
Maryland Imprints of the Colonial Period, 1689-1776

1768

278. [ALLEN, BENNET. Advertisement.] Baltimore: Printed by Nicholas Hasselbach. (?) 1768.]

No copy known. Reprinted in *Maryland Gazette* for Sept. 22, 1768, where, as also on Sept. 29, 1768, it is specifically stated that it was printed in Baltimore. There is no evidence that any other printer was living in Baltimore in 1768 except Hasselbach, and indeed the evidence herein contained that printing was being done in Baltimore in 1768 is the only existing indication that Hasselbach or any other printer was active there at that time, although it is known traditionally that Hasselbach lived until 1769.

This broadside, a reply to that issued by William Green on May 28, (below, No. 280) was an attack on the Greens, Anne Catharine and William, for their refusal to print more of Allen's letters under the pseudonym "The Bystander," unless he should disclose his identity. This Allen refused to do, although he was willing to indemnify them against suit for libel. He alleged that the Greens were under such obligations to the Dulanys that they feared to incur the displeasure of that family by publishing matter which was distasteful to them. The Greens were ably defended by Mrs. Green's son-in-law, John Clapham, in *Maryland Gazette* for Sept. 22, 1768. Allen was abusive, the Greens conducted their cause with reticence and dignity.

279. ALLEN, BENNET. To the | Public. | November 9, 1768. | Mr. Wolstenholme having, in his Hand-Bill of this Day, vindicated his Conduct | . . . [signed, Bennet Allen, and has below a note asserting that two hand-bills by him on this subject had preceded this one.] [Annapolis: Printed by Anne Catharine and William Green. 1768.]

Broadside. 17½ x 10½ inches.

Among those who were forward in contesting Mr. Allen's attempt at ecclesiastical pluralism was Mr. Walter Dulany, between whom and Allen a newspaper controversy was carried on in the columns of the *Maryland Gazette* in the spring of 1768, Mr. Dulany signing his articles "C. D.," Parson Allen pretending to conceal his identity behind "The Bystander." The controversy was carried on at first with common sense and righteous indignation by Dulany and with remarkable learning and impudence by Allen. Degenerating into invective, especially on Allen's part, the Greens eventually had refused to print more of it except under conditions noted below, entry No. 280. Feeling became so warm between Dulany and Allen that on Sunday, Nov. 6, 1768, these two met in Annapolis and after high words proceeded to cudgel play. Dulany wrested Allen's cane from him and gave it into the keeping of Mr. Daniel Wolstenholme. Immediately after the encounter, Allen published two handbills, as he says in a footnote to the above broadside, reflecting on Wolstenholme's part in the affair, and these were replied to by Wolstenholme in the broadside noted below, No. 288. The item here described is Allen's reply to Wolstenholme's broadside and contains his own version of the altercation.

The story of this brilliant clerical profligate has never been fully written. Ample material exists for it in the Sharpe Correspondence; in the *Maryland Gazette* for the spring and fall of 1768; in the "Gilmor Papers" and the "Dulany Papers" in the Maryland Historical Society; in Allen, *St. Ann's Parish*; in the "Letters of Jonathan Boucher" in vols. 7-9 of the *Maryland Historical Magazine*; and in Allen's own pamphlet, printed by William Goddard of Philadelphia in 1768, entitled *An Address to the Vestrymen, Church-Wardens, and Parishoners of All-Saints, in Frederick County, Maryland*, a copy of which is in the Gilmor Papers.

It should be said that the Dulanys later had cause to regret whatever victories they had obtained over Allen. In London in 1782, Allen avowed himself the author of an attack on Daniel Dulany, Jr. which had appeared some time before in an English journal. Lloyd Dulany, the younger brother of Walter and Daniel, challenged the detractor of his brother to a meeting on the field of honor. Dulany was killed; Allen plead his "clergy" and was acquitted of the charge of manslaughter which was brought against him.

MdHS. (in Gilmor Papers).

280. GREEN, WILLIAM. To the Public. | Annapolis, May 28, 1768. | Whereas a Controversy has been published in the Gazette, for | a considerable Time, betwixt a certain Gentleman, who calls | himself a Bystander, and his Opponents, . . . [Annapolis: Printed by Anne Catharine and William Green. 1768.]

Broadside. 11½ x 7½ inches.

First paragraph signed "The Printers"; second, unsigned; third and last signed "William Green." Refers to the demand made by the Greens upon the Rev. Bennet Allen (The Bystander) either to disclose his identity or to indemnify them against suit for libel by Walter Dulany (C. D.), the other principal in the controversy, whom Allen had begun to attack on personal grounds. See Nos. 278 and 279.

MdHS. (Gilmor Papers).