

MSA SC 5881-1-153

MARYLAND
HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

PUBLISHED UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF
THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY



VOLUME XXXIX

BALTIMORE

1944

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXIX

	PAGE
A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY'S HUNDRED YEARS. <i>By Samuel K. Dennis,</i>	1
THE LIBRARY COMPANY OF BALTIMORE, 1795-1854. <i>By Stuart C. Sherman,</i>	6
A DISCORDANT CHAPTER IN LINCOLN'S ADMINISTRATION: THE DAVIS-BLAIR CONTROVERSY. <i>By Reinhard H. Luthin,</i>	25
BENNET ALLEN, FIGHTING PARSON, <i>continued.</i> <i>By Josephine Fisher,</i> . . .	49
THE HISTORIC MULBERRY TREE OF ST. MARY'S CITY. <i>By William B. Marye,</i>	73
A LIST OF PROMOTIONS IN THE MARYLAND REGULAR TROOPS, 1776. <i>Edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr.,</i>	81
BOOK REVIEWS, 85, 164, 269,	345
NOTES AND QUERIES, 93, 175, 274,	357
VIGNETTES OF MARYLAND HISTORY: PART I. <i>By Raphael Semmes,</i>	95
LETTERS OF SEVERN TEACKLE WALLIS, 1816-1894. <i>By Frederick Down Scott, S. J.,</i>	127
MADAME GRELAUD'S FRENCH SCHOOL. <i>By Lucy Leigh Bowie,</i>	141
POLITICS IN MARYLAND DURING THE CIVIL WAR, <i>continued.</i> <i>By Charles Branch Clark,</i>	149, 315
AN ACCOUNT OF THE JOHN BROWN RAID,	162
CONTROVERSY OVER THE COMMAND AT BALTIMORE IN THE WAR OF 1812. <i>By Ralph Robinson,</i>	177
CIVILIAN DEFENSE IN BALTIMORE, 1814-1815: MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE OF VIGILANCE AND SAFETY. <i>Edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr.,</i> 199,	293
ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF ELECTRICAL COMMUNICATION IN THE UNITED STATES. <i>By Frank B. Jewett,</i>	225
A MARYLAND TOUR IN 1844: DIARY OF ISAAC VAN BIBBER,	237
WILLIAM PINKNEY'S FIRST PUBLIC SERVICE. <i>By Max P. Allen,</i>	277
EARLY MARYLAND BOOKPLATES <i>By Edith Rossiter Bevan,</i>	310
GOVERNOR CHARLES GOLDSBOROUGH'S VIEWS ON SLAVERY,	332
AMONG THE "MEETERS AT THE BAYSIDE." <i>By Emerson B. Roberts,</i>	335

ILLUSTRATIONS

	PAGE
Newsboys' Address, 1780,	opp. 95
Announcement of a Lottery Broker, 1823,	115
Toll Rates at Norwood's Ferry Bridge, 1817,	123
Eliza Law (Mrs. Lloyd Nicholas Rogers) (1797-1822),	opp. 141
Julia Calvert (Mrs. Richard Henry Stuart) (1810 ?-1888),	opp. 141
William Henry Winder (1775-1824) by Joseph Wood,	opp. 177
Isaac Van Bibber (1810-1847),	opp. 237

MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. XXXIX

MARCH, 1944

No. 1

A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY'S HUNDRED YEARS *

By SAMUEL K. DENNIS

It is a pleasure and an honor to participate on any terms in the birthday celebration of this virile and learned centenarian; to tell you briefly of its power, and triumph; to mention also some of the existing weaknesses it will doubtless correct long before its next centennial. Since I am not an officer of the Society I am the better enabled to do both objectively.

Your magnetic and progressive President lately ordered me to deliver an address covering the crowded century this Society has lived. I protested. That would consume hours; would postpone too long the promised opportunity to hear one of the world's fine poets and authors, the Honorable Archibald MacLeish.

Again it is superfluous to rehearse the history of the Society, when the splendid historical address of the late Bernard C. Steiner, carefully prepared and delivered in 1919, is available. A compromise was reached; which is "A Brief Summary"; and you will find that indeed enough.

I would prefer to speak without manuscript. But to do so

* Address before the Centennial Meeting of the Society at the Peabody Institute, February 21, 1944.

involves the danger that I might overrun your patience. A written paper imposes calculated limits; a salutary device.

All know this Society was organized by large and enlightened men, the intellectual elite of the City, at a time when there was direst need of its offices. Its corporate function expressed in its ancient charter was to collect, preserve and diffuse information relating to biography and to the civil and literary history of this State and of America. We are proud of that small group of progressive men, with a blessed sense of the past, such as Mayer, whose portrait adorns the Society's hall, Latrobe, Brune, Lucas, Brown, Donaldson and J. Morrison Harris (the last of the founders to pass away), who sacrificed valiantly and labored fruitfully a century ago to found and nurture this institution.

Perhaps they would feel rewarded for their efforts, their faith confirmed, could they note the growth of this unique Society, now of over 2,000 members, which maintains a considerable museum, an art gallery, and a really great library that includes a fine collection of original historical material, housed in part in a mansion itself nearly a century old. That is not all. The Society publishes a magazine of unquestioned quality; and has happily become patron and host for a popular free lecture program, as is abundantly demonstrated by the presence of our gifted guest speaker of the evening. It is clear the Society is still true to the original ideals of its founders.

We are proud of the vitality of the Society, its drawing power, its quality of continuity. Descendants of the founders are potent today in its affairs. Men and women of the Mayer, Latrobe, Donaldson and Brune blood, for example, are among our members. Perhaps the most signal instance of sustained loyalty to tradition is found in our secretary, Mr. W. Hall Harris, Jr. His grandfather, a great and forceful man, J. Morrison Harris, helped found the Society. He lived to deliver the address when the Society celebrated its fiftieth birthday. Secretary Harris' father, the late W. Hall Harris, suave, intellectual, gifted, was our President for thirteen years. Hence the Society over a period of a century has incurred a debt of gratitude to the Harris family.

For over sixty years the Society had its home in the old Athenaeum Building, at Saratoga and St. Paul Streets, where the garage—what a change—now stands. That dignified old building was not fire proof, was dingy, dark, and ill-suited. It must be

owned the meetings held there were formidable. Minutes and correspondence were read *in extenso* to a mere handful of faithful members present, and late in the evening they were rewarded, or punished, with a "discourse." The streamlined mechanics of a corporate meeting you witnessed tonight are not of the past century. Nor was the Athenaeum a pleasant place to work. Patient, pallid genealogists shuffled in perennial gloom; and the public rarely invaded their semi-solitude.

We were emancipated from those severe quarters February 18, 1919, through the generosity of the greatest of the Society's multitude of benefactors, Mrs. H. Irvine Keyser. She it was who bought the old Enoch Pratt mansion, through which you lately passed; and she it was who added the fire proof structure, passed on its plans, and presented the whole to the Society as a memorial to her husband. It is perhaps in poor taste to mention figures in connection with a memorial so dignified, so august, presented so graciously to honor her husband, and to preserve from fire and moth the historical treasures she so sincerely appreciated. Yet for the record it should be said, I hope without impropriety and if we judge correctly, that the property cost Mrs. Keyser about \$200,000. The Society has received countless rich gifts from generous friends; legacies, and works of art, whole libraries, manuscripts, which defy appraisal for they are not to be priced in dollars. Nevertheless the glorious generosity of Mrs. Keyser, according to tangible standards, overtops the rest.

We look back to the fabulous characters who have been our guests or patrons; men of the caliber of Webster, Clay, Peabody, Bulwer Lytton, James Bryce, Clemenceau, and Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden. A century hence your descendants will reflect proudly upon the many famous public men who have been attracted to this platform by our indefatigable President, constantly aided by Mr. Benjamin Howell Griswold, Jr., Chairman of the Committee on Addresses. Posterity will envy us the opportunity, which we in fact richly enjoy, of seeing those figures and hearing their living voices.

The Society collected, and, until the Hall of Records was completed, preserved, an immense mass of early public records at a time when the State itself was neither disposed nor able to protect them from theft and loss. The Society's own enormous collections of manuscripts, original corporate and personal records

are of inestimable value to students and antiquarians. The Society has edited and published fifty-nine volumes of *State Archives*, aided by State appropriations, and thereby made the most important provincial records of the State available. It is amazing how constantly the Archives are consulted. Some of those volumes are dog-eared with use. Dr. J. Hall Pleasants merits unstinted praise for lately performing that exacting editorial task.

Perhaps the *Maryland Historical Magazine*, started in 1906, under the editorial care of Professor William Hand Browne, supplies our widest popular appeal. Our members are scattered here, there and even abroad. Relatively few have access to Society headquarters, or may listen to the interesting lectures delivered there by accomplished journalists, statesmen and authors. The *Magazine* reaches them all. It is also available to patrons of many libraries. The magazine continued to find public favor during the golden period when that remarkable man of letters, Louis H. Dielman, was its editor. And now that editorial duty falls to our gifted Director, Mr. James W. Foster.

A further triumph: In 1891 the Society abandoned its original anti-feminist policy and welcomed women to membership. True, no undignified haste marked that step. But the wisdom of the new and enlightened policy has been graciously and beautifully vindicated. Many of our most useful and devoted members and officers are women. I believe that Mrs. Robert F. Brent and Miss Harriet P. Marine were the first women to become officers of the Society. Miss Mary W. Milnor was the first, and Mrs. Annie Leakin Sioussat was the second woman admitted to membership.

The Society has had many vicissitudes, has survived or will survive three devastating wars. The demoralization, turmoil, and local dissensions of the Civil War reduced its life to a flickering flame. Its strength was not much abated by the first world war; we trust the present world struggle will leave it strong to serve the ends of learning and culture. It would seem so. Headed by a succession of scholarly, devoted Presidents, revived and vigorous, it has developed and grown steadily. Its recent growth has been amazing. Tonight, in spite of the preoccupations due to war, its membership, usefulness and public support break all records; tributes to the enthusiasm and ability of its responsible officers.

The light this Society might spread in the community ought not to be limited, much less concealed. To do so is ungenerous. Our

treasures ought to be shared with and enjoyed by the public, made more easily and hospitably available to the people; for a large element will enjoy them. I have belonged to this Society since 1905 and have yet to see some of its exhibits and rooms. They are locked. I am sure Director Foster will correct that condition when he can. He faces an immediate obstacle, the lack of guards to protect exhibits of hallowed associations, and manuscripts from theft.

Though the Society has gone far, has succeeded beyond the hopes of its founders, much remains unattained.

A large membership is desirable. With slight effort our members might be twice doubled in number. Tons of records lie uncataloged, undigested, because the men and means are lacking. Many valuable papers now stored in garrets, churches and homes should be sought and collected ere they are lost. Mr. J. Alexis Shriver, who sits on the front row, had a genius for discovering and retrieving such hidden material. You who find our rooms on Monument Street inadequate, the chairs hard, will argue the Society sorely needs a comfortable lecture hall; such as we now enjoy as guests of the hospitable Peabody Institute. The original Pratt Mansion is not fire-proof. The Society imperatively needs enlarged fire-proof storage space for its rare and exquisite objects, as well as for books and original documents. It needs additional endowments; it needs, and will always need, additional income, for the requirements of culture are insatiate. We hope the future providentially produces a patron who will follow the noble example of Mrs. Keyser with the gift of those needed facilities. A lady of wisdom and wealth she knew that:

If thou art rich, thou art poor;

Thou bear'st thy heavy riches but a journey,
And death unloads thee.

The next century may bring our hearts' desires. Perhaps Senator Radcliffe will see them miraculously established during his career as President; vast and hopeless though that development now appears. We may take courage when we recall the Senator's capacity for miracles, as expressed by a business associate, who said: "George Radcliffe, his methods are odd, you think sometimes he will never come through, but give him time enough, let him do it in his own way and he will move the pyramids from Egypt to Druid Hill Park."

THE LIBRARY COMPANY OF BALTIMORE, 1795-1854

By STUART C. SHERMAN

A few days before Christmas in the year 1795, "some Gentlemen in Baltimore Town, impressed with a sense of the benefits resulting from a Public Library, & concerned that there was no Institution of the kind in this Town, drew up some Constitutional outlines of one, which they submitted to several, who they supposed would patronize so Laudable an Institution. In a very few days, fifty-nine persons Subscribed these outlines."¹ So states the earliest record of the Library Company of Baltimore.

Among the prominent merchants and intellectuals who were present at the organization meetings at Bryden's Inn during January were the Right Rev. Dr. John Carroll, cousin of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, later to become the first American Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, and for many years a loyal president of the Library Company; Rev. Patrick Allison, first minister of the Presbyterian Church; Rev. J. G. J. Bend, pastor of St. Paul's Church;² Richard Caton, a leading merchant, who later married the daughter of Charles Carroll; Robert Gilmore, founder of the first powder mill in Baltimore, and the first president of the Academy of Sciences; Nicholas Brice, lawyer, and David Harris, military officer and merchant. At these meetings a constitution was "agreed to," the price of a share set at twenty dollars, and every member was required to "annually contribute Four Dollars for every share which he may lawfully possess."

Such were the beginnings of the institution whose founders

¹ Quotations, unless otherwise mentioned in footnotes, are taken from the constitution, by-laws, or minutes of the meetings of the Library Company now in possession of the Maryland Historical Society.

² It is pertinent to note the close alliance between books and libraries, and the clergy in this period.

were convinced that the "diffusion of useful knowledge" would augment the "prosperity of the community."

The year 1795 showed Baltimore to be a flourishing seaport. War had broken out in Europe three years previously, and exports from Baltimore, chiefly wheat and tobacco, increased over seven-fold in the decade from 1790 to 1800. This period brought the many social and cultural changes which accompany prosperity. A new theater had been opened by Mr. Hallam in 1794, banks were established to handle the sudden inflow of capital, a medical society and a school of medicine (though unsuccessful) had been founded, many new churches established and others strengthened, and several attempts were made to establish academies for the instruction of youth. Society had grown too large for entertaining in private homes and had erected a building called the "Assembly Rooms."

From the founding of the town of Baltimore in 1729 to its incorporation in 1796 the book needs of the inhabitants were met only in a superficial manner by a few circulating libraries operated by booksellers. Of these libraries Baltimore could boast five in 1796. Recent studies of the estates of Maryland families dating from 1674 reveal that nearly sixty percent of the inventories analyzed contained books, although some contained only a Bible or a Common Prayer Book or both.³ Many of the colonists owned large collections, but these were chiefly held by doctors, lawyers, clergymen, and successful planters and merchants.

After the Revolution, the expansion of the book trade progressed hand in hand with the developing commercial and industrial activity. Newspapers, almanacs, sermons, government reports and legislative enactments, and original and reprinted works of literary character were the chief productions of the press. In Baltimore by 1800 there were twenty printers and booksellers operating.⁴ But the trade had not developed to the extent that libraries and private collectors could depend solely on American publications. England was still a world center and America depended upon her literary output. Philadelphia was, at this time, the chief center of the book trade in America, with New York becoming a close rival.

³ Joseph T. Wheeler, "Books owned by Marylanders, 1700-1776," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XXXV (1940), p. 338.

⁴ *The New Baltimore Directory and Annual Register for 1800 and 1801* (Baltimore, 1800).

It is interesting to speculate on the possible origin of the Library Company. There may have been no direct connection between the series of letters which appeared in the "Baltimore Daily Repository"⁵ of January and February, 1793, urging the establishment of a circulating library, and the actual founding of the Library Company. However, they may have been read, if not written, by some of the founders, and might have influenced their eventual organization. No clue is given to the identity of "Philonaus," "A Citizen," and "Another Citizen," the signers of the letters. Could some of the founders have been stimulating interest and sizing up a public reaction to their project?

"Philonaus" says on January 29th, "It is a circumstance to be regretted, that a town like this, containing upwards of fifteen thousand inhabitants, does not afford a circulating library; . . . The advantages that would accrue towards the mental accomplishments from an institution of this nature, and the disadvantages arising from the want of one, are too obvious to need a recital."⁶ He then proceeds to suggest outlines for the proper running of such a library.

"A Citizen," in reply to "Philonaus" two days later, proposed the "adoption of one similar to that of the Philadelphia Library Company established by Dr. Franklin, many years ago, which from its extensive utility is too notorious to require a particular recital."⁷ This writer is more eloquent than his co-planner. He further writes that "The advantages resulting to society from an institution which has for its object the information of the inquisitive, the entertainment of the superficial, and the general improvement of the human mind, must strike the most unlettered observer."⁸

"Is it not therefore astonishing that a town respectable for its number, respectable for its commerce, should have continued so long inattentive to the advancement of science, the belles lettres, and the real ornaments of life?" Since some of the suggestions made in the letters actually appear in the Constitution of the Library Company there is sound reason to believe that one or more of the founders wrote the letters.

⁵ This was the "first daily paper successfully printed in Baltimore." It was begun on October 24, 1791. Joseph T. Wheeler, *The Maryland Press, 1777-1790* (Baltimore, 1938), p. 72.

⁶ Reprinted in the *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XII (1917), pp. 297-302.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibid.*

During January and February of 1796 meetings of the Directors of the Library Company were held nearly every week, for there was much to be done. The Rev. Dr. Carroll was unanimously chosen President and for 20 years ably directed the affairs of the Library. A constitution and by-laws had to be drawn up and adopted "for the orderly managing of the institution," and a "room conveniently situated in a central part of the Town, as a depository for their books" had to be procured.

Notices were inserted in the newspapers informing citizens of the newly-formed library and calling upon "those who have subscribed to pay the price of their shares" so that books could be obtained and the library could be opened "with all possible expedition."

On February 29th the Directors, "having duly considered the ends of the Institution, and at the same time, the very low price at which the most valuable Books may be purchased," it was resolved that a committee be appointed to draw up a catalogue of books for the library. On the book committee, there were three clergymen and a doctor, which is perhaps proof of the trust placed in professional men's knowledge of books. In drawing up the catalogue they were directed to confine their selections to books "in the English language, a small proportion of French books excepted," that "rare books introduced into the Catalogue be few," and "that it consist chiefly of books in general demand" and "of general utility."

Two months later a letter was sent to William Murdock, Esq., of London "requesting his assistance in the purchase of the books." The treasurer, Mr. John Brice, Jr., had previously been directed to invest \$1200 in the purchase of a Bill of Exchange which would cover the cost of the Library's first large order.

In September, 1796, a room was obtained, and a Librarian, John Mondesir, chosen. He did not remain long in the employ of the Library Company, however, for six weeks later he offered his resignation (we are not told why) and was succeeded by Mr. Perrigny. The Librarian's salary was set at two hundred dollars a year. According to the By-Laws, he was required to "attend at the Library every day in the week, Sunday excepted, from ten o'clock A. M. to two o'clock P. M., in order to deliver and receive the books of the company." To a subscriber he could deliver "one folio for six weeks; or one quarto for five weeks; or one

octavo, or two duodecimos, or four pamphlets, for two weeks.”⁹ Non-members (i. e., those who did not own shares) could borrow books by leaving a deposit of double the value of the books. Fines were collected by the Librarian for over-due books. He, furthermore, was required to keep the books in proper condition, to keep a register of books issued, and present a monthly financial statement of money received for hire of books, fines, and forfeitures of shares for non-payment.

In the October 5th issue of *The New World: or, The Morning and Evening Gazette* published by Samuel H. Smith, we are informed that “In addition to our information of Saturday we are able to say that the number of books actually imported for the Baltimore Library exceeds 1,300 volumes of various sizes; and that at least 700 more purchased in American bookstores will speedily be added. It is expected that in ten days the library will be opened for the accommodation of the public.”¹⁰

Another contemporary record tells us that “The Baltimore Library Company opened their library for the use of the members on the evening of October 22nd, at the house of Mr. Williams, Lemon street.”¹¹

In March, 1797, another order for books to the amount of £300 sterling was forwarded to London.¹² The records do not show what titles were imported and which were bought from American booksellers. The book committee did not completely overlook books published in this country, for the Directors proposed that they look into what “American productions it may be proper to add to those already selected.”

During this early period of the Library’s existence the Directors were often compelled to move the collection. The reason is not given, but the probable answer is that at the rate at which the collection was growing, more and more space was required. The Treasurer’s account-books frequently show entries covering payment for new bookcases to shelve the rapidly expanding collection. In the spring of 1798 a room on the first floor of the Dancing Assembly on Holliday Street was engaged for three years at

⁹ Books were classed, and also loaned according to size, i. e., folio, quarto, octavo, duodecimo.

¹⁰ Issue of October 5, 1796.

¹¹ J. Thomas Scharf, *The Chronicles of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1874), p. 278.

¹² This order was received in February, 1798.

\$150 a year. This proved to be the home of the Library Company for many years.

In March, 1798, the president was requested to ascertain the price for printing a catalogue of the books belonging to the Library Company. Although there is no copy of the catalogue among the other records of the Library, we know that the project was carried out from an entry in Evans' *American Bibliography*,¹³ This was the first printed catalogue of the Library Company, and was issued in 600 copies.

It was not one of the duties of a librarian at that time to select and order books. This was the prime function of the book committee, composed of several Directors of the library. A clear picture is not offered in the Minutes, but from what is recorded it appears that the book committee drew up a list of desired books, perhaps from notices sent out by London and American booksellers.¹⁴ This list, called a catalogue, was then submitted to their London agent. Books may also have been bought from itinerant book peddlars and subscription agents, as, for example, "Parson" Mason Locke Weems.

The Minutes for May, 1798, record the first inventory of the Library as follows:

The Committee appointed to compare the books in the Library with the catalogue of those which have been from time to time purchased for and given to the Company, and to report the Condition in which the books are;—Report, That upon examination, none appear to be wanting, except *Newton on Curves*, *Ned Evans*, and *De Retz's Memoirs*. . . . They farther report that the books are, in general, very little worse for the use which has been made of them: that of those which have suffered, fresh American editions have received incomparably the greatest injury.

The system of reserving library books is evidently not a modern one for the Minutes record that "if a person leaves with the Librarian a written application for a book which may have been delivered to another, and does not apply for said book within [a stated number of] days after it shall have been returned; It may then be delivered to the next applicant."

¹³ "Catalogue of the books, &c. belonging to the Library Company of Baltimore; with the by-laws of the company, and list of members. Baltimore; Printed by John Hayes, 1797."

¹⁴ The newspapers often printed lists of books imported by American booksellers.

In December, 1798, a committee was appointed to write to the Library Company of Philadelphia as to the advisability of "petitioning Congress to take off the imposts upon books imported for public Libraries and concerning the best mode of making such applications, if it should be thought advisable." Whether or not this proposal was carried through is not recorded.

It seems evident from the tone of the Minutes in the spring of 1799 that the affairs of the Company were progressing favorably. The Library collection now exceeded 3,300 volumes and there was a total membership of 346 subscribers, nearly 100 having been added during the year. Because of this increased membership and greater demand for the use of books, the Library was henceforth to be open from ten A. M. till two P. M. every day of the week, Saturday and Sunday excepted. The Librarian's salary was again increased (to \$450) plus an allowance of one hundred dollars for stationery, firewood and a servant. Frequent gifts of books and pamphlets are recorded. An examination of the Treasurer's statement showed receipts amounting to over \$2,500 for the current year.

At the annual meeting of the Directors the following April (1800) it was gravely announced that the ship carrying books ordered from London was reported missing. The books were, however, insured and it was expected that the Company could collect £250 insurance. In spite of this loss there was a general feeling of optimism at the meeting. The Minutes read: "The Directors regret the misfortune which has probably happened in the loss or capture of the ship *John Brickwood*; but they still think that they have great reason for congratulating the Company on the rapid progress of their undertaking, and the prosperous state of their affairs."

What were Baltimoreans reading in 1800?¹⁵ An extremely valuable source for this information is found in the circulation registers which are among the existing records of the Library Company of Baltimore. As far as is known, these are the sole existing records of the reading interests of Baltimoreans, except for diaries and letters. Social and cultural historians have, until recently, failed to recognize the value of these library records as an index to the reading of our ancestors. We must, however, recognize that

¹⁵ The ledger used contained borrower's records for the inclusive years 1800 to 1803 so that this is merely an approximate date.

they do not represent a true cross-section of the reading public at that time, since it was only the wealthy who could afford membership in these societies.

The ledgers contain the names of each member of the Library Company listed alphabetically at the top of the page. Below each name appears a list of the books issued to that person by the Librarian. One may also find when the books were borrowed and just when they were returned. From the entries under such names as Charles Carroll of Carrollton, Roger B. Taney, and John Eager Howard in each successive register, one may gain a pretty satisfactory idea of the interests of these men. A revealing study might be made of the influence of the books of the Library Company on future statesmen. It is perhaps significant that Roger B. Taney, later Chief Justice of the U. S. Supreme Court, was a lover of the classics. At about age 45 he read widely in poetry, including *Canterbury Tales*, Burns, Gray, Percivale, Ovid, Coleridge, and enjoyed Gothic mysteries and romances. Among the latter were *The Castle of Otranto* and the novels of Maria Edgeworth. But his more serious reading included Chalmer's *Political Annals*, Sully's *Memoirs*, and lives of Columbus and Lafayette.

On the whole, our ancestors were well-read and were keeping abreast of the times through newspapers and magazines, chiefly English, besides the best books that were available in the Baltimore Library and in local bookstores and circulating libraries. The erroneous idea that they read little but theology, religious tracts and sermons should be dispelled. The printed catalogue of 1809 reveals that the Library Company owned more books on these subjects than on any other, but the reading of such books was not in proportion to the number available. In fact, except for the few clergymen who were members, the percentage of books on religion which the majority read was practically negligible.

The truth is that the early Baltimoreans were not greatly different from ourselves in what they read. Books on law, medicine, agriculture, husbandry, architecture, and other practical subjects were read to aid them in their occupations or professions. They relaxed at home in the evening with a novel by Fielding, Scott, Richardson, or Fanny Burney following the hero and heroine through their "trials and tribulations." *The Romance of the Forrest*, *Tales of the Castle* and similar Gothic mysteries, and romances with such titles as *Errors of Innocence* and *Exhibitions*

of the Heart were in vogue. But Baltimoreans were not entirely diverted from more solid reading, even though nearly 25 per cent. of all books read was fiction. They kept in touch with the changing world by reading history. Gibbon's *Rome*, Herodotus, Rollin's *Ancient History*, and Hume's *England* were especially popular. They read lives of Garrick and Dr. Johnson and Plutarch's *Lives*, and were very fond of following the discoveries of new lands as in Cooke's and Bligh's *Voyages* and other books on travel. Such books undoubtedly helped them to become better citizens and to do more ably the tasks that confronted them in an expanding America. The Baltimorean who could not discourse intelligently on the great English authors over the tea-cup or after-dinner wine and cigar in the drawing rooms at Homewood or Mount Clare was considered provincial and unenlightened.

READING BY SUBJECT IN BALTIMORE FOR THE YEAR 1800

Subject	Number of Books Read	Percentage
1. Fiction	384	24.90
2. Biography	253	16.40
3. Literature and Criticism.	243	15.76
4. Voyages and Travel.	228	14.79
5. History	211	13.68
6. Science and Medicine.	100	6.49
7. Theology and Philosophy.	95	6.16
8. Law and Government.	28	1.82
	1542	100.00

MOST POPULAR NON-FICTION IN BALTIMORE—1800

Titles	Circulation
1. Pope's Works (Iliad, Odyssey, etc.)	14
2. Gibbon's <i>Rome</i>	12
3. Plutarch's <i>Lives</i>	12
4. Johnson's <i>Works</i>	11
5. <i>Men and Manners</i> (Travel in N. Am.)	11
6. <i>Canterbury Tales</i>	10
7. Rollin's <i>Ancient History</i>	9
8. Hume's <i>England</i>	8
9. Jefferson's <i>Notes on Virginia</i>	8
10. Bligh's <i>Voyages</i>	7

Other books which were among the best-read books of the day included Shakespeare, *Cooke's Voyages*, *Boswell's Johnson*, and

Boswell's Tour of the Hebrides, Stedman's American War, Wealth of Nations, Macaulay's History of England, Life of Garrick, and Rights of Women.

MOST POPULAR FICTION IN BALTIMORE—1800

Titles	Circulation
1. Don Quixote.....	16
2. Castle of the Rock.....	14
3. Gil Blas.....	10
4. Grasville Abbey (Gothic novel).....	10
5. Sir Charles Grandison.....	9
6. Exhibitions of the Heart.....	8
7. Fielding's works.....	8
8. Scott's novels.....	8
9. Ned Evans.....	7
10. Arabian Nights.....	6

Other books on this list included *Clarissa Harlowe, Emmeline, Pamela, Humphrey Clinker, Romance of the Forest, Castle of Otranto, Evelina, and Peregrine Pickle.*

ANALYSIS OF THE 1809 CATALOGUE OF THE LIBRARY COMPANY

Subject	Number of Volumes	Percentage
1. Miscellaneous.....	466	12.90
2. Theology.....	401	11.09
3. History.....	350	9.68
4. Fiction.....	339	9.37
5. Law and Politics.....	318	8.79
6. Poetry and Plays.....	308	8.51
7. Voyages and Travel.....	275	7.60
8. Science and Mathematics.....	263	7.30
9. Surgery and Medicine.....	263	7.27
10. Biography.....	211	5.83
11. Belles Lettres.....	138	3.81
12. Classics and Antiquities.....	135	3.73
13. Agriculture and Domestic Economy.....	85	2.35
14. Art and Music.....	64	1.77
Total.....	3616	100.00

In the Annual Report for April 26, 1802, we find the first record of the Library's book selection policy. It reads:

The Directors flatter themselves that the Company will approve the selection of authors, whose works constitute the valuable accession to

their literary treasure. In the making the selection, the Directors were guided by the intention and desire of enriching the Library with those productions which are esteemed most conducive to encourage Religion and Morality, diffuse correct historical information, and advance the cultivation of the sciences and useful arts. But tho' the Directors appropriated to these purposes, the largest portion of the funds within their management, they were not unmindful of employing a competent share of them for gratifying the taste of genius and providing for the entertainment of those readers who seek amusement and instruction in works of a lighter and less durable kind, but made interesting, by their reference to the events and manners of our own times.

This, of course, is a very broad and general statement, designed to include the demands of most readers, and how eloquently phrased it is!

In the annual report of April, 1804, a greater demand for books was noted, the busiest time of the year being from October to June. During that period a daily average of 66 volumes was delivered to readers. A year later the President reported that the library had spent \$1,300 during the year for books, and that the total membership was then 404. The price of shares was raised to \$35.

At the February meeting, 1807, a suggestion was submitted that "measures be taken to raise funds for purchasing a suitable lot, and erecting a commodious building for the deposit of the Library." This was not the first mention of such a plan, for several years previously a committee had been appointed to look for a suitable lot. Just how active the Directors really were is not clear from the records. However, when the Minutes frequently record that notices were inserted in the *Federal Gazette* stating that many members had not paid their annual contributions, in consequence of which the library was obliged to borrow money from the banks, one can see that the Company was in no position as yet to invest in real estate.

Somewhat later, the Committee on the Library Lot suggested that all members pay an additional annual fee of \$2.00 for eight years, that a fund be formed from these payments toward the purchase of a suitable lot, and that the Library Company apply to the General Assembly for permission to establish a lottery to aid the fund. A notice of this was printed in the *Federal Gazette* and *The American*.

In the annual report of April 27, 1807, the following statement appears:

The Directors of the Baltimore Library Company are sorry to report to their constituents, that the ship *Shepherdess* from London to Norfolk, on board of which were the books ordered last spring, was cast away early in the winter. They could have been a valuable accession to the literary treasure already possessed by the Company. However, there is this alleviation of the disappointment, that the books will probably be repurchased and forwarded during the course of the present year without any material injury to the public stock, in consequence of the property being insured . . .

A year later the books lost on the *Shepherdess* had been replaced and another order filled. However, the uncertainty of shipments from London at this time, and previous losses, induced the Directors to "think of other methods of obtaining the annual supplies of the Library." The "present embarrassment of navigation, and the rates of exchange" impelled them to request that the book committee pay particular attention to the purchasing of books published in the United States.

We must keep in mind the condition of the world at this time. Impressments of British subjects from American ships on the high seas were increasing. In December, 1807, Congress passed the Embargo Act which prevented any American ships from clearing for a foreign destination. But conditions soon gave way to the War of 1812. "The terrific impact of the blockade fell with full force upon New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and other parts of the Middle States . . ." ¹⁶ "The year 1814 was unique in American maritime annals with commerce and shipping movements practically at a dead standstill." ¹⁷

Such far-reaching events could not fail to have their effect on libraries in this country. Decreasing shipments were felt by American booksellers, and, in turn, by the Library Company. By 1809 these conditions had altered the large importation of books and the book committee "found in the possession of the booksellers few works of real merit" which were not already on the Library's shelves.

¹⁶ Robert G. Albion and Jennie B. Pope. *Sea Lanes in Wartime; the American Experience, 1775-1942* (New York, 1942), p. 121.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 120.

For the next few years the growth of the Library was not commensurate with the means for its increase. The annual report of 1812 optimistically states that the "accumulation of funds will furnish more ample means for a rich gratification when the usual intercourse between this and other countries shall be restored, or less exposed to hazard than at present." A year later we were at war with Britain and the Directors had to rely wholly on the output of American printers. But the Non-Importation, Embargo and Non-Intercourse Acts probably acted as a stimulus for an expansion of the American press. Since ink and paper could not be imported from London, printers were forced to rely more and more on their own resources and abilities to supply their needs. Obligated to depend on American printers, the Directors were surprised to learn that the "talents and industry of our own Country afforded facilities greater than was generally foreseen. . . . Many [American editions of European publications] are no wise inferior in typographical excellency, quality of paper, correctness of execution" to the best English editions.

Much eloquence is often to be found in the Annual Reports concerning the value of the collection and its great benefit to society, for example: "The Directors look forward with pleasure to that period when the Antiquary, the Historian, the Astronomer and Geometrician, the Poet and Connoisseur of the fine arts, and in general, the Studious in all useful learning will find whatever may aid, and enlighten them, in their various pursuits." This is obviously aimed at a particular scholarly class of readers and is typical of most subscription libraries of the period. Their collections did not place as much emphasis on the light and popular romance which would appeal more to the tradesmen and clerks, as did the popular circulating libraries which offered for a few pence a week the most popular novels and books of all the accepted authors.

In the spring of 1809 the second Library catalogue was printed, several copies of which are extant. It is alphabetically arranged in 60 classes, and shows a total of 7,231 volumes.

The collection was characteristic of subscription libraries of the period, being more of an academic than a popular one. Theology represented the largest single class, followed by History, Politics, and Fiction, which were about equally represented. There was a rather large collection of books on such practical subjects

as agriculture, husbandry, manufactures, domestic economy, and rural improvement.

There was a fair representation of American classics. A subscriber might find several theological works of Jonathan Edwards, *The Federalist Papers*, John Marshall's *Life of General Washington*, and Franklin's *Autobiography*. One might also find the Holy Bible printed by Isaiah Thomas of Massachusetts. But the writings of Cotton Mather and Thomas Paine were lacking. Several European works are of interest, among them being an incunabulum, *Dionysii Holicarnasei Originum Sive Antiquitatum Romanorum, Libri XI*, [1480]; Newton *On Optics*; Buffon's *Natural History*; Cook's *Voyage Towards the South Pole and Around the World from 1772-1775*; Boswell's *Life of Johnson*; and Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.

In January, 1815, Bishop Carroll, who had been one of the most active founders, and an able president for twenty years, submitted his resignation. He was succeeded by Bishop James Kemp. The Librarian also resigned and was later succeeded by Mr. Richard Owen. This latter change was for the better and the new Librarian made several recommendations concerning the reduction of fines, longer terms of loans, and new titles for purchase which were shortly put into effect.

It was in the spring of 1815 that a lot on Calvert Street was purchased by the Company and shortly thereafter it was announced that the Legislature had approved the library's request to hold a lottery for raising \$30,000 with which to erect a library. A building committee was appointed and two years later an architect was authorized to draw up plans.

But conditions were not so rosy for the Library Company. After the war, the American market was flooded with products from overseas which had piled up during the war. This influx of cheap goods drove many American manufacturers and mills out of business. Expanding American industry could not compete with cheap goods. Unemployment became widespread, banks failed in 1819, and depression prevailed until 1824.

These were difficult times for a library which depended for support on the financial ability of its members. Dues and annual subscriptions were hard to collect, and thus, only a few additions could be made to the collection. The Library Company at this time was forced to dispose of the lot because it could not keep up its

payments. Although the storm of the decade was weathered, the Library had passed its prime and was not again to attain the success it had enjoyed before the war.

If we pause for a moment to examine the state of the nation at this time we may discover a cause for this declining interest in the library. The period from 1820 to 1840 represented years of tremendous industrial growth in the north, the expansion of the west, and the adjustment of the south to the cotton kingdom.

Turnpikes, canals, railroads, steamboats, factories, banks, and telegraphy were new words to Americans. Inland canals and new highways were competing seriously with Baltimore's access to the west. To offset this, the ingenuity of Baltimore merchants and business men was responsible, in 1828, for establishing the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad—the first American railroad to convey freight and passengers.

Free education was one of the most tangible social gains of the period. In Baltimore four schools were established in 1829. Five years previously the cornerstone of the old Baltimore Athenaeum was laid, where for many years public meetings, exhibitions, concerts and lectures on literary and scientific subjects were held for general enlightenment of the citizens. This was probably a part of the lyceum movement which swept the country at this time and served as a most important educational agency.

This period was also the beginning of the flowering of the American spirit in literature. The really great names were to come a little later. For the present, however, the literary and debating societies played an important part in the cultural life of the day. The literary activity of Baltimore in the post-war period centered about the Delphian Club whose purpose was to foster the interest of its members in literary and scientific pursuits. Among the members of this select group of literati were Francis Scott Key; John Neal, poet and dramatist; Samuel Woodworth, author of the "Old Oaken Bucket"; John P. Kennedy, novelist; and John Howard Payne, author of "Home, Sweet Home."¹⁸

It is said that between 1815 and 1833 "no less than seventy-two new periodicals were announced for publication in Baltimore. Few never got beyond the prospectus stage, and forty-seven did

¹⁸ See article by John E. Uhler, "The Delphian Club," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XX (1925), pp. 305-346.

not survive over twelve months."¹⁹ This gives some indication of the extensive literary activity present at the time, and perhaps offers an additional reason why Poe came to Baltimore in 1831²⁰

A study of American library history reveals that progress is greatest during periods of wealth and leisure. With the establishment of such notable institutions as the University of Maryland, the McKim Free School, the Peale Museum, the Maryland Academy of Sciences, the Maryland Institute of Mechanic Arts, lyceums, new theaters, and the circulating libraries of Joseph Robinson and other printers and booksellers who circulated popular books at a small fee, one might expect that the library would also prosper. However, the situation was almost the reverse, and the reason for it seems quite obvious. This was the age of the rise of the common man with the nearly complete absence of class distinction. The Library Company of Baltimore, on the contrary, was not a classless society. It catered to a select group of merchants and intellectuals who could afford to own a share in the company costing fifty dollars, plus an annual contribution of five to ten dollars. The Directors failed to keep their institution in tune with the times by making its services available to the common man with limited income. The trend in library history at this time was toward the complete popularization of books and libraries.

The new need was later recognized with the establishment of the Mercantile Library Association whose purpose it was to provide opportunities for reading and study to young clerks and apprentices. The movement had started by the establishment of similar libraries in Boston and New York, and its success was due to the low fees (\$3.00 annually after an initiation fee of \$2.00 in Baltimore), the popular nature of the book collections, and memberships within the means of the young men for whom they were intended. The libraries were usually connected with a school which offered classes in arithmetic, bookkeeping, languages, writing, and debating. The lectures and library were open to all who

¹⁹ John C. French, "Poe's Literary Baltimore," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XXXII (1937), pp. 101-112.

²⁰ Several biographers of Edgar Allan Poe have speculated on the possibility of his having used the Baltimore Library Company. Although no proof appears in the library's records, it is apparent that Poe could not have written as he did without recourse to printed works. It is quite possible that Neilson Poe, a cousin, who was a member of the library at this time, was instrumental in securing permission for him to use the collection.

could pay the annual fee, and the movement was of great service to the interests of literature.

During the mid-twenties the Directors were concerned about the harmful effects of reading light novels and cheap romances by the youth of Baltimore. Such books, the Directors said, are the "delight of youth and not unfrequently the charm of old age. The taste for such productions, particularly in the morning of life, we cannot repress. It can only be controlled and directed to some useful end by the choice of the best performances in this walk of literature." An examination of the catalogues of booksellers' circulating libraries of the period reveal such lush titles as *Andronica, or the Fugitive Bride; Coquette; Doubtful Marriage; Effects of the Passions*; and the *Perplexities of Love*. Perhaps there was due cause for their concern!

On the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the Library Company, April 23, 1827, the Directors paused to look back and survey their progress. The report speaks of their indebtedness to the founders for the promotion of the institution amidst the uncertain state of the nation. "This library, for its extent may justly be regarded as perhaps the most select of any in this country, and well suited to the really scientific and practical genius of the present day. . . ."

There is also a less pleasant side of the report which decries the falling off of patronage and the apathy in regard to reading in the community. More than half of the membership joined between 1797 and 1800. In 1827 the library consisted of 10,422 volumes which had cost over thirty thousand dollars. But because of the large number of unpaid dues the library was virtually in a state of inactivity.

"For years," President Gilmor reported in 1834, the "affairs of the institution . . . have continued gradually to decline" in spite of continued efforts to revive interest. Membership was below 300 and the revenue of the library down to \$1,000 a year. It was even intimated that the books might have to be sold in order to pay the debts of the Company. Five dollars was finally assessed to each share of stock to help pay the debts, and the annual shares were raised to \$50.00.

During this year 435 colored plates in five "elephant folio" volumes, the work of John Audubon, the American naturalist and painter, were presented to the library by President Gilmor. This

was probably the most costly and unique work on ornithology ever published, and one of the treasures of the library's collection.

Publication of another supplementary catalog in 1841 revealed that the library contained 12,338 volumes.

In 1845 a letter from Mr. William Rodenwald, one of the Company's directors, was read "proposing a plan for the erection of an edifice to accommodate the Library and the Maryland Historical Society." Evidently much had been done that did not get into the records, for in 1848 the "Baltimore Athenaeum was opened and the edifice inaugurated by the address of Mr. Brantz Mayer, on Monday evening, October 23rd, in the presence of a large and brilliant audience of ladies and gentlemen. . . ." ²¹ The speaker, whose address was entitled "Commerce, Literature, and Art," paid tribute to the donors, chiefly commercial men of the city, who gave \$45,000 for the purchase of the lot and the erection of the building. He spoke of the usefulness of the Library Company as a place "into which the honest and industrious student may freely come, and carefully collate the discordant materials that have been accumulated with commendable industry for future use." ²²

The Mercantile Library Association was granted a permanent lease of the ground floor for its collections and Reading Rooms; the Library Company occupied the second floor; and the Historical Society, with its art gallery, the third floor. Thus, for a time, all of Baltimore's important libraries were housed under one roof.

Members of the Historical Society and the Library Company were entitled to admission to the Reading Rooms and Art Gallery of either society under a cooperative plan. The three societies formed a Council of Government of the Athenaeum consisting of two members from such society empowered to make resolutions with regard to general maintenance such as janitorial service, insurance, fuel, and repairs.

The new building seemed to give a new spurt of life to the Library Company, for we learn that nearly fifty persons subscribed to the free shares which entitled them to use the Reading Rooms at \$8.00 per year. In the annual report of 1851 it was stated that for the first time in over twenty years the library was free of debt

²¹ J. Thomas Scharf. *The Chronicles of Baltimore*, Baltimore, 1874, pp. 525-526.

²² "Dedication of the H. Irvine Keyser Memorial Building," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XIV (1919), p. 16.

and had "acquired stronger claims to the attention of its friends as well as to a generous support from the community."

These improved and satisfying conditions were, however, only temporary. On May 15, 1854, the President of the Library Company called an important general meeting of all stockholders, when a resolution was adopted calling for a union of the Library Company with the Maryland Historical Society. The book collections of the Library were turned over to the Historical Society which was to accept members of the Library on the same terms as its own members, maintain a Reading Room, and open the Library for the free reference use of the general public, the latter service existing today.

Thus, the Library Company of Baltimore passed from the local scene. Though it no longer exists as an institution, its influence has been apparent since its dissolution through its book collection, still owned by the Maryland Historical Society. Its contribution to the library history of Baltimore was to offer a useful collection of books and periodicals for the recreation and enlightenment of the people. But its Directors failed to recognize that the subscription library had passed its zenith, and was rapidly being superseded by a more democratic form of library, which ultimately became what we now know as the American free public library.

A DISCORDANT CHAPTER IN LINCOLN'S ADMINISTRATION: THE DAVIS- BLAIR CONTROVERSY

By REINHARD H. LUTHIN

It is a familiar fact that Abraham Lincoln was beset by countless problems during his service in the White House. Few situations, however, proved so difficult for the War President as the fierce rivalry of Henry Winter Davis and Montgomery Blair, the two most influential Union leaders in Maryland.

Maryland, with its commercial as well as agricultural interests, had been a traditional Whig State during the antebellum years.¹ Essentially conservative and nationally-minded, this "border slave" State had maintained an opposition alike to the abolition-tainted northerners and secession-influenced southerners. When the national Whig party, for long a bulwark against both northern and southern extremism, collapsed in 1854-1855, most Marylanders who opposed the Democrats gave their support to the new "American" or Know-Nothing party. The latter organization, in addition to its anti-Catholic and anti-immigrant doctrines, muffled the slavery issue and preached the necessity of preserving the Union.² Most prominent of Maryland "American" leaders was Henry Winter Davis, representative in Congress from the Baltimore district.³

¹ Arthur C. Cole, *The Whig Party in the South* (Washington, D. C., 1913), pp. 2-4, 44, 62, 133.

² Laurence F. Schmeckebier, *History of the Know Nothing Party in Maryland* (Baltimore, 1899), p. 69; Benjamin Tuska, "Know-Nothingism in Baltimore, 1854-1860," *The Catholic Historical Review*, New Series, V (July, 1925), 217-251; Harry J. Carman and Reinhard H. Luthin, "Some Aspects of the Know-Nothing Movement Reconsidered," *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, XXXIX (April, 1940), 229.

³ The only biography of Davis is Bernard C. Steiner, *Life of Henry Winter Davis* (Baltimore, 1916). A more adequate treatment of Davis is badly needed. An uncritical summary of Davis's career is J. Frederick Essary, *Maryland in National Politics From Charles Carroll to Albert C. Ritchie* (Baltimore, 1932), pp. 201-225.

During 1859 Davis, concerned with defeating the hated Democrats and checking secessionist influence, acquired ideas of forming a union of the "Americans" and the Republicans for the Presidential election a year hence.⁴ He proclaimed that Maryland's true interests were with the North rather than the South: In January, 1860, he voted for William Pennington, New Jersey Republican, for Speaker of the House of Representatives.⁵ The Republicans reciprocated by giving the office of Sergeant-at-Arms to Davis's lieutenant, Henry W. Hoffman, of Cumberland.⁶ Davis maintained that in supporting Pennington he was combatting the "disunion" Democratic party.⁷ He firmly believed that the Republicans might be induced to vote for the "American" candidate for President in 1860.⁸

But however valiantly Davis might work for an "American" Republican coalition against the Democrats, he was destined to disappointment. For the progress of events—and the Blairs—decreed otherwise.

The Blair family constituted a mighty power in national politics. Few spoke of this Blair or that Blair, for they were usually termed "the Blairs." Francis P. Blair, Sr., had exerted influence in Democratic circles ever since the days when he had been Andrew Jackson's right arm. One of his sons, Francis P., Jr.,—"Frank"—had settled in St. Louis, where he became a strong factor in Missouri politics. Francis P. Blair's other son, Montgomery, lived with him in Maryland, where the elder Blair held forth at his country seat at Silver Spring, on the outskirts of Washington. In 1856 the Blairs had cast their lot with the Republicans.⁹

The senior Blair and his son, Montgomery, believed that the

⁴ Davis to Morrill, August 20, 1859, Justin S. Morrill Papers, Library of Congress; *Speeches and Addresses Delivered in the Congress of the United States and on Several Public Occasions by Henry Winter Davis, of Maryland* (New York, 1867), p. 119.

⁵ J. Thomas Scharf, *History of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1879), III, 346.

⁶ *Congressional Globe*, 36th Cong., 1st sess., p. 663; J. Thomas Scharf, *History of Western Maryland* (Philadelphia, 1882), II, 1400; *Indianapolis Daily State Sentinel*, February 7, 1860.

⁷ Steiner, *Henry Winter Davis*, pp. 145, 150-151; Schmeckebeier, *op. cit.*, pp. 107, 107 n.

⁸ Henry Winter Davis to Hicks, February (?), 1859, in George L. P. Radcliffe, *Governor Thomas H. Hicks of Maryland and the Civil War* (Baltimore, 1901), p. 18.

⁹ For a scholarly treatment of the Blairs' extensive political activities, see William E. Smith, *The Francis Preston Blair Family in Politics* (New York, 1933), 2 vols.

slavery question could be settled by colonizing freed Negroes in Central America. They were certain that if the South were assured that the Republicans had no idea of white and Negro equality, the states below the Potomac might even join the Republicans in their fight against the Democrats!¹⁰ They laid plans to have conservative, slave-holding Maryland represented in the Republican National Convention, scheduled to assemble in Chicago on May 16, 1860. The Maryland Republican party, wrote one Blair ally, was "a concealed one, its sentiments felt by those who hold them as sentiments not safely or wisely to be avowed."¹¹ Francis P. Blair and Montgomery Blair, aided by loyal followers, called a state Republican convention at Baltimore on April 27 (1860) at Rechabite Hall. Montgomery was selected as chairman. The elder Blair and Judge William L. Marshall were chosen as delegates-at-large to the Republican national conclave at Chicago. A typical Blair plank advocating Negro colonization was approved. Essentially a Blair project, this sparsely attended State convention assured Maryland votes at Chicago for Judge Edward Bates of Missouri, whom the Blairs were backing for the Republican presidential nomination.¹²

At Chicago all three Blairs—Francis P. and his two sons—were early on the scene, endeavoring to secure the nomination of Bates. When Abraham Lincoln was selected as standard-bearer in preference to Bates and others, the Blairs supported the future Emancipator.¹³ The elder Blair and Montgomery conducted a fight for Lincoln in Maryland and Frank did the same in Missouri.¹⁴

Meanwhile, Henry Winter Davis would have no part of "Black" Republicanism. Like most erstwhile "Americans" and others opposed to the Democrats in the border regions, Davis

¹⁰ Montgomery Blair to James R. Doolittle, "1859," in Walter L. Fleming, "Deportation and Colonization," in *Studies in Southern History and Politics; Inscribed to William A. Dunning* (New York, 1914), p. 10.

¹¹ William L. Marshall to Montgomery Blair, May 30, 1860, Francis Preston Blair Papers, Library of Congress.

¹² Baltimore *Sun*, April 27, 1860; Matthew P. Andrews, *Tercentenary History of Maryland* (Chicago and Baltimore, 1925), I, 820; Reinhard H. Luthin, "Organizing the Republican Party in the 'Border-Slave' Regions: Edward Bates's Presidential Candidacy in 1860," *The Missouri Historical Review*, XXXVIII (January, 1944), 153-154.

¹³ William Baringer, *Lincoln's Rise to Power* (Boston, 1937), pp. 204-205, 233, 280, 286-287; Murat Halstead, *Caucuses of 1860* (Columbus, Ohio, 1860), pp. 125-127, 144.

¹⁴ Smith, *op. cit.*, I, 485 ff; Lucy L. Tasher, "The Missouri Democrat and the Civil War," *The Missouri Historical Review*, XXXI (July, 1937), 402-403.

went into the newly-founded "Constitutional Union" party and supported Senator John Bell, of Tennessee, for President.¹⁵ Lincoln won the presidency but, as expected, he lost Maryland to his southern Democratic opponent, John C. Breckinridge. Lincoln's popular vote in the State was negligible—only 2,294 contrasted with Breckinridge's 42,482, Bell's 41,760 and Stephen A. Douglas's 5,966.¹⁶

Fierce competition ensued between Davis and Montgomery Blair for a place in Lincoln's Cabinet. The President-elect's staunch Illinois friend, Judge David Davis, was Davis's cousin, and the Judge exerted efforts in behalf of his Maryland kinsman. But the clannish Blairs—the most potent single personal element in the border regions—were determined that Montgomery Blair should be the Maryland member of the Cabinet. Lincoln chose Blair as Postmaster General primarily because he recognized that the Blairs would be invaluable in exerting influence in the pivotal border states. This infuriated Henry Winter Davis. Thus began the unbridled competition between Maryland's two outstanding Unionists.¹⁷

Immediately upon entering the White House Lincoln was confronted with the Maryland dilemma: A skeleton Republican party controlled by his Postmaster General, calling for recognition; whereas the bulk of the opposition to the Democrats was enrolled in the Constitutional Union party, in which Davis held vast power. The Davis-Blair rivalry, precipitated when Lincoln favored Blair over Davis for his Cabinet, grew more bitter in April, 1861, as the President set about distributing the Federal patronage.¹⁸

The Davis-led Constitutional Unionists, having supported Bell for President, were fearful lest Lincoln would give to the Blair-dominated Republicans all of the federal offices in the State. Accordingly, when Lincoln, during the days preceding the firing on Fort Sumter, was making up the slate of Maryland appoint-

¹⁵ Steiner, *op. cit.*, pp. 160-162.

¹⁶ *The Tribune Almanac*, 1861, p. 49; Carl M. Frasure, "Union Sentiment in Maryland, 1859-1861," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XXIV (September, 1929), 212 n.

¹⁷ F. P. Blair, Jr., to F. P. Blair, Sr., December 23, 1860, Blair Papers; Smith, *op. cit.*, I, 514-515; Henry C. Whitney, *Lincoln the President* (New York, 1909), p. 15; *New York Herald*, February 26, 1861.

¹⁸ Smith, *op. cit.*, I, 487-489, 501-502, 513-515; Steiner, *op. cit.*, p. 189; Marshall to Montgomery Blair, May 27, 1860, Blair Papers.

ments, the Constitutional Union newspapers sent out a guarded appeal to the President for recognition.¹⁹

Lincoln realized that it would be unwise to give Blair's Republicans a monopoly of the federal appointments for Maryland. Hopefully, therefore, he suggested that Davis and Blair together arrange a slate. Some of the high offices went to Constitutional Unionists and others to Republicans. For collector of customs of the Port of Baltimore Lincoln agreed to a Constitutional Unionist, Davis's loyal aide, Henry W. Hoffman.²¹ For postmaster of Baltimore another Constitutional Unionist, William H. Purnell, was chosen. For naval officer of the Baltimore Custom House Lincoln approved the selection of a Republican associate of Blair and delegate to the Chicago Convention of 1860, Francis S. Corkran.²² For navy agent the choice was another Blair Republican, William P. Ewing, who had served as an alternate to the Chicago Convention.²³ Still another Republican, Blair's friend Judge Marshall,²⁴ received the surveyorship of the Port of Baltimore. Constitutional Unionists, on the other hand, filled three jobs as appraisers in the Baltimore Custom House. And a pro-Blair Republican, Washington Bonifant, became United States Marshal for Maryland.²⁵ When the slate had been filled a Baltimore journal printed it:²⁶

Collector—Henry W. Hoffman (Union)
 Postmaster—William H. Purnell (Union)
 Naval Officer—Francis S. Corkran (Republican)
 Navy Agent—Wm. Pinkney Ewing (Republican)
 Surveyor—Judge Marshall (Republican)
 Appraisers—Messrs. Fred'k Schley, Montague and Meredith (Union)
 U. S. Marshal—[Washington] Bonifant (Republican).

¹⁹ Baltimore *Clipper*, April 13, 1861.

²⁰ Wrote Attorney General Edward Bates to Blair: "I understood at the time that the Maryland appointments were made chiefly on arrangement made by you & Mr. Davis." See Bates to Montgomery Blair, May 4, 1861, Blair Papers.

²¹ W. H. Purnell to Montgomery Blair, February 3, 1864, Blair Papers; Scharf, *History of Western Maryland*, II, 1400; *Biographical Directory of the American Congress* (Washington, D. C., 1928), p. 1105.

²² Baltimore *Sun*, April 27, 1860; F. S. Corkran to Montgomery Blair, December 23, 1863, Blair Papers.

²³ Baltimore *Sun*, April 27, 1860.

²⁴ *Ibid.*; Marshall to Montgomery Blair, May 5, 27, 1860, Blair Papers.

²⁵ Baltimore *Sun*, April 27, 1860; Bates to Montgomery Blair, May 4, 1861, Blair Papers.

²⁶ Baltimore *Clipper*, April 16, 1861. The Baltimore *Sun*, April 16, 1861, mentioned eleven federal appointments made by Lincoln for Maryland, and commented: "Of the whole number but five have acted with the Republican party. The others were prominent members of the 'American' organization."

Similarly, in the two foreign appointments awarded to Maryland Lincoln treated both Unionist factions equally: A Davis follower, James R. Partridge, was made minister-resident to Honduras,²⁷ while a Blairite, the German-American leader, Dr. George E. Wiss, received the post of consul at Rotterdam.²⁸

Even with Lincoln's impartial distribution of the main Baltimore offices, peace did not reign long in Maryland. When Naval Officer Corkran, a Blair man, did not immediately appoint French S. Evans, a Constitutional Unionist, as deputy naval officer, Lincoln took a hand. In April—one month following his inauguration and less than two weeks following his parcelling of the Baltimore patronage—the President rebuked Corkran in a letter:²⁹

I am quite sure you are not aware how much I am disoblged by the refusal to give Mr. F. S. Evans a place in the Custom House. I had no thought that the men to whom I gave the higher offices would be so ready to disoblge me. I still wish you would give Mr. Evans the place of Deputy Naval Officer.

Lincoln referred this matter to Secretary of the Treasury Salmon P. Chase: "I have been greatly—I may say grievously—disappointed and disoblged by Mr. Corkran's refusal to make Mr. Evans deputy naval officer as I requested him to do."³⁰ It is significant that Evans became Corkran's deputy.

But it was Davis and Blair themselves who precipitated much of the friction. Maryland seems not to have been large enough to hold both the Baltimore Congressman and the Postmaster General. The State was hardly over the dangers of secession when the feud between the two broke out again, if indeed it was ever silenced.

Soon after the attack on Fort Sumter and consequent outbreak of the War, Davis became a frequent White House visitor and succeeded in cultivating closer relations with Lincoln, largely because of his intimacy with Governor Thomas H. Hicks, who had responded to the President's call for volunteers.³¹ Davis per-

²⁷ *Baltimore Sun*, April 24, 25, 1861; *The National Cyclopaedia of American Biography* (New York, 1897), VII, 519.

²⁸ *U. S. Official Register*, 1861, p. 5; Dieter Cunz, "The Maryland Germans in the Civil War," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XXXVI (December, 1941), 407-409; *Baltimore Sun*, April 27, 1860.

²⁹ Paul M. Angle (ed.) *New Letters and Papers of Lincoln* (Boston and New York, 1930), pp. 271-272.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 272.

³¹ *Baltimore Sun*, April 24, 25, 1861.

sueded Lincoln to place more federal patronage under his control, on the plea that he needed aid in his campaign for re-election to Congress,⁸² and in this Montgomery Blair reluctantly acquiesced. Davis ran for Congress and was defeated.⁸³ The rivalry for control of Maryland was further intensified by Secretary of the Treasury Chase.⁸⁴ Blair wanted a certain employee removed from a Treasury job in Baltimore and his own man put in. Chase refused to agree and began co-operating with Davis. Incensed at the power wielded by his rival, the Postmaster General complained to Lincoln:⁸⁵

I am struggling to make a party in the State of Maryland for the Administration on the basis of your Messages. Mr. Chase opposed the appointment of the names I submitted to you for the State & the bulk of them were finally given to Mr. Winter Davis's friends with my consent because I could not get those I preferred. Davis did not keep faith with me as to the management of the matter & instead of allowing the smaller offices to go to new & obnoxious men as I would have done he gave them to the most obnoxious plugs in Baltimore to a considerable extent. They were to get [him] the nomination for Congress. It secured that & also his defeat before the people. I have found him impracticable & selfish & not likely to be of much service in the organization for this reason.

Blair's intention to form a party in his State on the basis of Lincoln's "Messages" was in reference to the question of Negro emancipation. The election of Augustus W. Bradford as Governor of Maryland in November, 1861, by the Union elements definitely ended the threat of secession in Maryland. The Unionists were henceforth to fight among themselves over the policy of emancipation for the next several years.

Lincoln's Proclamation of Emancipation of September 22, 1862, which did not affect the status of slaves in the loyal border states, stirred anew the struggle between the Maryland factions.⁸⁶ The Blair party—now called the "conservatives"—became known as the Conditional Union Party, favoring a gradual policy of emancipation with compensation to the slaveholder; in its ranks, besides

⁸² New York *Herald*, June 21, 1861.

⁸³ Steiner, *op. cit.*, pp. 194-196; Baltimore *Clipper*, June 14, 1861.

⁸⁴ Montgomery Blair to the President, undated, (copy), Blair Papers. In box marked "1864."

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

⁸⁶ Charles H. McCarthy, *Lincoln's Plan of Reconstruction* (New York, 1901), p. 384; William Starr Myers, *The Maryland Constitution of 1864* (Baltimore, 1901), p. 14.

Blair, were Postmaster Purnell and Mayor Thomas Swann, of Baltimore. The Davis party—now called the “radicals”—advocated immediate emancipation; its leaders, in addition to Davis, were Collector Henry W. Hoffman, of Baltimore, and Congressman John A. J. Creswell, of Elkton.³⁷ Paradoxically enough, Davis and Blair had, by 1863, shifted positions since the beginning of the War insofar as the terms “radical” and “conservative” were applicable. Davis, who in 1860 had little if any interest in the slavery issue and had supported the conciliatory John Bell for President, now became classified as a “radical” because he stood for immediate emancipation of the slaves. Blair, who for several years had been concerned over the Negro question and had worked for the anti-slavery candidacy of Lincoln in 1860, was henceforth regarded as a “conservative” because he opposed immediate emancipation. In 1863 Blair’s friend, Secretary of the Navy Gideon Welles, expressed it:³⁸

The Blairs were all early emancipationists though southern men. Frank took the bull by the horns in Missouri and Montgomery and his father here [in Washington] and in Maryland. They broke the ice—they fought the battle for ten years at least before those who now claim to be stronger emancipationists than the Blairs. Winter Davis was a Know Nothing and opposing Blair only a short time ago. But Davis now claims to go farther than Blair.

Intertwined with the emancipation issue in brewing more bad blood between the Davis and Blair factions was the jealousy aroused among the Blairs because Lincoln, striving for harmony in the party, permitted Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton and Secretary of the Treasury Chase to award much of the patronage of their respective departments to Davis and the “radicals.” Both Stanton and Chase were radicals on the emancipation question and personal enemies of Montgomery Blair and Blair’s friend Gideon Welles. The provost-marshals assigned to Maryland by the War Department owed their positions to the Davis group; and Davis himself, having subsequently succeeded in being elected

³⁷ H. Winter Davis to Creswell, December 20, 1863, March 15, 1865, John A. J. Creswell Papers, Library of Congress; *A Biographical Sketch of Hon. A. Leo Knott With a Relation of Some Political Transactions in Maryland, 1861-1867* (Baltimore, n. d.), pp. 36-37; Myers, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9, 12-15.

³⁸ Welles to his son, February 24, 1864, Gideon Welles Papers, Library of Congress. See also H. Winter Davis to Wade, June 21, 1864, Benjamin F. Wade Papers, Library of Congress.

to Congress again in 1863, paid more than one visit to Lincoln in behalf of his friends among the provost-marshals.³⁹ Chase readily allowed the Baltimore Custom House, under his jurisdiction, to be used to sustain the Davis faction rather than the Blair following.⁴⁰

As if to disrupt further the relations between the followers of Davis and Blair, Naval Officer Corkran—who had meanwhile deserted the Blairs to align himself with Davis—co-operated with Chase in having a pro-Blair office-holder, Internal Revenue Collector James L. Ridgely of the Second Maryland District, removed and a Davisite, Joseph J. Stewart, appointed in his place. Montgomery Blair was furious. The fight assumed major proportions, and committee after committee from both the Davis and Blair factions waited on the President, seeking justice. Blair endeavored to persuade Lincoln to remove Stewart and re-appoint Ridgely.⁴¹ In anger the Postmaster General wrote Corkran, quoting Lincoln as saying to him (Blair):⁴²

My friend Corkran has got me into a scrape. He got me to sign a paper appointing a friend of his to office and removing Mr. Ridgely, a friend of Col. Webster's [a Blair follower], a fast friend of the administration then in the field fighting the enemies of his country. I do not wish to remove Mr. Stewart for he has been a faithful officer but I am satisfied I have done injustice to Mr. Ridgely. I have been looking around for something for Mr. Stewart, but as yet nothing has turned up. Time flies and Mr. Ridgely's friends are sore, can you not induce Mr. Stewart to resign?

In the showdown with Lincoln, Secretary Chase defended Stewart's appointment.⁴³ The President allowed Stewart to remain in office, and the Senate confirmed him.⁴⁴

Between Stanton and Chase, life for Montgomery Blair became miserable. Dejectedly the Postmaster General wrote an associate:⁴⁵

³⁹ George M. Russum to Creswell, February 26, 1864; John Frazier, Jr., to Creswell, November 20, 28, 1863, Creswell Papers.

⁴⁰ Smith, *op. cit.*, II, 255.

⁴¹ F. S. Corkran to Chase, December 21, 1863, April 21, 1864; Joseph J. Stewart to Chase, February 3, 1864, Salmon P. Chase Papers, Library of Congress; *U. S. Senate Executive Journal* (1862-1864), XIII, 15, 387.

⁴² Statement of Montgomery Blair to Corkran, as quoted in Joseph J. Stewart to Chase, February 3, 1864, Chase Papers.

⁴³ Corkran to Chase, April 21, 1864, Chase Papers.

⁴⁴ *U. S. Senate Executive Journal* (1862-1864), XIII, 498.

⁴⁵ Montgomery Blair to Edward L. Thomas, (copy), "confidential," July 14, 1864, Blair Papers. For Chase's and the radicals' support to Stanton for the War

The Provost Marshals and their Deputies aided by the Custom House employees carry the primary elections in parts of the county [of Baltimore] easily—nobody but themselves attending. Mr. Stanton's advisers for Md. are known to be Judge Bond and Mr. Henry Winter Davis, who are equally confided in . . . [as are] the protegees of the late Secy of the Treasury [Chase]; so that we have the Purse & the Sword of the Nation against us in Md. in our efforts to sustain the President.

The feud between the two Maryland groups over the questions of patronage and Negro emancipation continued with bitter intensity. In the November, 1863, state election for comptroller and members of the Legislature the Davisites triumphed on the issue of immediate emancipation as opposed to Blair's plan for gradual, "compensated" emancipation. Lincoln declined to interfere in the state contest.⁴⁶ The Blairites, considerably weakened, continued the fight. In January, 1864, the Postmaster General, in company with his now ally, United States Senator Thomas H. Hicks,⁴⁷ addressed the Legislature at Annapolis, alleging that Lincoln was favorable to their plan of Negro emancipation. This only inflamed Davis and his followers the more.⁴⁸

The approach of the Presidential campaign of 1864 opened even wider the rift among the Maryland Unionists. Davis's forces, led by Congressman Creswell and Collector Hoffman, secured control of the Union state convention held on February 22 to select delegates to the National Convention. The Postmaster General's father, old Francis P. Blair, and the Blair associate, Postmaster William H. Purnell of Baltimore, were defeated for delegate-at-large. The four delegates-at-large chosen were Creswell, Hoffman and two other Davis followers. Moreover, after a stormy session, the convention adopted a resolution declaring for "immediate" emancipation, over the Blairs' opposition.⁴⁹

Flushed by success, the Davis forces set out to win victory for immediate, unconditional emancipation and to destroy the last vestige of the Blair influence in Maryland. They enlisted Lincoln's support. One Davisite wrote another:⁵⁰

portfolio in 1862 and for the Blairs' hatred of Chase, see T. Harry Williams, *Lincoln and the Radicals* (Madison, Wis., 1941), pp. 89-90, 297-298.

⁴⁶ *Biographical Sketch of Hon. A. Leo Knott* . . . , pp. 37-38.

⁴⁷ By late 1862 Hicks, formerly friendly to Davis, was inclined to favor the conservation, or Blair faction of the Union party. See Radcliffe, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

⁴⁸ Hugh L. Bond to Creswell, January 19, 1864; George Earle to Creswell, January 18, 28, 1864, Creswell Papers.

⁴⁹ Baltimore *Clipper*, February 23, 1864; Earle to Creswell, February 24, 1864, Creswell Papers. ⁵⁰ R. H. Jackson to Bond, April 18, 1864, Creswell Papers.

I would suggest that President Lincoln certainly ought to know that Blairism is a mere myth in this State. Please impress this upon his attention if necessary. There are, as we all know, but two political parties in this State, viz: the Unconditional emancipationist, and the so-called States Rights [Democratic] party. Conditional emancipation or apprenticeships meet with but little favor anywhere in Maryland. The masses are either in favor of retaining negro slavery as it now is, or for its immediate, unconditional abolishment.

Neither Mr. Blair or (*sic*) the P. O. Department of this State have *legitimately* anything to do with the Custom Office of this Port. . . . Please draw heavily upon the President. We must be sustained or go to the wall.

Meanwhile, in Washington Davis as member of Congress was stirring a hornet's nest within the Republican party. He opened unrestricted warfare upon the President's plan to restore the conquered Confederate States to their former places in the Union. The historian of Lincoln's reconstruction policy concludes that Davis's opposition to Lincoln was based on two grounds: chagrin at his being passed over in 1861 for a Cabinet seat in favor of Blair; and a conviction that Lincoln's "Presidential" plan of reconstruction was unwise.⁵¹

Lincoln took the view that reconstruction of the defeated States of the Confederacy was a Presidential—not a Congressional—function to be performed through the encouragement of a loyal minority within those states and by the initial agency of those provisional governments which operated under executive control during the War in occupied portions of the South. In his Proclamation of December 8, 1863, the President offered pardon, with certain exceptions, to any adherents of the Confederacy who would take an oath to support "the Constitution of the United States and the Union of the States thereunder." Whenever in any State a loyal nucleus equal to one-tenth of the votes cast in the Presidential election of 1860 should qualify by such oath-taking and establish a State government with abolition of slavery, Lincoln promised executive recognition of such government.⁵²

Davis, encouraged by his radical colleagues in Congress, sponsored in the House of Representatives a reconstruction measure as an alternative to Lincoln's plan. Identical legislation was intro-

⁵¹ McCarthy, *op. cit.*, p. 283.

⁵² James G. Randall, *The Civil War and Reconstruction* (Boston and New York, 1937), p. 699.

duced in the Senate by Benjamin F. Wade of Ohio. By July, 1864, as Lincoln's campaign for re-election to the Presidency opened, the Wade-Davis bill had passed both houses of Congress. It was a drastic measure which made restoration difficult by intrusting the reconstruction of a State not to a minority ready for future loyalty, but to a majority whose Unionism was a matter of past conduct. Under authority of the provisional government an enrollment of white male citizens was to be made. If the persons taking oath to support the Constitution of the United States should amount to a majority of those enrolled, the loyal people were to be invited to choose a constitutional convention for the launching of a new State government; but no one who had held office, State or Confederate, "under the rebel usurpation," or had voluntarily borne arms against the United States, should be permitted to vote or serve as delegate at such election. In the new governments to be set up slavery was to be prohibited, the "rebel" debt was to be repudiated, and no office-holder under the "usurping power" (with minor exceptions) should "vote for or be a member of the legislature or governor." There can be little doubt that Davis's and Wade's bill was full of vindictive severity and would have perpetuated war-time bitterness. By a pocket-veto Lincoln prevented the radical measure from becoming law.⁵³ Wade and Davis replied to Lincoln by a public appeal—the celebrated Wade-Davis Manifesto, the most severe attack ever made upon Lincoln within his own party.⁵⁴

The ever-widening split between Lincoln and the Wade-Davis faction of radical Republican-Unionists, added to the then poor showing of the Union armies, bade fair to result in the President's defeat for re-election. His campaign managers were frankly alarmed.⁵⁵ And Lincoln himself was pessimistic about his chances to win in November over his Democratic opponent, General George B. McClellan.⁵⁶ As if to add to the Lincolnites' worries, the more irreconcilable radicals in his party had nominated Gen-

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 699-700; Williams, *op. cit.*, pp. 318-319; Allan Nevins, "Lincoln's Plans For Reunion," *Abraham Lincoln Association Papers* (Springfield, Ill., 1931), 1930, pp. 69-72.

⁵⁴ John K. Hosmer, *Outcome of the Civil War, 1863-1865* (New York and London, 1907), pp. 139-143.

⁵⁵ Henry J. Raymond to Cameron, August 19, 21, 1864, Simon Cameron Papers, Library of Congress.

⁵⁶ Memorandum, August 23, 1864, printed in John G. Nicolay and John Hay (ed.) *Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln* (New York, 1894), X, 203-204.

eral John C. Frémont, the famed "Pathfinder," as an independent candidate for President.⁵⁷ These circumstances placed Davis and his fellow-radicals in a most strategic position in their fight against Lincoln—or, perhaps, in their struggle with the potent conservative influence in the Cabinet, Montgomery Blair.

Scarcely less bitter than Davis against the Blairs was General John C. Frémont. For Frank Blair had been the spearhead in the successful effort to induce Lincoln to depose Frémont as commander of the Department of the West back in 1861, when Missouri became too small to hold both the Pathfinder and himself. At that time Lincoln had sent Montgomery Blair to St. Louis to investigate Frémont's military administration, and the Postmaster General had returned to Washington with a report highly unfavorable to Frémont. Then the President had removed Frémont from his command. There was small wonder that bad blood existed between the Pathfinder and the Blairs.⁵⁸

With the three most conspicuous radical Republicans—Frémont, Wade, and Davis—having a common hostility toward Montgomery Blair, Senator Zachariah Chandler of Michigan (himself a radical who had become fearful lest Frémont's independent candidacy endanger Lincoln's re-election and bring into the White House the hated "Copperhead" Democrat, General McClellan) reluctantly concluded to restore harmony within the Republican-Union ranks. Chandler endeavored to persuade Frémont to withdraw from the Presidential race. First he journeyed to the home in Ohio of Senator Wade, who agreed to support Lincoln for re-election if the President would remove Blair from the Cabinet. On his return East, the Michigan senator obtained similar assurances from other radical leaders on condition that Blair be ousted. At the White House Chandler is said to have extracted from Lincoln a promise to remove Blair if Frémont would withdraw from the campaign. There is some evidence that the President gave this assurance, although most reluctantly. Then Chandler visited Davis in Baltimore. Davis agreed to back Lincoln for re-election if Blair left the Cabinet. Finally, the Michigan senator went to New York, where after strenuous arguments, he

⁵⁷ Allan Nevins, *Frémont: Pathmarker of the West* (New York, 1939), pp. 568-574.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, Chapters XXX, XXXI; William E. Smith, "The Blairs and Frémont," *The Missouri Historical Review*, XXIII (January, 1929), 214-260.

finally persuaded Frémont to withdraw from the Presidential contest, in return for Lincoln's sacrifice of Blair. Frémont's letter of withdrawal was published on September 22.⁵⁹ On the next day, the 23rd, the Chief Executive requested Blair to send in his resignation as Postmaster General:⁶⁰

Executive Mansion,

Washington, September 23, 1864.

Hon. Montgomery Blair.

My Dear Sir:—You have generously said to me, more than once, that whenever your resignation could be a relief to me, it was at my disposal. The time has come. You very well know that this proceeds from no dissatisfaction of mine with you personally or officially. Your uniform kindness has been unsurpassed by that of any other friend, and while it is true that the war does not so greatly add to the difficulties of your department as to those of some others, it is yet much to say, as I most truly can, that in the three years and a half during which you have administered the General Post-Office, I remember no single complaint against you in connection therewith.

Yours, as ever,

A. Lincoln.

Blair in reply sent Lincoln his letter of resignation as Postmaster General of the United States.⁶¹ Davis and his radical associates had done much to eliminate Blair from the Presidential inner council.

Peace did not come to Maryland, nor to Lincoln, with Blair's retirement from the Cabinet. Following the President's re-election over General McClellan in November, Blair visited the White House. Lincoln's assistant secretary, John Hay, left the written record:

November 9, 1864. . . . Montgomery Blair came in this morning. He . . . is very bitter against the Davis clique (what's left of it), and fool-

⁵⁹ This account is based on: Winfred A. Harbison, "Zachariah Chandler's Part in the Reelection of Abraham Lincoln," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XXII (September, 1935), 267-276; Letter of Charles Moore in "Zachariah Chandler in Lincoln's Second Campaign," *The Century Magazine*, New Series, XXVIII (July, 1895), 476-477; Walter Buell, "Zachariah Chandler," *Magazine of Western History* (1886), IV, 437-438; Charles R. Wilson, "New Light on the Lincoln-Blair-Frémont 'Bargain' of 1864," *American Historical Review*, XLII (October, 1936), 71-78; *Private and Official Correspondence of Gen. Benjamin F. Butler During the Period of the Civil War* (Norwood, Mass., 1917), V, 168.

⁶⁰ Lincoln to Montgomery Blair, September 23, 1864, in Henry J. Raymond, *The Life and Public Services of Abraham Lincoln* (New York, 1865), p. 602.

⁶¹ Reply of Blair, printed in *ibid.*

ishly, I think, confounds the War Department and the Treasury as parties to the Winter Davis conspiracy against the President.⁶²

Blair was indeed furious at Salmon P. Chase, who as Secretary of the Treasury had favored the Davis faction. During the late campaign Chase had resigned the Treasury portfolio and was now, in November, being prominently mentioned to fill the vacant position of Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Blair himself longed to be Chief Justice. His father, Francis P. Blair, nurtured a burning ambition to see his son wearing this most coveted of American judicial robes. The elder Blair had already written Lincoln: "I think Montgomery's unswerving support of your administration in all its aspects coupled with his unfaltering attachment to you personally fits him to be your representative man at the head of that Bench."⁶³ The devoted father also enlisted the aid of the Pennsylvania boss, Simon Cameron, in behalf of his son.⁶⁴

The pressure on Lincoln to select Chase as Chief Justice was intense.⁶⁵ Much of the support for the former Treasury head came from radical Republican members of the Senate.⁶⁶ But Montgomery felt certain that he could outdistance Chase and rallied around him powerful conservative foes of Chase.⁶⁷ His efforts, however, were in vain. Lincoln had long made up his mind to appoint Chase, and on December 6 sent the latter's nomination as Chief Justice to the Senate for confirmation.⁶⁸ And Blair's friend and former colleague, Secretary of the Navy Welles, believed that Chase's appointment was satisfactory only to Senator Charles Sumner and other radicals.⁶⁹

It was to Welles that Montgomery Blair went for consolation and council in his disappointment. Of the visit the Navy chief noted at the time:⁷⁰

December 10, Saturday: Blair called on me in somewhat of a disturbed state of mind and wanted my advice. He had had one interview with the

⁶² Tyler Dennett (ed.), *Lincoln and the Civil War in the Letters and Diaries of John Hay* (New York, 1938), p. 236.

⁶³ Smith, *op. cit.*, II, 299.

⁶⁴ F. P. Blair to Cameron, November 24, 1864, Cameron Papers.

⁶⁵ G. Volney Dorsey to Lincoln, (copy), October 26, 1864, Chase Papers.

⁶⁶ Albert B. Hart, *Salmon Portland Chase* (Boston, 1899), p. 321.

⁶⁷ Charles Warren, *The Supreme Court in United States History* (Boston, 1935), II, 402 n.

⁶⁸ *U. S. Senate Executive Journal* (1864-1866), Vol. XIV, Part I, p. 1.

⁶⁹ *Diary of Gideon Welles* (Boston and New York, 1902), II, 196.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 195-196.

President since I last saw him, in which the President said he disliked to remove Hoffman from the collectorship of Baltimore, but that the Spanish mission would be vacant and he placed that at Blair's disposal to arrange with Senator Hicks and Hoffman, as he pleased. Blair replied that he could go into no such arrangement. . . .

The appointment of Chase has brought the Maryland malcontents into position. . . . Blair fears the President is flinching and will succumb, and thought it advisable that he, or some one, should have an explicit conversation with the President, and wanted my advice. I told him that it seemed to me very important that such a conversation should take place, but no one could do this so well as himself. . . . Blair . . . said he would see the President, and would boldly and frankly express himself. Blair's present view is to go to the Senate, in place of Governor Hicks, who wishes to be made collector of Baltimore. Of course Hoffman, the present collector, must be removed as the initiatory step to this end.

Blair's plan, in which Welles acquiesced, was thus to have Davis's loyal ally, Henry W. Hoffman, ousted from the Baltimore collectorship, have Hicks resign his Senate seat and be appointed to the collectorship, and have himself sent to the United States Senate in Hicks's place.⁷¹ But Lincoln was reluctant to remove Hoffman lest he estrange further the Davis radicals, whom he still hoped to conciliate.⁷² The President, striving for harmony, now offered Blair the post of Minister to Spain. But the former Postmaster General declined this.⁷³ He declared that he had refused the Madrid mission when he was a young man during the Polk administration.⁴⁷

When Welles gave Blair his moral support he felt himself fully justified. For the Navy head was himself involved in a controversy with Henry Winter Davis. Welles had disliked Davis ever since the beginning of the administration and believed that the radical Maryland congressman was disgruntled because he had not received the Navy portfolio. Welles even requested the Speaker of the House of Representatives not to give the Marylander a place on the House Naval Affairs Committee.⁷⁵ The Secretary of

⁷¹ "It is understood that Governor Hicks is to resign his seat in the Senate and be appointed Collector of Customs at Baltimore, in the place of Hoffman, one of the Davisites, and that Montgomery Blair is to have the Senatorship thus vacated"—so wrote a Washington correspondent. See *New York Herald*, December 31, 1864.

⁷² See Blair's complaint concerning Lincoln's treatment of him in Dennett, *op. cit.*, pp. 243-244.

⁷³ Smith, *op. cit.*, II, 331.

⁷⁴ Edward L. Pierce, *Memoir and Letters of Charles Sumner* (Boston, 1893), IV, 255.

⁷⁵ *Diary of Gideon Welles*, I, 482.

the Navy had become a friendly co-operator with the Blairs and often had their relatives and friends appointed to offices in his department. Montgomery Blair's brother-in-law, the able Gustavus V. Fox, was chosen by Lincoln as Assistant Secretary of the Navy. Another of the Blair clan in Welles's department was Admiral S. Phillips Lee, who was a son-in-law of Francis P. Blair, Sr.⁷⁶ The Blairs' opponents were highly critical of this influence in the Navy Department, one critic complaining editorially: ⁷⁷

The Blair Family and the Navy Department—Old Blair and young Blair, Postmaster Blair and General Blair, all the small Blairs and all the little Blairs, all the sons-in-law and all the brothers-in-law of the Blairs, have their broad hands and broad feet upon the Navy Department. . . . The Blair family . . . keeps the fossilized stick, Gideon Welles, in office; it gives the sly fox, who is a relative of the family, control of naval matters; it foists upon the navy such imbeciles as Admiral Lee, who is another relative of the family.

We have no objection to Postmaster Blair's administration of the Post Office Department; but we do emphatically object to his attempt to manage the Navy Department for family purposes. In Welles he has a pliant tool; for Welles is too far gone to do anything except what the Blairs tell him.

Welles, largely because he was closely associated with the Blairs and disliked Davis, was drawn into a fierce fight with Davis and his radical associates. The feud between the Secretary of the Navy and Davis reached its most bitter stage following the ill-starred naval expedition against Charleston in 1863.

Welles and Fox became enthusiastic over the potential offensive powers of the new iron-clad warships. The capture of Charleston, strongly defended by Fort Sumter, appeared feasible, and a fleet of monitors under Rear Admiral Samuel F. Du Pont was commissioned to capture the South Carolina metropolis. With less faith in the new vessels than Welles and Fox, Du Pont was of opinion that they were deficient in "aggression or destructiveness as against forts;" that in order to secure success in such operations troops were necessary. In early April (1863) Du Pont attacked the defenses of Charleston. He met a severe defeat by the Confederates—one of the worst reverses suffered by the Union

⁷⁶ Smith, *op. cit.*, II, 2-3, 11; Charles O. Paullin, "President Lincoln and the Navy," *The American Historical Review*, XIV (January, 1909), 290. For Fox, see Claude M. Fuess's article in *Dictionary of American Biography*. For Lee, see *ibid.*, XI, 129-130.

⁷⁷ *New York Herald*, June 30, 1864.

Navy. Soon Du Pont opened an acrimonious correspondence with Welles. The Admiral believed that the Secretary of the Navy was attempting to shift to him the blame that should fall upon the Navy Department. The controversy found its way into Congress.⁷⁸

Davis, a personal friend of Du Pont,⁷⁹ saw his chance to attack the Blair influence in the Navy Department and defend Du Pont on February 25, 1864, when the Naval Appropriation Bill came up in the House for consideration. The Maryland congressman assailed the management of the Department and asked an investigation while he eulogized Du Pont. Referring to the attack on Charleston as "insane," he hurled an oratorical bomb at Blair's brother-in-law, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Fox: "If there is shame, it is because the department thought a cotton-spinner was better than an admiral to plan it." Davis was answered by Frank Blair, now a member of Congress from Missouri, who told him that, while he was starting investigations of the Navy Department, he opposed all inquiries into the Treasury, then headed by the radical Chase.⁸⁰

Throughout 1864 the fight between the Blairs and Davis—the struggle between conservatives and radicals, and the rivalry for control of Maryland—continued. Now the Navy Department was the center of controversy. Toward the end of the year Davis joined hands with Senator John P. Hale of New Hampshire, Chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, in sniping at the Lincoln administration and badgering the Navy Department, the Blairs' last vestige of influence since Montgomery's resignation from the Postmaster Generalship. Hale, in a sour mood since 1861 when Lincoln selected Welles instead of himself as the New England member of the Cabinet, freshened his quarrel with the Navy Department at every opportunity. Moreover, the New Hampshire senator nurtured an intense dislike of Fox, whom he accused of "spying" on him when he tried to obtain naval contracts for his constituents. Fox held similar sentiments of ill

⁷⁸ See Dr. Charles O. Paullin's account of the naval engagement in *Dictionary of American Biography*, V, 532. There are some details in Henry A. Du Pont, *Rear-Admiral Samuel Francis Du Pont, United States Navy: A Biography* (New York, 1926) and in H. W. Wilson, *Ironclads in Action* (Boston, 1898), I, 90-105.

⁷⁹ Du Pont to Henry Winter Davis, November 6, 1861, in *Army and Navy Journal* (May 30, 1914), Vol. 51, p. 1237; *Diary of Gideon Welles*, I, 482; *New York Herald*, November 25, 1864.

⁸⁰ *Diary of Gideon Welles*, I, 531.

will toward Hale.⁸¹ Following Lincoln's re-election in November, Fox complained about Davis and Hale—"two fellows that have been especially malignant to us,"⁸² the Assistant Secretary told him. But Lincoln, free from vindictiveness and anxious to heal the factionalism that threatened both the party and the Union, answered Fox:⁸³

You have more of that feeling of personal resentment than I. Perhaps I may have too little of it, but I never thought it paid. A man has not time to spend half his life in quarrels. If any man ceases to attack me, I never remember the past against him. It has seemed to me recently that Winter Davis was growing more sensible to his own true interests and has ceased wasting his time by attacking me. I hope for his own good he has. He has been very malicious against me but has only injured himself by it. His conduct has been very strange to me. I came here, his friend, wishing to continue so. I had heard nothing but good of him; he was the cousin of my intimate friend Judge Davis. But he had scarcely been elected when I began to learn of his attacking me on all possible occasions.

On January 30, 1865, when the annual Naval Appropriation Bill came before Congress once more, Hale and Davis jointly assailed the Navy Department—the former in the Senate, the latter in the House. Hale attacked the Blair kinsman, Fox, and held forth on the shabby treatment which the Department had accorded Davis's friend, Admiral Du Pont.⁸⁴ Davis moved amendments in the House creating a "Board of Admiralty," consisting of high-ranking naval officers whose all-embracing duties would be to "deliberate in common and advise the Secretary [of the Navy] on . . . the direction, employment, and disposition of the naval forces in time of war."⁸⁵ This proposal was naturally to shear the power of Welles and Fox. A few weeks later—February 17—Davis's co-sponsor of the radical "Congressional" reconstruction measure of the year previous, Benjamin F. Wade of Ohio, introduced in the Senate legislation for the creation of a Board of

⁸¹ G. V. Fox to Chandler, February 6, 1865, William E. Chandler Papers, Library of Congress; *Diary of Gideon Welles*, I, 485; II, 247; Paullin, "President Lincoln and the Navy," *op. cit.*, p. 286; *Congressional Globe*, 38th Cong., 2nd sess., pp. 362-363, 489-901, 851; *New York Herald*, January 31, 1865.

⁸² Dennett, *op. cit.*, p. 234.

⁸³ John Hay quoting Lincoln, in *ibid.*, pp. 234-235.

⁸⁴ *Congressional Globe*, 38th Cong., 2nd sess., pp. 489-491.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 509. The *New York Herald*, January 31, 1865, correctly stated that Davis's action was "a co-operative movement with Senator Hale, each of these gentlemen availing themselves of the opportunity to avenge their grievances and annihilate Secretary Welles and Captain Fox by a simultaneous discharge of their rhetorical batteries."

Admiralty, similar to Davis's in the House.⁸⁶ In the debate that followed Hale took the Senate floor and intemperately accused Fox: "It was the Assistant Secretary of the Navy who sent . . . spies to Boston and Portsmouth, instructing them to inquire especially into any connection that I might have had with any contracts for the Navy Department."⁸⁷ So the fight against the Navy Department raged in both houses of Congress.

Welles and Fox retaliated against Davis and Hale and Wade and their radical associates by requesting Congress to provide for the creation of a law officer of the Navy Department—the "Solicitor and Naval Judge-Advocate General." Congress approved the request—whereupon Welles and Fox recommended to Lincoln that Hale's bitter foe in New Hampshire politics, William E. Chandler, be appointed to the new position. Lincoln agreed. Youthful state legislator, chairman of the Republican Committee of the Granite State, brilliant strategist of the election craft, and loyal Lincoln supporter against the radical element, Chandler had recently led the successful fight in the New Hampshire Legislature against Hale's re-election to the Senate.⁸⁸ There is strong evidence that Fox brought the able Chandler into the Navy Department to act as a sort of *liaison* agent between the Department and the conservative, or pro-Lincoln members of the Senate and House naval affairs committees.⁸⁹

In late February the Davis-Wade proposal for creation of a Board of Admiralty was overwhelmingly defeated in both houses of Congress. Fox could then write to Chandler:⁹⁰

Hale and Davis and Wade have given us a very small trouble. They were easily beaten. The Admiralty bill was aimed at me. It got one vote in the Senate—John P. Hale!

I dont think there is the slightest chance of these fellows to get Mr. Welles out. I told the Prest. that. We both went together. Blair will not get the U. S. Senate. The War and Treasy Dept both fight him which is enough.

⁸⁶ *Congressional Globe*, 38th Cong., 2nd sess., pp. 850-851.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 851.

⁸⁸ Leon B. Richardson, *William E. Chandler, Republican* (New York, 1940), pp. 43-46, 54; Charles O. Paullin, "A Half Century of Naval Administration in America, 1861-1911," *Proceedings, United States Naval Institute*, XXXVIII, 1912, 1322-1323; *Portsmouth (New Hampshire) Journal of Literature and Politics*, January 9, 1864.

⁸⁹ Fox to Chandler, February 6, 23, 1865, William E. Chandler Papers.

⁹⁰ Fox to Chandler, February 23, 1865, *ibid.*

Fox's reference to the Senate related to the seat left vacant by the death of Senator Hicks of Maryland the week previous—which made the Davis-Blair controversy flare anew.⁹¹ Immediately a mad scramble ensued between Montgomery Blair and Davis's lieutenant, Congressman John A. J. Creswell, for Hicks's Senate place. At Annapolis the Legislature waxed warm over rival candidates, the conservative members supporting Blair for Senator because he was "expected to favor compensation for the slaves liberated," while the "radical" members (or Unconditional Emancipationists) worked for Creswell's election.⁹² Although Lincoln was said to favor Blair, the War Department patronage in Maryland, at the radical Stanton's direction, and the pro-Chase hold-overs in the Treasury Department were utilized for Creswell in his fight against Blair for the Senate.⁹³ The *Baltimore Clipper*, friendly to the Blairs, charged bitterly: "The purse and the sword, the Treasury of the United States and all the patronage of the War Department may elect him [Creswell]. . . . No person ever wished him to be a candidate but Henry Winter Davis and his friends."⁹⁴ The Maryland Legislature, under Davis's adept management, chose Creswell to fill Hicks's unexpired term in the Senate.⁹⁵ Again the Davisites had triumphed over the Blairs.

Creswell's election to the Senate brought no improvement in the Maryland impasse, though Lincoln tried valiantly to bring peace. But the warring factions were in no mood to listen. The Blairs, stung by Montgomery's defeats—his withdrawal from the Cabinet, his failure to win the Chief Justiceship, and now his defeat for the Senate—did not want an end of hostilities.⁹⁶ Neither did Davis, flushed as he was by Creswell's victory under his maneuvering.

The Blairites' next move was to induce Lincoln to remove Davis's ally, Hoffman, from the collectorship of the Port of

⁹¹ Welles wrote: "The death of Governor Hicks has brought on a crisis of parties in Maryland. Blair is a candidate for the position of Senator, and the President wishes him elected, but Stanton and the Chase influence, including the Treasury, do not, and hence the whole influence of those Departments is against him. See *Diary of Gideon Welles*, II, 243.

⁹² *New York Herald*, February 18, 1865.

⁹³ *Diary of Gideon Welles*, II, 243.

⁹⁴ *Baltimore Clipper*, March 6, 1865.

⁹⁵ Elizabeth M. Grimes, "John Angel James Creswell, Postmaster General," MS., M. A. thesis, Columbia University, 1939, pp. 2-4. Copy in Burgess Library, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

⁹⁶ F. P. Blair, Jr., to Montgomery Blair, April 9, 1865, Blair Papers.

Baltimore. By this time (March, 1865) the President, his patience at an end, had made up his mind to reshuffle the entire Baltimore patronage—perhaps to clip Davis's power because of his long insurgency but more probably in order to harmonize the conflicting Maryland factions by recognizing both groups more equitably. Creswell in his new position as United States Senator would, in accordance with custom and tradition, be given a powerful voice by Lincoln in the matter. Now Davis, preparing to fight, advised Creswell sternly during this month:⁹⁷

I have been reflecting on the proposed Custom House arrangements & the more I think of it the more serious & dangerous it looks.

I sounded Bond & Stirling. . . . B. & S. were unwilling to agree unless it were especially agreed the patronage should be disposed of *wholly* to our satisfaction you of course included. . . .

I wish you to revise the ground & act prudently. Dont buy enemies nor pay allies from necessity at the expense of our best friends.

Let the Custom House stand unless there is an absolute union of the head proposed with us & a dissolution of relations with Swann & Blair.

A word for yourself in absolute confidence. Some of our friends think or are inclined to think you prefer to coalesce with our enemies too readily for temporary purposes. I have combated (*sic*) it sharply but you will understand how such a suspicion will impair your just influence.

Davis's fears that Creswell was not averse to co-operating with the Blairites were well founded. For the Senator and Blair's chief associate, Governor Thomas Swann, drew up a new slate of federal appointments for Baltimore. The following month—April, 1865—Creswell and Swann sent to the White House the following list of names on which they had agreed:⁹⁸

For Collector.	Edwin H. Webster Bel-Air, Harford Co'y, Md.
Post Master.	Genl. Andrew W. Denison Baltimore, Md.
Surveyor	Edington Fulton Baltimore, Md.
Naval Officer.	Samuel M. Evans Baltimore, Md.

⁹⁷ H. Winter Davis to Creswell, March, 1865, Creswell Papers. No date is given in this letter, but it is inserted after Floyd to Creswell.

⁹⁸ A facsimile of this list is printed in Emanuel Hertz, *Abraham Lincoln: A New Portrait* (New York, 1931), Vol. II, opposite page 900. This list, with only a slight modification, appeared in the Baltimore press two days after Lincoln died. See *Baltimore Clipper*, April 17, 1865.

Marshal	James W. Clayton Baltimore, Md.
District Attorney.....	Wm. J. Jones Elkton, Cecil County, Md.
Navy Agent.....	Doctor Thomas King Carroll Cambridge, Md.
Appraiser	Robert G. Proud Baltimore, Md.
Appraiser	Thomas A. Smith Urbana, Frederick Co'y
Appraiser	Ephraim F. Anderson Hagerstown, Washington County, Md.

Under this list—dated April 14, 1865!—Lincoln wrote the words: ⁹⁹

Gov. Swann and Senator Creswell present the above today, which they do on a plan suggested by me.

A. L.

April 14, 1865.

Several days after the assassination one Baltimore journal referred to Lincoln's "selection" of the above office-holders for Maryland as "one of the last official acts of the lamented President."¹⁰⁰ At least one of the proposed selections—Edwin H. Webster for the important Baltimore collectorship—was appointed by Lincoln's successor, Andrew Johnson.¹⁰¹

The Maryland factional fight over power and patronage and over the dual issue of Negro emancipation and reconstruction, not having been settled when Lincoln met his death, remained to plague President Johnson. Although Davis ended his service in Congress, returned to the law and passed away the last day of the year in which Lincoln died and the War terminated,¹⁰² Maryland's other stormy petrel, Montgomery Blair, attempted to take a new lease on political life. Blair became an adviser of Johnson and unsuccessfully endeavored to persuade the new President to remove Stanton as Secretary of War and have Ulysses S. Grant and then his brother, Frank, appointed to his place.¹⁰³

⁹⁹ Hertz, *loc. cit.*

¹⁰⁰ Baltimore *Clipper*, April 17, 1865.

¹⁰¹ *Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1927*, p. 1678.

¹⁰² Steiner, *op. cit.*, pp. 350-372.

¹⁰³ Smith, *op. cit.*, II, 328-338.

The fierce feud between Davis and Blair—ended only when retirement and then death removed Davis from the scene—had tormented Lincoln until the latter's end. In its larger phase the Davis-Blair rivalry was a significant aspect of the struggle between radicals and conservatives during the War and was to hold over into Johnson's administration to contribute to the débacle of Reconstruction.

Columbia University.

BENNET ALLEN, FIGHTING PARSON

By JOSEPHINE FISHER

(Concluded from Vol. XXXVIII, page 322, December, 1943)

That Dulany should be anxious to present his version of the unfortunate occurrences in Frederick to the authorities at home is understandable because Allen had again publicly attempted to connect his own interests with those of the Proprietor and to make his quarrel Lord Baltimore's. In describing "Mr. W. D." in a Philadelphia newspaper he said, "This is the man, who, in possession of £1500 a year, insults his Noble and generous Benefactor by his Words, defies him by his Actions, and wrests the Government of the Province out of his Hands, by the Fury of a Mob . . . the security of . . . the Prerogative will be the security of my Property."¹⁵⁶ Dulany's defense was that his salary as Commissary was less than half that sum and that "even if it were true I think he is by no Means entitled to his Lordship's thanks for publishing such a view . . . for ye Lower Ho. are always glad to catch at any Pretence for reducing ye Fees of his Lordships officers. . . ." ¹⁵⁷

This was a serious accusation to bring against an important government official and at the request of Dulany the Council attempted to make an investigation of the charges. Sharpe asked the parson to attend a meeting of the Council where notice would be taken of the publication "in which Mr Walter Dulany . . . or some person that enjoys an honourable and lucrative Office in this Government, is positively accused of raising the Mob in Fredericktown. . . . If you can undertake to prove that fact; and what else is asserted or suggested in that piece relative to the Conduct of the

¹⁵⁶ *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, September 12, 1768.

¹⁵⁷ W. D. to Hamersley, September 29, 1768, Dulany Papers.

Person accused, it would, I think, be well for you to do so on that occasion, so that his Behaviour might be properly certified to the Lord Proprietor." ¹⁵⁸ Dulany maintained that an investigation by the Council would be "a decisive Mode of trying ye Merits of an Accusation, and much more eligible . . . than ye novel unprecedented Method introduced by Mr Allen of attacking Persons in his Lordship's Service with charges of Disaffection in ye public Papers exposing his Govern^t to ye Contempt of ye whole World, and even of introducing his Name upon all Occasions with Irreverence and Disrespect, tho' intermixed with . . . Adulation, too gross, too fulsome, too servile to be countenaced by a Person of his Lordship's Understanding and ingenuous Disposition." ¹⁵⁹ But Allen was unwilling to attend the meeting and gave three reasons for his refusal: first, there was no obligation for him to appear before the Council and "obeying a summons of this kind would be of a dangerous tendency"; secondly, no court in Maryland could take cognizance of an article printed in another province ¹⁶⁰ and thirdly, he did not consider himself "liable for the Consequences, the piece being anonymous." ¹⁶¹ Exasperating as this answer must have been and although the Council believed there was no foundation for the "indecent insinuations" in the publication, their opinion was that since Allen refused to appear the Governor could take no further notice of "a matter so irregularly suggested." ¹⁶² Another communication which was also published in the *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, was not discussed at the meeting of the Council although it not only contained a more violent attack on Dulany ¹⁶³ but also recklessly included some thinly veiled criticism of the Governor. ¹⁶⁴ Perhaps this attack was not noticed officially because it was signed merely "A Friend."

¹⁵⁸ Sharpe to Allen, September 26, 1768, *Archives*, XXXII, 252.

¹⁵⁹ W. D. to Hamersley, September 29, 1768, Dulany Papers.

¹⁶⁰ The article had been reprinted in the *Maryland Gazette* but Allen said that this was "without the request as far as I know of the Author." Allen to Sharpe, *Archives*, XXXII, 252-253.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.* It was signed "B. A." *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, September 21, 1768.

¹⁶² Council Meeting, October 10, 1768, *Archives*, XXXII, 253-255.

¹⁶³ "Is not a Counsellor . . . in duty bound to support and defend the legal rights and just Prerogative of his Lord Proprietary against the encroachments of the people . . . ? Can the people trust a man who has wronged his Prince?" The writer implied that "a certain Councillor" bore the marks of "a base birth, mean education and contemptible understanding" and was addicted to "whoring, drinking . . . corruption, bribery . . ." *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, September 26, 1768, Supplement.

¹⁶⁴ "Are not frequent mobs and riots a sign of a weak administration?" *ibid.*

Obviously by this time the state of feeling must have been tremendous and the scene which occurred when the two chief antagonists met in the streets of Annapolis on a Sunday afternoon early in November, although deplorable, would seem to have been inevitable. Mr. and Mrs. Walter Dulany with their two daughters were walking toward the house of Mr. Daniel Dulany where they had been invited to dine.¹⁶⁵ They were joined on the way by another of the dinner guests, Mr. Daniel Wolstenholme who was on horseback; he was lame and after apologizing to the ladies for not accompanying them on foot he rode his horse at a walk behind them. Suddenly Mr. Dulany was seen to change his course and hasten toward a gentleman who was coming up the street. When Mr. Wolstenholme recognized the newcomer as Mr. Allen he hurriedly tied his horse to a paling fence and hastened forward "with a view of preventing their Fighting, if possible," but by the time he arrived on the scene "the Gentlemen were closely engaged" with canes as their weapons.¹⁶⁶ Wolstenholme was unable to say who struck the first blow,¹⁶⁷ but the parson claimed that "Mr. D. saluted me, without speaking a Word, with a Rap over the Head with his Cane. This I returned."¹⁶⁸ Wolstenholme shouted, "For Shame, Gentlemen or words to that Effect; but finding himself unable to part them, by Reason of the Height of their Resentment, without a Probability of suffering Blows from each, he retreated some Steps back, to wait the Event." The honors of victory fell to Mr. Dulany; he was able to deprive his opponent of his stick which was found to contain a sword and immediately taken into custody by Wolstenholme.¹⁶⁹ Allen, however, was unwilling to surrender; removing his coat, he swore "By God, I will box you." The crowd which by then had gathered were, according to Wolstenholme, "staring, as well they might, at such a striking Novelty." But hostilities were ended by Miss Allen who appeared suddenly upon the scene and fran-

¹⁶⁵ Hand bill, November 9, 1768, signed Bennet Allen, Gilmore Papers, I, p. 69. Hereafter cited as Allen Handbill.

¹⁶⁶ Handbill, November 9, 1768, signed Daniel Wolstenholme, Gilmore Papers, I, p. 69. Hereafter cited as Wolstenholme Handbill.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁸ Allen Handbill.

¹⁶⁹ Wolstenholme thought it "justice due to Mr. Allen, to declare, That as far as I could observe, he did not endeavour to strike Mr. Dulany with the Tuck End of his stick." Wolstenholme Handbill.

tically clasped her brother so firmly in her arms that "with *all his Struggling*, he could not disengage himself."¹⁷⁰

The outcome of this engagement was not unnaturally the source of some amusement to the Dulany party. "Ye Booby acquitted himself, as was expected, like a poltroon" was the verdict.¹⁷¹ He had been soundly thrashed by Dulany who was "a heavy, gouty and clumsy man"¹⁷² and finally subdued by his sister who was described as rather fragile.¹⁷³ He was advised to cease "affecting an ostentatious Parade of Qualities he neither possesses, nor are in the least essential to his Character as a Minister."¹⁷⁴

After this encounter and another impulsive attack made by Allen on Dulany a few days later, again in the streets of Annapolis,¹⁷⁵ the parson showed a decided, although rather ungraciously expressed, willingness to let bygones be bygones. He explained that "It was recommended to me in strong Terms from home in my last letters to compromise Matters" and promised that unless Mr. Dulany renewed his attacks "no new Cause of Contest, or Altercation, shall be given on my side."¹⁷⁶ Apparently a truce was arranged.¹⁷⁷ Two years later however Dulany accused the parson of attempting, unsuccessfully, to bribe an indentured servant to assassinate him.¹⁷⁸ Allen defended himself ably; he maintained that as to the quarrel, he had "long since forgiven and forgot it" and pointed out that for him to have trusted a recently purchased indentured servant with such an errand would have been "Folly, or rather Madness"; he believed that the servant had told the tale in order to gain his freedom and agreed with many of the people of Maryland that the fact that "the most abandoned of the human species, . . . who were capable of any-

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁷¹ Boucher to James, November 26, 1768, *Md. Hist. Mag.*, VIII, 35.

¹⁷² Boucher, *Reminiscences*, p. 56.

¹⁷³ Boucher to James, November 26, 1768, *loc. cit.* Allen's explanation was that "A Sister's Arms have Force, when we know her Intercession proceeds from a Warmth of Affection.—The same Principle that gave her Strength might conduce to weaken me to *disengage* myself by *struggles* which might have injured her Person." Allen Handbill.

¹⁷⁴ Wolstenholme Handbill.

¹⁷⁵ Allen said that his lack of premeditation was proved by the fact that the attack was made "with a small cane, not at all suitable to the Purpose." Allen Handbill.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁷ "A final suspension of hostilities was agreed upon by the Mediation of Mr. John Hammond in November 1768." *Maryland Gazette*, September 27, 1770.

¹⁷⁸ Statement written by Walter Dulany, September 18, 1770. Dulany Papers, II, 53.

thing to shake off their yokes" were pouring into the Province, constituted a serious menace. The accusation however was considered sufficiently serious for the parson to be bound to appear before the Provincial Court in order to answer it.¹⁷⁹

In the meantime Allen's career in civil office was also proving to be a stormy one. Supervision over the Agent and Receiver General of the Taxes was exercised by the Board of Revenue¹⁸⁰ and when one discovers that during the time Allen held the office the Board was composed of five members who included the Governor and Daniel and Walter Dulany while the secretary was John Clapham¹⁸¹ one would expect friction and one would not be disappointed. The chief struggle arose when the unexpected news arrived from England that the Proprietor, on learning of Allen's appointment as Agent, was "surprised & displeased at the hasty Appointment of M^r Allen to the sole Exercise & Administration of so Capital a Department. He always desired . . . such an establishment for M^r Allen as might place him upon an independent Footing & if he could not proceed efficiently in his Ecclesiastical Walk that a Secular Employ might be found for him . . . but His Ldp never entertained the least Imagination of Conferring the first Employ in the Province . . . on him."¹⁸² By sending a commission appointing Matthew Tilghman to the office Lord Baltimore provided for the removal of Allen¹⁸³ One cannot help sympathizing with the Governor's bewildered indignation at this unexpected rebuke. He defended his action by quoting the orders he had received, which were to give Allen a good post and which mentioned specifically that he might be given any office "now vacant or which may become so . . . in Consequence of any Resignation of M^r Lloyd [the former Agent and Receiver General] . . . His Ldp desires & expects M^r Allen may be immediately promoted & the better it is & the sooner it reaches him His Ldp will be the better pleased."¹⁸⁴

¹⁷⁹ *Maryland Gazette*, September 27, 1770.

¹⁸⁰ *Archives*, XXXII, 396-407.

¹⁸¹ Clapham, the son-in-law of Mrs. Green, the printer of the *Maryland Gazette*, had engaged in a quarrel with Allen after that paper had refused to continue publishing Allen's articles unless he signed them or posted a bond to indemnify the printer. *Maryland Gazette*, September 22, November 17, December 8, 1768; *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, October 17, 1768.

¹⁸² Quoted by Sharpe in a letter to Hamersley, October 30, 1768, *Archives*, XIV, 544.

¹⁸³ *Archives*, XXXII, 411.

¹⁸⁴ Sharpe to Hamersley, October 30, 1768. *Archives*, XIV, 544.

The explanation of Lord Baltimore's sudden change of heart is found in a letter to Walter Dulany from Hamersley in which he said of Allen that

His Lordship once had a great regard for him, but all his Measures from the time of his Arrival in the Province, particularly in attacking his Lordship's best friends, your Brother and yourself, his Turning his Pen against the Colonies & Indecent Outragious behav^r on his Institutⁿ at Frederick, as well as his Subseq^t conduct have been very ill calculated to encrease it, and I believe his Lordship has wrote him with his own hand, that the most acceptable Service he can render, will be to retire to his living, and be quiet—an advice I sincerely hope he will take for his own Sake.¹⁸⁵

When faced with the necessity of making a choice between his favorite and the Dulany family Lord Baltimore chose the Dulanys.

But Allen refused to accept his dismissal from office gracefully. In fact he maintained that he had not been dismissed. In making provincial appointments the usual procedure was for the governor to issue the commission and only occasionally were direct commissions sent over by the proprietor. Since however a law of the Province forbade the holding of office without at least three year's residence unless the commission came from the proprietor, Lord Baltimore at the time he decided to provide for his protégé in the civil establishment, had sent a blank commission for Allen with the office to be filled in by the governor¹⁸⁶ and it was by this commission that Allen had received his appointment as Agent. The commission by which Allen was superseded by Tilghman was also an immediate one but Tilghman refused the office. Sharpe with the advice of the Board of Revenue then appointed Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer and an accounting was demanded from Allen; but the parson claimed that since his appointment had been made by the proprietor, a commission issued by the governor could not deprive him of the office and that his commission would be valid "until superseded by the power that granted it."¹⁸⁷ He also asserted that the Board of Revenue did possess the power to take action, "the Board of the Treasury in England having just as much right of displacing the Lord Treasurer, as the Board of Revenue have of removing an Agent here. . . ."¹⁸⁸ As to the

¹⁸⁵ Hamersley to Walter Dulany, August 1, 1769. Dulany Papers.

¹⁸⁶ Hamersley to Sharpe, November 10, 1768, *Archives*, XIV, 433.

¹⁸⁷ *Archives*, XXXII, 411-414.

¹⁸⁸ Allen to Sharpe, November 29, 1768, *ibid.*, p. 415.

auditing of his accounts he said that on being appointed to office he had been informed by the Board that his accounts to September 29 would be due on March 25 in every year and that he intended to abide by those orders;¹⁸⁹ and that although he could easily produce the accounts at any moment "it was a matter of Punctilio, and that he did not chuse to gratify the Board."¹⁹⁰

He adopted rather petty delaying tactics; he was not "at home" when Jenifer went to his house with an order from the Governor for the delivery of papers relative to the Agent's office¹⁹¹ nor would he receive the Attorney General who was delegated by the Board to point out to Allen the "Irregularity and Indiscretion of his Conduct and to advise him to comply with the order of the Board."¹⁹² By the beginning of 1769 he had abandoned his claim to the office, probably because the Board had threatened to put his bond in suit,¹⁹³ but he continued to cling to his policy of obstruction. Jenifer found it necessary on January 25 to consult the Board "in regard to some Difficulties he was under relative to the execution of the office of Agent and Receiver General" since he had been unable to get "any Papers or Information from the late Agent respecting sums he may have rec^d on His Ldp's acc^t."¹⁹⁴ It was not until March 25, the day on which he had said he would hand over his accounts but two months after he had been notified "that he will be looked upon as Answerable for every Consequence that may attend a failure" to supply Jenifer immediately with the necessary information, that Allen delivered to the Board his accounts to September 29, 1768.¹⁹⁵ He had achieved the satisfaction at the cost of causing what must have been grave inconvenience to the administration of the proprietary revenues, of stubbornly carrying through his program of adhering to the orders issued by the Board at the time it was believed that he was to be the permanent Agent. Although the accounts were "very irregularly stated," the Board was still patient and wrote the parson requesting him to "state them anew" and offering him the assistance of the Clerk of the Board should he need it in drawing

¹⁸⁹ Same to same, November 25, 1768, *ibid.*, p. 412.

¹⁹⁰ Meeting of the Board of Revenue, December 5, 1768, *ibid.*, p. 419.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 414-418.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 417-418.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 417.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 442.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 442-444.

them up.¹⁹⁶ In answer they received a letter from Miss Allen stating that her brother was suffering from an attack of the gout and "that as soon as he is well enough to attend Business I shall give him their letter."¹⁹⁷ This was too much for the Board to endure and orders were given that his bond be put in suit immediately.¹⁹⁸

The result was apparently unexpected and quite shattering to the parson. "If anything," he said, "could astonish me in this Country, it would be the arrest I was put under on Wednesday last, at the Horse Race¹⁹⁹ in the face of the whole Province at the Suit of the Lord Proprietary."²⁰⁰ In spite of his presence at the races he insisted that it was "his extreme illness . . . and total incapacity for business" which had prevented his complying with the Board's last order and that he would immediately obey it "if Your Excellency will be pleased to befriend me so far as to direct the Writ to be withdrawn."²⁰¹ He was evidently unsure to what extent he could still rely on the protection of the Proprietor; he said he was "far from thinking his Lordship conscious of so violent a proceeding . . ." but went on to suggest that Sharpe should consider "If Things were driven to an extremity . . . how far his Lordship's Credit may suffer, after the various Assurances of Support & promises of protection he has made me . . ."; on the other hand he threatened, if Baltimore were ignorant of the proceedings "how far your Excel^y may escape censure, in an affair of so delicate a nature, and which will be severely canvass'd both in England & America." Apparently he even felt some doubt concerning the way he had administered the office of Agent, for he said, "I trust it will appear that I have Acted upon the Credit of my own Bond as uprightly and faithfully as if it was supported by that of the most responsible Securities, and even could any flaw be found in it, I have known Lord B. too long, and have too good opinion of him to conceive he would take undue advantage

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 446. Allen however maintained "that he was satisfied that the Board had injured him as much as it was in their Power to do, that they could not prejudice him more than they had done." *Ibid.*, p. 419.

¹⁹⁷ Elizabeth Allen to John Clapham, April 10, 1769, *ibid.*, p. 446.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁹ The Annapolis races were held on May 2, 3 and 4 in 1769 "on the Race-Ground near this City." On the day of Allen's arrest Mr. McGill's Nonpareil, Mr. Galloway's Selim and Dr. Hamilton's Ranger ran for a purse of one hundred pounds. *Maryland Gazette*, April 27, 1769, May 4, 1769.

²⁰⁰ Allen to Sharpe, May 11, 1769, *Archives*, XXXII, 447.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 449.

of it, or subject a man, to whom he had once professed a Friendship to so ignominious a Process." ²⁰²

The Board was not vindictive. Allen was informed that if "he will without delay submit . . . a regular Account of his Transactions during the Time of his having acted in the office of Agent & make Satisfaction of the Sum which shall be found due to His Lordship on such Account; the Process against him shall be withdrawn, as thereby the end, or purpose thereof, will be Answered." ²⁰³ Delays continued which apparently were the result of Allen's inability to state his accounts "in a mercantile manner," ²⁰⁴ but eventually, in June 1771 after Robert Eden had succeeded Sharpe as governor, they were passed by the Board with reservations. ²⁰⁵

In the midst of these difficulties Allen found time to involve himself in political controversy. After his arrival in Maryland he had devoted some attention to the study of politics and considered the subject "a flattering one, as it gives a man a high opinion of his own abilities to manage adroitly so many minds with much dissonant dispositions, & jarring interests." ²⁰⁶ Fortified by this comforting belief he did not hesitate to express publicly his criticism of the attitude of the colonists toward the British government when his study of local politics had led him to the conclusion that "Mr Pitt has infatuated the minds of these people. The Spirit of Anarchy & Confusion is gone forth & God Knows where it will stop. . . ." ²⁰⁷ He elaborated this theme in three articles signed "Machiavel" published in the *Pennsylvania*

²⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 449. A postscript in which he excused his pen and paper as the best which he could obtain suggests that the letter was written from prison; it was dated April 9 which was probably an error caused by agitation since at the meeting of the Board of Revenue held on May 11, 1769, it was stated that the letter was received on the "10th instant," *ibid.*, p. 447.

²⁰³ Meeting of the Board of Revenue, May 11, 1769, *ibid.*, p. 449.

²⁰⁴ Meeting of the Board of Revenue, March 26, 1770, *ibid.*, p. 463. He lost the services of his clerk when they quarreled about the salary; Allen to Sharpe, May 15, 1769, *ibid.*, pp. 450-451. Apparently the accounts were finally drawn up by William Eddis and John Clapham, Meeting of the Board of Revenue, March 26, 1770, *ibid.*, p. 463.

²⁰⁵ They were approved "provided the Remittances and payments therein charged have been made, no vouchers having been produced except for the Sum of £403. . 12. . 3 paid to the present Agent and a Bond for the Sum of £147. . 15 lodged in the Revenue Office." Meeting of the Board of Revenue, June 6, 1771, *ibid.*, p. 468.

²⁰⁶ Allen to Baltimore, August 27, 1767, Calvert Papers, 1307.

²⁰⁷ Same to same, February, 1767, Calvert Papers, 1303.

Chronicle in the summer of 1768,²⁰⁸ in which he upheld the then unpopular theory that "America had thrown off all allegiance to Great Britain . . . since the treatment accorded to the officers appointed by the king to collect the Stamp tax can only be considered a denial of the authority which appointed them."²⁰⁹ Walter Dulany would not believe that the parson was defending a principle and claimed that he was

exerting his feeble Efforts to bring into Contempt a Pamphlet²¹⁰ written by my brother in relation to ye Stamp Act, which was rec'd with universal Approbation both in England & America . . . it is apparent that M^r Pitt grounded his whole Argument for Repeal upon y^e Principles of this Pamphlet, and not a single Pen has ever appear'd against it but y^e Parson's.²¹¹

The articles were taken sufficiently seriously for threats to be made against their author²¹² and according to Walter Dulany their result was "to bring upon his Back y^e universal Hatred of y^e People in America."²¹³ Another accusation of plagiarism followed this publication; it was said that "some resemblances of Swift's 'Discourse of the Contents and Dissentions between the Nobles and the Commons in Athens, Rome, etc.' is discoverable in the illustrations and style, in the historical deductions and political reflections."²¹⁴ Swift, as the critic pointed out, was an unwise choice for he was "an author in everybody's hands."²¹⁵ Perhaps the most serious result for Allen of "his turning his Pen against the Colonies" was that it helped to lose him the favor of Lord Baltimore.²¹⁶

²⁰⁸ W. D. to Hamersley, September 29, 1768, Dulany Papers, II, 51.

²⁰⁹ *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, August 8, 15, 22, 1768. At another time Allen claimed that he had written in favor of repeal of the Stamp Act in *St. James's Chronicle*, under the signature of Sebastian Cabot. Allen, *Address to the Parishioners*, p. 7.

²¹⁰ Daniel Dulany, *The Considerations on the Propriety of Imposing Taxes in the British Colonies for the Purpose of Raising a Revenue, by Act of Parliament* (Annapolis, 1765).

²¹¹ W. D. to Hamersley, September 29, 1768, Dulany Papers, II, 51. "Machiavel" compared Daniel Dulany to Anthony, John Dickinson to Octavius and James Otis to Lepidus, *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, August 8, 1768.

²¹² *Ibid.*, September 12 and 19, 1768.

²¹³ W. D. to Hamersley, September 29, 1768.

²¹⁴ *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, October 12, 1768. Reprinted in the *Maryland Gazette*, October 20, 1768, supplement.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.* Dulany reported that Allen had "brought himself . . . into great Contempt as a Writer by those Publications, for he is detected of stealing almost y^e whole" from Swift. W. D. to Hamersley, September 29, 1768.

²¹⁶ Hamersley to Walter Dulany, August 1, 1769, Dulany Papers, I, 44.

Allen also took an active part in the controversies concerning the Established Church which helped to agitate the province in the years immediately preceding the Revolution. On the obviously important question of the reform of the government of the Church Allen was a member of the High Church group which criticized as "unconstitutional and palpably Presbyterian" the plan advocated by some of the clergy of setting up an ecclesiastical court to be composed of laymen as well as clergy and advocated instead the establishment of an American episcopate.²¹⁷ He was the author of a pamphlet, *A Reply to the Church of England Planter's First Letter respecting the Clergy*,²¹⁸ signed "A Constitutionalist," which was written in 1770 to refute arguments that the clergy should receive lower salaries and be subject to control by their vestries. These Proposals had been made in a handbill signed by "A Church of England Planter."²¹⁹

Except for these suitable activities Allen appears to have accepted the advice sent him by Lord Baltimore, "to retire to his living and be quiet."²²⁰ He attempted to conciliate the parishioners of All Saints' by announcing that he wanted peace and would do all that he could to benefit the parish²²¹ and, although the parish was not divided, three curates chosen by the vestry²²² with a salary of £150 "Common Money, exclusive of Perquisites" were provided.²²³ The parson explained to his parishioners that the system of having curates was more beneficial to their interest than a division of the parish would be, since rectors "would have been more independent, and therefore, through the Frailty of Nature, more liable to have neglected their Duty than Assistants, whose Dependence is on good Behaviour."²²⁴

Many of the inhabitants of Frederick county were German and the parson attempted to win their support; he declared that the rumor that he intended to "level their Steeple with that of Church"

²¹⁷ *Archives*, XXXII, 379-387.

²¹⁸ Wroth, *op. cit.*, p. 234. It was published in Annapolis by Anna Catherine Green and a copy is in Gilmor Papers, I, 2. Hereafter cited as Allen, *A Reply*.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²²⁰ Hamersley to Walter Dulany, August 1, 1769, Dulany Papers, I, 44.

²²¹ Allen, *Address to the Parishioners*, pp. 10-11.

²²² *Maryland Gazette*, June 8, 1769.

²²³ *Ibid.* Their salary was paid by Allen. American Loyalists, Audit Office Manuscripts, Vol. 35, bk. 1, 467. Transcripts in the New York Public Library. Hereafter cited as Loyalist Transcripts.

²²⁴ Allen, *Address to the Parishioners*, p. 10.

was false and he expressed great admiration for the "Dutch."²²⁵ He agreed to pay £25 annually toward the support of ministers for both the Lutheran and the Dutch Reformed churches.²²⁶ One would like to know what explanation lay behind this unexpectedly princely gesture; possibly Allen agreed to the arrangement as the result of official pressure exerted in order to make Maryland as attractive as Pennsylvania to German settlers.²²⁷ There was however apparently some difficulty in collecting the money from the parson for the accounts of the Lutheran church in 1775 show "Expenditure for Sheriff because of Mr. Allen, 0. 7. 7."²²⁸ But the next year the church received £50 from the parson.²²⁹ When writing anonymously Allen expressed far less enthusiasm for what he described as "the back Parts of the Province, where three fourths of the inhabitants are foreigners, invincibly attached to their own Religion, Language and Manners, amongst whom no Clergymen of the Church of England can hope for any more Respect than his Humanity entitles him to or his Income commands."²³⁰ But evidently his efforts to make himself popular bore some fruit for he was able to boast publicly that "I made it my particular study to cultivate the Goodwill and Affection of all my loving Friends of every Denomination in Frederick County, not, I flatter myself without some Success."²³¹ The Dulanys remained unmoved but their friend Jonathan Boucher, at last settled at St. Ann's in Annapolis, showed signs of softening; he said that although Allen was "contemptible in the eyes of all" he would strive to be "decent to him."²³² He was on friendly terms with an eminent fellow Wadhamite,²³³ the Reverend Mr. Richard

²²⁵ *Ibid.*

²²⁶ Ernest Helfenstein, *History of All Saints' Parish in Frederick County, Maryland, 1742-1932* (Frederick, 1932), p. 23.

²²⁷ In advocating allowing naturalized citizens to sit in the lower house of the Assembly, Governor Eden pointed out that in Pennsylvania they were given this privilege, which placed Maryland at a disadvantage, "especially as (notwithstanding they maintain their Ministers by Contribution) they are equally taxed with others to support the established Clergy; a Charge to which they are not liable in Pennsylvania." Eden to Lord Dartmouth, January 29, 1773, "Correspondence of Governor Eden," *Md. Hist. Mag.*, II, 303.

²²⁸ Records of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Frederick City, I, 291, Ms. copy, MHE.

²²⁹ *Ibid.*

²³⁰ Allen, *A Reply*, p. 15.

²³¹ *Maryland Gazette*, September 27, 1770.

²³² Boucher to James, June 8, 1770, *Md. Hist. Mag.*, VIII, 39. They were associated together in advocating an American Episcopate, *Archives*, XXXII, 387.

²³³ D. A. B., article on Richard Peters.

Peters of Christ Church, Philadelphia,²³⁴ and he made a favorable impression on Lord Fairfax and his brother.²³⁵

It has been said that the parson spent little time in Frederick²³⁶ but he bought a house in the town in 1774²³⁷ and was living there with his sister at the outbreak of the Revolution.²³⁸ The establishment included a garden,²³⁹ two Negro slaves,²⁴⁰ "A new Book case and tables,²⁴¹ and "A box of table and Bed Linen" worth £20.²⁴² His way of life continued to be that of a scholar and a gentleman; his library contained three hundred volumes; he owned manuscripts and prints a cellar of wine worth £30 and a violoncello;²⁴³ and in spite of painful associations he continued to frequent the Annapolis races.²⁴⁴

Allen, unlike many of the Church of England clergy in the Province, did not make himself conspicuous by opposition to revolutionary measures. In the beginning of "the troubles" he referred with a light touch to current happenings; he wrote from Frederick to the Reverend Mr. Peters of Philadelphia, "Should the Calamities of War ever force you from your place of residence. You will find welcome Asylum here, which is looked on so safe they make it the magazine of all the powder in the Province and we expect the Ladies to follow it shortly. . . ." ²⁴⁵ Later he claimed that he had "in a variety of Publications vindicated & maintained the authority of the British Gov^t" ²⁴⁶ and that in May, 1775, when the dissenting ministers had "preached up Rebellion on the Fast Day app^d by Congress, he thought it his Duty to recommend Peace."²⁴⁷ He was summoned before the Committee of Observation of Frederick for preaching this sermon but upon examination the Committee found its sentiments "not

²³⁴ Allen to Peters, May 2, 1775, Wayne MSS., HSP.

²³⁵ Lord Fairfax to "My Lord," July 3, 1782, Society Miscellaneous Collection, HSP.

²³⁶ "Mr. Allen, when not in Philadelphia, resided in Hagerstown, visiting the parish church not more than once or twice a year and devoting his attention principally to Antietam congregation." Helfenstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-22.

²³⁷ Loyalist Transcripts, 35, i, 461. He paid £600 currency for it. *Ibid.*

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 459, 636-643.

²³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 461.

²⁴⁰ Together worth £85 sterling, *ibid.*, p. 457.

²⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 643.

²⁴² *Ibid.*

²⁴³ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁴ *Maryland Gazette*, September 27, 1770.

²⁴⁵ Allen to Peters, May 2, 1775, Wayne Mss. HSP.

²⁴⁶ Loyalist Transcripts, 35, i, 453.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 453, 459.

exceptionable." ²⁴⁸ Allen attempted to gloss over this rather tame ending by explaining that had not this been the case "he should have been tarred and feathered." ²⁴⁹ The parson stated emphatically that he had never taken an oath of loyalty to the United States ²⁵⁰ but a list of the members of the Association in Frederick County includes the name of "Bennett Allen." ²⁵¹

According to Allen's story, he was considered a person of considerable importance by the rebels. His frontier parish was "the chief nursery of the body of Riflemen" ²⁵² and in the summer of 1775 "General Gates who had then just got his Commission called on him & gave him to understand that if he would assist him & General Washington in levying Men in his Parish they would Preserve his Property and situation secure and by way of Enforcement told him the Ministry had nothing so good to give him as he possessed there." But Allen easily withstood the temptation; he asked for time to consider the offer, "not . . . that he was at all dubious as to the Part he should Act but because he wished to gain time." ²⁵³ Finally, with "the situation growing daily more critical" and "preferring his Allegiance to the King & his attachment to his native Country to the preservation of his property" he returned to England in September 1775. ²⁵⁴

But hope for saving his possessions was not entirely abandoned; his faithful sister remained in Frederick in order to try to salvage some of his property. ²⁵⁵ Although she was unsuccessful in her original purpose she was able to make herself of use in other ways since

From her situation in Frederic Town . . . where many British Prisoners were confined she had an opportunity of rendering them great and important Services in their distressed Situation. . . . Her Donations were

²⁴⁸ Peter Force, *American Archives*, 4th series, II, 1044-1045.

²⁴⁹ Loyalist Transcripts, 35, i, 459. A fellow clergyman who was present when the sermon was preached testified that it "gave great offence as it preached up moderation instead of Opposition to the measures of Great Britain," *ibid.*, pp. 463-464.

²⁵⁰ "Some Loyalist claims have been dismissed owing to the Claimants having taken the Oaths to the United States—I never was required to take any such Oaths. . . ." Allen to William Tilghman, March 6, 1800, Gratz Collection, HSP.

²⁵¹ "Journal of the Committee of Observation of the Middle District of Frederick County, Maryland," *Md. Hist. Mag.*, X, 163.

²⁵² Allen to J. Goulburn, September 10, 1814, Goulburn Papers, William L. Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

²⁵³ Loyalist Transcripts, 35, i, 460.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 453; Allen to Tilghman, March 6, 1800, Gratz Collection, HSP.

²⁵⁵ Loyalist Transcripts, 35, i, 637.

bestowed chiefly on those who could not express their wants in Writing whom she furnished with money rum and clothing.²⁵⁶

Eventually her kindness to the enemy made her so unpopular with the citizens of Frederick that she was driven from her house²⁵⁷ and in 1780, finding herself of danger of starvation and her brother's "affairs . . . totally ruined," she returned to England²⁵⁸ where, since her brother said that he was unable to support her and she was "quite incapable of getting her own Living" she applied to the Lords of the Treasury for an allowance. In 1783 she was granted £5 a year but found this sum "inadequate to her Board in any part of the Kingdom"²⁵⁹ and in 1786 she was receiving an allowance of £20 a year from the Treasury.²⁶⁰

In May of 1781 Allen was among a number of Maryland loyalists who were presented for high treason but the action was discontinued;²⁶¹ it was stated that his property was confiscated²⁶² but the available evidence seems to indicate that although he lost most of his property it was not through confiscation. His losses consisted of the income from All Saints' Parish which for a time was apparently paid but sequestered in the hands of his agent, John Hanson, Jr.,²⁶³ but ceased entirely after the adoption of the Maryland constitution of 1776 which made no provision for payment of the clergy.²⁶⁴ Allen at first claimed that the living of All Saints' was worth £1000 a year²⁶⁵ but when pressed for details he said that in 1774 his salary had been £1563. 16 in currency or £938. 5. 8, sterling;²⁶⁶ the sheriff of Frederick County estimated

²⁵⁶ She claimed to have spent about £300 for these supplies. *Ibid.*, pp. 637-641.

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 643.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 637-639.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 639-640.

²⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 643.

²⁶¹ "List of Outlawries, Western Shore." *Md. Hist. Mag.*, IV, 288.

²⁶² *Ibid.*

²⁶³ "March 19, 1776 . . . Resolved that the . . . Committee petition . . . that all such sums of money as may have been or shall be received by the Sheriff for the use of M^r Bennett Allen shall be paid into the hands of M^r John Hanson Jun^r his Attorney the Residue after the payment of his just debts to remain there subject to the order of the Convention." "Journal of the Committee of Observation of the Middle District of Frederick County, Maryland, *Md. Hist. Mag.*, XI, 246.

²⁶⁴ Allen to William Tilghman, April 11, 1803, HSP.

²⁶⁵ Loyalist Transcripts, 35, i, 454.

²⁶⁶ Each of the 7819 taxable inhabitants of the county paid 4 shillings currency for the support of the clergyman. *Ibid.*, p. 457. In 1814 he claimed that when he left Maryland in 1775 his living was £1069. 14 sterling per annum exclusive of fees." Allen to Lord Bathurst, July 18, 1814, Goulburn Papers, I, Clements Library.

that the average value of the living for 1774-1775 was £820 while Governor Sharpe believed that in 1768 the parish had been considered worth £800 sterling.²⁶⁷ He also suffered from the depreciation of funds left in the hands of his agent²⁶⁸ and was deprived of a rather questionable claim to 1000 acres of land worth, he said, £600.²⁶⁹ He listed among his losses household goods valued at £200²⁷⁰ and an item, "Loss on Insolvents as stated by M^r Hanson £2176. 7. 1 Currency," which Allen explained as "Debts due for his Salary from Part of his Parishioners."²⁷¹ At the time he left the province he was himself indebted for two bonds worth £350.²⁷²

The parson however received some compensation from the British government for his losses. After his return to England he was given an allowance by the Treasury. This was discontinued in 1782,²⁷³ possibly pending a general investigation of the claims of the American loyalists; powerful friends sprang to his rescue in this crisis and the sum of 140 guineas was subscribed for the support of a man who had suffered as a result of his "Loyalty to the King & . . . attachment to the british Constitution."²⁷⁴ In 1785 he was receiving £100 a year from the Treasury²⁷⁵ and under the act of Parliament of June, 1788, he was granted a pension of £300;²⁷⁶ eventually he was allowed £650 for the loss of his income and £150 for his property losses.²⁷⁷ These sums were not munificent and Allen did not abandon the hope that he might still win

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 463.

²⁶⁸ "Loss in 14053 continental Dollars exchanged forty for one agreeable to the Laws of Maryland received by M^r Hanson as Good Money for debts due your Memorialist." *Ibid.*, p. 457. This sum included the money received by Hanson for the sale of Allen's house in Frederick and of two Negroes. *Ibid.*

²⁶⁹ Allen said that in 1773 he had obtained a warrant from the governor for 1000 acres "to the Westward of Fort Frederick" and that the warrant was returned to the Office but that the outbreak of the war had prevented his obtaining a patent. *Ibid.*, pp. 457, 460-461. Samuel Chase gave as his opinion that the land taken up by Allen "among the Glades in Frederick . . . to be from nine shillings to twelve per annum" [*sic*]. *Ibid.*, p. 457.

²⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

²⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 457, 462-463.

²⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 454.

²⁷³ Allen to Lord Shelburne, February 4, 1783. Clements Library.

²⁷⁴ Lord Sackville to Allen, October 11, 1782, Clements Library. Lord Bateman, the Duke of Montague, Lord North, Lord Sackville, Bamber Gascoyne, H. Hamersley and J. Fazakerly each gave 20 guineas. "State of a Voluntary Subscription entered into for the Rev^d Bennet Allen. Shelburne Papers, Clements Library.

²⁷⁵ Loyalist Transcripts, 35, i, 460.

²⁷⁶ Loyalist Transcripts, II, 78-79.

²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

the fortune he had endured exile in the wilds to find. He was encouraged by the adoption of the Convention of January 8, 1802, under which the United States turned over to the British government £600,000 for the payment of debt owed by Americans to British subjects. According to Allen a large proportion of this sum should come to him; the allowance granted the loyalist clergy by the British government, he said, "does not exonerate America . . ." and since his living was in the nature of a freehold²⁷⁸ "a Constitution [the Maryland constitution of 1776] formed . . . before the independence of the Colonies was acknowledged, could not repeal & annul a law of above 70 Years Standing . . ."; he therefore should receive from the fund provided by the convention "the arrears due to me . . . on account of my Parish from 1775 to 1803."²⁷⁹ and found precedents for his case in the fact that "at the dissolution of the Monasteries in England, pensions were allowed the Monks and Abbots" and that even the non-juring clergy were provided for at the beginning of the French Revolution.²⁸⁰ The parson thought that the minimum amount he should receive was "above ninety thousand pounds Sterling . . .," the arrears of his salary between 1775 and 1803, allowing for an annual increase in population of 535 which was the average for the increase in the three years before the outbreak of the war, with six percent simple interest; "But if the Calculation be made with compound Interest," he suggested hopefully, "the Account would stand thus: Income with increase and compound Interest at 6 p cent 115,319.6.0½ Sterling."²⁸¹ The commissioners awarded him the sum of £1106 "in part of arrears of . . . Debts contracted before the War began" but refused to consider his claim for salary after 1775.²⁸²

In 1814 the negotiations of the Treaty of Ghent appeared to Allen to offer an excellent opportunity to force the Americans to pay up, and he expressed to Lord Bathurst the hope that "the British Plenipotentiaries . . . may be instructed to make the

²⁷⁸ His life tenure of All Saints' was acknowledged, he claimed, by the Maryland Assembly in passing the act of November 21, 1770, which provided for a division of the parish "upon the death or removal of Bennet Allen." Allen to Tilghman, April 11, 1803, HSP.

²⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

²⁸¹ *Ibid.*

²⁸² Allen to Lord Bathurst, July 18, 1814. Goulburn Papers, I, Clements Library.

Liquidation of his Demands one of the Conditions on which Peace may be concluded with the United States." ²⁸³ At this time he was attempting to obtain the payment of salary from 1775 to 1783, with interest to 1813; if 5 percent interest were allowed the amount due to him was £48, 985. 9. 10¾ but if he were granted 6 percent which he said was customary in the Province, he would obtain £53,290. 2. 0. ²⁸⁴ He suggested that his claim might be of value to the British plenipotentiaries "as a makeweight against the claims which the subjects of the United States will not be backward to make for Spoiliations by sea & on their Coasts." ²⁸⁵ But there is no evidence indicating that Allen's case played any part in the negotiations at Ghent.

It was nearly seven years after Allen's return to England that his last and most famous encounter took place with a member of the Dulany family. In 1779 a series of sketches entitled "Characters of some of the leading Men in the present American Rebellion" appeared anonymously in the *Morning Post*. Among the "characters" was that of George Washington who was described as a land speculator whose "abilities are of that mediocrity which created no jealousy"; the private life of Benjamin Franklin was shown in the worst possible light and the hope was expressed that "if the axe or the halter are to be employed on this occasion . . . the first example could be made of this hoary traitor." Eventually the name of Daniel Dulany of Maryland appeared; he was placed before the public, among the leading men of the rebellion, in the unattractive guise of a person of low origin whose family

had determined . . . to divide, part coming to England, under character of sufferers in the Royal cause, and part residing in America, to take care of their property, and to be ready to close with the winning side—Policy too common on this occasion as it only serves to prolong the War, and becomes a heavy burden on this Country; there being several of this name and family who have allowances from Government. ²⁸⁶

The members of the Dulany family, perhaps more than any other family in Maryland, were outstanding in their loyalty to the

²⁸³ *Ibid.*

²⁸⁴ Allen to Goulburn, September 10, 1814. Goulburn Papers, Clements Library.

²⁸⁵ Allen to William Adams, August 11, 1814. Goulburn Papers, I, Clements Library.

²⁸⁶ Quoted from the *Morning Post*, in the *Political Magazine*, July, 1782, pp. 445-446.

old regime and as a result their material losses were heavy.²⁸⁷ Walter Dulany had died in 1773²⁸⁸ but two of his sons joined the Maryland Loyalist Regiment.²⁸⁹ Daniel Dulany was living in retirement in Maryland, "despised and detested" for his opposition to revolutionary measures;²⁹⁰ Daniel his elder son was an exile in London²⁹¹ and Benjamin, the younger, was apparently the only member of the family who joined the American cause.²⁹² Lloyd the half brother of Daniel and Walter was also living in England.²⁹³

The Dulanys had broken their ties with Maryland and their fortunes depended upon the attitude of the British government toward them. There could be no doubt that the *Morning Post* article was not only an insult to their convictions but also a very real danger to the future of the family. Perhaps the fact that there were circumstances which might be interpreted to lend weight to the accusation made it harder to endure; Daniel Dulany had divided most of his property between his two sons, Daniel the loyalist and Benjamin who adhered to the American cause;²⁹⁴ the younger Daniel Dulany had been granted £400 by the Treasury on his arrival in England and was receiving an allowance of £200 a year.²⁹⁵

²⁸⁷ The numerous offices which had been held by members of the family in the proprietary government were of course abolished and the property of at least five members of the family was confiscated. *Archives*, 48, pp. 436, 459, 539.

²⁸⁸ *Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser*, September 18, 1773.

²⁸⁹ Captain Grafton Dulany died of a fever in 1778 while the regiment was stationed in Jamaica. W. O. Raymond, ed., *Winslow Papers*, A. D. 1776-1826 (St. John, N. B., 1901), p. 45. Walter Dulany was a Major in the regiment, Lorenzo Sabine, *Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American Revolution with an Historical Essay* (Boston, 1864), 2 vols., I, 266. Their brother was presented for high treason in 1781, *Md. Hist. Mag.*, IV, 288.

²⁹⁰ Force, *op. cit.*, 4th series, III, 819-820; Hugh Egerton, *The Royal Commission on the Losses and Services of American Loyalists 1783-1785*, p. 321.

²⁹¹ *Ibid.*

²⁹² *Archives*, 47, *passim*.

²⁹³ According to Governor Eden he had left "a considerable Estate here to escape with his Life from the persecution he has been under, for having withstood every insidious and violent Attempt to draw him into Connection with Men whose Measures he abhors. . . . Eden to Lord Dartmouth, August 27, 1775, *Md. Hist. Mag.*, II, 12. He had been a student at the Middle Temple in 1761 (Joseph Towne Wheeler, "Reading Interests of the Professional Classes in Colonial Maryland, 1770-1776," *Md. Hist. Mag.*, XXXVI, 281) and cultivated an interest in science (Thomas J. Wertenbaker, *The Founding of American Civilization*, Vol. II, "The Old South," [New York, 1942], II, 68).

²⁹⁴ Egerton, *op. cit.*, p. 321; *Archives*, 47, 422.

²⁹⁵ Egerton, *op. cit.*, p. 321. It seems probable that Lloyd Dulany was being aided by the British government but his death prevented his name from appearing on any of the available records.

It was Lloyd Dulany who rushed to the defense of the family name. He called upon the editor of the *Morning Post* and persuaded him to publish a retraction of the accusations which had been made against the family²⁹⁶ together with a peremptory demand that the anonymous author make himself known.²⁹⁷ After several weeks had passed without a reply Dulany issued a stronger challenge to the author to reveal his name, "that I might see my enemy, and combat him fairly . . ." otherwise, he said, "you must pass with the world for what you know yourself to be, a detestable liar and a cowardly assassin!"²⁹⁸ Three years however passed before "that old and inveterate enemy to the family, Mr. Bennett Allen" disclosed himself as the author.²⁹⁹ The reason for his long silence and the sudden breaking of it remains obscure. One explanation was that "it was said that some intricate family affairs respecting money, occasioned Allen to keep himself from being known as the writer. . . ." ³⁰⁰ To Lloyd Dulany Allen merely said, "It is not till the present moment that I find myself at liberty to avow that the character of Daniel Dulany . . . was written by me."³⁰¹ The circumstances were considered odd by the friends of the Dulanys, one of whom wrote, "Thus was this most unhappy affair terminated, after the intermission of three years, without any fresh provocation on either side; neither had Mr. D. or Mr. A. been for one moment out of Great Britain during the above Period—they had neither spoken or been in Company."³⁰² But the answer, when it finally arrived on Tuesday, June 18 in 1782, left no doubt of the parson's acceptance of Lloyd Dulany's challenge. Among other things he said:

I know you to be from facts what I am only in your imagination, both an infamous *liar* and a *cowardly assassin*. I shall not go about to recrimi-

²⁹⁶ "The brother of M^r Dulany whose character was given in this paper of Tuesday last, having called at the office and convinced us that the circumstances there alledged against his family are totally groundless; We are happy in the opportunity of publishing this his positive denial of the infamous charges. . . ." *Political Magazine*, 1782, p. 447.

²⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.* Another version of the letter reads "assassin of a private character." Walter Dulany, Jr., to ———, August 11, 1782, quoting a letter of James Brooks to Captain Philip Barton Key, Maryland Historical Collection, Portfolio 11, MHS. Hereafter cited as Brooks letter.

²⁹⁹ Walter Dulany, Jr., to ———, August 11, 1782.

³⁰⁰ *Political Magazine*, July, 1782, p. 447.

³⁰¹ Brooks letter.

³⁰² *Ibid.*

nate, because I do not wish to imitate, but to punish your insolence. If you harbour still the same degree of resentment, the bearer will put in a way of carrying it into immediate execution.³⁰³

After this outburst however Allen again became elusive; when Lloyd Dulany, having provided himself with a second in the person of a well-connected fellow loyalist, James Delancy, accompanied Mr. Morris to Allen's house in Islington Spa he was told that the parson had departed for Barking in Essex "where he was likely to remain for some time."³⁰⁴ Dulany wished to set out at once for Barking but was deterred by the refusal of Mr. Morris to accompany him. It is difficult to judge from the available accounts whether their subsequent meeting was accidental and against the will of Allen or not. Dulany's next move was to write two letters, one of which was left at Allen's house and the other "sent to Illford, to Mr. Bamber Gascoyne's where he then was."³⁰⁵ That evening Dulany and the two seconds met at Marybone Coffee House and went together to "Mr Fazakerly's in Clifford Street"; as the coach stopped at the door Allen was seen entering the house.³⁰⁶ The two opponents met and it was decided to settle the issue immediately. Even then there were difficulties to be surmounted; Allen had no balls for his pistols and when these were finally obtained Mr. Morris suggested deferring the affair until the next day but Dulany refused. The four drove to Hyde Park through Grosvenor Gate and entered the Deer Park. The time was between nine and ten in the evening but since it was June it was merely "darkish."³⁰⁷ It was decided that the opponents should stand eight yards apart.³⁰⁸ and that the signal for firing

³⁰³ *Ibid.* The bearer was Robert Morris, secretary to the Bill of Rights, *ibid.* According to the rather unreliable recollections of Boucher, Morris like Allen had won the gratitude of Lord Baltimore by writing in his defense at the time of his trial for the rape of Miss Woodcock, Boucher, *Reminiscences*, p. 55. Baltimore apparently did make Morris one of his executors and guardian of his illegitimate children. One of the younger Dulanys wrote his father from London that "Your Suspicions of Morris from his Acquaintance with Allen, were extremely well founded," since he was reported to have made several attempts to marry his ward, Miss Harford, who was not yet thirteen, and not only to have attempted to introduce young Henry Harford, then a student at Eton, "into the worst Debaucheries" but also to be cherishing designs to "make away with him." Daniel Dulany, Jr., to Walter Dulany, July 13, 1772. Dulany Papers, II, 68; same to same, August 29, 1772, Dulany Papers, II, 59.

³⁰⁴ *Political Magazine*, 1782, p. 447.

³⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 448.

³⁰⁸ "De Lancey . . . proposed placing them 12 yds asunder—M^r Morris . . . objected & proposed 8 yds to which M^r Dulany readily acquiesced." Brooks letter.

should be the removal of their hats by the seconds. Both men fired simultaneously and Dulany fell, shot through the right lung. Mr. Delancey remarked solicitously, "My dear Lloyd, I hope you are not much hurt," but Dulany replied, "My dear Jemmy, I am afraid I am done for." He was carried from the field to his house in Park Street where he died three days later.³⁰⁹

In July of the same year the Reverend Mr. Bennet Allen and Mr. Morris were indicted at the Old Bailey for the wilful murder of Lloyd Dulany.³¹⁰ In charging the jury the judge stated the law against duelling "in a strong and express manner" and said that if the jury reached the conclusion that the duel was deliberate the prisoners must be found guilty of murder.³¹¹ The prosecution produced a witness who testified that on the day of the duel Allen had been seen shooting at a mark in a field near Blackfriar's Bridge but Bamber Gascoigne,³¹² supported by two ladies, provided him with an alibi for the time in question,³¹³ Probably the strongest point in favor of the accused was that after the challenge had been sent no real enthusiasm could be said to have been displayed by him for bringing the affair to a conclusion.³¹⁴ Morris was acquitted and Allen found guilty of manslaughter only, for which he was sentenced to pay a fine of one shilling and to undergo six months imprisonment in Newgate.³¹⁵

Although scarcely profitable it is interesting to speculate why Allen should suddenly feel it imperative to resent an insult which he had managed to endure for three years with apparent equanimity. The explanation that it was "some intricate family affairs respecting money" which kept him silent seems unconvincing. Was it perhaps that no one had known that it was the Reverend

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.* One account states that "Mr. Allen and Mr. Morris as they went off, sent for a coach" (*Political Magazine*, 1782, p. 448) but the Dulany version was that "Allen with his second went away immediately though their assistance was required for Mr. Dulany, but a carriage fortunately passing by, he was put in it." Brooks letter.

³¹⁰ *Gentlemen's Magazine*, lii (1782), 353.

³¹¹ *Ibid.*

³¹² Bamber Gascoigne was a member of Parliament who supported government policy during the Revolution. L. B. Namier, *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III* (London, 1929), 2 Vols., I, 134-137, 167, note 1.

³¹³ *Annual Register*, 1782, pp. 213-214.

³¹⁴ "It appearing, however, in the course of the evidence that the prisoners wanted to evade the challenge, and particularly Mr. Morris . . ." (*Gentleman's Magazine*, lii, 353). James Delancey agreed that Morris had wished to defer the duel until the next day (*Annual Register*, 1782, p. 213).

³¹⁵ *Ibid.*

Mr. Bennet Allen who had been publicly insulted in the pages of the *Morning Post* and that in 1782 the news was somehow beginning to leak out? Even an 18th century would-be gentleman might resist defending his honor until it was known that it had been assailed. Or may have some unknown episode brought too vividly to his recollection the memory of his sufferings in Maryland which he persisted in attributing to the machinations of the Dulanys? His behaviour subsequent to the sending of the letter accepting the ancient challenge seems to indicate either that the act was the result of a sudden impulse which he later regretted or that he was following out a rather skilfully planned attempt to appear reluctant in order to provide for the eventuality which did occur. But it is improbable that his real motives can ever be known.

Almost nothing is known of the parson's latter days.³¹⁶ For a time at least he maintained a tenuous connection with the church;³¹⁷ he obviously did a little occasional anonymous writing and was "supposed to have a considerable share in the management of the *Morning Post*"³¹⁸ which is described as being in the years 1775-1780 "a shameless organ of the king's party" with "an evil reputation as a retailer of coarse social gossip."³¹⁹ He continued to be subject to attacks of gout³²⁰ but lived to be at least 77. Maryland tradition would have it that Allen ended his days a destitute drunkard in the streets of London³²¹ but there is no evidence to indicate that belief in this perhaps suitable end to his career was anything more than wishful thinking.

It is difficult not to allow the more dramatic episodes of Allen's life in America to obscure the fact that for the student of Maryland history in the years immediately preceding the Revolution his sojourn there has real significance. This would be a pity because his comparatively brief career in the Province serves admirably

³¹⁶ "Of Allen's later life no account is accessible." D. N. B.

³¹⁷ In 1783 he had "no preferment but the Chapel of Great Ilford in Essex, the salary of which does not exceed £20 per Annum, in the presentation of Bamber Gascoigne, Esq." *Loyalist Transcripts*, 35, i, 454.

³¹⁸ *Gentleman's Magazine*, lii, 353.

³¹⁹ H. R. Fox Bourne, *English Newspapers, Chapters in the History of Journalism* (London, Chatto and Windus, 1887, 2 vols.), I, 220-221.

³²⁰ Allen to Tilghman, March 6, 1800, HSP; Allen to William Adams, August 11, 1814, Goulburn Papers, Clements Library.

³²¹ Helfenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 29; Rev. Ethan Allen, *Historical Sketches of St. Ann's Parish in Ann Arundel County, Maryland* (Baltimore, 1857), p. 58.

to illustrate and explain several of the factors which made the Revolution inevitable: for instance, the almost impossible position of a conscientious governor attempting to carry out the wishes of a distant and irresponsible proprietor without losing the necessary popular support for his administration of the Province; the growing criticism of the Anglican church as established in Maryland; the friction which was the inevitable result of the arrival of newcomers from England who tended to regard the proud and self-conscious Maryland gentry as uneducated and ill-bred provincials.

THE HISTORIC MULBERRY TREE OF SAINT MARY'S CITY

By WILLIAM B. MARYE

The anonymous author of the well known *A Relation of Maryland*, which came out in the year 1635, informs his readers that, among fruit trees of divers sorts which are to be found "in great abundance" in Maryland, are "Mulberries"; and, in another place, he remarks that this land is "stored" with them.¹ We must remember that the "Relation" was a recruiting pamphlet, which was designed for the benefit of prospective settlers. Whether or not the (to us) insipid fruit of the red mulberry tree was esteemed as an article of human diet three centuries ago we have no means of knowing. Mulberries are still valued as food for hogs and chickens. However, the intention of the author of the "Relation" seems to have been to conjure up the prospect of a silk industry in Lord Baltimore's colony.

A single variety of mulberry tree (*morus rubra*) is indigenous to the eastern United States, from Massachusetts to Florida.² According to our experience, mulberry trees of this variety are not often seen growing in the woods of eastern Maryland or in other situations where they are not obviously "volunteers," escaped from cultivation. It would seem that this tree is intolerant of shade. Where, then, in these parts, did it find a congenial home before 1634, or rather, before the wilderness was destroyed and light replaced its darkness? It is our guess that such favorable situations were to be found along the shores of Chesapeake Bay and its estuaries; on the banks of the larger freshwater streams; on cliffs and rocky declivities; in natural meadows, savannas and barrens; in the Indian towns and in Indian old fields.³

¹ "A Relation of Maryland," in *Narratives of Early Maryland*, Clayton Colman Hall, editor, pp. 79, 82.

² *Manual of the Trees of North America*, by Charles S. Sargent, pp. 302, 303.

³ The same remarks are applicable to our native red "cedar," which is equally exacting in the matter of sunlight.

This comparative rarity of the wild mulberry tree in Maryland (granted that it is a fact) may have led some persons to suppose that it is an imported variety, not a native. Others, perhaps, were saved from this error, because they had heard tell of the venerable and historic mulberry tree, which stood on Church Point, not far from the bluffs of Saint Mary's River, and within the former limits of Saint Mary's City, on land which was taken up by Governor Calvert in 1641, and which he called "East Saint Mary's" or "The Governor's Field." The spot on which this remarkable tree grew, has been occupied, since 1890, most appropriately, by the Leonard Calvert Monument. It commands a view, which extends all the way to the mouth of the river and to the distant Potomac. It is but a short way from the site of the State House of 1676.⁴

In their *Popular History of the United States*, William Cullen Bryant and Sidney H. Gay, far from ignoring the old mulberry tree, treat the subject with what seems to us a not undue seriousness:

On the highest part of the bluff [of Saint Mary's River] stood a mulberry tree large enough even then [i. e., in 1634] to throw a broad shade about it, and to be visible for a long distance up and down the river. For more than two hundred years afterwards its mass of foliage still crowned the promontory; and its decayed and blackened trunk, lying where it fell but a few years ago" [i. e., ante 1876] yet marks the place of its growth, but nearer to the edge of the bank than it was when the settlers first stood around it, for the river has changed and reduced the sandy cape. Under this tree, *according to well authenticated tradition*,⁵ Leonard Calvert made a treaty with the Indians of the village.⁶

Messrs. Bryant and Gay do not vouchsafe any information as to how this tradition was "authenticated" to their satisfaction; but they acknowledge indebtedness to Dr. John M. Brome (1819-1887), a gentleman of that neighborhood and the then owner of Church Point and of a large estate lying thereabout known as

⁴ On his admirable Map of Saint Mary's City, Henry Chandlee Forman, the leading authority on the archaeology of that town, indicates the site of the mulberry tree, now that of the Calvert Monument, in relation to the site of the State House completed in 1676.

⁵ The italics used in this article are the author's own.

⁶ Vol. I, p. 496. Fortunately for us in the present instance New Englanders have always been great on the subject of historic trees. For a description of the making of the treaty with the Yoacomico Indians see "A Relation of Maryland," in *Narratives of Early Maryland*, pp. 73, 74.

"Saint Mary's Manor," who, according to these authorities, "has carefully preserved many local traditions."⁷ We are informed that Bryant met Dr. Brome and enjoyed the privilege of talking over such matters with him.⁸

In the *Popular History* there is a realistic drawing of the trunk of the old mulberry tree as it lay prone on the ground in a clump of pines. A somewhat less distressing picture of the tree, made during one of the earlier stages of its disintegration, is attributed to a seminary student, a Miss Piper. It was drawn in the year 1852, and shows the tree already dead, but still *in situ*. A sapling is growing out of the hollow trunk and gives to the all but dismembered carcass a fictitious semblance of life.⁹ Through the thoughtfulness of Mrs. J. Spence Howard, this valuable drawing is today one of the treasures of the replica of the State House at Saint Mary's.

Other traditions regarding the mulberry tree, besides that recorded by Bryant and Gay, are not wanting. The historian Thomas, not neglecting to mention the tradition concerning the Indian treaty, tells us furthermore that, according to "traditional history," it sheltered "the first mass at Saint Mary's."¹⁰ It is also said (but on whose authority we do not know), that a bell was hung in the tree for the purpose of calling members of the Assembly to their meetings.

The fame of Maryland's historic mulberry tree has been celebrated both in verse and in prose.¹¹ More than one prose writer is so much moved to reverence by his subject, that, when he comes to mention the final end of the grand old tree, he can not bring himself to speak plainly, but must needs resort to an euphemism, which falls little short of saying that it was "laid to rest." The

⁷ Bryant and Gay, *op. cit.*, 504.

⁸ For this information the author is indebted to Mrs. J. Spence Howard, granddaughter of Dr. Brome.

⁹ This illustration, showing the historic tree reduced to a trunk and lying prone, will be found in the *Popular History*, Vol. 1, opposite page 496. A photograph of Miss Piper's drawing is the property of the Maryland Room of the Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, Maryland. A reproduction of this drawing was published in the Baltimore *Evening Sun* of August 4, 1934.

¹⁰ James Walter Thomas, *Chronicles of Colonial Maryland* (1913), p. 32. Forman, in his *Jamestown and Saint Mary's* (1938), reasserts the tradition of the mulberry tree as site of the making of the Indian treaty, in 1634, and adds, that the Maryland colonists assembled under this tree to hear the reading of the royal charter and of a statement of Lord Baltimore's intentions regarding the Province.

¹¹ The poem referred to is the work of Miss Dora Maddox and was published some years ago.

remains of the mulberry tree did not rest, however, but were put to various uses, both sacred and profane:

Most of the trees was sawed into timber and used in decorating and furnishing the old Trinity Episcopal Church which stood hard by. From the smaller pieces were made numerous crosses, canes, gavels and like emblems that have since found their way to the cabinets of many noted collection of historical souvenirs.¹²

People who have lived to a great age have been known stoutly to maintain to the very end of their days that their lives were shortened by the inconsiderate or cruel acts of others, or by an adverse and unkind Fate. The case of the historic mulberry tree is analogous. For a tree of its species it certainly enjoyed a remarkable longevity, although, in its younger days, despite the respect in which it may have been held, it seems to have been subjected to a sort of ill usage and to have been made use of in a way highly detrimental to its welfare:

On the mulberry tree, . . . probably then the only large tree on the bluff, were nailed the proclamations of Calvert and his successors, the notices of punishments and fines, the inventories of debtors whose goods were to be sold, and all notices calling for the public attention. Even of late years curious relic hunters have dug from the decaying trunk the rude nails which thus held the forgotten state papers of two centuries ago.¹³

We have seen that Bryant and Gay accept as "well authenticated" the tradition concerning the mulberry tree, that under it Leonard Calvert made a treaty with the Yoacomico Indians in the year 1634. Documentary evidence, which corroborates this tradition, or tends to substantiate it, does not seem to be in existence. Those who are inclined to be more sceptical in these matters than the author are free to believe that it never happened; that the treaty and the tree never met together. However, if any of these last should question the very existence of this tree as early as the seventeenth century, they are in for a change of mind, since it not only existed then, but (or so the record implies) it was a landmark well known to the citizens of Saint Mary's. We owe this

¹² "Maryland's Historic Mulberry Tree," by J. E. Harrison, in *The Patriotic Marylander*, Vol. III (1916-17), p. 94. The Maryland Historical Society owns various articles manufactured from the tree, including a goblet and two canes of considerable interest, one cut in 1836 from the tree by John P. Kennedy and presented by him in 1857, and another with a beautifully carved head intended to represent Governor Leonard Calvert.

¹³ Bryant and Gay, I, 504.

information to a deposition of Garrett Van Sweringen, taken before the Lower House on August 29th, 1681, which runs, in part, as follows:

That on Saturday last in the afternoon *he came by the Mulberry Tree* where he Discoursed with one of the Burgesses about Repairing the house for the Committee to Sitt in.¹⁴

The death of our historic mulberry tree occurred some time—probably not many years—before 1852. How old was it when it died? Speculation on this point may be based on a tentative acceptance of tradition. *Morus rubra* grows rapidly in its youth. While our mulberry tree must have attained to a certain respectable size and spread by 1634, in order to attract attention and to draw beneath its "shade" (it was not, to be sure, in full leaf) Leonard Calvert, his followers and the Indian natives of the place, bent on making a treaty, it need not have been more than fifty years old, and it may even have been somewhat younger. On this basis we take it upon ourselves to suggest an age, at time of death, of not less than two hundred and fifty years. To those who may object, that no North American mulberry tree ever lived to such an age, we rejoin that the tree was a landmark in 1681, and could not have been much less than fifty years old at that time; therefore, it almost certainly reached an age of two centuries. We imagine it as a mature tree "sixty or seventy feet tall." The variety to which it belonged develops "stout spreading smooth branches," which form "a dense round topped shapely head." This tree rarely exceeds three or four feet in diameter;¹⁵ but Maryland's historical mulberry tree probably bettered these dimensions. It is doubtful, however, if it made any considerable growth in the last decades of its very long life; and it probably lost a part

¹⁴ *Archives of Maryland*, Vol. VII, p. 140. Van Sweringen, who had held office at New Amstel on the Delaware, was a resident of Saint Mary's by 1671. In 1679 he was keeping an inn in that town (*ibid.*, XV, 264). On Feb. 15, 1680/1, the Council met at his house (*ibid.*, p. 329). He was High Sheriff of Saint Mary's County, 1686-1688. The author has looked elsewhere for an early mention of the mulberry tree, but without success. His thanks are due to Mr. Arthur C. Trader, of the Land Office of Maryland, for examining land records there on file, which relate to "East Saint Mary's," in order to ascertain if by chance they contained any allusion to the tree. This mulberry tree, standing within the bounds of an original survey, was neither a bounded tree nor a line tree. Incidentally, we may add, mulberry trees are very rarely called for in the land records of colonial Maryland, to judge by this author's experience.

¹⁵ We are quoting Sargent's *Manual*.

of its chief glory, its crown, long before it gave up the ghost. Indeed, we wonder that, growing as it did in such an exposed situation, lightning spared its life so long.

Granted, if it may be, that Maryland's best-known mulberry tree was a mature specimen of its kind by the year 1634, it is by no means certain that it began life as a "wild" tree, and that it may not have been closely associated with human life and destiny, in a proprietary way, long before it became involved with the history of Maryland. It is a well known and well authenticated fact, that our first colonists peaceably took possession of, and settled in, an Indian town or village of the Yoacomico Indians. In a letter addressed to his friend, Sir Richard Lechford, and dated May 30, 1634, Governor Leonard Calvert describes the site as he first saw it:

A most convenient harbour [i. e., of Saint George's or Saint Mary's River] and pleasant Country, lying on each side of it *wth many large fields of excellent land cleared from all wood.*¹⁶

A contemporary writer on the founding of Maryland tells us how the prospective colonists under Calvert, "cumming thus to seate upon an Indian Towne," "found ground cleered to their hands."¹⁷ Governor Calvert's words are the more important in the present connection, because he implies that those Indian fields were clean of obstructions and seemingly ready for the plough. He appears to indicate that dead trees, girdled by the natives, which characterized those Indian fields which had not been long in existence, were not conspicuous in this case, if they were not wholly absent. It seems to be not unlikely, therefore, that it was a case of an Indian settlement, which had been established in that place for a relatively long time. It is a remarkable fact, that could we but witness that scene as it presented itself to the eyes of Leonard Calvert—his first sight of Saint Mary's River—(unless, indeed, the presence of Indian cabins near shore betrayed its primitive character), we should "recognise" in it the typical Maryland "tidewater" landscape of open fields, intercepted by woods, minus, of course, the rows of bungalows and villas, which are fast destroying the pristine solitude, the antique loneliness, of our Chesapeake shores, effacing their native characteristics and

¹⁶ *Calvert Papers*, No. 3 (Fund Publication No. 35) (Baltimore, 1899), p. 21.

¹⁷ This assertion is made by the anonymous author of *A Relation of Maryland*, for which see *Narratives of Early Maryland*, p. 76.

blotting out all signs and evidence of their appealing, if humble, past.

To return to the point in question, we learn from the writings of William Strachey that, in Virginia, the common sight of corn and tobacco, of beans, pumpkins and squashes, or, as we say here, cymplings, growing in fields or in gardens situated within, or adjacent to, the Indian towns, was not the only sign of the Indian's interest in agriculture and horticulture.

By their dwellings *are some great mulberry trees* and these in some parts of the country are found growing naturally in pretty groves.¹⁸

The historian, Strachey, appears to imply that those mulberry trees, which were observed by the English in the coastal towns of Virginia, were cherished, or, so to speak, cultivated, by the natives, as contrasted with those which grew "naturally" in those parts of the colony. This impression is strengthened by his use of the adjective "great" in connection with the former.

The same authority testifies to the fact that the Virginia Indians were not blind to the appeal of native trees and shrubs, which, so far as we know, they did not put to any particular use.

By the dwellings of the salvages are *bay-trees, wild roses* and a kind of low tree, which beares a cod like to peas, but nothing so big: we take yt to be a locust.¹⁹

¹⁸ *Historie of Travaile into Virginia Britannia*, by William Strachey (London, 1849), p. 117. Strachey was Secretary of Virginia in 1610-1611; member of the Council in 1610. In his *Description of Virginia*, Captain John Smith makes the same statement, using the same words (*Narratives of Early Virginia*, Lyon G. Tyler, Editor, p. 90). In his dictionary of the (Virginia Algonkian) Indian language Strachey gives two words for mulberries, viz., muskmuims and paskamath (*Historie*, pp. 191, 192).

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 130. Strachey's editor thinks that "bay-trees" may refer to *laurus carolinensis*, but why not to the small tree, which, in Maryland, is generally an arborescent shrub, and is popularly known as the sweet bay (*magnolia glauca*)? There is no reason to suppose that the Indian did not find the odor of the blossoms of the sweet bay delectable, even as we do. The locust tree (*robinia pseudacacia*) may have been valued by Indians for its flowers, but it was probably respected most for its usefulness, since its wood was used for making spears. ("Extracts from the Annual Letters of the . . . Society of Jesus," 1642, in *Narratives of Early Maryland*, p. 138. It is not clear whether the author of this letter is speaking for all the Indians of whom he had any knowledge, or merely of the Susquehannocks). That the Indians actually planted useful and ornamental trees and shrubs in their towns, rather than that they merely spared and cherished these plants where they found them growing naturally within the confines of their settlements, is, with particular reference to mulberry trees, not excluded from the realm of possibility. Writing in 1666, Captain Robert Sandford tells us in his "Relation," that he visited an Indian town in the Carolinas, where he saw "Before the Doore of their State-

What was true of the Indian towns of the "tidewater" region of Virginia was probably true also of Indian villages in "tidewater" Maryland, the natives of which, in language and customs, were, for the most part, almost identical with those of the more southern colony.

Whereas no other tree of that species in Maryland acquired any sort of fame, it is only fair to add (and it may not be without interest), that Baltimore City had its mulberry tree, a native, wild specimen of its kind, which was for many years a landmark and a well-known boundary tree, before houses and streets occupied the neighborhood where it had formerly stood. First bounded in the year 1669, in an utter wilderness, this mulberry tree was alive in 1743, and was still standing *in situ*, though dead, in 1785. Its site lies east of Charles Street, some sixty or seventy feet north of Jones's Falls, within the confines of the Pennsylvania Station yards.²⁰

house a spacious walke rowed with trees on both sides, tall and full branched, not much unlike to Elms, which serves for the Exercise and recreation of the men." ("A Relation" by Robert Sandford in *Narratives of Early Carolina*, Alexander S. Salley, Jr., Editor, p. 91.) In this case, it is, of course, barely possible that these Indians had received instructions or suggestions from the Spaniards.

²⁰ Land Office of Maryland, Patent Records for Land, Liber XII, folio 276: George Hickson's certificate for 200 acres, called "Saint Mary Bourne," surveyed May 20, 1669. The first line of this land runs N. E. and by N., 25 perches, across the "Main Run" of the North West Branch of Patapsco River (i. e., Jones's Falls which was not then as yet so called) "to a marked mulberry." "Saint Mary Bourne" was resurveyed, September 25, 1720, for Jonathan Hanson, and called "Mount Royal (Land Office of Maryland, Patented Certificate No. 3407, Baltimore County). The bounded mulberry then became a bounded tree of the resurvey. In the year 1785 Joseph Merryman and Major Thomas Rutter proved this "forked" mulberry tree, then dead, to be a boundary of "Mount Royal" (Baltimore County Land Records, Liber W. G. No. X, folio 155 *et seq.*).

A LIST OF PROMOTIONS IN THE MARYLAND REGULAR TROOPS, 1776

Edited by WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR.

"Above is two distinct States of the Line of Rank you desire," wrote Brigadier General William Smallwood, commander of the Maryland troops in the Continental Army, to Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, president of the Maryland Council of Safety. The list, purchased recently by the Maryland Historical Society is a valuable addition to the military history of Maryland in the Revolution. It shows the changes in officer personnel made necessary by the casualties suffered in the autumn campaigns of 1776, and it establishes definite dates for eligibility in the promotions.

The battalion of Maryland Regular Troops commanded by General Smallwood¹ had, indeed, undergone rough treatment during the fighting around New York. These were the men who bore the brunt for the American cause in the battles at Brooklyn Heights (Long Island) and White Plains. They sustained the full attack of the enemy and guarded the retreat of Washington's ragged army as it escaped from the trap which might have eliminated it completely and crushed the Revolution early in the struggle. An eyewitness described the action in these terms: "Smallwood's battalion of Marylanders were distinguished in the field by the most intrepid courage, the most regular use of the musket and judicious movements of the body. . . . When our party was over come and broken, by superior numbers surrounding them on all sides, three companies of the *Maryland* broke the enemy's lines and fought their way through."²

¹ William Smallwood (1732-92) was commissioned a colonel when the Maryland troops were organized in January, 1776. The Continental Congress did not elect him a brigadier general until October 23, 1776, so that he still held the lower rank at the time of the heavy fighting during the early fall.

² Peter Force, *American Archives*, Fifth Series (Washington, 1848), I, 1244.

It was not surprising, therefore, that the loss in dead, wounded, and captured should be large. The listed quoted below shows a loss of five officers at Long Island and two at White Plains, even in this small group of nineteen names. The general reaction was expressed by Colonel Tench Tilghman in a letter to Smallwood: "We lament your loss on Long Island but glory in the honor you have brought to our province and yourself."³

A LIST OF FIRST SECOND THIRD LIEUTENANTS & ENSIGNS OF THE
MARYLAND REGULAR TROOPS WHO WERE ENTITLED TO
BREVETS DOWN TO THE 16TH OF DECEMBER 1776

<i>first Lieutenants</i>	<i>Date as Capt. under Brevet.</i>
William Sterrett ⁴	26th Sept 1776 on Death of Capt. Bowie ⁵
John Stewart ⁶	28th October of Bracco ⁷
Levin Winder ⁸	30th Scott ⁹
Archd. Anderson ¹⁰	10th Decemr. resigntn. of Harrison ¹¹

³ Tilghman to Smallwood, Annapolis, September 20, 1776. Quoted in Thomas Balch, ed., *Papers Relating Chiefly to the Maryland Line During the Revolution* (Philadelphia, 1857), p. 65.

⁴ William Sterrett—1st lt. of Smallwood's Maryland Regiment, January 14, 1776; taken prisoner at Long Island, August 27, 1776; exchanged, November 8, 1776; capt. 1st Maryland, December 10, 1776; major, April 10, 1777; resigned, December 15, 1777. [All data concerning the military careers of the officers named on the list are taken from Francis B. Heitman, *Historical Register of Officers of the Continental Army During the War of the Revolution* (Washington, 1914).]

⁵ Daniel Bowie—1st lt. of Smallwood's Maryland Regiment, January 14, 1776; capt., February 1776; wounded and taken prisoner at Long Island, August 27, 1776; died in captivity shortly afterward.

⁶ John Stewart (d. 1783)—1st lt. of Thomas' Independent Maryland Company, January 14, 1776; capt. 2nd Maryland, December 10, 1776; major, April 17, 1777; taken prisoner at Staten Island, August 22, 1777; lt. col. 1st Maryland, February 10, 1781.

⁷ Bennett Bracco—1st lt. of Beall's Independent Maryland Company, January 14, 1776; capt. August 16, 1776; killed at White Plains, October 28, 1776.

⁸ Levin Winder (1757-1819)—1st lt. of Smallwood's Maryland Regiment, January 14, 1776; capt. 1st Maryland, December 10, 1776; major, April 17, 1777; wounded and taken prisoner at Camden, August 16, 1780; exchanged, June 1781; lt. col. 5th Maryland, April 27, 1781.

⁹ John Day Scott—capt. of Smallwood's Maryland Regiment, January 14, 1776; killed at White Plains, October 28, 1776.

¹⁰ Archibald Anderson—2nd lt. of Hindman'd Independent Maryland Company, January 14, 1776; 1st lt., September 1776; capt. 2nd Maryland, December 10, 1776; major, 3rd Maryland, June 10, 1777; brigade major, June 16, 1778; killed at Guilford, March 15, 1781.

¹¹ William Harrison—capt., January 14, 1776; wounded at Long Island, August 27, 1776; resigned, and died from wounds in 1777.

second Lieutts.

Date as 1st. lt. under Brevet

Dent ¹²	26th Sept. 1776
Hindman ¹³	28 Octobr.
Gaither ¹⁴	30
Hudson ¹⁵	10 December ..

Ensigns & 3d. Lieutts.

Date as second Lts. under Brevet

Cox ¹⁶	26th Sept. 1776
Thomas Beale ¹⁷	28 Octobr.
Fernandis ¹⁸	30 October
C. Williams ¹⁹	10 December

[*first Lieutenants*]

[*Date as Capt.*]

William Sterrett	26 Sept 1776
Halkerston ²⁰	28 Octobr. D, th Bracco
L. Winder	30- Octobr. D, th Scott
Saml. Wright ²¹	10 Decmr. Resign. of Harrison

¹² Probably George Dent (d. 1812)—1st lt. 3rd Maryland Battalion of the Flying Camp, July-December 1776.

¹³ Edward Hindman—3rd lt. of Hindman's Independent Maryland Company, January 14, 1776; 2nd lt., April 1776; capt. 3rd Maryland, December 10, 1776; resigned, October 15, 1777.

¹⁴ Henry Gaither (1751-1811)—ens. of Smallwood's Maryland Regiment, January 14, 1776; 1st lt. Maryland Battalion of the Flying Camp, June 8, 1776; 1st lt. 1st Maryland, December 10, 1776; capt., April 17, 1777; brevet major, November 5, 1777.

¹⁵ Hooper Hudson—2nd lt. of Barrett's Independent Maryland Company, January 14, 1776; 1st lt. 2nd Maryland, December 10, 1776; marked "dead" on roll, December 1777.

¹⁶ Walter Cox—ens. of Smallwood's Maryland Regiment, January 14 to May 1776; capt. of Hartley's Continental Regiment, February 5, 1777; retired, December 1778.

¹⁷ Thomas Beall—2nd lt. of Bracco's Independent Maryland Company, August 27, 1776; 1st lt. 2nd Maryland, December 10, 1776; resigned, April 17, 1777.

¹⁸ James Fernandis—ens. of Smallwood's Maryland Regiment, May 1776; taken prisoner at Long Island, August 27, 1776; exchanged, March 24, 1777; 2nd lt. 1st Maryland, December 10, 1776; 1st lt., April 17, 1777; capt. lt., March 1, 1778; resigned, July 15, 1779.

¹⁹ Possibly Nathan Williams—ens. Maryland Battalion of the Flying Camp, July to December 1776; 2nd lt. 6th Maryland, December 10, 1776; 1st lt., October 10, 1777; wounded at Monmouth, June 28, 1778; capt. lt., June 1, 1779; killed at Camden, August 16, 1780.

²⁰ John Halkerstone—2nd lt. of Beall's Independent Maryland Company, January 14, 1776; 1st lt., July 1776.

²¹ Samuel Turbutt Wright (1749-1810)—2nd lt. of Veazey's Independent Maryland Company, January 14, 1776; taken prisoner at Long Island, August 27, 1776; exchanged, April 20, 1778; capt. 2nd Maryland, December 10, 1776; resigned, July 1, 1779.

[*second Lieutts.*]

Dent
T. Beale
Gaither
De. Courcey ²²

[*Date as 1st. Lt.*]

26 September 1776
28 Octobr. . . .
30 O[c]tobr. . . .
10 Decemr. . . .

[*Ensigns & 3d. Lieutts.*]

Cox
C: Williams
Fernandis

[*Date as second Lts.*]

26 September 1776
28 Octobr. . . .
30 Octobr. . . .

Sir,

Above is two distinct States of the Line of Rank you require; the first points out the Degrees which ought regularly to have been held under Brevet (upon the first Establishment) by first second third Lieutenants & Ensigns of the Regular Troops, and the latter shows such as the several Independant [*sic*] Officers were entitled to by the Promotion in Companies adopted by the Council of Safety, which having been irregular was one Reason of Brevets not having been granted—and as I am unacquainted with the Promotions, or Rule by which they have been made, can't ascertain whether they hold Rank in either Instance agreeable to what such Brevets might have entitled them, & I am &c

W. SMALLWOOD B. G.

Hble. D. St. T. Jenifer

²² Edward De Courcey—3rd Lt. of Veazey's Independent Maryland Company, January 14, 1776; wounded and taken prisoner at Long Island, August 27, 1776; exchanged, September 27, 1777.

BOOK REVIEWS

Behind the Lines in the Southern Confederacy. By CHARLES W. RAMSD-
DELL. (The Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History.)
Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1943. 136 pp. \$2.

General Lee, in his farewell address to the Army of Northern Virginia at Appomattox, told his men that "after four years of unsurpassed courage and fortitude" they were compelled to surrender to "overwhelming numbers and resources."

Dr. Ramsdell reaches the same conclusion in his book, *Behind the Lines in the Southern Confederacy*, but he goes deeper into the reasons that made it a Lost Cause.

Dr. Ramsdell finds that the cause was lost at home before it was lost at the battlefield. As a result of a lifetime of research and reflective thinking, he suggests that the collapse of the Confederacy was due primarily to three factors—the chaotic financial conditions, the industrial weakness of the South and the breakdown of the South's transportation system.

In answer to the question: Could the South have won? Dr. Ramsdell believes that only a series of miracles could have given it the victory.

Much has been written by historians about the controversies in the Confederacy over State rights. Dr. Ramsdell shows that State governments, and even individual governors, exerted themselves far more loyally in helping the general government than in thwarting it.

Of special interest—although it does not make pleasant reading—is Dr. Ramsdell's story of the open trading in cotton between the North and the South. And he tells us that in the winter of 1864-65, Lee's half-starved men in the trenches before Richmond were fed with bacon from New York exchanged for cotton, which was worth its weight in gold in the North. And that at a time when Grant was losing thousands of men in his efforts to cut off Lee's supplies.

That Lincoln approved of this trading and that it was finally stopped by Grant is the statement of the author.

Dr. Ramsdell's concluding paragraph is well worth quoting:

"Perhaps the Lost Cause was doomed from the beginning of the war, but its gallant and courageous people upheld it until their whole economic and social order disintegrated and collapsed about them. And they went on to the tragic end, aware of what was impending without faltering. For that they will live, with honor, throughout history."

RICHARD D. STEUART

Delaware's Forgotten Folk. By C. A. WESLAGER. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943. 215 pp. \$2.50.

Probably few Marylanders have heard of the We-Sorts, yet this is the name applied to several hundred people of mixed white, Indian and, in some instances with an admixture of Negro blood, who live apart from their neighbours in Charles and Prince George counties. Mr. Weslager in his book treats of people having similar racial blends who live in Delaware. As the author points out, there are two distinct settlements of such people living in Delaware, one group living on the Indian River not far from Millsboro, and the other group at Cheswold, near Dover. The people living near Millsboro are descendants of the Nanticoke Indians: the others are descendants of various Indian tribes.

Of the two settlements, those living on the Indian River place greater emphasis on their mixed white and Indian blood. This group has sought to secure from the State of Delaware recognition of this fact by securing separate schools for their children and other legal rights. They have objected to having their children educated in schools attended only by Negroes. In their struggle for recognition, Mr. Frank G. Speck, a professor of anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania, championed their cause.

While Mr. Speck spent much time in visiting the Indian River settlement, Mr. Weslager has confined his investigations to the group living near Dover. Both men have been impressed with the characteristics of these mixed blood people. Of interest to them have been the traditions handed down from one generation to another, their folklore, and the mysticism once prevalent among their Indian ancestors. As an example of the latter is their belief in dreams. When the author was visiting a family having Indian and white blood, the husband told him that it was a very bad omen to dream of a snake three nights in succession. "It means," said the man, "that someone who don't like you will presently fault you. The onliest way to keep him for faultin' you is to go out next day and kill a snake. That will break the spell."

Mr. Weslager gives examples of their use of herbs as drugs, and also of their folklore, such as the belief that a ringing in your ears, or "death bells," means that a friend or relative will shortly die, and, if a dog comes to your door and howls, that is a sure sign of the death of a member of the family.

The book is illustrated with some photographs of the people living in Delaware who are of mixed Indian and white blood. Features characteristic of their aboriginal forbears are easily discernible.

The author modestly says that much remains to be written about these mixed blood people. While this may be so, it is also true that Mr. Weslager has told what he has found out about them in an instructive and interesting manner. Perhaps he may be persuaded to extend his investigations to the We-Sorts of southern Maryland.

Leaves from an Old Washington Diary, 1854-1863. By ELIZABETH LINDSAY LOMAX. Edited by LINDSAY LOMAX WOOD. New York: Dutton, 1943. 256 pp. \$2.50.

The general run of diaries is either boring or scandalous. This one is neither, but with the aid of discriminating editorship, manages even in the brief entries, to win the reader's interest in and sympathy with the author. Here is a self portrait of an extremely intelligent, sincere and courageous woman, a devoted mother and a skilful diplomat. At sixteen, Mrs. Lomax married Major Mann Page Lomax, U. S. A. After several years at Newport, where her husband was stationed, and where she made the many warm friends who were later to be of such help to her, her husband died. As the diary opens in 1854, thrown upon her own resources, she had settled in Washington with her six children, five daughters and one son. The boy secured an appointment to West Point; the girls immediately became very popular and were invited to many balls and levees.

In addition to having a quick wit and kind sense of humor—she declared that wit at the expense of someone else was merely scoffing—Mrs. Lomax was a deeply religious woman, and highly gifted musically on both harp and piano.

Through those uncertain pre-war years, she met and entertained many people. Col. R. E. Lee, then Superintendent at West Point, told her not to worry about her son, a "very promising young man." Hers was truly an "open house," and if it had not been for her pension, secretarial work copying records first under President Pierce and then for President Buchanan, for the State Department and later for the War Department, she would have been in very straightened circumstances. Her son also sent her the major part of his salary.

Mrs. Lomax was a person of decided opinions. In 1858 she approved of equal education for both men and women. "Every woman should be fitted to be a mental companion for her husband and sons, though I still believe that the duties of men and women should be different." She had a mind capable of grasping the implications of the times. She was interested in the laying of the Atlantic Cable. She foresaw the tragic outcome of Harper's Ferry. Her heart was torn between her belief in the Union, and the attack upon her homeland, Virginia. Her up-to-date daughters bought a sewing machine and had instructions as to its use. In twelve days, Mrs. Lomax was making shirts for her beloved son. "Once in a while I become too enthusiastic; pedal too fast, and it runs away with me, but I shall soon learn to *adapt myself* to the *machine*. What a thought!"

Upon the election of Abraham Lincoln, chaos in Washington redoubled. Mrs. Lomax wrote: "I am after much thought and deliberation, *definitely for the Union with some amendments to the Constitution.*" Despite her emotional feelings, she was invited and present at the entertainment of the first Japanese diplomats. She did not like the Japs.

Division among families wrung her heart. When the War actually came, she called it fratricide, even though she continued her friendships with those on the Northern side as well as those on the Southern. Her son resigned his commission in the U. S. Army, in a letter which strongly indicated his impartiality—the letter is on record at the War Department as characteristic of the spirit of the times.

The *Baltimore Sun* reached Mrs. Lomax frequently, and she was intensely interested in the news of the Baltimore riots. Alarmed friends advised her to move to Charlottesville, and sending part of her family to Norfolk, she finally complied. Letters from her daughters in Norfolk were ultimately received by Mrs. Lomax in Charlottesville, via Memphis.

During the next year Mrs. Lomax moved to Fredericksburg, then to Baltimore, as expediency and her own conscience demanded. Her pension had been stopped, her copying, of course, was no longer allowed, and her proud spirit revolted at the thought that she was an extra burden upon relatives and friends whose resources were almost exhausted. In September, 1862, she ventured a short trip to her lovely home in Washington. She was there when Lincoln issued his Emancipation Proclamation, with which she heartily agreed.

Mrs. Lomax's stay in Washington was brief. Lincoln had decreed that the homes of all Southern sympathizers would be subject to confiscation. She returned to Baltimore, but she felt the urge to be where news came in most quickly and most reliably. What a reporter she would have made! Through her friendship with Federal officers she was able almost at will, to pass not only herself and her friends, but even part of her family through the Federal lines.

This is a book which should be read by any historically-minded person in either Maryland or Virginia. Familiar names appear on almost every page: Garretts, Bucklers, Randolphs, Cabells, Lees and Carmichaels—until this reviewer was positive that her own forebears might pop up at any moment. Deep below the surface record of gay evenings spent in dancing to harp, violin and piano, lies the indomitable spirit of the author—devout, devoted, brave, sincere and loyal. The diary ends with the imprisonment of three of her daughters as "Southern sympathizers." Illness overcame her stout heart—she could write no more.

In the Supplement, Epilogue and Appendices may be found the answers to the questions to which many may seek a reply. The book is delightful reading. The interest, despite the brevity of the entries, is that of a well rounded story, with a background of War, through which the personality of Elizabeth Lomax shines—radiant, wise and loyal—a truly remarkable woman.

PENELOPE W. JAMISON

Mirror for Americans: Likeness of the Eastern Seaboard, 1810. By RALPH H. BROWN. New York: American Geographical Society, 1943. xxxii, 312 pp. \$4.00.

Professor Brown's "concise geographical view of the inhabited parts of eastern America" boasts a Preface, an Introduction, and a Prologue, all of which are required reading. Required, because they explain the creation of the fictitious American geographer, Thomas Pownall Keystone, author of *Mirror for Americans*.

At the close of the eighteenth century and in the very early days of the nineteenth, an exciting and even sensational political experiment was being conducted in North America. Scholarly, cultivated, and curious Europeans were eager to study the country in which an intriguing experiment in democracy was being carried on. European investigators and travelers wrote copiously, if sometimes inaccurately, on the nature and appearance of the new republic. And native historians and geographers responded with on-the-spot reporting. The geography of the United States became a subject of great interest and much spirited controversy.

Special evidence of this interest in the new country is the library of several thousand books, pamphlets, articles, manuscripts, and maps relating to America which was collected, probably before 1816, by a German scholar, Christophe Daniel Ebeling. Between 1793 and 1816, Ebeling (whose collection was eventually acquired by the Harvard College Library), with characteristic thoroughness, produced seven volumes of his own on the subject: *Erdbeschreibung und Geschichte von Amerika. Die Vereinten Staaten von Nordamerika*.

Professor Brown, disturbed by the fact that apparently no native American counterpart of Ebeling had existed, found it necessary to create one, Thomas Pownall Keystone. Keystone, according to his inventor, was a native of Philadelphia, a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, and the owner of a library rivaling Ebeling's in completeness. Concentrating on geography and disregarding history, Keystone, having access to even more original source material than Ebeling, produced an authoritative and at the same time lively account of the Eastern Seaboard, "embellished with illustrations and maps." Keystone's description of America-on-the-Atlantic includes notes on the physical geography of the country, on the population, on modes of travel, on the occupations of the inhabitants, on maritime affairs, and detailed comment on the various sections of Eastern America from the St. Lawrence to "the Carolina Low Country."

In the chapter devoted to the Chesapeake Country it is noted that "The settled parts of the Bay country are best seen from the waterways, not from the crossroads, for this land is a kind of Venice and by no means a little one. It may at first be doubted that there are not less than two thousand miles of land fronting tidewater in Maryland and Virginia."

Of Baltimore, "Her harbor is more ample than that of Annapolis and though farther inland its water is said to contain a higher proportion of

salt inimical to the growths that honeycomb the hulks of vessels. The city stands at the head of Patapsco Bay, eighteen miles northwest from its entrance to the Chesapeake. The upper part of Patapsco Bay, called the Harbor, is connected with the outer bay at Whetstone Point, about two miles below the city, by a narrow strait scarcely a pistol shot across, which is defended by Fort McHenry. Large vessels go up to Fell's Point, which projects from the east side, but only small boats can approach the other parts of the shore. The city is divided by a creek into two parts, of which the eastern and smallest is Old Town."

Chosen for reproduction in the book is the "East View of Baltimore" (prints of which are in several Baltimore collections), a view noteworthy for the large trees in the foreground and the very sketchy panorama of the city in the distance, but drawn by G. Beck, Philadelphia.

Professor Brown has done a brilliant job in creating such an entertaining and well-informed amateur geographer as Thomas P. Keystone and in so carefully editing and documenting Keystone's work. The bibliography, by the way, is quite consistently called: "A Selection of Titles from the Library of Thomas Pownall Keystone."

RICHARD CARL MEDFORD

Baltimore Municipal Museum.

Jefferson and the Press. By FRANK L. MOTT. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1943. 65 pp. \$1.00.

In a letter written in 1787 Thomas Jefferson said: ". . . were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter." Again in 1786 he wrote to a friend: "Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost." Finally, three years before his death he wrote to Lafayette: "But the only security of all, is in a free press."

No one was ever put to a more severe test by the free press than was Jefferson. He was a constant object of abuse and slander from most of the Federalist editors who turned liberty into license. James Callender, a writer, was the author of a false charge against Jefferson's morals which has survived to this day. At last, stung by repeated attacks, Jefferson abandoned his principle so much as to say: "Nothing can now be believed which is seen in a newspaper. Truth itself becomes suspicious by being put into that polluted vehicle." But, as his letter to Lafayette indicates, that was a passing fit of cynicism which is not surprising considering what he had endured. Dr. Mott endeavors to explain that, in spite of occasional evidences to the contrary, Jefferson was on the whole consistent in his belief in the freedom of the press.

F. F. BEIRNE

The Plain People of the Confederacy. By BELL IRVIN WILEY. [The Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History, Louisiana State University, 1943.] Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1943. ix, 104 pp. \$1.50.

One hears so much about the glory and the romance of the South that it is interesting to read a book about the common people who "constituted the bone and sinew of the Southern Confederacy." Apparently, there was nothing grand and glorious about the reactions of the plain folk, white and black, to the impact of the sectional conflict.

There are three essays, one on each of the groups which together composed the overwhelming majority of the population in the region which paid allegiance to Jeff. Davis' government: the common soldiers, the civilians at home, and the colored folk. Each essay describes in some detail the phases of life during the war, and there are numerous quotations from letters and diaries to support the points made.

It appears, for instance, that the common soldier behaved very much as he has done in every war. He stole and plundered during the infrequent sorties into enemy territory, he resorted to wine and women in the effort to show that he was free from home restraints, he deserted to the tune of more than a hundred thousand, and he was often cowardly at crucial moments. The folk at home indulged in red tape and profiteering quite as much as anywhere else, there were many instances of extreme deprivation and of loss of homes, and moral deterioration and crime increased to a marked extent. The Negroes in sections invaded by the Federals ran away in droves, and even trusted house servants in more remote sections took part in minor insubordinations.

This slender volume is stimulating and refreshing. It does not go after the subject in a debunking manner; it simply states the facts from the records. It will not please some patriotic organizations, but it is the sort of truth which helps one to obtain a balanced point of view on a matter which continues controversial after eighty years.

WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR.

Parliamentary Privilege in the American Colonies. By MARY PATTERSON CLARKE. (Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany, XLIV.) New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943. 303 pp. \$3.00.

Dr. Clarke's study of parliamentary privilege, in an earlier form, was accepted by Yale University as her doctor's dissertation. That says a great deal in its favor. The research on which it was based was carried on in several libraries in the United States, and, during one summer, in London. As far as the colonies are concerned, the main source was the colonial journals.

The book begins, properly, with a chapter on the privilege in Great

Britain, since all the colonies began as British colonies or soon became British. From there on, each chapter treats one particular topic from Massachusetts to Georgia, and not the whole question of privilege in one colony: the treatment is thus horizontal, not vertical. The position of the Speaker as the embodiment of the Lower House, and the control of the House over the election of its own members, over the members themselves, once they are elected, and over such acts by outsiders as occur in its presence, these topics make up the remainder of the book. There is a lengthy bibliographical chapter, and it is on that point that objections occur to a Marylander. Dr. Clarke made no use of any material in Maryland at all, either in Baltimore, or in Annapolis, and no use of anything at the Library of Congress. Of course no account of the situation in this province could be done without the printed *Archives* and *Bacon's Laws*. But it does not seem that an adequate account could be written with those sources only, and they are the sole ones mentioned by the author.

One point Dr. Clarke makes about Maryland cannot be accepted without a mild protest. She says (p. 161) that the idea of excluding ministers from sitting in the Lower House "was, of course, derived from England." Had she read more Maryland colonial history, she would almost surely omit the "of course," and she might even change her opinion that English experience was the only source of the prohibition. The prohibition, by the way, still stands.

ELIZABETH MERRITT

The Providence Oath of Allegiance and its Signers, 1651-2. By RICHARD LEBARON BOWEN. Providence: Society of Colonial Wars in the State of Rhode Island, 1943. 92 pp.

This little book focuses a search-light on a bit of early Rhode Island history hitherto neglected. Fifteen years after the first settlement by Roger Williams of the Town of Providence, twelve younger leaders in the Colony signed an oath of allegiance to the "Commonwealth of England" to enable their appointed agent to regain from the mother land his charter for the Providence Plantations. Mr. Bowen gives biographical sketches of each signer and shows the weight they exerted in holding together the remnants of the Colony in these crucial years.

The author presupposes a knowledge of Rhode Island history but presents in a scholarly manner new data and detail on this incident in the long and colorful story of that State.

ROSAMOND R. BEIRNE

OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED

International Bearings of American Policy. By ALBERT SHAW. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. 492 pp. \$3.50. Gift of publisher.

The Economic Thought of Woodrow Wilson. By WILLIAM DIAMOND. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. 210 pp. \$2.50 (Paper \$2.00). Gift of publisher.

- Force and Freedom: Reflections on History.* By JACOB BURCKHARDT. Edited by JAMES HASTINGS NICHOLS. New York: Pantheon Books, 1943. 382 pp. Gift of Consul General of Switzerland.
- Edgar Allan Poe's Contributions to Alexander's Weekly Messenger.* By CLARENCE S. BRIGHAM. (Reprinted from the *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society.) Worcester, Mass.: the Society, 1943. 83 pp. Gift of author.
- "I Have Tried to Think and Other Papers." By ANNA MELISSA GRAVES. Baltimore: Author, 1943. 81 pp. Gift of author.
- The Chapman Family; A Study in the Social Development of Central West Virginia.* By BERLIN B. CHAPMAN. Tulsa, Okla.: Mid-West Printing Co., 1943. 290 pp. \$2.25. Gift of publisher.
- The Family of Bray Wilkins, "Patriarch of Will's Hill," of Salem (Middleton) Mass.* By WILLIAM CARROLL HILL. Milford, N. H.: Cabinet Press, 1943. 213 pp. \$3. Gift of author.
- The Early History of the Stricklands of Sizergh.* By S. LEE WASHINGTON. (Reprinted from the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*.) Boston: Rumford Press, 1943. 100 pp. Gift of author.

NOTES AND QUERIES

MARYLAND BOOKPLATES

As a matter of record, I am compiling a Check List of early Maryland bookplates, prior to 1830, with some data about their owners, and have seen or seen mentioned, a number of plates attributed to Maryland, the owners of which I have been unable to locate. I will appreciate very much any information—birth and death dates—about the following:

Rowland Robinson Crocker, engraved label with wreath
 Su: Duke, 1780, printed label
 John Fisher, armorial, no motto
 Henry Guinand, circa 1775, armorial, motto: *Sans venin*
 Thomas Leland, circa 1810, armorial, motto: *Demur*

Can any one furnish information about "Daniel Carroll—Mount Dillon"? His very rare bookplate, circa 1730, shows the arms of the Carroll family of Maryland and bears the motto, *In bello e[?] in fido fortes*. Where was Mount Dillon and which of the many Daniel Carrolls of Maryland lived there?

I lack information—birth and death dates—about the owners of the following bookplates, all definitely of Maryland. Can any reader help me?

Thomas Bond, Judge of the Orphan's Court, St. Mary's Co. Bookplate by T. Sparrow, of Annapolis.

Thomas M. Brady, Baltimore

John de Butts, Judge of the Orphan's Court, St. Mary's Co.

Philemon St. John Downes, Easton

Alexander Frazier, 1784, bookplate by Thomas Sparrow of Annapolis

Henry H. Gaither, Hagers-town

George Hanson, Md., 1750

T. Munroe, Annapolis (in ink, 1822)

Rev. Levi Stork (of Talbot Co., married Anne G. Nicholson in 1834)

Gulielmi G. Stuart

Dr. Arthur Woolford, Baltimore, April 12, 1797

EDITH G. BEVAN (MRS. WILLIAM F.)
Ruxton, Md.

Who was the father of Anthony Law who died Feb. 21, 1831, in Baltimore? He married Catherine Bausman nee Shryer at the First Presbyterian Church here on Dec. 3, 1799.

Who was the father of Hannah Thompson who married John Rowe in 1790 in the London Grove Meeting of Chester Co., Penna., and married secondly James Gibson?

Who was the father of Gloria Ann Linn who on Jan. 21, 1753, married Baltzer Sumwalt at York, Penna.?

Reply to Editor, *Maryland Historical Magazine*.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

SAMUEL K. DENNIS, Chief Judge of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City since 1928, is a native of Worcester County, a former Vice President of the Society, and now one of its two Honorary Members. ☆ Formerly resident in Baltimore while a member of the Pratt Library staff, STUART C. SHERMAN recently returned to his native Providence, Rhode Island, where he is supervisor of branches in the Public Library. ☆ REINHARD H. LUTHIN, a native of New York City is a member of the history faculty of Columbia University. He was formerly University Fellow in History at Duke University. With Dean Harry J. Carman, of Columbia College, he is author of *Lincoln and the Patronage* (Columbia University Press, 1943) and is now finishing a volume on Lincoln's rise to the Presidency. ☆ A graduate of Bryn Mawr College, Miss Josephine Fisher is doing civilian work for the Navy Department. ☆ William B. Marye, Corresponding Secretary of the Society since 1937, is widely known for his studies of Indians of the Chesapeake region and other special phases of local history. ☆ As heretofore mentioned in these pages, WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR., is a member of the Society's staff and editor of its news bulletin, *Maryland History Notes*.

The Annual Reports of the Committees of the Society, formerly printed in the *Magazine*, will hereafter appear with the List of Members as a pamphlet to be published in April of each year.