					
Ithaca, N. Y.		farmer	H.S.	I	Friend	7		+	4
Washington, D. C.	Father, S. G. Drake, 1798	book-seller	H.S.	I		2+	1		
		physician	H.S.	I					
		clergyman	H.S.	I	Bapt.	4	3	+	3+
		farmer	G.S.					+	
Lynchburg, Va.			H.S.	I		2+			
			A.B.			2+			
Norwich, Conn.			A.B.					+	1

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1828	1861	* Winthrop T.	lawyer	pr.	New Haven, Conn.
1829	1894	Childs G. W.	{ publisher journalist	llb.	Baltimore, Md.
1829	1909	Helper H. R.		pub.	near Mocksville, N. C.
1829	1905	* Jefferson J.	actor	act.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1829	1893	<i>Lamb M. J. R. N.</i>	author	erud.	Plainfield, Mass.
1829	1899	Miller L.	manufacturer	pat.	Greentown, O.
1829	1914	* Mitchell S. W.	physician	pr. p.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1829	1892	Smith R.	publisher	llb.	Lebanon, Conn.
1829	1867	* Timrod H.	author	p.	Charleston, S. C.
1829	1908	Townsend T. S.	business	erud.	New York, N. Y.
1829	1904	Train G. F.	promoter	pub.	Boston, Mass.
1829	1900	* Warner C. D.	{ journalist editor	pr. narr. pop.	Plainfield, Mass.
1830	1895	<i>Bowers E. C.</i>	actress	act.	Stamford, Conn.
1830	1903	Brooks N.	{ journalist author	pr.	Castine, Me.
1830	1886	* Cooke J. E.	author	pr. narr. erud.	Winchester, Va.
1830	1886	<i>Dickinson E. E.</i>		p.	Amherst, Mass.
1830	1901	Egle W. H.	{ physician librarian	erud.	Harrisburg, Pa.
1830	1866	Hayne P. H.	author	p.	Charleston, S. C.
1830	1894	Kirkland J.	lawyer	pr.	Geneva, N. Y.
1830	1905	Perry A. L.	teacher	pop.	Lyme, N. H.
1830		<i>Terhune M. V.</i>	author	pr.	Amelia Co., Va.
1830	1903	Trumbull H. C.	editor	pop.	Stonington, Conn.
1830	1908	<i>Wister A. L.</i>	author	pop.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1830	1875	Wright C.	mathematician	spec.	Northampton, Mass.
1831	1894	* Austin J. G.		pr.	Worcester, Mass.
1831	1895	Badeau A.	army officer	narr.	New York, N. Y.
1831		Baxter J. P.	{ manufacturer banker	erud.	Gorham, Me.
1831	1889	<i>Booth M. L.</i>	author	erud. pop.	Yaphank, N. Y.
1831	1912	Brooks E.	educator	pop.	Stony Point, N. Y.
1831	1913?	Clark G. W.	clergymen	pop.	South Orange, N. J.
1831	1910	<i>Davis R. B. H.</i>		pr. pop.	Washington, Fa.
1831	1905	* Dodge M. M.	editor	pr.	New York, N. Y.
1831	1901	* Donnelly I.	publicist	pub.	Philadelphia, Pa.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
Great Bethel, Va.	Uncle, T. D. Woolsey, 1801		A.B.			1+			
Philadelphia, Pa.			G.S.					+	
Washington, D. C.			H.S.					+	
New York, N. Y.		actor						+	
New York, N. Y.			H.S.					+	
Philadelphia, Pa.		builder	H.S.	I				+	
New York, N. Y.	Uncle, R. C. Smith, 1797	physician	A.B.P.	I P.E.		2+		+	11
Columbia, S. C.		teacher	A.B.	I		2	1	+	3
		book-binder	A.B.P.	P		3+		+	
		lawyer	H.S.					+	1
Sister, A. D. T. Whitney, 1824		ship-owner	G.S.	I M.E.		4		+	4
Hartford Conn.		farmer	A.B.	I		4+		+	
Washington, D. C.		clergyman		P.E.				+	
		ship-builder	H.S.	I Cong.				+	
near Boyce, Va.	Brother, P. P. Cooke, 1816	lawyer	G.S.	I				+	3
Amherst, Mass.		college treasurer	A.B.	I				-	
			H.S.					+	
Augusta, Ga.	Uncle, R. Y. Hayne, 1791	naval officer	A.B.	W		1	1	+	1
Chicago, Ill.	Mother, C. M. S. Kirkland, 1801	educator	H.S.P.	I Unit.		2		+	4
Williamstown, Mass.		clergyman	A.B.	P Cong.		4		+	7
		merchant	A.B.	W Pres.		8		+	6
	Brother, J. H. Trumbull, 1821		H.S.P.			3+		+	
Cambridge, Mass.		clergyman	H.S.P.	I Unit.		4		+	
Roxbury, Mass.		trader	A.B.	I				-	
Ridgewood, N. J.		lawyer	H.S.					+	3
			H.S.					+	
New York, N. Y.		physician	H.S.	I Cong.		6		+	11
		teacher	H.S. A.B.P.			2+		-	
			A.B.	Bapt.				+	
Onteora, N. Y.		professor scientist	H.S.	I Unit.		7		+	4
	Brother, E. C. Donnelly, 1838	physician	H.S.	I R.C.		4		+	3

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1831	1891	Florence W. J.	actor	act.	Albany, N. Y.
1831	1908	Gilman D. C.	educator	pat. erud.	Norwich, Conn.
1831	1912	Goodwin W. W.	professor	pop.	Concord, Mass.
1831		Hammond E. P.	evangelist	pop.	Ellington, Conn.
1831	1885	* Jackson H. H.		p. pr.	Amherst, Mass.
1831	1893	Jones C. C.	lawyer	erud.	Savannah, Ga.
1831		Miller H. M.		narr.	Auburn, N. Y.
1831		Peloubet F. N.	clergyman	pop.	New York, N. Y.
1831		Rice E. W.	{ editor author	pop.	Gloversville, N. Y.
1831	1885	Victor M. V.	author	pr. pub.	Erie, Pa.
1831	1902	Ward C. O.	gov't. official	erud.	Jollet, Ill.
1831	1869	Watson H. C.	journalist	pop.	Baltimore, Md.
1831	1897	* Winsor J.	librarian	erud.	Boston, Mass.
1832	1888	* Alcott L. M.	author	pr.	Germantown, Pa.
1832		Allen E. A.		p.	Strong, Me.
1832	1906	Baird H. M.	professor	erud.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1832		* Bancroft H. H.	{ historian publisher	erud. lib.	Granville, O.
1832	1907	* Conway M. D.	clergyman	pop. erud.	Stafford Co., Va.
1832	1896	Perry N.		p.	Dudley, Mass.
1832	1898	Perry W. S.	clergyman	erud.	Providence, R. I.
1832	1902	Talmage T. D.	clergyman	pop.	Bound Brook, N. J.
1832	1801	Townsend M. A.	author	p.	Lyons, N. Y.
1832		Vincent J. H.	clergyman	pat.	Tuscaloosa, Ala.
1832		* White A. D.	educator	erud.	Homer, N. Y.
1832	1884	Work H. C.	printer	p.	Middletown, Conn.
1833	1893	* Booth E.	actor	act.	Bel Air, Md.
1833	1879	Clarke J. S.	actor	act.	Baltimore, Md.
1838	1906	Clarke R. S.		pr.	Norridgewock, Me.
1833	1896	* Dodge M. A.	author	pr. pub.	Hamilton, Mass.
1833	1905	Drake S. A.	author	erud.	Boston, Mass.
1833	1912	* Furness H. H.	{ lawyer author	erud.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1833	1899	* Ingersoll R. G.	{ lawyer lecturer	pub. or.	Dresden, N. Y.
1833	1888	Locke D. R.	journalist	pub. pr.	Vestal, N. Y.
1833	1903	McCrady E.	lawyer	erud.	Charleston, S. C.
1833	1913	Miller E. C. H.	editor	pop.	Brooklyn, N. Y.
1833		Morris C.	author	pop.	Chester, Pa.
1833	1908	* Stedman E. C.	{ author editor	p. pop.	Hartford, Conn.
1833	1902	Stevens B. F.	publisher	erud.	Barnet, Vt.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
Philadelphia, Pa.			G.S.	P	R.C.	7	1	++	2
Norwich, Conn.		- manufacturer	A.B.	I	Cong.	9	5	+	2
		- clergyman	A.B.	I					
			A.B.						
San Francisco, Cal.		- professor	H.S.	I				+	2
near Augusta, Ga.		- clergyman	A.B.	I	Pres.			+	4
		- banker	H.S.	I	Cong.	4		+	
			A.B.						
Hohokus, N. J.		{ farmer	A.B.	I	Prot.		5	+	5
		{ manufacturer	H.S.	I			3	+	
Yuma, Ariz.	Brother, L. F. Ward, 1841	- farmer	A.B.P.	I	M.E.	8		+	3
Sacramento, Cal.		- merchant	A.B.	W	Unit.	5	2	+	
Cambridge, Mass.		- teacher	H.S.	P		5	2	-	1+
Concord, Mass.	Father, A. B. Alcott, 1799	- clergyman	A.B.	I	Pres.	8			
		- farmer	H.S.P.	I				+	
Dudley, Mass.		- judge	A.B.	I	M.E.	3	2	+	4
Dubuque, Ia.		- merchant	H.S.P.	I				-	
Washington, D. C.			A.B.						
Galveston, Tex.		- farmer	A.B.P.	I	D.R.	12	12	+	3+
		- merchant	A.B.P.	I	M.E.	9		+	1
		- banker	A.B.	I	P.E.	2		+	6
Hartford, Conn.		- actor	G.S.						
New York, N. Y.			G.S.	I		10	7	+	1
London, England.			G.S.					-	
		- farmer	H.S.		Cong.	7	7	-	
Wallingford, Pa.	Father, S. G. Drake, 1798	- book-seller	H.S.	I		2+			
Dobb's Ferry, N. Y.	Father, W. H. Furness, 1802	- clergyman	A.B.	I	Unit.	4	2	+	4
Toledo, O.		- clergyman	H.S.P.	I	Cong.	2+		+	2
		- journalist	G.S.P.	P	M.E.			+	3
		- lawyer	A.B.			8+	2	+	
		- physician	A.B.	I				+	4
New York, N. Y.		{ marble-cutter	G.S.P.	I	M.E.	11		-	
		{ hotel-keeper							
		- lawyer	A.B.	I	Prot.		3	+	4
Surbiton, Eng.	Brother, H. Stevens, 1819	{ farmer	A.B.P.	I		11	10	+	
		{ inn-keeper							

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1833	1911	Thompson D.	actor	act. dram.	Girard, Pa.
1833		* <i>Tincker M. A.</i>	author	pr.	Ellsworth, Me.
1833		<i>Ward G.</i>	actress	act.	New York, N. Y.
1833		Warren W. F.	{ educator author	erud. pub.	Williamsburgh, Mass.
1834	1877	Adams E.	actor	act.	Medford, Mass.
1834	1899	* <i>Alger H. Jr.</i>	clergyman	pr.	Revere, Mass.
1834	1865	Arnold G.	author	p.	New York, N. Y.
1834	1867	* <i>Browne C. F.</i>	humorist	pr.	Waterford, Me.
1834		Champlin J. D.	{ author editor	pop.	Stonington, Conn.
1834		<i>Clement C. E.</i>		erud. pop.	St. Louis, Mo.
1834		Gibbons J.	clergyman	pub.	Baltimore, Md.
1834		<i>Harris M. C.</i>		pr.	Dosoris, N. Y.
1834	1907	<i>Holmes M. J.</i>		pr.	Brookfield, Mass.
1834		Hosmer J. K.	{ professor librarian	pop. erud.	Northfield, Mass.
1834	1903	Hurst J. F.	clergyman	erud. pop.	Dorchester Co., Md.
1834	1902	Osmun T. E.	author	pop.	Montrose, O.
1834	1902	* Stockton F. R.	{ editor author	pr.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1834		Vincent M. R.	{ clergyman professor	pop.	Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
1835		Abbott L.	{ clergyman editor	pop.	Roxbury, Mass.
1835	1915	Adams C. F.	lawyer	erud.	Boston, Mass.
1835	1902	* Adams C. K.	professor	erud. pop.	Derby, Vt.
1835	1893	Brooks P.	clergyman	or. pop.	Boston, Mass.
1835	1910	* Clemens S. L.	author	pr.	Florida, Mo.
1835	1898	<i>Dahlgren M. V.</i>		pr.	Gallipolis, O.
1835	1896	Knox T. W.	journalist	narr. pr.	Pembroke, N. H.
1835	1868	<i>Menken A. I.</i>	actress	act.	near New Orleans, La.
1835	1908	<i>Moulton L. C.</i>		p. pr.	Pomfret, Conn.
1835	1909	Newcomb S.	astronomer	pop.	Wallace, N. S.
1835		Piatt J. J.	gov't. official	p.	Rising Sun, Ind.
1835		<i>Spoofford H. P.</i>	author	pr. p.	Calais, Me.
1835		Stoddard W. O.	{ author journalist	pr.	Homer, N. Y.
1835	1908	Stone W. L. Jr.	journalist	erud.	New York, N. Y.
1835	1907	Tilton T.	journalist	p. pr.	New York, N. Y.
1835	1900	Tyler M. C.	professor	erud.	Griswold, Conn.
1835		<i>Wilson A. J. E.</i>	author	pr.	Columbus, Ga.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
West Swanzey, N. H.		- carpenter	I					+	2+
Boston, Mass.		{ prison- warden	H.S.P.	I	Cong.	12		-	
		- planter				1	1	+	7+
		{ builder- farmer	A.B.	I	M.E.	6		+	4
Philadelphia, Pa.		- clergyman	A.B.		Unit.			+	
Natick, Mass.			G.S.P.					+	
Strawberry Farms, N. J.		- surveyor	G.S.	P				-	
Southampton, England.		- contractor	A.B.	I	Cong.	5		+	1
			H.S.P.					+	5
			A.B.		R.C.			+	
			H.S.	I	P.E.	5		+	3
	Uncle, J. Hawes, 1789		G.S.					+	
		- clergyman	A.B.	I	Unit.	7		+	7
			A.B.					+	
New York, N. Y.			A.B.P.					+	
Washington, D. C.	Brotuer, J. D. Stockton, 1836		H.S.			3+		+	
		- clergyman	A.B.	I	M.E.	4		+	4
	Father, J. Abbott, 1803	- clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.	5	3	+	6
	Father, C. F. Adams, 1807	{ lawyer publicist	A.B.			4+	2+	+	
		- farmer	A.B.	P	Pres.			+	0
		- merchant	A.B.	I	P.E.	6	2	-	
		- merchant	G.S.	P		6	5	+	3+
			H.S.					+	5
Pasadena, Cal.			H.S.	P				+	
Boston, Mass.					Jewish	2+		+	
Redding, Conn.			H.S.					+	
Washington, D. C.								+	
New York, N. Y.								+	
Paris, France.								+	
Boston, Mass.								+	
		- teacher	A.B.					+	
		- farmer	A.B.	I	Pres.	10		+	8
		{ lumber- merchant	H.S.	I	Unit.	6	1	+	1
		- lawyer						+	
		{ publisher book-seller	A.B.	I	Bapt.	6		+	6
	Father, W. L. Stone, 1792	- journalist	A.B.	I				+	4
			A.B.					+	
			A.B.					+	
Paris, France.			H.S.P.	I	M.E.	8		+	
Ithaca, N. Y.								+	2
Mobile, Ala.		- cotton- factor						+	0

Born	Died	Name	Occupation	Literary Fields	Place of Birth
1836		Alden H. M.	editor	pr.	Mt. Tabor, Vt.
1836	1907	* Aldrich T. B.	author	p. pr.	Portsmouth, N. H.
1836		Delmar A.	economist	erud. spec.	New York, N. Y.
1836	1867	Dorgan J. A.	lawyer	p.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1836		Gladden W.	clergyman	pop.	Pott's Grove, Pa.
1836	1913	* Larned J. N.	librarian	pop.	Chatham, Ont.
1836		Lewis A. H.	clergyman	pub.	Scott, N. Y.
1836	1901	Newell R. H.	journalist	pr.	New York, N. Y.
1836	1887	O'Brien J.	actor	act.	Buffalo, N. Y.
1836		Piatt S. M. B.		p.	near Lexington, Ky.
1836	1903	Robson S.	actor	act.	Annapolis, Md.
1836	1886	Steele J. D.	{ teacher author	pop.	Lima, N. Y.
1836	1877	Stockton J. D.	journalist	dram.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1836	1894	* Thaxter C.		p.	Portsmouth, N. H.
1836		Townsend V. F.		pr.	New Haven, Conn.
1836		Venable W. H.	teacher	p.	near Waynesville, O.
1836	1900	Whitmore W. H.	merchant	erud.	Dorchester, Mass.
1836		Winter W.	author	pr. narr. p.	Gloucester, Mass.
1837		Alden W. L.	journalist	pr.	Williamstown, Mass.
1837	1902	Bourinot J. G.	journalist	erud.	Sidney, N. S.
1837	1899	* Brinton D. G.	{ ethnologist surgeon	erud.	Thornbury, Pa.
1837		* Burroughs J.	naturalist	narr. p.	Roxbury, N. Y.
1837	1880	DeMille J.	professor	pr.	St. John, N. B.
1837		Douglas A. M.		pr.	New York, N. Y.
1837	1902	* Eggleston E.	{ clergyman author	pr. pop.	Vevay, Ind.
1837	1909	Gilman A.	educator	pop.	St. Louis, Mo.
1837	1898	Halsey H. P.		pr.	New York, N. Y.
1837	1907	Hays W. S.	journalist	p.	Louisville, Ky.
1837	1900	Hinsdale B. A.	educator	erud. pop.	Wadsworth, O.
1837		* Howells W. D.	{ editor author	pr. narr. p.	Martin's Ferry, O.
1837	1899	* Moody D. L.	evangelist	pub. pop.	Northfield, Mass.
1837	1913	Morgan J. P.	financeer	pat.	Hartford, Conn.
1837	1911	Pierson A. T.	{ clergyman author	pop.	New York, N. Y.
1837	1903	Rand E. A.	clergyman	pr.	Portsmouth, N. H.
1837		Walworth J. R.		pr.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1837	1873	Walworth M. T.	author	pr.	Albany, N. Y.
1838		Adams H.	{ educator historian	erud.	Boston, Mass.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
Boston, Mass.		+ merchant gov't.-official	A.B. H.S. A.B.P.	P I I	H.F.	3	1	+	2+ 7
Philadelphia, Pa.		teacher	A.B. H.S.	I	Prot.	2		+	4 3
Westerly, R. I.		+ farmer	A.B. H.S.	I	S.D.B.	2		+	6
Brooklyn, N. Y.		+ manuf'turer	G.S. A.B.P.	I				+	1+
Evansville, Ind.			G.S.				2+	+	8
Elmira, N. Y.		+ clergyman	A.B.		M.E.				
Philadelphia, Pa.	Brother, F. R. Stockton, 1834		H.S.			3+			
Isles of Shoals, N. H.		{ light-house keeper	H.S.P.					+	3+
Boston, Mass.		{ surveyor farmer merchant ship-master professor	A.B. H.S.P. A.B. A.B. A.B.	I P I	Unit.	5		+	8 1 5
Atlantic City, N. J.		+ farmer	A.B.		Friend			+	2
Halifax, N. S.		+ farmer	G.S.P.	I	Bapt.	11		+	1
Lake George, N. Y.	Brother, G. C. Egglesston, 1839	+ lawyer + business	A.B.P. H.S.	P	M.E.	4		+	4 7
Brooklyn, N. Y.			A.B.					+	3+
Atlanta, Ga.		+ farmer + printer + editor	A.B. G.S.P. G.S.P.	I I	Disc. Swed.	5 9		+	3 3
Northfield, Mass.		+ brick-maker + mason	G.S.P.	P	Unit.	9		+	3
Rome, Italy.	Grandfather, J. Pierpont, 1785	+ banker	A.B.	W				+	4
Brooklyn, N. Y.		{ confidential clerk and salesman	A.B.	P	Pres.	12		+	7
Watertown, Mass.			A.B.					+	5
New York, N. Y.	Father, C. F. Adams, 1807	+ educator + jurist { lawyer publicist	H.S.P. A.B. A.B.	I I I	Unit.	4+	3+	+	2+

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1838	1891	* Barrett L.	actor	act.	Paterson, N. J.
1838	1876	* Bliss P. P.	vocalist	p.	Clearfield Co., Pa.
1838	1901	Cook J.	lecturer	pop.	Ticonderoga, N. Y.
1838	1872	<i>Crane A. M.</i>		pr.	Baltimore, Md.
1838	1899	Daly A.	theatre-manager	dram.	Plymouth, N. C.
1838	1913	* Didier E. L.	author	erud.	Baltimore, Md.
1838		<i>Donnelly E. C.</i>		p.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1838		<i>Foster T. T.</i>		pop.	
1838	1905	Hay J.	publicist	p. narr. erud.	Oneida Castle, N. Y.
1838		<i>Proctor E. D.</i>		p.	Salem, Ind.
1838	1888	* Roe E. P.	{ clergymen author	pr.	Henniker, N. H.
1838	1912	<i>Sangster M. E.</i>	editor	pop. p.	New Windsor, N. Y.
1838	1902	Scudder H. E.	author	pop. pr.	New Rochelle, N. Y.
1838		Smith F. H.	engineer	pr. narr.	Boston, Mass.
1838	1905	* Tourgee A. W.	jurist	pub. pr.	Baltimore, Md.
1838		Townsend L. T.	{ clergymen author	pop.	Williamsfield, O.
1839	1905	Butterworth H.	editor	narr. pop. pr.	Orono, Me.
1839		<i>Campbell H. S.</i>	author	pop. narr. pr.	Warren, R. I.
1839	1914	De Leon T. C.	journalist	pr. dram.	Lockport, N. Y.
1839		* Denison G. T.	lawyer	erud.	Camden, S. C.
1839	1911	Eggleson G. C.	journalist	pr.	Toronto, Ont.
1839	1912	Funk I. K.	publisher	lib. erud.	Vevay, Ind.
1839	1897	* George H.	journalist	pub. spec.	Clifton, O.
1839	1902	* Harte F. B.	journalist	pr. p.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1839	1901	Herne J. A.	actor	dram.	Albany, N. Y.
1839	1896	Mayo F.	actor	act.	West Troy, N. Y.
1839	1908	Randall J. R.	journalist	p.	Boston, Mass.
1839	1888	Ryan A. J.	clergyman	p.	Baltimore, Md.
1839	1898	<i>Willard F. E.</i>	reformer	pop.	Norfolk, Va.
1840	1904	Chadwick J. W.	clergyman	p. pop.	Churchville, N. Y.
1840		Cox P.	{ artist author	p. pr.	Marblehead, Mass.
1840	1906	Curtin J.	{ philologist author	pop. erud.	Granby, P. Q.
1840	1898	Eagleson T. R.	actor	act.	Milwaukee, Wis.
1840		Ellis E. S.	author	pr. pop.	New York, N. Y.
1840		Holt H.	publisher	lib. pop.	Geneva, O.
1840		Johnson R.	editor	pop.	Baltimore, Md.
1840	1891	Maeder F. G.	actor	dram.	Rochester, N. Y.
1840	1914	* Mahan A. T.	naval officer	erud.	New York, N. Y.
1840		Miller J. R.	clergyman	pop.	West Point, N. Y.
1840		Morse J. T.	lawyer	erud.	Frankfort Springs, Pa.
					Boston, Mass.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
New York, N. Y. near Ashtabula, O.		- mechanic - farmer - farmer	G.S.P. H.S.P. A.B.	P P	Prot.	2+		+	5
Stuttgart, Germany.			H.S.P.					+	
Paris, France.			H.S.P.					+	
Baltimore, Md.			A.B.P.	I	R.C.	5	1	+	10
	Brother, I. Donnelly, 1831	- physician - physician - physician	A.B.P. A.B.P. A.B.P. A.B. A.B.P.	I I	R.C. Prot.	4		+	2+
Cornwall, N. Y.			A.B.P.	I	Pres.	6	5	+	3+
Cambridge, Mass.		- merchant - farmer - mechanic	A.B. A.B. A.B.	I I P	Cong. M.E.	5		+	1+
		- lawyer	A.B.P. A.B.P.	I	P.E.	3		+	2
Mobile, Ala.	Brother, E. De Leon, 1818	- physician - lawyer	A.B. A.B.	I I	P.E.	6	3	-	1
New York, N. Y.	Brother, E. Egglesston, 1837	- lawyer	A.B. A.B.	P Luth.	M.E.	4		+	4
New York, N. Y.	{ publisher gov't.-official professor	H.S.P.	I	P.E.	10	2		+	4
Camberley, England.		G.S. G.S.	I					+	4
near Grand Island, Neb.		G.S.						+	3
Augusta, Ga.		A.B.						+	
Louisville, Ky.		H.S.		R.C.				+	
New York, N. Y.	- farmer	A.B.	I	Prot.	5	4	-		
Brooklyn, N. Y.	- mariner	A.B.P.						+	
	- farmer	H.S.	I	P.E.	9		-		
			A.B.						
New Brighton, N. Y.	- journalist - brick-maker	A.B.P.	P I	M.E.	5		+	4	2
	{ provision- canner teacher	A.B.	W	Pres.	7		+	11	
	professor	A.B.	I	Pres.	9		+	4	
New York, N. Y.	professor	H.S.P.							
Washington, D. C.	professor	A.B.	I	P.E.	6		+	3	
Philadelphia, Pa.	- farmer	A.B.	I	Pres.	10		+	3	
		A.B.					+	2	

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1840	1900	* Ridpath J. C.	{ educator author	pop. erud.	near Fillmore, Ind.
1840	1909	* Sankey I. D.	evangelist	p.	Edinburgh, Pa.
1840		<i>Smith M. P. W.</i>	author	pr.	Attica, N. Y.
1840	1910	* Sumner W. G.	professor	erud.	Paterson, N. J.
1840		Walcot C. M. Jr.	actor	act.	Boston, Mass.
1840	1897	* Walker F. A.	{ economist educator	spec. erud. pop.	Boston, Mass.
1840		Waterson H.	journalist	pub.	Washington, D. C.
1840		Winslow W. C.	{ archeologist clergyman statistician	erud.	Boston, Mass.
1840	1900	Wright C. D.		pop. erud.	Dunbarton, N. H.
1840	1903	<i>Wright J. M.</i>	author	pop. pr.	Oswego, N. Y.
1840	1894	Bailey J. M.	journalist	pr.	Albany, N. Y.
1841		Baldwin J.	{ teacher editor	pop.	Westfield, Ind.
1841		<i>Bolton S. K.</i>	{ author philanthropist	pop.	Farmington, Conn.
1841	1913	Briggs C. A.	{ clergyman teacher	erud.	New York, N. Y.
1841	1891	Emmet J. K.	actor	act.	St. Louis, Mo.
1841	1905	Glazier W.		narr.	Fowler, N. Y.
1841		MacArthur R. S.	clergyman	pop.	Dalesville, P. Q.
1841		Martyn W. C.	clergyman	erud.	New York, N. Y.
1841	1913	* Miller C. H.	journalist	p. pr.	Liberty, Ind.
1841	1898	<i>Pool M. L.</i>		pr.	Rockland, Mass.
1841		Savage M. J.	clergyman	pop.	Norridgewock, Me.
1841	1887	Shill E. R.	educator	p.	Windsor, Conn.
1841		Stanwood E.	editor	erud.	Augusta, Me.
1841	1893	Towle G. M.	{ consul journalist	pop.	Washington, D. C.
1841	1913	* Ward L. F.	palaeontologist	spec. erud.	Joliet, Ill.
1842	1911	Abbey H.	banker	p.	Rondout, N. Y.
1842		* Alden I. M.		pr.	New York, N. Y.
1842		Bateman K. J.	actress	act.	Baltimore, Md.
1842	1893	Bynner E. L.	{ lawyer author	pr.	Brooklyn, N. Y.
1842	1899	Coues E.	biologist	pop.	Portsmouth, N. H.
1842		<i>Dickinson A. E.</i>	lecturer	or.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1842	1909	Dodge T. A.	army officer	erud.	Pittsfield, Mass.
1842	1901	* Fiske J.	author	spec. erud. pop.	Hartford, Conn.
1842	1915	Fosdick C. A.	author	pr.	Randolph, N. Y.
1842		* Habberton J.	journalist	pr.	Brooklyn, N. Y.
1842	1908	* Howard B.	dramatist	dram.	Detroit, Mich.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
New York, N. Y.		- farmer	A.B.	P	M.E.	9		+	5
		- { editor - banker		I	M.E.			+	5
		- physician	A.B.P.	I	Unit.	2		+	1
Englewood, N. J.			A.B.					+	2
Boston, Mass.		- actor	A.B.					+	8
		- { merchant - manufacturer	A.B.	I	Cong.	3		+	5
		- lawyer	H.S.	I	Pres.	1		+	
	Father, II. Winslow, 1799	- clergyman	A.B.	I	Cong.	2+			
Vorcester, Mass.		- clergyman	H.S.					+	3
Danbury, Conn.		- { civil- - engineer	H.S.	I				+	2
		- carpenter	G.S.						
		- farmer	H.S.P.	I	Friend	6	6	+	3
			A.B.P.		Pres.	3		+	1
			A.B.		Pres.	1+	1	+	5
Cornwall, N. Y.			H.S.P.					+	1
		- farmer	A.B.P.	I	Pres.	2+			
		- farmer	A.B.	W	Bapt.	11		+	5
Oakland, Cal.		- clergyman	A.B.P.	I	Pres.	7		+	6
Cockland, Mass.		- teacher	G.S.P.	P					
			H.S.						
Cleveland, O.		- farmer	H.S.	P	Cong.	8		+	4
		- physician	A.B.	I		2	2	+	
		- book-seller	A.B.	I	Cong.	11		+	3
Brookline, Mass.			A.B.					+	
Washington, D. C.	Brother, C. O. Ward, 1832	- farmer	A.B.	I	M.E.	6		+	0
			H.S.					+	
		- actor				3		+	
Boston, Mass.			H.S.						
Baltimore Md.		- { merchant gov't.-official	A.B.	I		3		+	5
hateau de Rosières, France.		- merchant	H.S.	P	Friend	5	5	-	
		- business	A.B.	W	Prot.	4		+	5
		- editor	A.B.	I	Prot.	1	1	+	
von-by-the Sea, N. J.		- business	H.S.	I	M.E.	4		+	6
		- merchant	H.S.	W				+	

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1842	1910	* James W.	{ educator author	spec. pop.	New York, N. Y.
1842		<i>Kirk E. W. O.</i>			
1842		* Ladd G. T.	professor	pop.	Painesville, O.
1842	1881	* Lanier S.	musician	p. pop.	Macon, Ga.
1842		Lewis C. B.	author	pr.	Liverpool, O.
1842	1894	Mackaye J. S.	actor	dram.	Buffalo, N. Y.
1842	1883	McCabe J. D.	author	erud. narr.	Richmond, Va.
1843		Abbott C. C.	naturalist	pop. narr.	Trenton, N. J.
1843	1888	Campbell B.		dram.	Allegheny City, Pa.
1843		* Griffis W. E.	clergyman	erud. narr. pop.	Philadelphia, Pa.
1843	1908	Heath D. C.	publisher	lib.	Salem, Me.
1843	1904	Hutton L.	author	narr. pop.	New York, N. Y.
1843	1916	* James H.	author	pr. narr.	New York, N. Y.
1843	1898	Scharf J. T.		erud.	Baltimore, Md.
1843		Smyth N.	clergyman	pop.	Brunswick, Me.
1843	1909	Stoddard C. W.	professor	narr.	Rochester, N. Y.
1844		Andrews E. B.	educator	pop.	Hinsdale, N. H.
1844		Avery E. M.	{ teacher author	pop.	Erie, Mich.
1844		* Cable G. W.			New Orleans, La.
1844	1909	* Gilder R. W.	editor	p.	Bordentown, N. J.
1844		* Holley M.	author	pr.	Ellisburg, N. Y.
1844	1895	Horton S. D.	lawyer	pub.	Pomeroy, O.
1844		King C.	army officer	pr.	Albany, N. Y.
1844		<i>Lothrop H. M.</i>		pr.	New Haven, Conn.
1844		<i>Noble A. L.</i>	author	pr.	Albion, N. Y.
1844	1911	Russell W. C.	author	pr.	New York, N. Y.
1844	1901	Thompson (J.) M.	engineer	pr.	Fairfield, Ind.
1844	1911	* Ward E. S. P.	author	pr.	Boston, Mass.
1845		<i>Baylor F. C.</i>	author	pr.	Fayetteville, Ark.
1845		Bolles A. S.	{ editor professor	erud.	Montville, Conn.
1845	1912	Carleton W.			Hudson, Mich.
1845		Crane W. H.	{ author lecturer	p.	Leicester, Mass.
1845		* Kennan G.			Norwalk, O.
1845		Mitchell J. A.	editor	pr.	New York, N. Y.
1845		Morgan J. A.	lawyer	erud.	Portland, Me.
1845	1906	Porter R.	author	pop.	New York, N. Y.
1845		<i>Rohlf's A. K. G.</i>	author	pr.	Brooklyn, N. Y.
1845		Stephens C. A.	author	pr.	Norway, Me.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
Chocorua, N. H.	Father, H. James, 1811	- author	A.B.P.	I	Prot.	5		+	5
	Father, J. Olney, 1798	- author - business - lawyer - contractor - clergyman - business - bank-president	H.S. A.B. A.B. A.B.P. H.S. G.S.P. A.B.	I I I I I W	Unit. Cong. Pres. Prot. Unit. Prot.	6 5 3 6 4 4		+	0
Lynn, N. C.								+	5
Germantown, Pa.								+	4
Timpas, Colo.								+	8
Middletown, N. Y.		- ship-master	A.B. A.B.	I	Cong.	7		+	3
Princeton, N. J.	Father, H. James, 1811	- merchant	H.S.	I				+	4
New York, N. Y.		- author	A.B.P.	I	Prot.	5		-	3
		- merchant	H.S.		R.C.			+	3
		- professor	A.B.	I	Cong.			+	
		- merchant	A.B.P.	I				+	0
		- clergyman	A.B.	P	Bapt.	11		+	2
		- farmer	A.B.	I	Prot.	4		+	0
		- merchant	H.S.P.	P	Pres.	6		+	8
		- clergyman	H.S.P.	I	M.E.	11		+	7
		teacher	G.S. A.B.			7	7	-	
Washington, D. C.		- soldier	A.B.	P	P.E.	2		+	4
		- editor						+	1
		- architect	H.S.	I				+	
		- physician	H.S.	I	Pres.	5		-	1
		- vocalist	G.S.						
		- clergyman	H.S.	I	Bapt.	2+		+	3
Frankfortsville, Ind.		- planter							
Boston, Mass.	Mother, E. S. Phelps, 1815	- clergyman	H.S.	I	Cong.	7	1	+	
		- army-officer	H.S.P.	I	P.E.	6		+	0
			H.S.						
		- farmer	A.B.						
		- lawyer	H.S.P.	I	Pres.	6		+	1
		- telegrapher							
		- author	A.B.P.	I	Unit.	3		+	0
		- lawyer	A.B.	I	P.E.	2		+	2
		- merchant	H.S.P.	I				-	
		- lawyer	A.B.	I	Pres.	4		+	3
			A.B.					+	

<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Literary Fields</i>	<i>Place of Birth</i>
1845	1909	Tabb J. B.	clergyman	p.	Amelia Co., Va.
1845	1905	Woolsey S. C.	author	pr.	Cleveland, O.
1846		Anderson R. B.	{ editor author	pop.	Albion, Wis.
1846	1902	Brooks E. S.	{ editor author	pop.	Lowell, Mass.
1846		Harrison C. C.		pr.	Fairfax Co., Va.
1846		Hawthorne J.	author	pr. narr.	Boston, Mass.
1846		Mable H. W.	editor	pr.	Cold Spring, N. Y.
1846		Remsen I.	{ chemist educator	pop.	New York, N. Y.
1846	1903	Savage R. H.	army officer	pr.	Utica, N. Y.
1846		Tiernan F. C.		pr.	Salisbury, N. C.
1846	1894	Tuttle H.	{ professor journalist	erud.	Bennington, Vt.
1846	1898	Wescott E. N.	banker	pr.	Syracuse, N. Y.
1847		Beers H. A.	teacher	p. pop.	Buffalo, N. Y.
1847		Bishop W. H.	{ editor teacher	pr.	Hartford, Conn.
1847	1910	Bowne B. P.	educator	spec.	Leonardsville N. J.
1847	1868	Bradley W. I.	author	pr.	Bristol, Conn.
1847	1902	Catherwood M. H.		pr.	Luray, O.
1847		* Clark J. B.	professor	spec.	Providence, R. I.
1847		Crabtree C.	actress	act.	New York, N. Y.
1847	1904	Fawcett E.	author	pr. p.	New York, N. Y.
1847		Hardy A. S.	professor	pr.	Andover, Mass.
1847	1898	Howard B. W.		pr.	Bangor, Me.
1847		Learned W.	banker	p.	New London, Conn.
1847	1903	Lloyd H. D.	journalist	pub.	New York, N. Y.
1847		Morris C.	actress	act.	Toronto, Ont.
1847		* Strong J.	clergyman	pub.	Naperville, Ind.
1848		* Adams B.	{ lawyer author	erud.	Quincy, Mass.
1848	1899	Allen G.	author	pop. pr.	Kingston, Ont.
1848		Bowker R. R.	{ editor publisher	pop.	Salem, Mass.
1848		Cheney J. V.	{ lawyer librarian	p.	Groveland, N. Y.
1848		Cooke G. W.	clergyman	pop.	Comstock, Mich.
1848		DeKay C.	journalist	p.	Washington, D. C.
1848	1908	* Harris J. C.	journalist	pr.	Eatonton, Ga.
1848	1911	Harrison J. A.	professor	pop.	Pass Christian, Miss.
1848	1913	Holland E. M.	actor	act.	New York, N. Y.
1848	1912	Kaler J. O.	author	pr.	Winterport, Me.
1848		Marden O. S.	author	pop.	Thornton, N. H.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literary Relatives</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
Ellicott City, Md.	Uncle, T. D. Woolsey, 1801	planter merchant farmer clergyman lawyer	H.S. H.S. A.B. A.B.P. H.S.P.	W I P I I	Prot. Luth. Univ.	3+		—	
	Father, N. Hawthorne, 1804	author merchant contractor	A.B.P. A.B. A.B.	I I I	D.R. A.B.	3 2	2	+	1+
Ithaca, N. Y.			A.B.					+	
Syracuse, N. Y.		farmer	A.B.	I	P.E.	2	+	8	
Bristol, Conn.			A.B.					+	
Chicago, Ill.		physician manuf'rurer miner book-merchant business	A.B. A.B. I A.B.	I I I I	Univ. Cong. M.E. Cong.	3 3	2 4		
Munich, Germany.			H.S.					+	
Chicago, Ill.		merchant clergyman farmer lawyer publicist clergyman merchant	H.S. A.B. A.B. A.B.	I P G.S.P. I	Cong. D.R. M.E. Unit.	5 5 1 4+	1 1 1 4+	+	1 3+ 0 4
Haslemere, England.	Father, C. F. Adams, 1807		A.B.					+	
Atlanta, Ga.	Grandfather, J. R. Drake, 1795	farmer naval officer farmer actor	A.B.P. A.B. H.S.P. G.S. H.S. A.B.	P 7 P I H.S. P	Prot. M.E.	9 7 6 2	5 6 9 2	+	

Born	Died	Name	Occupation	Literary Fields	Place of Birth
1848		Merrill F. T.	artist	lib.	Boston, Mass.
1848		Rexford E. E.	author	p.	Johnsburg, N. Y.
1848		* Rhodes J. F.	{ author manufacturer	erud.	Cleveland, O.
1848		Vincent F.	author	narr.	Brooklyn, N. Y.
1849		Allen J. L.	author	pr.	Lexington, Ky.
1849		Auringer O. C.	clergyman	p.	Glen Falls, N. Y.
1849		Buel J. W.	author	pop.	Golconda, Ill.
1849		Crozier J. B.	physician	spec.	Galt, Ont.
1849	1912	* Gliman N. P.	{ clergyman professor	pub.	Quincy, Ill.
1849	1909	Jewett S. O.	author	pr.	South Berwick, Me.
1849		Johnson V. W.		pr.	Brooklyn, N. Y.
1849	1887	Lazarus E.		p.	New York, N. Y.
1849	1901	Mathews J. H.		pop.	—, U. S.
1849		Mead E. D.	editor	pop.	Chesterfield, N. H.
1849	1913	Ober F. A.		pr. narr.	Beverly, Mass.
1849		Redway J. W.	{ geographer author	pop.	near Murfreesboro, Tenn.
1850	1901	Adams H. B.	professor	erud.	Shutesbury, Mass.
1850		Bates A.	teacher	pr. p.	East Machias, Me.
1850	1898	* Bellamy E.	journalist	pub. pr.	Chicopee Falls, Mass.
1850		Chambers J.	journalist	pr.	Bellefontaine, O.
1850		Champney E. W.	author	pr.	Springfield, O.
1850		Crafts W. F.	clergyman	pop.	Fryeburg, Me.
1850	1911	Curtis W. E.	journalist	narr.	Akron, O.
1850	1895	* Field E.	journalist	p. pr.	St. Louis, Mo.
1850		French A.	author	pr.	Andover, Mass.
1850	1889	Grady H. W.	journalist	or.	Athens, Ga.
1850		* Hill D. J.	{ educator publicist	pop. pub.	Plainfield, N. J.
1850		Laughlin J. L.	professor	spec. erud.	Deerfield, O.
1850		* Lodge H. C.	{ author publicist	erud.	Boston, Mass.
1850		Munroe K.	author	pr.	near Prairie du Chien, Wis.
1850		Murfree M. N.	author	pr.	near Murfreesboro, Tenn.
1850	1896	Nye E. W.	journalist	pr.	Shirley, Me.
1850		Richards L. E.	author	pr.	Boston, Mass.
1850		Sloane W. M.	{ professor author	erud.	Richmond, O.
1850		Stoddard J. L.	lecturer	narr.	Brookline, Mass.
1850		Thorpe R. H.	author	p.	Mishawaka, Ind.

<i>Place of Death</i>	<i>Literar.</i>	<i>Father's Occupation</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Marriage</i>	<i>Children</i>
	- business	H.S.P.	I	Cong.	5			+	4
	- farmer	A.B.	I	Prot.	3			+	0
	- manuf'turer	A.B.P.	I	P.E.	3			+	1
	- merchant	A.B.P.	I	Pres.	3			+	0
		A.B.	P		7			-	
	- farmer	A.B.P.	I	Pres.	4			+	0
	- tanner	A.B.P.	I	M.E.	10			+	6
	- farmer	A.B.	P	Pres.	5		5	+	3
Meaaville, Pa.	- lawyer	A.B.P.	I	Unit.	3	1		+	1
Berwick, Me.	- physician	H.S.	I					-	
New York, N. Y.			A.B.P.	W	Jewish			-	
Summit, N. J.	- farmer	A.B.	I	D.R.				+	0
		H.S.P.		Prot.	4				
	- clergyman	A.B.P.	I	Bapt.	6			+	0
	{ lumber-	A.B.						-	
	merchant								
	{ physician	A.B.	I	Cong.	9	3+		+	1
Chicopee Falls, Mass.	- merchant	A.B.	I	Pres.	3			+	2
	- judge	A.B.	I	Cong.	4			+	3
	- clergyman	A.B.	I	M.E.	6			+	0
	- clergyman	A.B.	I					+	3
Chicago, Ill.	- lawyer	A.B.P.	I	Prot.	8	2		+	6
Atlanta, Ga.	- manuf'turer	A.B.P.	W	P.E.	9			-	
	- business	A.B.	W		3	1		+	2
	- clergyman	A.B.	I	Bapt.				+	
	- lawyer	A.B.	P	Disc.	4			+	2
	- merchant	A.B.	W	Unit.	2			+	3
	- missionary	A.B.P.	P	Pres.	0			+	0
near Asheville, N. C.			H.S.					+	4
	Mother, J. W. Howe, 1819	{ physician	H.S.	I	Unit.	6		+	7
		{ educator							
		{ teacher							
		{ clergyman	H.S.	I	Pres.	3		+	4
		A.B.							
	- tailor	H.S.	I	Bapt.	5			+	3

APPENDIX C

Conjugal condition of men of letters, classified by period of birth, and by median number of children born to them.¹

Period of birth	Married	Men			Women			Median number of children
		Single	Unknown	Total	Married	Single	Total	
Before 1771	56	1	8	65	2	1	3	7.25
1771-80	28	2	3	33	7	1	1	..
1781-90	29	3	12	44	9	2	3	6.33
1791-1800	62	4	30	96	6	6	7	4.56
1801-10	65	4	41	110	6	8	12	5.50
1811-20	91	6	58	155	6	17	23	5.21
1821-30	83	1	33	117	1	17	23	4.56
1831-40	88	8	35	131	8	27	38	4.14
1841-50	82	5	21	108	6	16	29	3.40
Total	584	34	241	859	6	96	141	32

Appendix C is given as being of interest, though it does not bear directly on the thesis. It is worthy of note that there was apparently an increasing tendency on the part of literary women to remain single, a tendency not manifest on the part of men.

The number of children born to literary persons appears to have been declining no faster than the number of children born to persons forming part of the general population, so that there seems to be no reason for believing that the literary stock of the nation has been dying out.

¹ The median is the middle number of a series, ranked according to size. It is used here instead of the average because in some cases the exact number of children could not be ascertained, and exact numbers are necessary for calculating an average. It was known, however, on which side of the median the number of children in any given family lay, so that that number could be used in determining a median.

² Of those whose conjugal condition was ascertained.

³ Not given when, because very few persons are concerned, the ratio would be spuriously accurate and therefore misleading.

APPENDIX D

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEN OF LETTERS WITH DATE OF BIRTH

Biographical facts in regard to any litterateur may be found in Appendix B, where the literati are classified by year of birth.

Abbey H. 1842	Alsop R. 1761	Barrow F. E. 1822	Booth M. L. 1831
Abbot E. 1819	Ames F. 1758	Barrows W. 1815	Botta A. C. L. 1820
Abbot J. S. C. 1805	Anderson J. J. 1821	Bartlett J. 1820	Bourinot J. G. 1837
Abbott C. C. 1843	Anderson R. B. 1846	Bartlett J. R. 1805	Bowditch N. 1773
Abbott J. 1803	Andrews E. B. 1844	Bartram J. 1739	Bowen F. 1811
Abbott L. 1835	Andrews E. A. 1787	Bartol C. A. 1813	Bowers E. C. 1830
Adams B. 1848	Angell G. T. 1823	Bascom J. 1827	Bowker R. R. 1848
Adams C. F. 1807	Anthon C. 1797	Bateman K. J. 1842	Bowles S. 1826
Adams C. F. 1835	Appleton D. 1785	Bates A. 1850	Bowne B. P. 1847
Adams C. K. 1835	Arnold G. 1834	Bates S. P. 1827	Brace C. L. 1826
Adams E. 1834	Arthur T. S. 1809	Baxter J. P. 1831	Bradley W. I. 1847
Adams F. G. 1824	Atkinson E. 1827	Baylor F. C. 1845	Brahnard J. G. C. 1796
Adams H. 1755	Auringer O. C. 1849	Beardsley E. E. 1808	Briggs C. A. 1841
Adams H. 1838	Austin J. G. 1831	Bedell G. T. 1793	Brinton D. G. 1837
Adams H. B. 1850	Avery E. M. 1844	Beecher H. W. 1813	Bristed C. A. 1820
Adams J. 1735	Backus I. 1724	Beecher L. 1775	Brockett L. P. 1820
Adams J. Q. 1767	Badeau A. 1831	Beers E. E. 1827	Brodhead J. R. 1814
Adams N. 1806	Bailey J. M. 1841	Beers H. A. 1847	Brooks C. T. 1813
Adams W. T. 1822	Bailey R. W. 1793	Belknap J. 1744	Brooks E. 1831
Icott A. B. 1799	Baird C. W. 1828	Bellamy E. 1850	Brooks E. S. 1846
Icott L. M. 1832	Baird H. M. 1832	Bellamy J. 1719	Brooks M. G. 1795
Icott W. A. 1798	Baird R. 1798	Benedict D. 1779	Brooks N. C. 1819
Iden H. M. 1836	Baker A. R. 1805	Bennett D. R. M. 1818	Brooks N. 1830
Iden I. M. 1842	Baker H. N. W. 1815	Bennett E. 1822	Brooks P. 1835
Iden J. 1807	Baker W. M. 1825	Benton T. H. 1782	Brown C. B. 1771
Iden W. L. 1837	Baldwin J. 1841	Bigelow J. 1817	Brown G. 1791
Idrich T. B. 1838	Ballou H. 1771	Bingham C. 1757	Browne C. F. 1834
Idridge I. 1808	Balleu M. M. 1820	Bird R. M. 1803	Browne W. H. 1828
Alexander A. 1772	Bancroft A. 1755	Birney J. G. 1792	Brownell H. H. 1820
Alexander J. W. 1804	Bancroft G. 1800	Bishop W. H. 1847	Brownson O. A. 1803
Alexander J. A. 1809	Bancroft H. H. 1832	Blackburn W. M. 1828	Bryant W. C. 1794
Iger H. 1834	Bangs N. 1778	Blake J. L. 1788	Buckminster J. 1751
Ilen A. A. 1832	Barber J. W. 1798	Blake W. R. 1805	Buel J. W. 1849
Ilen G. 1848	Barlow J. 1754	Bliss P. P. 1838	Bulfinch T. 1796
Ilen J. H. 1820	Barnard H. 1811	Boardman H. A. 1808	Bunce O. B. 1828
Ilen J. L. 1849	Barnes A. 1798	Boker G. H. 1823	Burnap G. W. 1802
Ilen W. 1784	Barnes A. S. 1817	Bolles A. S. 1845	Burr E. F. 1818
Ilbone S. A. 1816	Barnett B. F. 1808	Bolton S. K. 1841	Burritt E. 1810
Iiston W. 1779	Barrett L. 1838	Booth E. 1833	Burroughs J. 1837

Burton W. 1800	Colton W. 1797	Deems C. F. 1820	Eddy M. B. G. 1827
Bush G. 1796	Colwell S. 1800	De Forest J. W. 1826	Edwards J. 1703
Bushnell H. 1802	Comly J. 1774	De Kay C. 1848	Edwards J. 1787
Butler W. A. 1825	Comstock J. L. 1789	De Leon E. 1818	Edwards T. 1809
Butterworth H. 1837	Conant H. O. C. 1809	De Leon T. C. 1839	Eggleston E. 1837
Bynner E. L. 1842	Conant T. J. 1802	Delmar A. 1836	Eggleston G. C. 1839
Cable G. W. 1844	Conrad R. T. 1810	De Mille J. 1837	Egle W. H. 1830
Calhoun J. C. 1782	Conway M. D. 1832	Denison M. A. 1826	Elliot S. 1821
Calkins N. A. 1822	Cook J. 1838	Denison G. T. 1839	Elliot W. G. 1811
Callender J. 1706	Cooke G. W. 1848	Dennie J. 1768	Ellet E. F. 1818
Calvert G. H. 1803	Cooke J. E. 1830	de Peyster J. W. 1821	Ellis E. S. 1840
Campbell B. 1843	Cooke, J. P. 1827	Dewey O. 1794	Ellis G. E. 1814
Campbell H. S. 1839	Cooke P. P. 1816	Dexter H. M. 1821	Embury E. C. 1806
Carey H. C. 1793	Cooper J. F. 1789	Diaz A. M. 1821	Emerson R. W. 1803
Carleton W. 1845	Cooper P. 1791	Dickinson A. E. 1842	Emmet J. K. 1841
Cartwright P. 1785	Cooper S. F. 1813	Dickinson E. E. 1830	Emmons N. 1745
Carver J. 1732	Coppée H. 1821	Dickinson J. 1732	English T. D. 1819
Cary A. 1820	Corson H. 1828	Dickinson J. 1688	Everett A. H. 1790
Cary P. 1824	Coues E. 1842	Didier E. L. 1838	Everett E. 1794
Catherwood M. H. 1847	Cox P. 1840	Ditson G. L. 1812	Farmer J. 1789
Catlin G. 1796	Cox S. S. 1824	Dix D. L. 1802	Fawcett E. 1847
Chadwick J. W. 1840	Coxe A. C. 1818	Dix J. A. 1798	Fay T. S. 1807
Chambers J. 1850	Coxe T. 1755	Dix M. 1827	Felt J. B. 1789
Champlin J. D. 1834	Cozzens F. S. 1818	Dodge M. A. 1833	Felton C. C. 1807
Champney E. W. 1850	Crabtree C. 1847	Dodge M. M. 1831	Fessenden T. G. 1771
Chandler E. M. 1807	Crafts W. F. 1850	Dodge T. A. 1842	Field E. 1850
Channing W. E. 1780	Cranch C. P. 1813	Donnelly E. C. 1838	Field H. M. 1822
Channing W. E. 1818	Crane A. M. 1838	Donnelly I. 1831	Fields J. T. 1816
Chapin E. H. 1814	Crane W. H. 1845	Dorgan J. A. 1836	Filson J. 1747
Checkley J. 1680	Crosby H. 1826	Dorr J. S. C. 1825	Finley M. 1828
Cheever G. B. 1807	Crozier J. B. 1849	Dorsey A. H. 1815	Finney C. G. 1792
Cheney J. V. 1821	Cummins M. S. 1827	Douglas A. M. 1837	Fish H. C. 1823
Chester J. L. 1821	Curtin J. 1840	Douglas S. A. 1813	Fisher G. P. 1827
Child F. J. 1825	Curtis G. T. 1812	Douglass F. 1817	Fiske J. 1842
Child L. M. 1802	Curtis G. W. 1824	Downing A. J. 1815	Flagg E. 1815
Childs G. W. 1829	Curtis W. E. 1850	Dowse T. 1772	Flint T. 1780
Choate R. 1799	Cushing L. S. 1803	Drake F. S. 1828	Florence W. J. 1831
Clark G. W. 1831	Cushman C. S. 1816	Drake J. R. 1795	Fletcher J. C. 1825
Clark J. A. 1801	Cuyler T. L. 1822	Drake S. A. 1833	Force P. 1790
Clark J. B. 1847	Dabney R. L. 1820	Drake S. G. 1798	Forrest E. 1806
Clark L. G. 1810	Dahlgren M. V. 1835	Drisler H. 1818	Fosdick C. A. 1842
Clark T. 1787	Daly A. 1838	Duché J. 1737	Foster J. W. 1815
Clarke J. F. 1810	Daly C. P. 1816	Duganne A. J. H. 1823	Foster S. C. 1826
Clarke J. S. 1833	Dana C. A. 1819	Dunlap W. 1766	Foster T. T. 1838
Clarke M. 1798	Dana J. D. 1813	Durant H. T. 1822	Fowler L. N. 1811
Clarke R. S. 1833	Dana R. H. 1787	Durbin J. P. 1800	Fowler O. S. 1809
Clay H. 1777	Dana R. H. Jr. 1815	Durrie D. S. 1819	Franklin B. 1706
Clemens S. L. 1835	Darley F. O. C. 1822	Duyckink E. A. 1816	French A. 1850
Clement C. E. 1834	Davenport E. L. 1814	Dwight B. W. 1816	French B. F. 1799
Cleveland C. D. 1802	Davidson L. M. 1808	Dwight T. 1752	Freneau P. 1752
Codman J. 1814	Davidson M. M. 1823	Eagleson T. R. 1840	Frost J. 1800
Coffin C. C. 1823	Davis R. B. H. 1831	Eastman C. G. 1816	Frothingham O. B. 1822
Coggeswell J. G. 1786	Dawson J. W. 1820	Eaton C. H. 1813	Frothingham R. 1812
Coles A. 1813	Day H. N. 1808	Eaton D. B. 1823	Funk I. K. 1839
Colton C. 1789	Deane C. 1813	Eddy D. C. 1823	Furness H. H. 1833

- Furness W. H. 1802
 Gallagher W. D. 1808
 Gardiner F. 1822
 Garrison W. L. 1805
 Gay S. H. 1814
 Gayarré C. E. A. 1805
 Gayler C. 1820
 George H. 1839
 Gibbons J. 1834
 Gilbert J. G. 1810
 Gilder R. W. 1844
 Giles C. 1813
 Gilman A. 1837
 Gilman C. H. 1794
 Gilman D. C. 1831
 Gilman N. P. 1849
 Gilmore J. R. 1822
 Gladden W. 1836
 Glazier W. 1841
 Godwin P. 1816
 Goodrich Charles A.
 1790
 Goodrich Chauncy A.
 1790
 Goodrich S. G. 1793
 Goodwin W. W. 1831
 Gordon T. F. 1787
 Gordon W. R. 1811
 Gould A. A. 1805
 Gould H. F. 1789
 Goulding F. R. 1810
 Grady H. W. 1850
 Grant U. S. 1822
 Graves J. R. 1820
 Gray Alonzo 1808
 Gray Asa 1810
 Graydon A. 1752
 Greeley H. 1811
 Green J. 1706
 Greene G. W. 1811
 Griffis W. E. 1843
 Griswold R. W. 1815
 Habberton J. 1842
 Hackett J. H. 1800
 Hale E. E. 1822
 Hale S. 1787
 Hale S. J. 1788
 Halliburton T. C. 1796
 Hall F. 1825
 Hall J. 1793
 Hall S. 1761
 Halleck F. G. 1790
 Hallock W. A. 1794
 Halsey H. P. 1837
 Hammond E. P. 1831
- Hardy A. S. 1847
 Harkness A. 1822
 Harper F. 1806
 Harper J. 1795
 Harris J. C. 1848
 Harris M. C. 1834
 Harris T. M. 1768
 Harrison C. C. 1846
 Harrison J. A. 1848
 Hart J. S. 1810
 Harte F. B. 1839
 Haven A. B. 1828
 Hawes J. 1789
 Haws F. L. 1798
 Hawthorne J. 1846
 Hawthorne N. 1804
 Hay J. 1838
 Hayne P. H. 1830
 Hayne R. Y. 1791
 Hays W. S. 1837
 Hazard R. G. 1801
 Hazard S. 1784
 Headley J. T. 1813
 Headley P. C. 1819
 Heath D. C. 1843
 Hedge F. H. 1805
 Helper H. R. 1829
 Henry P. 1736
 Hentz C. L. 1800
 Herne J. A. 1839
 Hickok L. P. 1798
 Higginson T. W. 1823
 Hildreth R. 1804
 Hill D. J. 1850
 Hill T. 1818
 Hill W. H. 1822
 Hillard G. S. 1808
 Hillhouse J. A. 1789
 Hinsdale B. A. 1837
 Hirst H. B. 1813
 Hitchcock E. 1793
 Hobart J. H. 1775
 Hodge A. A. 1823
 Hodge C. 1797
 Hoffman C. F. 1806
 Holland E. M. 1848
 Holland J. G. 1819
 Holley M. 1844
 Holmes A. 1763
 Holmes M. J. 1834
 Holmes O. W. 1809
 Holt H. 1840
 Hooper L. 1816
 Hope J. B. 1827
 Hopkins M. 1802
- Hopkins S. 1721
 Hopkins S. 1807
 Hopkinson F. 1737
 Hopkinson J. 1770
 Hoppin J. M. 1820
 Horton S. D. 1844
 Hosmer J. K. 1834
 Hosmer W. H. C. 1814
 Hough F. B. 1820
 Houghton H. O. 1823
 Hovey A. 1820
 Howard B. W. 1847
 Howard B. 1842
 Howe H. 1816
 Howe J. B. 1813
 Howe J. W. 1819
 Howells W. D. 1827
 Hoyt R. 1806
 Hubbard M. S. 1814
 Hudson H. N. 1814
 Humphreys D. 1752
 Huntington F. D. 1819
 Hurst J. F. 1834
 Hutchins T. 1730
 Hutchinson T. 1711
 Hutton L. 1843
 Ingersoll R. G. 1833
 Ingraham J. H. 1809
 Irving J. T. 1812
 Irving T. 1809
 Irving W. 1783
 Jackson H. H. 1831
 James H. 1811
 James H. 1843
 James W. 1842
 Janney S. M. 1801
 Jarvis J. J. 1818
 Jarvis S. F. 1786
 Jay J. 1817
 Jay W. 1789
 Jefferson J. 1829
 Jefferson T. 1743
 Jenkins J. S. 1818
 Jenks W. 1778
 Jewett C. C. 1816
 Jewett S. O. 1849
 Johnson R. 1840
 Johnson V. W. 1849
 Johnston R. M. 1822
 Jones C. C. 1831
 Jones J. S. 1811
 Judd S. 1813
 Judson E. C. 1817
 Judson E. Z. C. 1822
 Kafer J. O. 1848
- Kane E. K. 1820
 Kellogg E. 1813
 Kendall G. W. 1807
 Kennan G. 1845
 Kennedy J. P. 1795
 Kent J. 1763
 Key F. S. 1780
 Kidder D. P. 1815
 Kimball R. B. 1816
 King C. 1844
 King T. S. 1824
 Klp L. 1826
 Klp W. I. 1811
 Kirk E. W. O. 1842
 Kirk J. F. 1824
 Kirkland C. M. S. 1801
 Kirkland J. 1830
 Knapp S. L. 1783
 Knox T. W. 1835
 Ladd G. T. 1842
 Lamb M. J. R. N. 1829
 Lanier S. 1842
 Lanman C. 1819
 Larcom L. 1824
 Larned J. N. 1836
 Laughlin J. L. 1850
 Lazarus E. 1849
 Lea H. C. 1825
 Learned W. 1847
 Lee H. F. 1780
 Leland C. G. 1824
 Lennox C. 1720
 Lenox J. 1800
 Leslie E. 1787
 Lester C. E. 1815
 Lewis A. 1794
 Lewis A. H. 1836
 Lewis C. B. 1842
 Lewis E. A. B. R. 1824
 Lewis T. 1802
 Lincoln A. 1809
 Lippincott J. B. 1816
 Lippincott S. J. 1823
 Littlel E. 1797
 Lloyd H. D. 1847
 Locke D. R. 1833
 Lodge H. C. 1850
 Logan C. A. 1806
 Longfellow H. W. 1807
 Longfellow S. 1819
 Lord J. 1809
 Lossing B. J. 1813
 Lothrop H. M. 1844
 Lowell J. R. 1819
 Lowell J. 1769

Lowell J. 1799	Morgan L. H. 1818	Percival J. G. 1795	Richards L. E. 1850
Lunt G. 1803	Morris C. 1833	Perry A. L. 1830	Richardson J. 1797
Lynch W. F. 1801	Morris C. 1847	Perry N. 1832	Ridpath J. C. 1840
Lyon M. 1797	Morris G. P. 1802	Perry W. S. 1832	Ripley G. 1808
Mable H. W. 1846	Morris J. G. 1803	Peterson C. J. 1818	Robinson E. 1794
MacArthur R. S. 1841	Morse J. 1761	Pettingill J. H. 1815	Robinson S. T. D. 1827
McCabe J. D. 1842	Morse J. T. 1840	Phelps A. H. 1793	Robson S. 1836
McClure A. K. 1828	Morse S. E. 1794	Phelps A. 1820	Roe A. S. 1798
McCrady E. 1833	Motley J. L. 1814	Phelps E. S. 1815	Roe E. P. 1838
MacIlvaine C. P. 1799	Moulton L. C. 1835	Phillips W. 1811	Rohlfis A. K. G. 1845
MacIntosh M. J. 1803	Munroe K. 1850	Platt J. J. 1835	Rolfe W. J. 1827
Mackaye J. S. 1842	Murdoch J. E. 1812	Platt S. M. B. 1836	Root G. F. 1820
MacKellar T. 1812	Murfree M. N. 1850	Pickering J. 1777	Rupp I. D. 1803
Mackenzie A. S. 1803	Murray L. 1745	Pierpont J. 1785	Rush R. 1780
McLellan I. 1806	Neal J. 1793	Pierson A. T. 1837	Russell W. C. 1844
Madison J. 1751	Neal J. C. 1807	Pike A. 1809	Ryan A. J. 1839
Maeder F. G. 1840	Neill E. D. 1823	Pike M. H. G. 1825	Sabine L. 1803
Mahan A. H. 1840	Newcomb H. 1803	Pike Z. M. 1779	Sanders C. W. 1805
Mahan A. 1799	Newcomb S. 1835	Placide H. 1799	Sangster M. E. 1838
Malcom H. 1799	Newell R. H. 1836	Poe E. A. 1809	Sankey I. D. 1840
Mann H. 1796	Niles H. 1777	Pollard E. A. 1828	Sargent E. 1813
Marden O. S. 1848	Noble A. L. 1844	Pool M. L. 1841	Sargent L. M. 1786
Marsh G. P. 1801	Norton A. 1786	Poole W. F. 1821	Savage J. 1784
Marsh J. 1788	Norton C. E. 1827	Poole B. P. 1820	Savage M. J. 1841
Marshall J. 1755	Norton J. N. 1820	Pope W. B. 1822	Savage R. H. 1846
Martyn S. T. 1805	Nott C. C. 1827	Porter E. 1772	Sawyer L. A. 1807
Martyn W. C. 1841	Noyes G. R. 1798	Porter N. 1811	Saxe J. G. 1816
Mason J. M. 1770	Nye J. W. 1850	Porter R. 1845	Scharf J. T. 1843
Mather C. 1663	Ober F. A. 1849	Potter A. 1830	Schmucker S. S. 1799
Mather I. 1639	O'Brien J. 1836	Prentiss E. P. 1818	Schoolcraft H. R. 1793
Mathews C. 1817	O'Hara T. 1820	Prentiss S. S. 1808	Scribner C. 1821
Mathews J. H. 1849	Olmsted D. 1791	Prescott W. H. 1796	Scudder H. E. 1838
Mathews W. 1818	Olmsted F. L. 1822	Preston M. J. 1820	Sears E. H. 1810
Mayo F. 1839	Olney J. 1798	Prime S. I. 1812	Sears R. 1810
Mayo W. S. 1812	Osgood F. S. 1811	Prince T. 1687	Sedgwick C. M. 1789
Mead E. D. 1849	Osmun T. E. 1834	Proctor E. D. 1838	Seiss J. A. 1823
Mellen G. 1799	Ossoli M. S. F. 1810	Proctor J. 1816	Semmles R. 1809
Melville H. 1819	Otis J. 1725	Putnam G. P. 1814	Seward W. H. 1801
Menken A. I. 1835	Owen J. J. 1803	Quackenbos G. P. 1826	Snow H. W. 1818
Merrill F. T. 1848	Packard F. A. 1794	Quincy J. 1772	Shea J. D. G. 1824
Miller C. H. 1841	Palfrey J. G. 1796	Ramsay D. 1749	Shedd W. G. T. 1820
Miller E. C. H. 1833	Palmer R. 1808	Rand E. A. 1837	Shields C. W. 1825
Miller H. M. 1831	Parker R. G. 1798	Randall J. R. 1839	Shillaber B. P. 1814
Miller J. R. 1840	Parker T. 1810	Randolph J. 1773	Sigourney L. H. 1791
Miller L. 1829	Parkman F. 1823	Rankin J. E. 1828	Sill E. R. 1841
Miller S. 1769	Parsons T. W. 1819	Raymond H. J. 1820	Simms W. G. 1806
Mitchell D. G. 1822	Parton S. P. W. 1811	Read H. 1802	Sloane W. M. 1850
Mitchell J. A. 1845	Paulding J. K. 1779	Read T. B. 1822	Smith C. H. 1826
Mitchell S. A. 1792	Payne J. H. 1792	Redway J. W. 1849	Smith E. O. 1806
Mitchell S. W. 1829	Payson E. 1783	Reed H. 1808	Smith E. P. 1814
Moody D. L. 1837	Peabody A. P. 1811	Remsen I. 1846	Smith F. H. 1838
Moore C. J. 1824	Peabody G. 1795	Rexford E. E. 1848	Smith H. B. 1815
Moore F. 1828	Peabody W. B. O. 1799	Rhodes J. F. 1848	Smith J. 1805
Morgan J. A. 1845	Peloubet F. N. 1831	Rice E. W. 1831	Smith M. P. W. 1840
Morgan J. P. 1837	Pendleton J. M. 1811	Rich O. 1777	Smith M. H. 1810

Smith R. P. 1799	Stuart M. 1780	Tuthill L. C. 1798	Weed T. 1797
Smits R. 1829	Sumner C. 1811	Tuttle H. 1846	Weems M. L. 1759
Smith R. C. 1797	Sumner W. G. 1840	Tyler M. C. 1835	Welby A. B. 1809
Smith S. F. 1808	Tabb J. B. 1845	Tyler R. 1757	Wells D. A. 1828
Smith S. 1792	Talmage T. D. 1832	Tyn S. H. 1800	Wells W. H. 1812
Smith W. 1728	Tappan H. P. 1805	Upham C. W. 1802	Wescott C. N. 1846
Smucker S. M. 1823	Tappan W. B. 1794	Upham T. C. 1799	Wheaton H. 1785
Smyth N. 1843	Taylor B. 1825	Van Alstyne F. J. C. 1820	Whipple E. P. 1819
Southworth E. D. G. N. 1819	Taylor B. F. 1819	Venale W. H. 1836	White A. D. 1832
Spalding M. J. 1810	Taylor W. 1821	Very J. 1813	White R. G. 1822
Sparks J. 1789	Terhune M. V. 1830	Victor M. V. 1831	Whitman W. 1819
Spencer I. S. 1798	Thaxter C. 1836	Victor O. J. 1827	Whitmore W. H. 1836
Spencer J. A. 1816	Thayer W. M. 1820	Vincent F. 1848	Whitney A. D. T. 1824
Spoofford A. R. 1825	Thomas I. 1749	Vincent J. H. 1832	Whitney W. D. 1826
Spoofford H. P. 1835	Thomas J. 1811	Vincent M. R. 1834	Whittier J. G. 1809
Spooner S. 1809	Thompson A. C. 1812	Walcot C. M. Jr. 1840	Wilkes C. 1798
Sprague C. 1791	Thompson D. P. 1795	Walker A. 1799	Willard E. 1787
Sprague W. B. 1795	Thompson D. 1833	Walker F. A. 1840	Willard F. E. 1839
Spring G. 1785	Thompson (J.) M. 1844	Walker J. B. 1805	Willard S. 1640
Squier E. G. 1821	Thompson J. P. 1819	Wallace L. 1827	Williams W. R. 1804
Stanwood E. 1841	Thoreau H. D. 1817	Wallace W. R. 1819	Willis N. P. 1806
Stedman E. C. 1833	Thorpe R. H. 1850	Wallach J. L. 1820	Willson M. 1813
Steele J. D. 1836	Ticknor G. 1791	Walsh R. 1784	Wilson A. J. E. 1835
Stephens A. H. 1812	Ticknor W. D. 1810	Walworth J. R. H. 1837	Winchell A. 1824
Stephens A. S. 1813	Tiernan F. C. 1846	Walworth M. T. 1837	Winchester E. 1751
Stephens C. A. 1845	Tilton T. 1835	Ward C. O. 1831	Winslow H. 1799
Stephens J. L. 1805	Timrod H. 1829	Ward E. S. P. 1844	Winslow W. C. 1840
Stevens A. 1815	Tincker M. A. 1833	Ward G. 1833	Winsor J. 1831
Stevens B. F. 1833	Todd J. 1800	Ward L. F. 1841	Winter W. 1836
Stevens H. 1819	Tomes R. 1817	Ware H. 1764	Winthrop R. C. 1809
Stewart C. S. 1795	Toombs R. 1810	Ware H. Jr. 1794	Winthrop T. 1828
Stockton F. R. 1834	Tourgee A. W. 1838	Ware W. 1797	Wirt W. 1772
Stockton J. D. 1836	Towle G. M. 1841	Warfield C. A. 1816	Wister A. L. 1830
Stoddard C. W. 1843	Town S. 1779	Warner A. B. 1820	Woods L. 1774
Stoddard J. L. 1850	Townsend L. T. 1838	Warner C. D. 1829	Woodworth F. C. 1812
Stoddard R. H. 1825	Townsend M. A. 1832	Warner S. 1819	Woodworth S. 178.
Stoddard W. O. 1835	Townsend T. S. 1829	Warren W. 1812	Woolman J. 1720
Stone J. A. 1801	Townsend V. F. 1836	Warren W. F. 1833	Woolsey S. C. 1845
Stone W. L. 1792	Train G. F. 1829	Waterbury J. B. 1799	Woolsey T. D. 1801
Stone W. L. Jr. 1835	Trowbridge J. T. 1827	Watson H. C. 1831	Worcester J. E. 1784
Story J. 1779	Trumbull B. 1735	Watson J. F. 1779	Worcester N. 1758
Story W. W. 1819	Trumbull H. C. 1830	Waterson H. 1840	Work H. C. 1832
Stowe H. B. 1811	Trumbull J. H. 1821	Wayland F. 1796	Wright C. D. 1840
Street A. B. 1811	Trumbull J. 1750	Webster D. 1782	Wright C. 1830
Strong J. 1822	Tuckerman H. T. 1813	Webster N. 1758	Wright J. M. 1840
Strong J. 1847	Tuckerman J. 1778	Webster P. 1725	Yancey W. L. 1814
	Turner S. H. 1790		Youmans E. L. 1821

