ELLICOTT CITY TIMES,
JOHN R. BROWN, Jr., Editor and Proprietor.
TERMS—$2 PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.
☞ ADVERTISING RATES—One square, constituting 6 lines, $1 for one insertion, $1.50 for two insertions, and 25 cts. for each subsequent insertion. All advertisements less than 6 lines charged as squares. Advertisements payable upon first insertion.

ELLICOTT CITY TIMES.

VOL. VIII. ELLICOTT CITY, Md., SATURDAY, MARCH 3, 1877. NO. 9.

JOB PRINTING,
Handbills, Circulars, Bill-Heads, Legal Forms, Cards, Tickets,
AND ALL KINDS OF
Plain & Fancy Job Work
Executed with Neatness and Dispatch and at the Lowest Rates.

Professional.

I. Thomas Jones,
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR-AT-LAW,
No. 32 St. Paul St., Baltimore,
Practices in the Courts of Baltimore City and Howard and adjoining Counties.
☞ Can be found at the Court House in Ellicott City, on the FIRST AND THIRD TUESDAY OF EVERY MONTH.
Dec. 12 '74-tf.

Wm. A. Hammond,
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW.
Can be found at the Court House, Ellicott City, on the FIRST AND THIRD TUESDAY OF EACH MONTH.
OFFICE—29 St. Paul St., near Lexington, Baltimore.
July 27 '72 tf.

EDWIN LINTHICUM,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
OFFICE.—Nearly opposite the Court House,
ELLICOTT CITY, Md.
Nov. 27'69ly.

HENRY E. WOOTTON,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
OFFICE—Nearly opposite the Court House,
ELLICOTT CITY, MD.
Nov. 27, '69-1y.

JOHN G. ROGERS,
ATTORNEY AT LAW
AND SOLICITOR IN CHANCERY,
Will Practice in Howard, Anne Arundel and the adjoining counties.
☞ Special attention given to Collections, and Remittances made promptly.
OFFICE—In the Court House, Ellicott City. [Jan 6, 72-1y.

J. D. McGUIRE,
Attorney at Law,
Ellicott City, Md.
☞ Office Two Doors West of Leishear's Store.
Oct 7, '76-tf.

C. IRVING DITTY,
ATTORNEY AND
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
No. 31 St. Paul Street,
BALTIMORE,
Practices in all the Courts of the State; in the U. S. Courts, in Admiralty and Bankruptcy.
☞ Particular attention given to collection of Mercantile Claims in the lower counties of Maryland. [Jan. 29, '70-1y.

ALEXANDER H. HOBBS,
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
Attends all the Courts in Baltimore City and the Circuit Court for Howard County, and will be at the Court House in Ellicott City the FIRST and THIRD TUESDAY of every month—(Orphans' Court days).
mar.6-'75.1y.

J. Harwood Watkins,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
ELLICOTT CITY.
☞ OFFICE—At the Court House.
Sept 12, '74-tf.

DR. SAMUEL A. KEENE,
ELLICOTT CITY, MD,
Having permanently located himself at Ellicott City, is prepared to practice his Profession in this City and County.
☞ He may be found at his place of business at all hours, except when professionally engaged. Night calls promptly attended to.
Oct. 3 '69-tf.

Dr. W. C. WATKINS,
Near CLARKSVILLE, Howard County,
Respectfully tenders his Professional Services to the citizens of Howard County.
☞ He will be found at his office when not professionally engaged.
May 1, '69 1y.

DR. E. CRABBE,
(*Graduate of the Baltimore College of Dental Surgery.*)
DENTIST,
ELLICOTT CITY, MD.
OFFICE MAIN ST., 3 DOORS BELOW J. H. LEISHEAR'S STORE,
☞ Particular attention paid to the preservation of the Natural Teeth.
Jan. 3-74-3mos.

WILLIAM B. PETER,
Notary Public,
Real Estate and Collection Agency, and
GENERAL INSURANCE AGENCY,
ELLICOTT CITY, Md.
Estates attended to; Rents and Bills Collected Money procured on Securities. Purchases and Sales of City and Country Property effected. Property Leased. Money Invested in Ground Rents, Mortgages, &c., &c., &c., Free of Charge. All kinds of Property Insured at Lowest Rates.
☞ MONEY TO LOAN, at Low Rates, on first Class Securities, in Sums from $1000 to $10,000. June 24, '71-tf.

Job Printing of every kind done neatly, cheaply and after the latest styles at the TIMES office.

Baltimore.

PERSONAL..

NOAH WALKER & Co.
THE
Celebrated Clothiers of Baltimore, Maryland,
Announce the introduction of a plan of ordering
Clothing and Underwear by Letter,
to which they call your special attention.
They will send on application their improved and accurate
RULES FOR SELF-MEASUREMENT
and a full line of samples from their immense stock of *CLOTHS, CASSIMERES, COATINGS, SHIRTINGS, &c., &c.*, thus enabling parties in any part of the country to order their Clothing and Shirts direct from them, with the certainty of receiving garments of
The Very Latest Style and Most Perfect Fit Attainable.
Goods ordered will be sent by Express to any part of the country.
As is well known throughout the Southern States, they have for FORTY-THREE YEARS
EXCELLED
in all departments of their business, which is a substantial guarantee as to the character of the Goods they will send out.
A large and well-assorted stock of
READY-MADE CLOTHING
always on hand, together with a full line of
FURNISHING GOODS,
including all the latest Novelties in demand at
POPULAR PRICES.
When Goods are sent per Express C. O. D. There will be no collection charge on amount of $20 and over.
Rules for Self-Measurement, Samples of Goods and Price List sent *free* on application.
The attention of the Trade is invited to our *WHOLESALE DEPARTMENT* which is always kept up to the highest standard.
NOAH WALKER & CO.,
Manufacturers and Dealers in Men's and Boys' Clothing and Furnishing Goods, either ready-made or made to order.
165 and 167 Baltimore Street,
April 1, '70-tf. BALTIMORE, MD.

Francis W. Plummer.
Good Wood, Smooth Work, Fine Finish!
PRICES TO SUIT ALL!
SEND FOR CATALOGUE OF
FURNITURE!
WALNUT, OAK, ASH, POPLAR!

Bookcases	$25 to $100
Chamber Suits	30 " 300
Desks	10 " 100
Lounges	7 " 75
Library Tables	8 " 18
Leg Rests	2 " 10
Patent Rockers	15 " 50
Parlor Suits	60 " 160
Parlor Tables	3 " 30
Bedsteads	3 " 60

49 Hanover St., Baltimore.
March 29, '73-1y.

S. S. LINTHICUM,
LUMBER DEALER,
Cor. Pratt & Green Sts.,
BALTIMORE, MD.,
KEEPS CONSTANTLY ON HAND ALL KINDS OF
BUILDING MATERIAL,
Lumber, Shingles, Palings,
Laths, &c.
ALSO
DOOR FRAMES, SASH,
BLINDS, &C.,
Furnished at Manufacturers' Prices.
☞ All orders promptly attended to, and delivered at Depot free of charge.
July 18, '74-tf.

JOHN NICKLAS,

WATCHMAKER & JEWELER
389 W. Balto. St., cor. of Paca,
BALTIMORE, Md.
PRACTICAL WATCHMAKER,
Offers for sale, at Reduced Prices, Gold and Silver American and Swiss Watches, a well selected Stock of fine Gold Jewelry, Sterling Silver Ware, Triple Plated Ware, Clocks, Table Cutlery, &c., &c.
☞ Particular attention paid to the Repairing of Watches and the Manufacture of Hair Jewelry.
April 16,70-1y.

J. W. RIGGS,
GROCER AND LIQUOR DEALER
(Established 1866),
Cor. Balt. and Stricker Streets,
One Square from Fred. Road.
HAS constantly on hand a large and fresh supply of Choice Groceries, Wines, Liquors, &c. Fine Teas and pure Spices a specialty. All goods guaranteed, and sold at the lowest market prices. Persons visiting Baltimore would do well to call before purchasing.
Country produce bought and sold.
July 27, '72-tf.

WATCHES, CLOCKS AND JEWELRY repaired by competent workmen at John Nicklas', COR. BALTIMORE & PACA STS.

Memorable American Duels.

The history of dueling dates back as far as that of the Romans, when single combat prevailed; and one instance in particular is related as having taken place about 361 B. C., when Torquatus fought in single combat with a Gaul.

Asiastic history shows that the custom prevailed in that country, and the Arabs of the time of Mohammed were familiar with it. It is said that the modern character of dueling was given to it by the barbarians who overran the Roman Empire, and who instituted the "ordeal by battle" or "judicial combat," the purpose of which ostensibly was to vindicate the innocent. This mode of trial was legalized as early as A. D. 501, and for centuries after the practice continued; while even in England it was recognized as legal to so late a date as 1818—being only abolished by Parliament in the following year. In France the judicial character of this custom was never formally admitted after 1547.

What is now understood by the term duel, dates from the first half of the sixteenth century; and within an hundred years later, we find the first instance on record in the history of the western continent. In 1621, on June 18th, a duel took place at Plymouth, Mass., between two servants, one of whom challenged the other to single combat with sword and dagger. In the struggle which followed, both were wounded; and both were thereafter punished by the Plymouth Company for what was esteemed an outrage on the colony, by the ignominious treatment of having their head and feet tied together, and lying thus without meat or drink. The punishment was at first assigned to last twenty-four hours; but after suffering in the painful posture described for one hour, at their master's intercession and their own humble request, combined with the promise of amendment, they were released by the governor. The names of these two Puritan duelists were Edward Doty and Edward Lester. It is believed that the ridiculous situation which was imposed upon them as a punishment for their misdemeanor, together with the fact that the first combat of this character occurred between menials, combined to bring the custom into disfavor, and may not improbably be the reason for the difference of opinion in this regard between the North and the South. Sabine says:

"A personal combat between the renowned Miles Standish and John Alden to adjust their difference about that arch maiden, Priscilla Mullens, would have been respectable, and might have afforded a precedent; but no persons of standing, for a generation at least, were likely to imitate two serving-men, who had been doomed to a punishment so entirely ridiculous."

However this may be, it is certain that we hear nothing of duels at the North for a long period afterward; though a tradition did grow up to the effect that Castle Island, now Fort Independence, in Boston Harbor, was once celebrated as the dueling-ground for the "hot-headed sons of England."

The public documents, private correspondence, and newspapers of the Revolutionary era, cite few instances of challenge or actual contest the Whig service, while, according to the best authorities, there was very little of it on the Loyalist side. Altogether, it may be readily believed that the practice of dueling was not common during the War of the Revolution on either side. It was not until the year 1799 that the practice had reached such a position in the American Army as to require the intervention of its superior officers.

To go back a little, we find that in the year 1728, a young man named Benjamin Woodbridge was killed in a duel on Boston Common by one Henry Phillips, the duel being fought without seconds in the night-time, and with swords. Phillips succeeded in escaping, through the assistance of friends, got on board a man-of war, and fled to France, where, however, he died a year later. This affair created much excitement, and was the cause of the enactment of very stringent laws against dueling.

In 1771, on the 16th of August, an altercation arose in the City of Charleston, between Dr. John Haley and a Mr. Delancey, of New York, an "elegant and accomplished royalist," a brother of Mrs. Ralph Izzard. Delancey being irrated in argument, insulted Dr. Haley, by giving him the lie. Haley challenged Delancey to fight with pistols where they then were, and the duel took place in an upper room, alone and without seconds. Delancey took one of the pistols offered him by Haley; they fought across a table, fired at the same moment, and Delancey was killed. Dr. Haley was an Irishman by birth, and an eminent practitioner of medicine in Charleston. Delancey being a prominent man among the royalists, much irritation was exhibited among them about his death, and the circumstances attending it. The Whigs, on the other hand, defended Dr. Haley, and concealed him until his trial came on. He was defended by Thomas Hayward, the Pinckneys, and the Rutledges, who proved that Delancey was the aggressor, and also that he had fired with an intent to kill Haley with his own pistol, the two bullets with which it was loaded being taken out of the wall on each side of where he stood. Haley was acquitted—a result considered as a great triumph by the Whigs, the popular party, and by the Royalists a proportionate source of chagrin.

In 1777, Button Gwinnett and Lackland McIntosh, the former a member of Congress, and a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and the latter an officer in the army in the Revolution, fought a duel with pistols at a distance apart of twelve feet. Both were wounded, Gwinnett mortally. The two were competitors for the office of brigadier-general, in which competition McIntosh was successful. Subsequently, Gwinnett failed in his expectation of being elected Governor of Gorgia, and McIntosh having indulged in some exulting expression in reference to this, the duel ensued. The duel was fought near Savannah. At its conclusion, the combatants shook hands.

General Israel Putnam, the "Old Put" of the American Revolutionary army, had two "affairs" during the war. His biographer records them in detail, although it neither adds to Putnam's fame, since he was bound to fight "according to usage," or decline the calls.

The first was with an American officer, whom, without design, he offended at table. The officer demanded instant satisfaction. Putnam agreed to meet him the next morning without seconds. The officer repaired to the spot designated, armed with sword and pistols, and, before taking his place, was greeted with a shot from Putnam's gun, at thirty rods. As Putnam was reloading his piece, the officer approached, and asked:

"What are you about to do? Is this the conduct of an American officer, and a man of honor?"

"What am I about to do?" replied the general, coolly. "A pretty question to a man whom you intended to murder! I'm about to kill you; and if you don't beat a retreat in less time than it takes old Heath to hang a Tory, you are a gone dog." The officer turned and fled.

Putnam's second affair was with a British officer, who was, at the time, a prisoner. Offended at some remarks of the general, he sent Putnam a challenge, which was promptly accepted. As the challenged party, Butnam agreed to select the weapon, and appear at a place which he named, with arms for both. The officer found him there, seated near a barrel—apparently containing powder—smoking his pipe. The general requested him to take a seat on the other side of the cask, and remarking that there was an equal chance for them, set fire to a show-match which communicated with the contents of the barrel. The officer looked at the match a moment, as the fire approached the supposed powder, and then departed. As he retired, Putnam exclaimed:

"You are just as brave a man as I took you to be; this is nothing but a barrel of onions, with a few grains of powder on the head, to try you by. But you don't like the smell."

1778 was a momentous year for duels. At that time, Georgia was the seat of the war. Prevost's invasion had been defeated, and the country rescued from depredation by the Carolina troops under General Robert Howe. But in this expedition the Carolinians suffered greatly, were badly fed and provided, and being stationed during the most sickly season of the year in the most unhealthy part of Georgia, were reduced to half their number by deaths, discharges, and desertions, and were finally driven out of Georgia by Colonel Campbell's 2,000 regular troops. For this result the conduct of Howe was censured, although, as is believed, without just cause. Among others who raised their voices against him, was Christopher Gadsen, of Charleston, who wrote a letter severely characterizing the conduct of General Howe, The latter required a restraction, which Gadsen refused to give, and a duel ensued. They met at Cannonsburgh; but all the damage sustained by either was a scratch upon the ear, received by Gadsden from Howe's bullet. In this affair, Bernard Elliott was the second of Gadsden, and General Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, of Howe. The duel occurred on the 13th of August, and after its conclusion Howe and Gadsden became warm friends.

An interesting incident in connection with this combat was the writing by Major Andre of a humorous poetical account of the affair, ending in this wise:

"Such honor did they both display,
They highly were commended;
And thus in short this gallant fray
Without mischance was ended.

"No fresh dispute, we may suppose,
Will e'er by them be started;
And now the chiefs, no longer foes,
Shook hands, and so they parted."

In the same year a duel was fought between Major-General Charles Lee and Colonel John Laurens, an aid of the Commander in Chief. Lee had come to America in 1773, the chief cause of his emigration from England having been, as is believed, his fighting with an Italian officer, whom he killed. He had the reputation of having been concerned in several "affairs of honor" prior to the period under consideration. After his trial, occasioned by his conduct at the Battle of Monmouth, Lee published a defense in which he reflected upon General Washington. Colonel Laurens felt impelled to notice this conduct, and accordingly sent Lee a challenge, which was accepted. The two met in a wood, near Philadelphia, General Lee being attended by a Major Edwards, and Colonel Laurens by Colonel Laurens by Colonel Hamilton. Pistols were the weapons chosen, and the two combatants were provided with a brace each, when General Lee proposed to advance one upon the other, and each fire whenever he chose. To his proposition Colonel Laurens agreed, and the two approached each other until within about five or six paces distance, when they exchanged shots almost the same moment. General Lee was slightly wounded at the first fire, and the combat was about to be renewed, when the seconds interfered, and the affair ceased.

Shortly after this duel, General Lee became embroiled in a quarrel with William Henry Drayton, Chief Justice of South Carolina. He challenged the judge, who, however, declined to go out; alleging that he was not bound "to sacrifice his public reputation and outrage public character merely to gratify General Lee in the line of his profession."

The next important duel in the history of this country, still in the same year, was that of Thomas Conway, a Knight of the Order of St. Louis, and General John Cadwalader, of Pennsylvania. General Thos. Conway was born in Ireland, and received his military education in France. He came to this country with strong recommendations; and in 1777 was appointed brigadier-general by Congress. He was chiefly distinguished by his hostility to Washington and by his ridiculous endeavors to place General Gates in chief command of the army. In consequence of having calumniated Washington, he was challenged by General Cadwalader, and a duel was fought between them near Philadelphia on February 22d, 1778. Conway was dangerously wounded, his adversary's bullet having entered his mouth, when he fell directly on his face. Thinking his injury mortal, he wrote Washington a note, in which he expressed his grief for having said, done, or written anything disagreeable to him. He, however, though painfully injured, recovered from the wound. It is said that immediately after being shot, and as soon as he was able to speak, General Conway, turning to his opponent, said, good-humoredly, "You fire, general, with much deliberation, and certainly with a great deal of effect.

Still another duel occurred in 1778, of interest in connection with the history of dueling in the United States, although the combat actually took place in Holland. The antagonists in this affair were Pierre Landais and a Captain Cottinneau, both officers in the navy of the United States. It appears that Landais behaved infamously in the celebrated battle between the *Bon Homme Richard* and the *Serapis*. He was in command of the frigate *Lyons;* and, disobeying the signal of John Paul Jones, he placed his ship in a position where he could be a spectator of the fight, until the *Richard* and *Serapis* had grappled, when he bore down under easy sail and deliberately fired into the *Richard*. This was no doubt his intention, for he would not desiet, though he was hailed from the *Richard*. Landais was accordingly, on charges preferred by officer of the American ships, summoned to Paris by Franklin to answer for his conduct. Continneau was a witness against him; and this circumstance, combined with the fact that other differences had occurred between the two during the cruise, gave rise to the duel. It was the opinion at the time that Landais intended to kill Jones, disable the *Bon Homme Richard* and obtain for himself the glory of conquering the *Serapis*. As it was, he claimed the merit of the victory on the ground that he gave a raking fire which caused the *Serapis* to surrender. In the duel with Cottineau, which was fought with small swords, Landais, who was a master of that weapon, gave his opponent a severe wound. Afterward, elated by his success in this affair, he sent a challenge to Commodore John Paul Jones. The commodore, however, dispatched officers to arrest him, when he made his escape.

The next historical event in the way of dueling is the case of Captain Gunn, of Georgia, who, in 1785 challenged General Nathaniel Greene. It appears that during Greene's service at the South, Gunn had exchanged a horse with a brother officer, and, by the general's order, had been tried for the offense, and compelled to make restitution. On this circumstance, on Greene's removal to Georgia, Gunn based his demand for satisfaction, and offered a formal challenge. This, on being refused, was followed by a second. The latter meeting with the same treatment, Gunn threatened a personal assault, to which Greene's reply was that he always carried pistols. The two never met. The general, under apprehension that his conduct might be misinterpreted, gave Washington a full history of the affair, and asked his opinion, to which Washington replied:

"I give it as my decided opinion that your honor and reputation will stand not only perfectly acquitted with the non-acceptance of his, Gunn's, challenge, but that your prudence and judgment would have been condemned by accepting it; because, if an officer is amenable to the private difficulties which the discharge of his duty may occasion, he can never move to the right or left, as there are few military decisions which are not offensive to one party or another."

In the early days of the history of the United States there was a small patch of low, unreclaimed land, lying a half mile or so beyond the boundary of the District of Columbia, and within a mile of Bladensburg, which gained a reputation and name as the scene of personal combats, whose memory still hangs about it. This was the old "Bladensburg Dueling Ground." It was a gloomy-looking place, occupying, perhaps, about ten or fifteen acres, shadowed by sycamores and cedars, heavy masses of brambles and shrubbery, all of which served to conceal the spot from the surrounding country. There could scarcely have been a more suitable place for a duel than this. It was just outside the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia, was easy of approach from the city of Washington, and convenient of escape from the authorities of Maryland. Hemmed in on three sides by hills, on the fourth, by which the road ran, it was effectually screened from observation by the foliage of trees and overhanging vines.

As early as 1814 it is recored that Edward Hopkins, of Maryland, an ensign of infantry, was slain in a duel on or about this spot. Many other meetings occured here. Indeed, the number is said to have been as many as fifty, in some of which the difficulties were amicably arranged after the parties came on the field, while others were settled after an exchange of shots. In some the conflict was continued until one or both parties were wounded, and in a few death resulted from the first fire.

One of the most desperate of the numerous encounters which have made this locality famous occured on the 6th of February, 1819, between General Armistead T. Mason, formermerly a Senator in Congress from Virginia, and Colonel Jon M. M'Carty. The parties to this affair were second cousins, and quarreled about politics, which ran high in Virginia. Several months previous to the meeting they had an altercation at the polls at Leesburg, occasioned by Mason having challenged M'Carty's vote. The result of this action was a challenge on the part of M'Carty to a duel, for which, however, he prescribed the terms and conditions and method of arrangement, to which Mason refused to submit, and on account of which, by the advice of his friends, he declined the challenge, notifying M'Carty, however, that he would accept a challenge in proper form. To this notification M'Carty paid no attention, but published Mason as a coward. Mason then challenged M'Carty, when M'Carty declined on the ground of alleged cowardice on the part of the challenger.

Here, for a time, the affair ended. Some months afterward, by the interposition of other parties—and some say General Jackson was one of them—Mason again challenged M'Carty, after having resigned his commission, as he alleged in a published card, for the special purpose of fighting him. M'Carty again declined, and a great deal of acrimonius discussion resulted between all those who saw fit to concern themselves in the matter, resulted in a number of reckless propositions on the part of M'Carty. One of these was that he and Mason should leap together from the dome of the Capitol; another, that they should fight together on a barrel of powder; a third, to fight with dirks in a hand-to-hand encounter. Finally, a proposition on his part to fight with muskets, charged with buckshot, at ten paces distance, was accepted—though this was afterward modified by the substitution of a single ball for the buckshot, and twelve feet instead of ten as the allotted distance—on Friday evening, the 5th of February, the parties, attended by their friends, drove to Bladensburg, where, on the following morning at eight o'clock, the meeting took place. The muzzles of their muskets, when the duelists were placed in position, were almost in contact; and when at the word both fired, Mason fell dead, while his antagonist was severely wounded in the arm and shoulder. M'Carty recovered from his wound, but is related to have suffered horribly during the remainder of his life from the effect upon his mind of this unnatural encounter.

The next fatal duel on the Bladenburg ground took place on March 22d, 1820, between James Barron and Stephen Decatur, both post captains in the American Navy. Decatur is said to have always recognized the authority of the duello in adjusting private difficulties, and even went so far in this respect as to favor the adoption of its principles in war, by antagonizing ship against ship. His first affair occurred in 1799, when a young lieutenant, attached to a frigate of the United States. Some of his enlisted men had afterward entered on board an India ship, from whose first officer Decatur demanded the deserters. The officer, in the course of the interview, insulted him, and by the advice of his father, Decatur demanded an apology, which, being refused, a challenge followed. The parties met on the banks of the Delaware, near Newcastle, when Decatur wounded his antagonist in the hip, escaping himself without harm. In 1801, while serving on board the frigate *Essex*, in the Mediterranean, Decatur challenged a Spanish officer who had treated him discourteously. The Spanish Captain-General interfering, however, a personal conflict was prevented. During the war of 1812, Decatur offered Sir Thomas Hardy, in a written communication, to meet the British frigates *Endymion* and *Statyra* with the *United States*, his own ship, and the *Macedonian*. Sir Thomas Hardy, however, declined the challenge, and the matter came to an end.

In the duel with Barron, Captain William Baindridge was the second of Decatur, Captain Jesse O. Elliott that of Barron. Before he fired, Barron observed to his antagonist that he hoped, on meeting him in another world, they would be better friends than in this. Decatur replied, "I have never been your enemy, sir. At the first shot both fell. They fired so near together that but one report was heard. Decatur was apparently shot dead; but receiving after a while, he and Barron had a short conversation while they lay on the ground. The physician who attended the parties is to have made the remark that the situation reminded him of the closing scene of the tragedy of "Hamlet," and the interview between *Laertes* and the *Dane*. Decatur was conveyed to Washington, where he expired just before eleven o'clock on the same night, at his residence near Lafayette Square. The house in which he died was afterward occupied by Mr. Livingston, while Secretary of State during the administration of President Jackson, and subsequently by Van Buren, while Vice-President of the United States. Barron was also borne to Washington, where he was confined by his wound until the 10th of April, when he left for his home at Hampton, Va.

The death of Decatur produced a profound sensation throughout the country. The cause of this duel was the fact that Commodore Decatur was a member of both the Court of Inquiry and the Court martial in the trial of Commodore Barron for neglecting his duty while in command of the frigate *Chesapeake*, by whose decision the latter was suspended from the service. Afterward Commodore Barron applied for restoration to his rank, and this being opposed by Decatur, the feeling between the two assumed the character of a personal enmity, which resulted as we have stated.

A painful occurrence, which may be related as prefatory to the celebrated duel between Hamilton and Burr, cost the famous Alexander Hamilton the life of his son. This young Phillip Hamilton was only eighteen years of age, a lad of singular promise, and particularly endeared to his father by his brilliant talents and noble temper. He had recently graduated from Columbia College with honor, delivering, on the occasion, an oration which had attracted considerable praise. In 1801, a Fourth of July orator leveled some exceedingly severe and unjust censure at the elder Hamilton. Philip, happening one evening in company with a friend to enter a box at the theatre, discovered the obnoxious orator near him; when, taking advantage of the occasion, the two young men began to ridicule the oration in question in loud tones. Enraged at this, the party who had offended them arose, and summoning the two young men into the lobby, seized young Hamilton by the coat-collar, applied an insulting epithet to both, and then left, with the remark that he expected to hear from them, and if he did not, he should treat them both as disgraced persons. No way appearing out of the unfortunate affair save by a challenge, a meeting took place between Hamilton's friend and their opponent, when four shots were exchanged without injury to either combatant. This was followed by a challenge from Philip Hamilton, and at this meeting the unfortunate young man fell, mortally wounded, at the first fire of his antagonist. He lingered in excessive anguish for nearly twenty hours, when death came to his relief. It is related of his father, that, hearing of the meeting, before he heard of the result he hastened to summon his physician, but fainted by the way. This is said to have been the severest bereavement of Hamilton's life.

The duel between Alexander Hamilton and Aaron Burr, took place on July 11th, 1804, at Weehawken, on the Jersey shore, opposite the City of New York, at seven o'clock in the morning. In this affair Burr was the challenger, his grounds being the alleged assertion on the part of Hamilton that Burr was a "dangerous man, and one who ought not to be trusted with the reins of government." Several letters passed between them in reference to the charge Hamilton taking exception to the tone of Burr's demand for retraction; and the matter became so complicated in the course of the correspondence, that it became impossible for any amicable solution of the difficulty to be effected. Colonel Trumbull mentions that, on July 4th, he dined with the "Cincinnati" of New York, and met, among others, General Hamilton and Cononel Burr; that the singularity of their manner was observed by all, though few had any conception of the cause; that while Burr was silent, gloomy, and sour, Hamilton entered with glee into all the gayety of the convival party, and even sang and old military song. It is to be remembered as to this incident, that Hamilton had been chosen to hold the distinguished position of President-General of the Society, and was obliged to preside; and also that, in this position, it was necessary that he should exert himself to appear even more than usually cheerful.

Hamilton himself, in a public explanation of his "conduct, motives, and views," alleges that the impossibility of his avoiding the meeting arose from intrinsic difficulties and artificial embarrassments from the manner of proceeding on the part of Colonel Burr. On the 9th of July, Hamilton executed his will, leaving his entire property, after the payment of all debts, to his wife.

The particulars of the duel have gone into history on the strength of the statements made by the seconds of the parties—Mr. William P. Van Ness on the part of Burr, and Colonel Pendleton on that of Hamilton. The place selected for the scene of the duel was a little secluded ledge beneath the heights of Weehawken, and not far above the level of the Hudson. It was the very spot where Philip Hamilton had fallen about three years before. The parties came up the stream by special arrangement. The parties being placed, the word was given, when Hamilton, raising himself convulsively, fell forward on his face, his pistol being discharged as he sank to the ground, sending the ball whizzing through the foliage of the surrounding trees. Van Ness and Burr immediately hurried to their boat. Colonel Pendleton and Dr. Hosack, who were in attendance, raised Hamilton into a sitting posture, when it was discovered that he had been struck in the right side. He was just able to articulate "this is a mortal wound," when he fell into a swoon. As he was carried gently to the river-bank, he opened his eyes for a moment, and said, "My vision is indistinct." Later, General Hamilton declared that he met Colonel Burr with a fixed resolution to do him no harm, and that he forgave all that had happened. He lingered during the remainder of that day, and the night following, but died at two o'clock on the afternoon of the next day.

Excepting the assassination of Lincoln, it is probable that no event since the death of Washington has created the general sorrow which was felt and expressed at the melancholy termination of this most unhappy affair. Mr. Morse, in his "Life of Hamilton," says:

"The city was not a safe place for Burr. He fled for his life, and his terrified myrmidons hastened to avail themselves of the protection of obscurity. Never again could that blood stained man redeem his reputation before mankind, so infinitely more fatal was that duel to the survivor than the victim."

Burr was disfranchised by the laws of New York, for having fought a duel, and was indicted for murder in New Jersey. The affair had the effect of arousing the public mind of the people in the Free States to a positive horror of dueling. The Society of the Cincinnati took the question under consideration, and General C. C. Pinckney, vice-president of that body, proposed that it should resolutely set its face against the practice. Yet, in the far West, and in some portions of the South, Burr gained a positive increase of popularity by this affair. On the day of Hamilton's funeral, the bells of New York tolled continually, minute-guns were fired from the forts, and the whole city was in morning.

In 1802, De Witt Clinton and John Swartwout disputed on political affairs, in which Alexander Hamilton was involved, and which resulted two years later in the duel between Hamilton and Burr. In the present instance, the seconds were Richard Riker and W. S. Smith. The duel took place near the City of New York, and five shots were actually exchanged; the first and second without effect, the third similarly inoffensive, but the fourth resulting in Mr. Swartwout's being wounded. At the fifth shot, Mr. Swartwout was again wounded, when Mr. Clinton declined to fight longer. In the following year, De Witt Clinton was again challenged, this time by Jonathan Dayton, both Senators in Congress, the occasion being words spoken in debate. In this affair, Mr. Clinton made an explanation, which was deemed satisfactory, and no meeting took place.

Henry Clay fought two duels, and was the challenger in both. The first was in 1808, with Humphrey Marshall, a fellow-member of the Legislature in Kentucky. Mr. Marshall was a gentleman of talents, of high position, and a Federalist of great influence. He was the constant opponent of Mr. Clay in debate, and finally indulged in personal remarks, which were so denunciatory and severe as to draw a message from the latter. They met, exchanged two or three shots, and retired from the field, each slightly wounded. In 1826 Clay challenged John Randolph, of Roanoke, and the two met on the Virginia shore of the Potomac. This duel was also occasioned by political difference, the two gentlemen having been warm friends before their meeting, and continuing to be so thereafter. The night before the occasion, Randolph told General Hamilton, of South Carolina, that he had determined to receive without returning Clay's fire. The meeting took place at four o'clock in the evening. Randolph was one of the best shots in Virginia, but from being unaccustomed to fire with a hair-trigger, his pistol exploded before the word was given, the muzzle being down. On the word for the second time, Mr. Clay fired without effect, Mr. Randolph discharging his pistol in the air. As soon as Mr. Clay saw that Randolph had thrown away his fire, he approached the latter and said with emotion: "I trust in God, my dear sir, you are untouched. After what has occurred, I would not have harmed you for a thousand worlds."

The duel between General Andrew Jackson and Charles Dickinson took place on May 30th, 1806, at a spot about a day's ride from Nashville, Tennessee. Dickinson was said to have been a crack shot, and on his way to the rendezvous amused his associates by displaying his wonderful skill with a pistol. Once, at a distance of twenty-four feet, he fired four balls each at the word of command, into a space which could be covered by a silver dollar. Several times he cut a string with his bullet from the same distance. It is related that he left a severed string hanging near a tavern, and said to the landlord, as he rode off: "If General Jackson comes along this road, show him that." The meeting took place in the morning, and both parties appeared to be perfectly collected. The arrangement agreed upon was, that the pistols were to be held downward until the word was given to fire, then each man was to fire soon as he pleased. As soon as the word was given, Dickinson

(Continued on fourth page).