HISTORY
FOR READY REFERENCE

FROM THE BEST HISTORIANS, BIOGRAPHERS, AND SPECIALISTS

THEIR OWN WORDS IN A COMPLETE

SYSTEM OF HISTORY

FOR ALL USES, EXTENDING TO ALL COUNTRIES AND SUBJECTS, AND REPRESENTING FOR BOTH READERS AND STUDENTS THE BETTER AND NEWER LITERATURE OF HISTORY IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

BY

J. N. LARNED

WITH NUMEROUS HISTORICAL MAPS FROM ORIGINAL STUDIES AND DRAWINGS BY

ALAN C. REILEY

REVISED AND ENLARGED EDITION

IN SIX VOLUMES

VOLUME IV—NEW YORK to TAPROBANE

LONDON
WILLIAM HEINEMANN
1906

LIST OF MAPS AND PLANS.

LOGICAL OUTLINE, IN COLORS.

NEW YORK.

The aboriginal inhabitants. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY, ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, HURONS, &c., HORIKANS; and MANHATTAN ISLAND.

A. D. 1498.—Probable discovery of the Bay by Sebastian Cabot. See AMERICA: A. D. 1498.

A. D. 1524.—The Bay visited by Verrazano. See AMERICA: A. D. 1523–1524.

A. D. 1606.—Embraced in the grant to the Plymouth or North Virginia Company. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1606–1607.

A. D. 1609.—Discovery and exploration of Hudson River by Hendrik Hudson. See AMERICA: A. D. 1609.

A. D. 1609-1615.—Champlain and the French in the North. See CANADA: A. D. 1608–1611; and 1611–1616.

A. D. 1610-1614.—Possession taken by the Dutch.—Named New Netherland.—The Dutch had just emerged from their long contest for freedom (see NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1562–1566, and after) when Hudson's discovery invited them to establish a footing in America and obtain a share of the profitable trade in furs. The first venture, made by Amsterdam merchants, in 1610, had success enough to stimulate more, and in 1613 a settlement of four houses had been made on the island of Manhattan; some small forts had been built on the river, and Hendrick Corstiaensen, its superintendent, was busy exploring the region and making acquaintance with the Indian tribes. In the course of the year, Captain Argal, of Virginia, returning from his expedition to Acadia (see CANADA: A. D. 1610–1613), ran in to the mouth of the River, called the Dutch to account as intruders on English territory, and forced Corstiaensen to promise tribute to the English crown; but the promise did not hold. "Active steps were taken, early in the next year, to obtain an exclusive right to the trade of those distant countries," and in March, 1614, the States General passed an ordinance conferring on those who should discover new lands the exclusive privilege of making four voyages thither before others could have admission to the traffic. This ordinance "excited considerable animation and activity among adventurers. A number of merchants belonging to Amsterdam and Hoorn fitted out and dispatched five ships: namely, the Little Fox, the Nightingale, the Tiger, and the Fortune, the two last under the command of Adriaen Block and Hendrick Corstiaensen, of Amsterdam. The fifth vessel was called the Fortune also; she belonged to Hoorn, and was commanded by Captain Cornelis Jacobsen Mey. The three last-named and now well-known navigators proceeded immediately on an exploring expedition to the mouth of the Great River of the Manhattans, but Block had the misfortune, soon after his arrival there, of losing his vessel, which was accidentally burnt. . . . He forthwith set about constructing a yacht, 38 feet keel, 44½ feet long, and 11½ feet wide, which, when completed, he called the 'Restless,' significant of his own untiring industry. . . . In this craft, the first specimen of European naval architecture in these waters, Skipper Block proceeded to explore the coast east of Manhattan Island. He sailed along the East River, to which he gave the name of 'The Hellegat,' after a branch of the river Scheld, in East Flanders; and leaving Long Island, then called Metoac, or Sewan-hacky, 'the land of shells,' on the south, he discovered the Housatonick, or river of the Red Mountain." Proceeding eastwardly, Block found the Connecticut River, which he named Fresh River, and ascended it to an Indian village at 41° 48′. Passing out of the Sound, and ascertaining the insular character of Long Island, he gave his own name to one of the two islands off its eastern extremity. After exploring Narragansett Bay, he went on to Cape Cod, and there fell in with Hendrick Corstiaensen's ship. "While these navigators were thus engaged at the east, Captain Cornelis Mey was actively employed in exploring the Atlantic coast farther south. . . . He reached the great Delaware Bay, . . . two capes of which still commemorate his visit; one, the most northward, being called after him, Cape Mey; another, Cape Cornelis; while the great south cape was called Hindlopen, after one of the towns in the province of Friesland. . . . Intelligence of the discoveries made by Block and his associates having been transmitted to Holland, was received there early in the autumn of this year [1614]. The united company by whom they had been employed lost no time in taking the steps necessary to secure to themselves the exclusive trade of the countries thus explored, which was guaranteed to them by the ordinance of the 27th of March. They sent deputies immediately to the Hague, who laid before the States General a report of their discoveries, as required by law, with a figurative map of the newly explored countries, which now, for the first time, obtained the name of New Netherland. A special grant in favor of the interested parties was forthwith accorded."—E. B. O'Callaghan, *Hist. of New Netherland, bk.* 1, *ch.* 4 (*v.* 1).

ALSO IN: *Docs. Relating to Colonial Hist. of N. Y., v.* 1, *pp.* 4–12.—B. Fernow, *New Netherland* (*Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v.* 4, *ch.* 8).

A. D. 1614-1621.—The first trading monopoly succeeded by the Dutch West India Company.—"It was perceived that, to secure the largest return from the peltry trade, a factor should reside permanently on the Mauritius River [North, or Hudson, as it has been successively called], among the Maquaas or Mohawks, and the Mahicans, at the head of tide-water. Hendrick Christiaensen, who, after his first experiment in company with Adriaen Block, is stated to have made 'ten voyages' to Manhattan, accordingly constructed [1614] a trading house on 'Castle Island,' at the west side of the river, a little below the present city of Albany. . . . To compliment the family of the stadtholder, the little post was immediately named Fort Nassau. . . . It has been confidently affirmed that the year after the erection of Fort Nassau, at Castle Island, a redoubt was also thrown up and fortified 'on an elevated spot' near the southern point of Manhattan Island. But the assertion does not appear to be confirmed by sufficient authority. . . . The Holland merchants, who had obtained from the States General the exclusive right of trading for three years to New Netherland, though united together in one company to secure the grant of their charter, were not strictly a corporation, but rather 'participants' in a

specific, limited, and temporary monopoly, which they were to enjoy in common. . . . On the 1st of January, 1618, the exclusive charter of the Directors of New Netherland expired by its own limitation. Year by year the value of the returns from the North River had been increasing; and the hope of larger gains incited the factors of the company to push their explorations further into the interior. . . . No systematic agricultural colonization of the country had yet been undertaken. The scattered agents of the Amsterdam Company still looked merely to peaceful traffic, and the cultivation of those friendly relations which had been covenanted with their savage allies on the banks of the Tawasentha [where they had negotiated a treaty of friendship and alliance with the Five Nations of the Iroquois, in 1617]. Upon the expiration of their special charter, the merchants who had formed the United New Netherland Company applied to the government at the Hague for a renewal of their privileges, the value of which they found was daily increasing. But the States General, who were now contemplating the grant of a comprehensive charter for a West India Company avoided a compliance with the petition." In June, 1621, "the long-pending question of a grand commercial organization was finally settled, and an ample charter gave the West India Company almost unlimited powers to colonize, govern, and defend New Netherland."—J. R. Brodhead, *Hist. of the State of N. Y.*, *v.* 1, *ch.* 2-3.

A. D. 1615-1664.—Dutch relations with the Iroquois. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES. IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY, THEIR CONQUESTS

A. D. 1620.—Embraced in the English patent of the Council for New England. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1620-1623.

A. D. 1621-1646.—Early operations of the Dutch West India Company.—The purchase of Manhattan Island.—The Patroons and their colonies.—"When it became evident that the war [of the United Provinces] with Spain would be renewed, the way was opened for the charter of a company, so often asked and denied. Just before the expiration of the twelve years' truce, April, 1621, the great West India Company was formed, and incorporated by the States General. It was clothed with extraordinary powers and privileges. It could make alliances and treaties, declare war and make peace. Although its field of operations was limited to Africa, the West India Islands, and the continent of America, it could in case of war fight the Spaniards wherever found on land or sea. And finally, it was permitted to colonize unoccupied or subjugated countries. To it especially were committed the care and the colonization of New Netherland. The West India Company, after completing its organization in 1623, began its work in New Netherland by erecting a fort on Manhattan Island [called Fort Amsterdam], and another on the Delaware, and by reconstructing the one at Albany. It sent over to be distributed in these places 30 families, not strictly as colonists, to settle and cultivate the land, but rather as servants of the Company, in charge of their factories, engaged in the purchase and preparation of furs and peltries for shipment. Some of them returned home at the expiration of their term of service, and no other colonists were brought out for several years. The Company found more profitable employment for its capital in fitting out fleets of ships of war, which captured the Spanish treasure-ships, and thus enabled the Company to pay large dividends to its stockholders. In 1626 its agents bought all Manhattan Island of the Indian owners for sixty guilders in goods on which an enormous profit was made; and about the same time they purchased other tracts of land in the vicinity, including Governor's and Staten Islands, on similar terms. The Company was now possessed of lands enough for the accommodation of a large population. They were fertile, and only needed farmers to develop their richness. But these did not come . . . Accordingly, in 1629, the managers took up a new line of action. They enacted a statute, termed 'Freedoms and Exemptions,' which authorized the establishment of colonies within their territory by individuals, who were to be known as Patroons, or Patrons. An individual might purchase of the Indian owners a tract of land, on which to plant a colony of fifty souls within four years from the date of purchase. He who established such a colony might associate with himself other persons to assist him in his work, and share the profits, but he should be considered the Patroon, or chief, in whom were centred all the rights pertaining to the position, such as the administration of justice, the appointment of civil and military officers, the settlement of clergymen, and the like. He was a kind of feudal lord, owing allegiance to the West India Company, and to the States General, but independent of control within the limits of his own territory. The system was a modified relic of feudalism. The colonists were not serfs, but tenants for a specified term of years, rendering service to the Patroon for a consideration When their term of service expired, they were free to renew the contract, make a new one, or leave the colony altogether The privileges of a Patroon at first were restricted to the members of the company, but in about ten years were extended to others The directors of the company were the first to improve the opportunity now offered of becoming 'princes and potentates' in the western hemisphere . . . In 1630, the agents of Director Killian Van Rensselaer bought a large tract of land on the west side of the Hudson River below Albany, and in July following other tracts on both sides of the river, including the present site of Albany. In July, 1630, Director Michael Paauw bought lands on the west side of the Hudson opposite Manhattan Island, and named his territory Pavonia. A few months later Staten Island was transferred to him, and became a part of his domain. . . . Killian Van Rensselaer also formed a partnership with several of his brother directors, among whom was the historian De Laet, for the purpose of planting a colony on his lands on the upper Hudson, to be known as the colony of Rensselaerwyck. He seems to have had a clearer perception of what was required for such a work than the other Patroons. The colony was organized in accordance with the charter, and on business principles. Before the colonists left Holland they were assigned to specific places and duties. Civil and military officers were appointed, superintendents and overseers of the various departments were selected, and all were instructed in their duties. The number of the first colonists was respectable.

They were chiefly farmers and mechanics, with their families. On their arrival, May, 1630, farms situated on either side the river were allotted to them, utensils and stock distributed, houses built, and arrangements made for their safety in case the natives should become hostile. Order was maintained, and individual rights respected. They were not long in settling down, each to his allotted work. Year by year new colonists arrived, and more lands were bought for the proprietors. In 1646, when Killian Van Rensselaer, the first Patroon, died, over two hundred colonists had been sent from Holland, and a territory forty-eight by twenty-four miles, besides another tract of 62,000 acres, had been acquired. The West India Company had changed its policy under the direction of new men, and no longer favored the Patroons The Van Rensselaers were much annoyed, and even persecuted, but they held firmly to their rights under the charter. Their colony was prosperous, and their estate in time became enormous. . . . Of all the Patroon colonies Rensselaerwyck alone survived. It owed its existence mainly to its management, but largely to its situation, remote from the seat of government, and convenient for the Indian trade "—G. W. Schuyler, *Colonial New York, introd., sect.* 1.

ALSO IN: I. Elting, *Dutch Village Communities on the Hudson, pp.* 12-16.—J. R. Brodhead, *Hist. of the State of N. Y, v.* 1, *ch* 7 —See, also, LIVINGSTON MANOR

A. D. 1629-1631.—Dutch occupancy of the Delaware. See DELAWARE A. D. 1629-1631.

A. D. 1630.—Introduction of public registry. See LAW, COMMON. A. D. 1630-1641

A. D. 1634.—The city named New Amsterdam.—Soon after the appointment of Wouter Van Twiller, who became governor of New Netherland in 1633, "the little town on Manhattan Island received the name of New Amsterdam . . . and was invested with the prerogative of 'staple right,' by virtue of which all the merchandise passing up and down the river was subject to certain duties. This right gave the post the commercial monopoly of the whole province "—Mrs. Lamb, *Hist. of the City of N. Y., v.* 1, *p* 73.

A. D. 1634-1635.—Dutch advance posts on the Connecticut. See CONNECTICUT: A D. 1634-1637.

A. D. 1635.—Territory granted to Lord Lennox and Lord Mulgrave, on the dissolution of the Council for New England. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1635.

A. D. 1638.—Protest against the Swedish settlement on the Delaware. See DELAWARE: A. D. 1638-1640.

A. D. 1638-1647.—The colony thrown open to free immigration and free trade.—Kieft's administration, and the ruinous Indian wars.—"The colony did not thrive. The patroon system kept settlers away, and the paternal government of a trading corporation checked all vigorous and independent growth, while Van Twiller [Wouter Van Twiller, appointed governor in 1638] went steadily from bad to worse. He engaged in childish quarrels with every one, from the minister down. . . . This utter misgovernment led at last to Van Twiller's removal. He retired in possession of large tracts of land, which he had succeeded in acquiring, and was replaced [1638] by William Kieft, a bankrupt merchant of bad reputation. Kieft practically abolished the Council, and got all power into his own hands; but he had some sense of order. . . . Despite his improvements, the place remained a mere trading-post, and would not develope into a colony. The patroons were the curse of the scheme, and too powerful to be overthrown; so they proposed, as a remedy for the existing evils, that their powers and privileges should be greatly enlarged. The Company had bought back some of the lands; but they were still helpless, and the State would do nothing for them. In this crisis they had a return of good sense, and solved the problem by destroying their stifling monopoly. They threw the trade to New Netherlands open to all comers, and promised the absolute ownership of land on the payment of a small quit-rent. The gates were open at last, and the tide of emigration swept in. De Vries who had bought land on Staten Island, came out with a company; while ship followed ship filled with colonists, and English came from Virginia, and still more from New England Men of property and standing began to turn their attention to the New Netherlands; fine well stocked farms rapidly covered Manhattan, and healthy progress had at last begun. Thus strengthened, the Company [1640] restricted the patroons to a water-front of one mile and a depth of two, but left them their feudal privileges, benefits which practically accrued to Van Rensselaer, whose colony at Beverwyck had alone, among the manors, thriven and grown at the expense of the Company. The opening of trade proved in one respect a disaster. The cautious policy of the Company was abandoned, and greedy traders who had already begun the business, and were now wholly unrestrained, hastened to make their fortunes by selling arms to the Indians in return for almost unlimited quantities of furs Thus the Mohawks obtained guns enough to threaten both the Dutch and all the surrounding tribes, and this perilous condition was made infinitely worse by the mad policy of Kieft. He first tried to exact tribute from the Indians near Manhattan, then offered a price for the head of any of the Raritans who had destroyed the settlement of De Vries; and, when a young man was murdered by a Weckquaesgeek, the Governor planned immediate war." Public opinion among the colonists condemned the measures of Kieft, and forced him to accept a council of twelve select-men, chosen at a public meeting, but "the twelve," as they were called, failed to control their governor. Acting on the advice of two or three among them, whose support he had secured, he ordered a cowardly attack upon some fugitive Indians from the River tribes, who had been driven into the settlements by the onslaught of the Mohawks, and whom De Vries and others were trying to protect. "The wretched fugitives, surprised by their supposed protectors, were butchered in the dead of a winter's night [1643], without mercy, and the bloody soldiers returned in the morning to Manhattan, where they were warmly welcomed by Kieft. This massacre lighted up at once the flames of war among all the neighboring tribes of Algonquins. All the outlying farms were laid waste, and their owners murdered, while the smaller settlements were destroyed. Vriesendael alone was spared. A peace, patched up by De Vries, gave a respite until summer, and

the war raged more fiercely than before, the Indians burning and destroying in every direction, while trade was broken up and the crews of the vessels slaughtered." Kieft's life was now in danger from the rage of his own people, and eight men, appointed by public meeting, took control of public affairs, as far as it was possible to do so. Under the command of John Underhill, the Connecticut Indian fighter, who had lately migrated to Manhattan, the war was prosecuted with great vigor and success on Long Island and against the Connecticut Indians who had joined in it; but little headway was made against the tribes on the Hudson, who harassed and ruined the colony. Thus matters went badly for a long period, until, in 1647, the Company in Holland sent out Peter Stuyvesant to take the place of Kieft. "In the interval, the Indian tribes, weary at last of war, came in and made peace. Kieft continued his quarrels; but his power was gone, and he was hated as the principal cause of all the misfortunes of the colony. The results of his miserable administration were certainly disastrous enough. Sixteen hundred Indians had perished in the war; but all the outlying Dutch settlements and farms had been destroyed, and the prosperity of the colony had received a check from which it recovered very slowly. In Connecticut, the English had left the Dutch merely a nominal hold, and had really destroyed their power in the East. On the South river [the Delaware] the Swedes had settled, and, disregarding Kieft's blustering proclamations, had founded strong and growing colonies. . . . The interests of Holland were at a low ebb."—H. C. Lodge, *Short Hist. of the Eng. Colonies, ch.* 16.—A more favorable view of Kieft and his administration is taken by Mr. Gerard, who says: "Few proconsuls had a more arduous task in the administration of the government of a province than had Director Kieft. The Roman official had legions at command to sustain his power and to repel attack; and in case of disaster the whole empire was at hand for his support. Kieft, in a far distant province, with a handful of soldiers crowded in a dilapidated fort and a few citizens turbulent and unreliable, surrounded on all sides by savages ever on the alert for rapine and murder, receiving little support from the home government, and having a large territory to defend and two civilized races to contend with, passed the eight years of his administration amid turmoil and dissension within, and such hostile attack from without as to keep the province in continuous peril. The New England colonies were always in a state of antagonism and threatening war. . . . The Swedes and independent settlers on the South and Schuylkill rivers were constantly making encroachments and threatening the Company's occupancy there, while pretenders under patents and independent settlers, knowing the weakness of the government, kept it disturbed and agitated. What wonder that mistakes were made, that policy failed, that misfortunes came, and that Kieft's rule brought no prosperity to the land? The radical trouble with his administration was that he was under a divided rule — a political governor with allegiance to the States-General, and a commercial Director, as the representative of a great company of traders. The States-General was too busily occupied in establishing its independence and watching the balance of European power to give supervision to the affairs of a province of small political importance — while the Company, looking upon its colony merely as a medium of commercial gain, drew all the profit it could gather from it, disregarded its true interests, and gave it only occasional and grudging support. . . . Towards the Indians Kieft's dealings were characterized by a rigid regard for their possessory rights; no title was deemed vested and no right was absolutely claimed until satisfaction was made to the native owner. Historians of the period have been almost universal in their condemnation of him for the various contests and wars engaged in with the Indians, and have put on him all responsibility for the revolts. But this is an ex post facto criticism, which, with a false judgment, condemns a man for the results of his actions rather than for the actions themselves. Indeed, without the energy displayed by the Director towards the aborigines, the colony would probably have been annihilated. . . . Imprudence, rashness, arbitrary action, want of political sagacity may be imputed to Director Kieft, but not excessive inhumanity, nor want of effort, nor unfaithfulness to his employers or to his province. He has been generally condemned, but without sufficient consideration of the trials which he experienced, the anxiety to which he was subject, and the perplexities incident to a government over discontented, ignorant and mutinous subjects, and to the continued apprehension of outside attack. Left mostly to his own resources, and receiving no sympathy and little aid, his motives the subject of attack from both tavern and pulpit, and twice the object of attempted assassination, his rule as a whole, though disastrous, was not dishonorable."—J. W. Gerard, *The Administration of William Kieft* (*Memorial History of the City of N. Y., v.* 1, *ch.* 6).

Also in: Mrs. Lamb, *Hist. of the City of N. Y., v.* 1, *ch.* 6-8.—E. B. O'Callaghan, *Hist. of New Netherland, bk.* 2, *ch.* 7 *and bk.* 3, *ch.* 1-9 (*v.* 1).

A. D. 1640-1643.—Expulsion of New Haven colonists from the Delaware. See New Jersey: A. D. 1640-1655.

A. D. 1647-1664.—Peter Stuyvesant and his administration.— Peter Stuyvesant, the director or governor who succeeded Kieft, "took possession of the government on the 11th of May, 1647. On his arrival he was greeted with a hearty and cordial reception by the citizens, to which he responded by reciprocal professions of interest and regard. He had for several years been in the Company's service as Director of their colony at Curaçoa, and was distinguished for his energy and bravery. Having lost a leg in an attack on the Portuguese settlement at St. Martin's, he had been obliged to return to Europe for surgical aid, whence, still retaining his former commission, he was sent to the charge of the Province of New Netherlands. Immediately on his accession he organized a representative Council of nine members from a list of eighteen presented to him by the inhabitants of the province, and gave his assent to various important provisions for the regulation of trade and commerce. By a conciliatory and just treatment of the Indians so recently in revolt he speedily gained their affection and goodwill, and by his judicious measures for their mutual protection restored peace and harmony among all classes."—S. S. Randall, *Hist. of the State of N. Y., period* 2, *ch.*

5.—"The powers of government—executive, legislative, and judicial—which he [Stuyvesant] assumed, were quite extensive, and often arbitrary. Directly or indirectly, he appointed and commissioned all public officers, framed all laws, and decided all important controversies. . . . He directed churches to be built, installed ministers, and even ordered them when and where to preach. Assuming the sole control of the public lands, he extinguished the Indian title thereto, and allowed no purchase to be made from the natives without his sanction; and granted at pleasure, to individuals and companies, parcels of land, subject to such conditions as he saw fit to impose In the management of these complicated affairs the Director developed a certain imperiousness of manner and impatience of restraint, due, perhaps, as much to his previous military life as to his personal character . . During the whole of his predecessor's unquiet rule a constant struggle had been going on between the personal prerogative of the Executive and the inherent sentiment of popular freedom which prevailed among the commonalty, leading the latter constantly to seek for themselves the franchises and freedoms of the Fatherland, to which, as loyal subjects, they deemed themselves entitled in New Netherland The contest was reopened soon after Stuyvesant's installation, and the firmness of both Director and people, in the maintenance of what each jealously considered their rights, gave indication of serious disturbance to the public weal" The governor, at length, in 1647, conceded "a popular representation in the affairs of government An election was therefore held, at which the inhabitants of Amsterdam, Breuckelen, Amersfoort and Pavonia chose eighteen of 'the most notable, reasonable, honest, and respectable' among them, from whom, according to the custom of the Fatherland, the Director and Council selected 'Nine Men' as an advisory Council, and although their powers and duties were jealously limited and guarded by the Director's Proclamation, yet the appointment of the Nine Men was a considerable gain to the cause of popular rights. . . . The subsequent history of Stuyvesant's government is a record of quarrels with colonial patroons, with the English in New England, the Swedes on the South River, and last—not least—with his own people. In fact, the government was by no means well adapted to the people or adequate to protect them The laws were very imperfect, and the Director and Council either incompetent or indisposed to remedy the serious defects which existed in the administration of civil and criminal justice."—H. R. Stiles, *Hist. of the City of Brooklyn, v.* 1, *ch.* 8.—"Director Stuyvesant was recalled to Europe soon after the surrender [to the English—see below], to vindicate his conduct . . . and . . . found himself the object of serious charges and most virulent attacks. He returned to this country in 1668, and died on his bouwerie in 1672. . . . Throughout his chequered life he exhibited a character of high morality, and in his dealings with the Indians an energetic and dignified deportment, which contributed, no doubt, considerably to the success of his arms and policy. Alike creditable to his talents are his negotiations with the neighboring English colonies. His vindications of the rights of his country, on these occasions, betoken a firmness of manner, a sharpness of perception, a clearness of argument and a soundness of judgment, combined with an extent of reading, which few of his contemporaries could equal, and none surpass. . . . It would afford pleasure were we justified in pronouncing a like panegyric on other parts of his administration, but none can review [his arbitrary resistance to just popular demands] . . and his persecution of the Lutherans and other Nonconformists, without reprobating his tyranny, and regretting that a character, so faultless in other respects, should be stained by traits so repulsive as these, and that the powers of a mind so strong should be exerted in opposing rather than promoting civil and religious freedom. The hostility this part of his public conduct evoked redounds most creditably to the character of the settlers, whose struggles for freer institutions cannot fail to win for them our sympathy and regard."—E. B. O'Callaghan, *Hist of New Netherland, bk.* 6, *ch* 8 (*v.* 2)

ALSO IN *Remonstrance of New Netherlands* (*Docs Relative to Col. Hist. of N. Y., v* 1, *pp.* 275–317); *also v.* 13—G. P. Fisher, *The Colonial Era, ch.* 9—B Fernow, *Peter Stuyvesant* (*Memorial Hist. of the City of N. Y., v.* 1, *ch.* 7).

A. D. 1650.—The adjustment of boundaries with Connecticut.—To settle the long pending controversy between Dutch and English respecting the territory claimed by each on Long Island and at the mouth of the Connecticut River, Governor Stuyvesant went in person to Hartford, September, 1650, and opened negotiations. His hands were tied from the beginning by instructions from his company to press no claim to the extremity of a quarrel, because the English were too strong in America to be fought with He assented, therefore, to the appointment of two arbitrators on each side, and he named Englishmen as his arbitrators. "The four agreed upon a settlement of the boundary matter, ignoring all other points in dispute as having occurred under the administration of Kieft It was agreed that the Dutch were to retain their lands, in Hartford [the post of 'Good Hope,' established in 1633, and which they had continued to hold, in the midst of the spreading English settlement]; that the boundary line between the two peoples on the mainland was not to come within ten miles of the Hudson River, but was to be left undecided for the present, except the first 20 miles from the Sound, which was to begin on the west side of Greenwich Bay, between Stamford and Manhattan, running thence 20 miles north, and that Long Island should be divided by a corresponding line across it, 'from the westernmost part of Oyster Bay,' to the sea. The English thus got the greater part of Long Island, a recognition of the rightfulness of their presence in the Connecticut territory, and at least the initial 20 miles of a boundary line which must, in the nature of things, be prolonged in much the same direction, and which in fact has pretty closely governed subsequent boundary lines on that side of Connecticut. If these seem hard terms for the Dutch, and indicative of treachery on the part of their two English agents, it must be borne in mind that, by the terms of his instructions from his principals, Stuyvesant had to take the best terms he could get. The treaty of Hartford was dated September 19, 1650."—A. Johnston, *Connecticut* (*Am. Commonwealths*), *ch.* 10.

ALSO IN E B O'Callaghan, *Hist of New Netherland, bk 4, ch 1-9 (v 2)*—C W Bowen, *The Boundary Disputes of Conn., pt 1 ch 1—Division of the Boundary in America (Docs Relative to Col Hist of N Y., v 1, pp 541-577)*

A. D. 1653.—The grant of municipal government to New Amsterdam.—"An interesting moment arrived A new city appeared in the annals of the world Its birth was announced on the evening of February 2, 1653 at the feast of Candlemas A proclamation of the governor defined its exceedingly limited powers and named its first officers It was called New Amsterdam There was nothing in the significant scene which inspired enthusiasm It came like a favor grudgingly granted Its privileges were few and even those were subsequently hampered by the most illiberal interpretations which could be devised Stuyvesant made a speech on the occasion in which he took care to reveal his intention of making all future municipal appointments instead of submitting the matter to the votes of the citizens as was the custom in the Father land, and he gave the officers distinctly to understand from the first that their existence did not in any way diminish his authority but that he should often preside at their meetings and at all times counsel them in matters of importance A pew was set apart in the church for the City Fathers and on Sunday mornings these worthies left their homes and families early to meet in the City Hall, from which, preceded by the bell ringer carrying their cushions of state, they marched in solemn procession to the sanctuary in the fort On all occasions of ceremony, secular or religious, they were treated with distinguished attention Their position was eminently respectable but it had as yet no emoluments There were two burgomasters Arent van Hattam and Martin Cregier There were five schepens,—Paulus Van der Grist, Maximilian Van Gheel, Allard Anthony Peter Van Couwenhoven, and William Beekman"—Mrs M J Lamb, *Hist of the City of N Y., v 1 ch 10*

ALSO IN D T Valentine, *Hist of the City of N Y., ch 5*

A. D. 1654.—Threatened attack from New England. See NEW JERSEY A D 1640-1655

A. D. 1655.—Subjugation of the Swedes on the Delaware. See DELAWARE A D 1640-1656

A. D. 1664.—The English conquest.—New Amsterdam becomes New York.—The Navigation Act of Cromwell, maintained by the English after the Stuart Restoration, was continually evaded, almost openly, in the British American colonies, and it was with the Dutch at New Amsterdam that the illicit trade of the New Englanders, the Virginians and the Marylanders was principally carried on "In 1663 the losses to the revenue were so extensive that the farmers of the customs complained of the great abuses which, they claimed, defrauded the revenue of £10,000 a year. The interest of the kingdom was at stake, and the conquest of the New Netherland was resolved upon. . The next concern of the Chancellor [Clarendon] was to secure to the Crown the full benefit of the proposed conquest He was as little satisfied with the self-rule of the New England colonies as with the presence of Dutch sovereignty on American soil; and in the conquest of the foreigner he found the means to bring the English subject into closer dependence on the King James Duke of York, Grand Admiral, was the heir to the Crown A patent to James as presumptive heir to the crown, from the King his brother, would merge in the crown, and a central authority strongly established over the territory covered by it might well, under favorable circumstances be extended over the colonies on either side which were governed under limitations and with privileges directly secured by charter from the King The first step taken by Clarendon was the purchase of the title conveyed to the Earl of Stirling in 1635 by the grantees of the New England patent This covered the territory of Pemaquid, between the Saint Croix and the Kennebec, in Maine, and the island of Matowack, or Long Island

A title being thus acquired by the adroitness of Clarendon, a patent was on the 12th of March, 1664 issued by Charles II to the Duke of York granting him the Maine territory of Pemaquid, all the islands between Cape Cod and the Narrows the Hudson River and all the lands from the west side of the Connecticut to the east side of Delaware Bay together with the islands of Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket The inland boundary was a line from the head of Connecticut River to the source of Hudson River, thence to the head of the Mohawk branch of Hudson River, and thence to the east side of Delaware Bay' The patent gave to the Duke of York, his heirs deputies, and assigns 'absolute power to govern within this domain according to his own rules and discretions consistent with the statutes of England' In this patent the charter granted by the King to the younger John Winthrop in 1662 for Connecticut in which it was stipulated that commissioners should be sent to New England to settle the boundaries of each colony was entirely disregarded The idea of commissioners for boundaries now developed with larger scope and the King established a royal commission consisting of four persons recommended by the Duke of York, whose private instructions were to reduce the Dutch to submission and to increase the prerogatives of the Crown in the New England colonies which Clarendon considered to be 'already well nigh ripened to a commonwealth' Three of these commissioners were officers in the royal army,—Colonel Richard Nicolls, Sir Robert Carr, Colonel George Cartwright The fourth was Samuel Maverick To Colonel Nicolls the Duke of York entrusted the charge of taking possession of and governing the vast territory covered by the King's patent To one more capable and worthy the delicate trust could not have been confided . His title under the new commission was that of Deputy-Governor, the tenure of his office, the Duke's pleasure

. When the news of the gathering of the fleet reached the Hague, and explanation was demanded of Downing [the English ambassador] as to the truth of the reports that it was intended for the reduction of the New Netherland, he boldly insisted on the English right to the territory by first possession. To a claim so flimsy and impudent only one response was possible,—a declaration of war But the Dutch people at large had little interest in the remote settlement, which was held to be a trading-post rather than a colony, and not a profitable post at best. The

West India Company saw the danger of the situation, but its appeals for assistance were disregarded. Its own resources and credit were unequal to the task of defence. Meanwhile the English fleet, composed of one ship of 36, one of 30, a third of 16, and a transport of 10 guns, with three full companies of the King's veterans, — in all 450 men, commanded by Colonels Nicolls, Carr, and Cartwright, — sailed from Portsmouth for Gardiner's Bay on the 15th of May. On the 23d of July Nicolls and Cartwright reached Boston, where they demanded military aid from the Governor and Council of the Colony. Calling upon Winthrop for the assistance of Connecticut, and appointing a rendezvous at the west end of Long Island, Nicolls set sail with his ships and anchored in New Utrecht Bay, just outside of Coney Island, a spot since historical as the landing place of Lord Howe's troops in 1776. Here Nicolls was joined by militia from New Haven and Long Island The city of New Amsterdam . . was defenceless The Director, Stuyvesant, heard of the approach of the English at Fort Orange (Albany), whither he had gone to quell disturbances with the Indians Returning in haste, he summoned his council together. The folly of resistance was apparent to all, and after delays, by which the Director General sought to save something of his dignity, a commission for a surrender was agreed upon between the Dutch authorities and Colonel Nicolls. The capitulation confirmed the inhabitants in the possession of their property, the exercise of their religion and their freedom as citizens The municipal officers were continued in their rule On the 29th of August, 1664, the articles were ratified and the city passed under English rule The first act of Nicolls on taking possession of the fort, in which he was welcomed by the civic authorities, was to order that the city of New Amsterdam be thereafter known as New York, and the fort as Fort James, in honor of the title and name of his lord and patron At the time of the surrender the city gave small promise of its magnificent future Its entire population, which did not exceed 1,500 souls, was housed within the triangle at the point of the island. . . . Nicolls now established a new government for the province A force was sent up the Hudson under Captain Cartwright, which took possession of Fort Orange, the name of which was changed to Albany, in honor of a title of the Duke of York "— J A Stevens, *The English in N Y. (Narrative and Critical Hist of Am., v. 3, ch. 10)*

Also in: J. R. Brodhead, *Hist of N Y., v 1, ch. 20.—Docs. Relative to Col Hist of N. Y., v. 2–3.* — See, also, Massachusetts A D 1660–1665.

A. D. 1664.—The separation of New Jersey, by grant to Berkeley and Carteret. See New Jersey: A. D. 1664–1667.

A. D. 1664.—The annexation of the Delaware settlements. See Delaware: A. D. 1664.

A. D. 1664-1674.—The province as the English received it.—Dutch institutions, their influence and survival.— "In the year 1664, when the government passed to the English, New Netherland is said by the Chevalier Lambrechtsen to have consisted of three cities and thirty villages. Its population was then about ten thousand souls, exclusive of the Indians, who were important auxiliaries for trade and peltries. The inhabitants enjoyed a fair measure of freedom and protection. High roads already existed, and there were numerous owners of flourishing farms, or bouweries, and other real property, while urban life was well policed by proper laws. The treatment by the Dutch of the many English and other aliens who already dwelt within the Dutch territory was rather in advance of the age, while the jurisprudence established here by the Dutch, being largely borrowed from the high civilization of Rome, was certainly superior in refinement to the contemporary feudal and folk law introduced by the English in 1664 Theoretically, the administration of justice conformed to a high standard, and both Dutch and aliens were protected by adequate constitutional guaranties We cannot for an instant presume that the institutions which half a century had reared were swept into oblivion by a single stroke of the English conquerors in 1664. It would be more rational to suppose that the subsidence of the Dutch institutions was as gradual as the facts demonstrate it to have been Negro slavery was introduced by the Dutch, but it existed here only under its least objectionable conditions A large measure of religious liberty was tolerated, although the Dutch Reformed Church was the only one publicly sanctioned. On several occasions delegates of the commonalty were brought into consultation with the Director-General and Council, and thus, to some extent, a principle of representative government was at least recognized, although it was somewhat at variance with the company's standard of colonial government, and savored too much of the English idea and encroachment to be palatable. It must not be forgotten that at home the Dutch were a self-governing people and accustomed to that most important principle of free government — self-assessment in taxation. In common with all commercial peoples, they possessed a sturdy independence of mind and demeanor. There is no proof that these excellent qualities were diminished by transplantation to the still freer air of the new country New Netherland was not altogether fortunate in its type of government, experience demonstrating that the selfish spirit of a mercantile monopoly is not the fit repository of governmental powers. Yet, on the whole, it must be conceded that the company's government introduced here much that was good and accomplished little that was pernicious. In 1664 it certainly surrendered to the English one of the finest and most flourishing colonies of America, possessing a hardy, vigorous, and thrifty people, well adapted to all the principles of civil and religious freedom. History shows that this people speedily coalesced with all that was good in the system introduced by the English, and sturdily opposed all that was undesirable. . . . It is certain . . . that after the overthrow of the Dutch political authority the English proceeded gradually to introduce into New York, by express command, their own laws and customs. Yet it requires a very much more extended examination of original sources than has ever been made to determine absolutely just how much of the English laws and institutions was in force at a particular epoch of colonial history. The subject perplexed the colonial courts, and it is still perplexing."—R. L. Fowler, *Constitutional and Legal Hist. of N. Y. in the 17th*

Century (*Memorial History of the City of New York*, v. 1, *ch.* 14).—"Although the New Netherland became a permanent English colony under the Treaty of Westminster in 1674 [see below], its population remained largely Dutch until nearly the middle of the next century. The prosperity of New York, growing steadily with the progress of trade and the exportation of grains, attracted emigrants from Holland notwithstanding the change of flag. Many families now living on Manhattan Island are descended from Dutchmen who came out after the English occupation. The old names with which we have become familiar in the early annals of New Amsterdam continue in positions of honour and prominence through the English colonial records. In 1673, we find among the city magistrates Johannes van Brugh, Johannes de Peyster, Ægidius Luyck, Jacob Kip, Laurans van der Spiegel, Wilhelm Beeckman, Guleyn Verplanck, Stephen van Courtlandt. In 1677, Stephanus van Courtlandt is mayor, and Johannes de Peyster deputy mayor In 1682, Cornelis Steenwyck is mayor; in 1685, the office is filled by Nicholas Bayard; in 1686, by Van Courtlandt again. Abraham de Peyster was mayor from 1691 to 1695, and in his time the following Dutchmen were aldermen. W. Beeckman, Johannes Kip, Brandt Schuyler, Garrett Douw, Arent van Scoyck, Gerard Douw, Rip van Dam, Jacobus van Courtlandt, Samuel Bayard, Jacobus van Nostrandt, Jan Hendricks Brevoort, Jan van Horne, Petrus Bayard, Abraham Wendell, John Brevoort. These names recur down to 1717 In 1718, John Roosevelt, Philip van Courtlandt, and Cornelius de Peyster are aldermen In 1719, Jacobus van Courtlandt is mayor, and among the aldermen are Philip van Courtlandt, Harmanus van Gilder, Jacobus Kip, Frederic Philipse, John Roosevelt, Philip Schuyler. In 1745, Stephen Bayard is mayor. During the last half of the eighteenth century the Dutch names are more and more crowded out by the English. . . . By the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Dutch names occur only occasionally These Dutchmen not only preserved their leadership in public affairs, but carried on a large proportion of the city's trade. New York was an English colony, but its greatness was largely built on Dutch foundations It is often said that the city became flourishing only after the English occupation. This is true, with the qualification that the Dutch trader and the Dutch farmer after that event had greater opportunities for successful activity. . . . Dutch continued to be the language of New York until the end of the seventeenth century, after which time English contended for the mastery with steady success. In the outlying towns of Long Island and New Jersey and along the Hudson River, Dutch was generally used for a century later. . . . In New York city the large English immigration, the requirements of commerce, and the frequent intermarriages of Dutch and English families had given to English the predominance by the year 1750. . . . In New York city the high-stoop house, and the peculiar observance of New Year's Day which continued until 1870, are two familiar relics of Holland. The valuable custom of registering transfers of real estate has been received from the same source."—B. Tuckerman, *Peter Stuyvesant, ch.*

A. D. 1665.—The Duke's Laws.—"At a general meeting held at Hempstead, on Long Island [March 1, 1665], attended by deputies from all the towns, Governor Nichols presently published, on his own and the duke's authority, a body of laws for the government of the new province, alphabetically arranged, collated, and digested, 'out of the several laws now in force in his majesty's American colonies and plantations,' exhibiting indeed, many traces of Connecticut and Massachusetts legislation . . The code [was] known as the 'Duke's Laws,' which Nichols imagined 'could not but be satisfactory even to the most factious Republicans.' A considerable number of immigrants seem to have come in on the strength of it from the neighboring colonies of New England."—R Hildreth, *Hist. of the U S., ch.* 17 (v. 2)

ALSO IN *The Duke of York's Book of Laws, comp and ed by S. George, et al*

A. D. 1665-1666.—French invasions of the Iroquois country, under Courcelles and Tracy. See CANADA A D. 1640–1700

A. D. 1673.—The reconquest of the city and province by the Dutch.—The seizure of New Netherland by the English in 1664 was one of several acts of hostility which preceded an actual declaration of war between England and Holland. The war became formal, however, in the following year, and ended in 1666, ingloriously for England—see NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND) A D 1665–1666—although she retained her American conquests Then followed a period of hypocritical alliance on the part of Charles II with the Dutch, which gave him an opportunity to betray them in 1672, when he joined Louis XIV. of France in a perfidious attack upon the sturdy republic—see NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND) A D. 1672–1674 During the second year of this last mentioned war, Cornelis Evertsen, worthy son of a famous Dutch admiral, made an unexpected reconquest of the lost province Evertsen "had been sent out from Zealand with fifteen ships to harass the enemy in the West Indies, which was effectually done At Martinico he fell in with four ships dispatched from Amsterdam, under the command of Jacob Binckes Joining their forces, the two commodores followed Krynssen's track to the Chesapeake, where they took eight and burned five Virginia tobacco ships, in spite of the gallantry of the frigates which were to convoy them to England. As they were going out of the James River, the Dutch commodores met a sloop from New York," and received information from one of its passengers which satisfied them that they might easily take possession of the town. "In a few days [August 7, 1673] the Dutch fleet, which, with three ships of war from Amsterdam, and four from Zealand, was now swelled by prizes to 23 vessels, carrying 1,600 men, arrived off Sandy Hook. The next morning they anchored under Staten Island." On the following day the city, which could make no defense, and all the Dutch inhabitants of which were eager to welcome their countrymen, was unconditionally surrendered. "The recovery of New York by the Dutch was an absolute conquest by an open enemy in time of war. . . . 'Not the smallest' article of capitulation, except military honors to the garrison, was granted by the victors. . . . Their reconquest annihilated British sovereignty over ancient New Netherland, and extinguished the duke's proprietary

government in New York, with that of his grantees in New Jersey. Evertsen and Binckes for the time represented the Dutch Republic, under the dominion of which its recovered American provinces instantly passed, by right of successful war. The effete West India Company was in no way connected with the transaction. . . . The name of 'New Netherland' was of course restored to the reconquered territory, which was held to embrace not only all that the Dutch possessed according to the Hartford agreement of 1650, but also the whole of Long Island east of Oyster Bay, which originally belonged to the province and which the king had granted to the Duke of York. . . . It was, first of all, necessary to extemporize a provisional government No orders had been given to Evertsen or Binckes about New Netherland. Its recovery was a lucky accident, wholly due to the enterprise of the two commodores; upon whom fell the responsibility of governing their conquest until directions should come from the Hague" They appointed Captain Anthony Colve to be Governor General of the Province "Colve's commission described his government as extending from 15 miles south of Cape Henlopen to the east end of Long Island and Shelter Island, thence through the middle of the Sound to Greenwich, and so northerly, according to the boundary made in 1650, including Delaware Bay and all the intermediate territory, as possessed by the English under the Duke of York. . The name of the city of New York was . changed to 'New Orange,' in compliment to the prince stadtholder . . . The metropolis being secured, 200 men were sent up the river, in several vessels, to reduce Esopus and Albany No opposition was shown." Albany was ordered to be called Willemstadt.—J. R. Brodhead, *Hist of the State of N Y., v. 2, ch. 4-5*

Also in: Mrs M. J. Lamb, *Hist of the City of N. Y., v 1, ch. 14-15.—Docs relating to Col Hist. of N. Y, v. 2.—Memorial Hist of the City of New York, v. 1, ch. 9.*

A. D. 1674.—Restored to England by the Treaty of Westminster. See Netherlands (Holland). A. D. 1674

A. D. 1674-1675.—Long Island annexed, with attempts against half of Connecticut. See Connecticut: A. D 1674-1675.

A. D. 1684.—Doubtful origin of English claims to the sovereignty of the Iroquois country.—"Colonel Dongan [governor of New York] was instrumental in procuring a convention of the Five Nations, at Albany, in 1684, to meet Lord Howard of Effingham, Governor of Virginia, at which he (Dongan) was likewise present. This meeting, or council, was attended by the happiest results. . . . Colonel Dongan succeeded in completely gaining the affections of the Indians, who conceived for him the warmest esteem. They even asked that the arms of the Duke of York might be put upon their castles; —a request which it need not be said was most readily complied with, since, should it afterwards become necessary, the governor might find it convenient to construe it into an act of at least partial submission to English authority, although it has been asserted that the Indians themselves looked upon the ducal insignia as a sort of charm, that might protect them against the French."—W. L. Stone, *Life and Times of Sir W. Johnson, v. 1, p. 15.*

A. D. 1684-1687.—French invasions of the Iroquois country under De La Barre and De Nonville. See Canada: A. D. 1640-1700

A. D. 1686.—The Dongan Charter.—"The year 1686 was distinguished by the granting of the 'Dongan Charter' to the city of New York It was drafted by Mayor Nicholas Bayard and Recorder James Graham, and was one of the most liberal ever bestowed upon a colonial city By it, sources of immediate income became vested in the corporation. Subsequent charters added nothing to the city property, save in the matter of ferry rights, in immediate reference to which the charters of 1708 and 1730 were obtained . . The instrument was the basis of a plan of government for a great city "—Mrs M J. Lamb, *Hist of the City of N Y, v. 1, p 317.*

Also in: M. Benjamin, *Thos. Dongan and the Granting of the N. Y Charter (Memorial Hist of the City of N. Y., v 1, ch 11)*

A. D. 1688.—Joined with New England under the governorship of Andros.—In April, 1688, Sir Edmund Andros, who had been made Governor-general of all New England in 1686, received a new commission from the King which "constituted him Governor of all the English possessions on the mainland of America, except Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia The 'Territory and Dominion' of New England was now to embrace the country between the 40th degree of latitude and the River St. Croix, thus including New York and the Jerseys The seat of government was to be at Boston, and a Deputy-Governor, to reside at New York, was to be the immediate head of the administration of that colony and of the Jerseys. The Governor was to be assisted by a Council consisting of 42 members, of whom five were to constitute a quorum The Governor in Council might impose and collect taxes for the support of the government, and might pass laws, which however were, within three months of their enactment, to be sent over to the Privy Council for approval or repeal. . . The seal of New York was to be broken, and the seal of New England to be used for the whole jurisdiction. Liberty of conscience was to be allowed, agreeably to the Declaration of Indulgence."—J. G. Palfrey, *Compendious Hist. of New Eng., bk. 3, ch. 14 (v. 2).*

Also in: Mrs. M. J. Lamb, *Hist. of the City of N Y, v. 1, ch. 18* —J. R Brodhead, ed. *Docs relative to Col. Hist. of N Y, v. 3, pp. 537-554.*

A. D. 1689-1691.—The Revolution.—Jacob Leisler and his fate.—News of the revolution in England which drove James II. from the throne, giving it to his daughter, Mary, and her husband, William of Orange, reached New York, from Virginia, in February, 1689, but was concealed as long as possible from the public by Lieutenant Governor Nicholson. No disturbance of the authority of the latter occurred until after the people of Boston had risen, in April, and seized the Governor-General, Sir Edmund Andros, stripping his authority from him and casting him into prison. This spirited movement was followed a little later by like action in New York. Two parties had quickly taken form, "one composed of the adherents of James, the other of the friends of William and Mary. The former embraced the aristocratic citizens, including Nicholas Bayard, the commander of the city militia, the members of the council, and the municipal authorities. The friends of the

new monarchs formed a large majority of the citizens. They maintained that the entire fabric of the imperial government, including that of the colonies, had been overthrown by the revolution, and that, as no person was invested with authority in the province, it reverted to the legitimate source of all authority — the people — who might delegate their powers to whomsoever they would. Among the principal supporters of this view was Jacob Leisler, a German by birth, a merchant, the senior captain of one of the five train-bands of the city commanded by Colonel Bayard, and one of the oldest and wealthiest inhabitants . . He was a zealous opponent of the Roman Catholics, and a man of great energy and determination . Rumors of terrible things contemplated by the adherents of James spread over the town, and produced great excitement The five companies of militia and a crowd of citizens gathered at the house of Leisler, and induced him to become their leader and guide in this emergency Colonel Bayard attempted to disperse them, but he was compelled to fly for his life A distinct line was now drawn between the 'aristocrats,' led by Bayard, Van Cortlandt, Robert Livingston, and others, and the 'democrats'- the majority of the people — who regarded Leisler as their leader and champion At his suggestion a 'Committee of Safety' was formed, composed of ten members — Dutch, Huguenot, and English They constituted Leisler 'Captain of the Fort,' and invested him with the powers of commander in-chief — really chief magistrate — until orders should come from the new monarch This was the first really republican ruler that ever attained to power in America. He took possession of Fort James and the public funds that were in it, and, in June, 1689, he proclaimed, with the sound of trumpets, William and Mary sovereigns of Great Britain and the colonies. Then he sent a letter to the king, giving him an account of what he had done " Lieutenant Governor Nicholson made little attempt to assert his authority in the face of these demonstrations, but departed presently for England, "after formally giving authority to his councillors to preserve the peace during his absence, and until their Majesties' pleasure should be made known Nicholson's desertion of his post gave Leisler and the Republicans great advantages. He ordered the several counties of the province to elect their civil and military officers Some counties obeyed, and others did not. The counter influence of Nicholson's councillors was continually and persistently felt, and Leisler and his party became greatly incensed against them, especially against Bayard, who was the chief instigator of the opposition to the 'usurper,' as he called the Republican leader. So hot became the indignation of Leisler and his friends that Bayard was compelled to fly for his life to Albany. The other councillors, alarmed, soon followed him. At Albany they acknowledged allegiance to William and Mary. They set up an independent government, and claimed to be the true and only rulers of the province. In this position they were sustained by the civil authorities at Albany." Leisler's son-in-law, Jacob Milborne, was sent with a force to take possession of their seat of government, but failed to accomplish his mission. "Soon after this event a letter arrived at New York by a special messenger from the British Privy Council, directed to 'Francis Nicholson, Esq., or, in his absence, to such as, for the time being, take care for preserving the peace and administering the laws in His Majesty's province of New York.'" This letter was delivered by the messenger to Leisler. Bayard, who had come to the city in disguise, and attempted to secure the missive, was arrested and imprisoned. "From this time the opposition to Leisler's government assumed an organized shape, and was sleepless and relentless Leisler justly regarding himself as invested with supreme power by the people and the spirit of the letter from the Privy Council, at once assumed the title of lieutenant-governor; appointed councillors; made a new provincial seal; established courts, and called an assembly to provide means for carrying on war with Canada . . . Colonel Henry Sloughter was appointed Governor of New York, but did not arrive until the spring of 1691 Richard Ingoldsby, a captain of foot, arrived early in the year, with a company of regular soldiers, to take possession of and hold the government until the arrival of the governor He was urged by Leisler's enemies to assume supreme power at once, as he was the highest royal officer in the province He haughtily demanded of Leisler the surrender of the fort, without deigning to show the governor his credentials. Leisler, of course, refused, and ordered the troops to be quartered in the city. Ingoldsby attempted to take the fort by force, but failed. For several weeks the city was fearfully excited by rival factions — 'Leislerians' and 'anti Leislerians' On the arrival of Governor Sloughter, in March (1691), Leisler at once loyally tendered to him the fort and the province. Under the influence of the enemies of Leisler, the royal governor responded to this meritorious action by ordering the arrest of the lieutenant governor, also Milborne, and six other 'inferior insurgents' , on a charge of high treason." The accused were tried, convicted and sentenced to be hanged, but all except Leisler and Milborne received pardon These two appealed to the king, but the governor's councillors succeeded in suppressing the appeal. As Sloughter hesitated to sign the death-warrant, they intoxicated him at a dinner party and obtained his signature to the fatal document while his judgment was overcome Before the drunken governor recovered his senses Jacob Leisler and Jacob Milborne had been hanged " When the governor became sober, he was appalled at what he had done. He was so keenly stung by remorse and afflicted by delirium tremens that he died a few weeks afterward. Calm and impartial judgment, enlightened by truth, now assigns to Jacob Leisler the high position in history of a patriot and martyr."—B. J. Lossing, *The Empire State, ch.* 8.—"Leisler lacked judgment and wisdom in administrative affairs, but his aims were comprehensive and patriotic. His words are imbued with a reverent spirit, and were evidently the utterances of an honest man. It was his lot to encounter an opposition led by persons who held office under King James. They pursued him with a relentless spirit. . . . It is the office of history to bear witness to Jacob Leisler's integrity as a man, his loyalty as a subject, and his purity as a patriot."—R. Frothingham, *The Rise of the Republic, ch.* 8.—"The founder of the Democracy of New York was Jacob Leisler. . . . And Jacob Leisler was truly an honest man, who, though a martyr to

the cause of liberty, and sacrificed by injustice, aristocracy, and party malignity, ought to be considered as one in whom New York should take pride — although the ancestors of many of her best men denounced him as a rebel and a traitor."—W. Dunlap, *Hist of the New Netherlands*, *v* 1, *ch* 12

ALSO IN: C F. Hoffman, *The Administration of Jacob Leisler* (*Library of Am Biog*, *series* 2, *v* 8)—*Papers relating to Lt Gov Leisler's Administration* (*O'Callaghan's Documentary Hist of N. Y*, *v.* 2)—*Docs relating to Leisler's Administration* (*N Y Hist Soc Coll*, 1868)

A. D. 1689-1697.—King William's War: The Schenectady massacre.—Abortive expedition against Montreal.—French plans of conquest. See CANADA A D 1689-1690, and 1692-1697

A. D. 1690.—The first Colonial Congress. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D 1690

A. D. 1692.—Bradford's press set up. See PENNSYLVANIA A D 1692-1696

A. D. 1696.—Count Frontenac's invasion of the Iroquois country. See CANADA A D 1696

A. D. 1696-1749.—Suppression of colonial manufactures. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D 1696-1749

A. D. 1709-1711.—Queen Anne's War: Unsuccessful projects against Montreal.—Capture of Port Royal. See NEW ENGLAND A D 1702-1710, and CANADA A D 1711-1713

A. D. 1710.—Colonization of Palatines on the Hudson.—Settlement of Palatine Bridge and German Flats. See PALATINES A D 1709-1710

A. D. 1720-1734.—Conflicts of royal governors with the people.—Zenger's trial.—Vindication of the freedom of the press.—"In September 1720, William Burnet, the son of Bishop Burnet and godson of William III, entered upon the government of New York, burdened by instructions from England to keep alive the assembly which had been chosen several years before This he did, to the great discontent of the people, until it had lasted more than eleven years. . . But he was intelligent, and free from avarice It was he who took possession of Oswego, and he 'left no stone unturned to defeat the French designs at Niagara' Nevertheless, for all his merit, in 1728, he was transferred to Massachusetts to make way for the groom of the chamber of George II while he was prince of Wales At the time when the ministry was warned that 'the American assemblies aimed at nothing less than being independent of Great Britain as fast as they could,' Newcastle sent as governor to New York and New Jersey the dull and ignorant John Montgomerie Sluggish, yet humane, the pauper chief magistrate had no object in America but to get money, and he escaped contests with the legislatures by giving way to them in all things. . . He died in office in 1731. His successor, in 1732, was William Cosby, a brother-in-law of the earl of Halifax, and connected with Newcastle. A boisterous and irritable man, broken in his fortunes, having little understanding and no sense of decorum or of virtue, he had been sent over to clutch at gain. Few men did more to hasten colonial emancipation. . . . To gain very great perquisites, he followed the precedent of Andros in Massachusetts in the days of the Stuarts, and insisted on new surveys of lands and new grants, in lieu of the old. To the objection of acting against law, he answered 'Do you think I mind that? I have a great interest in England' The courts of law were not pliable, and Cosby displaced and appointed judges, without soliciting the consent of the council or waiting for the approbation of the sovereign Complaint could be heard only through the press A newspaper was established to defend the popular cause, and, in November 1734, about a year after its establishment, its printer, John Peter Zenger, a German by birth, who had been an apprentice to the famous printer, William Bradford and afterward his partner, was imprisoned, by an order of the council, on the charge of publishing false and seditious libels The grand jury would find no bill against him, and the attorney-general filed an information The counsel of Zenger took exceptions to the commissions of the judges, because they ran during pleasure, and because they had been granted without the consent of council The angry judge met the objection by disbarring James Alexander who offered it, though he stood at the head of his profession in New York for sagacity, penetration, and application to business All the central colonies regarded the controversy as their own At the trial the publishing was confessed, but the aged and venerable Andrew Hamilton, who came from Philadelphia to plead for Zenger, justified the publication by asserting its truth 'You cannot be admitted,' interrupted the chief justice, 'to give the truth of a libel in evidence' 'Then,' said Hamilton to the jury, 'we appeal to you for witnesses of the facts The jury have a right to determine both the law and the fact, and they ought to do so' 'The question before you,' he added, 'is not the cause of a poor printer nor of New York alone, it is the cause of liberty' The jury gave their verdict, 'Not guilty' Hamilton received of the common council of New York the franchises of the city for 'his learned and generous defence of the rights of mankind and the liberty of the press'"—G Bancroft, *Hist of the U S* (*Author's last rev*), *pt* 3, *ch* 15 (*v* 2)

ALSO IN J Grahame, *Hist of the U S* (*Colonial*), *bk* 10, *ch* 1 (*v* 2)—W L Stone, *Hist of N Y City*, *2d period*, *ch* 2.—E Lawrence, *William Cosby and the Freedom of the Press* (*Memorial Hist. of the City of N Y.*, *v* 2, *ch.* 7)

A. D. 1725.—The first Newspaper. See PRINTING AND THE PRESS A D. 1704-1729

A. D. 1726.—How the Iroquois placed themselves under the protection of England.—"Governour Burnet . . assembled the chiefs of the Iroquois at Albany [1726]; he reminded them of all the benefits they had received from England, and all the injuries that had been inflicted by France He pointed out the evils that would flow to them from a French fort at Niagara, on their territory The Indians declared their unwillingness to suffer this intrusion of the French, but said they now had not power to prevent it. They called upon the Governour of New York to write to the King of England for help to regain their country from the French of Canada. Burnet seized this opportunity to gain a surrender of their country to England, to be protected for their use. Such a surrender would be used by Europeans for their own purposes; but (in the sense they viewed and represented it), was

altogether incomprehensible by the Indian chiefs, and the deputies had no power from the Iroquois confederacy to make any such surrender. . . . By the treaty of Utrecht . . . France had acknowledged the Iroquois and their territory to be subject to Great Britain."—W. Dunlap, *Hist. of New York, v.* 1, *p.* 289.

A. D. 1741.—The pretended Negro Plot.—Panic and merciless frenzy of the people.—In 1741, "the city of New York became the scene of a cruel and bloody delusion, less notorious, but not less lamentable than the Salem witchcraft. That city now contained some 7,000 or 8,000 inhabitants, of whom 1,200 or 1,500 were slaves Nine fires in rapid succession, most of them, however, merely the burning of chimneys, produced a perfect insanity of terror. An indented servant woman purchased her liberty and secured a reward of £100 by pretending to give information of a plot formed by a low tavern-keeper, her master, and three negroes, to burn the city and murder the whites. This story was confirmed and amplified by an Irish prostitute, convicted of a robbery, who, to recommend herself to mercy, reluctantly turned informer. Numerous arrests had been already made among the slaves and free blacks. Many others followed. The eight lawyers who then composed the bar of New York all assisted by turns on behalf of the prosecution. The prisoners, who had no counsel, were tried and convicted upon most insufficient evidence. The lawyers vied with each other in heaping all sorts of abuse on their heads, and Chief-justice Delancey, in passing sentence, vied with the lawyers. Many confessed to save their lives, and then accused others. Thirteen unhappy convicts were burned at the stake, eighteen were hanged, and seventy-one transported. The war and the religious excitement then prevailing tended to inflame the yet hot prejudices against Catholics A non-juring schoolmaster, accused of being a Catholic priest in disguise, and of stimulating the negroes to burn the city by promises of absolution, was condemned and executed."—R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S., ch.* 25 (*v.* 2).

ALSO IN: Mrs. Lamb, *Hist. of the City of N. Y., v.* 1, *ch.* 26.—G. W. Williams, *Hist. of the Negro Race in Am., v.* 1, *ch.* 13.

A. D. 1744.—Treaty with the Six Nations at Albany. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1744.

A. D. 1744-1748.—King George's War. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1744, 1745; and 1745–1748.

A. D. 1746-1754.—The founding of King's College. See EDUCATION, MODERN: AMERICA: A. D. 1746–1787.

A. D. 1749-1774.—The struggle for Vermont.—The disputed New Hampshire Grants, and the Green Mountain Boys who defended them. See VERMONT: A. D. 1749–1774.

A. D. 1754.—The Colonial Congress at Albany and Franklin's Plan of Union. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1754.

A. D. 1755.—The French and Indian War: Battle of Lake George.—Abortive expedition against Niagara.—Braddock's defeat. See CANADA: A. D. 1755; and OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1755.

A. D 1756-1757.—The French and Indian War: English loss of Oswego and of Fort William Henry. See CANADA: A. D. 1756–1757.

A. D. 1758.—The French and Indian War: Bloody defeat of the English at Ticonderoga.—Final capture of Louisburg and recovery of Fort Duquesne. See CANADA: A. D. 1758; and CAPE BRETON ISLAND: A. D. 1758–1760.

A. D. 1759.—The French and Indian War: Niagara, Ticonderoga, Crown Point and Quebec taken. See CANADA: A. D. 1759.

A. D. 1760.—The French and Indian War: Completed English conquest of Canada. See CANADA: A. D 1760.

A. D. 1763-1764.—Pontiac's War.—Sir William Johnson's Treaty with the Indians at Fort Niagara. See PONTIAC'S WAR.

A. D. 1763-1766.—The question of taxation by Parliament.—The Sugar Act.—The Stamp Act and its repeal.—The Declaratory Act.—The Stamp Act Congress. See UNITED STATES OF AM: A. D 1760–1775; 1763–1764, 1765; and 1766.

A. D. 1765.—Patriotic self-denials.—Non-importation agreements. See UNITED STATES OF AM: A. D. 1764–1767

A. D. 1765-1768.—The Indian treaties of German Flats and Fort Stanwix.—Adjustment of boundaries with the Six Nations. See UNITED STATES OF AM · A D 1765–1768

A. D. 1766-1773.—Opening events of the Revolution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.. A. D 1766–1767, to 1772–1773, and BOSTON: A D 1768, to 1773

A. D. 1773-1774.—The Revolutionary spirit abroad.—The conflict of parties.—The Vigilance Committee, the Committee of Fifty-One, and the Committee of Sixty.—"In 1773 the tax on tea was imposed. On October 25th the Mohawks of New York, a band of the Sons of Liberty, were ordered by their old leaders to be on the watch for the tea ships; and it was merely the chances of time and tide that gave the opportunity of fame first to the Mohawks of Boston . An 'association' was now circulated for signatures, engaging to boycott, 'not deal with, or employ, or have any connection with' any persons who should aid in landing, or 'selling, or buying tea, so long as it is subject to a duty by Parliament', and December 17th a meeting of the subscribers was held and a committee of fifteen chosen as a Committee of Correspondence that was soon known as the Vigilance Committee. Letters also were exchanged between the speakers of many of the houses of assembly in the different provinces; and January 20, 1774, the New York Assembly, which had been out of touch with the people ever since the Stamp Act was passed in the year after its election, appointed their Speaker, with twelve others, a standing Committee of Correspondence and Enquiry, a proof that the interest of all classes was now excited. April 15th, the 'Nancy' with a cargo of tea arrived off Sandy Hook, followed shortly by the 'London.' The Committee of Vigilance assembled, and, as soon as Captain Lockyier, of the 'Nancy' landed in spite of their warning, escorted him to a pilot boat and set him on board again. . . . April 23d, the 'Nancy' stood out to sea without landing her cargo, and with her carried Captain Chambers of the 'London,' from which the evening before eighteen chests of tea had been emptied into the sea by the Liberty Boys. The bill closing the port of Boston was enacted March 31st, and a copy of the act reached New York by the ship Samson

on the 12th. Two days later the Committee of Vigilance wrote to the Boston Committee recommending vigorous measures as the most effectual, and assuring them that their course would be heartily supported by their brethren in New York. So rapid had been the march of events that not till now did the merchants and responsible citizens of New York take alarm. Without their concurrence or even knowledge they were being rapidly compromised by the unauthorized action of an irresponsible committee, composed of men who for the most part were noted more for enthusiasm than for judgment, and many of whom had been not unconcerned in petty riots and demonstrations condemned by the better part of the community . . 'The men who at that time called themselves the Committee,' wrote Lieutenant Governor Colden the next month, 'who dictated and acted in the name of the people, were many of them of the lower ranks, and all the warmest zealots of those called the Sons of Liberty. The more considerable merchants and citizens seldom or never appeared among them. . . . The principal inhabitants, being now afraid that these hot-headed men might run the city into dangerous measures, appeared in a considerable body at the first meeting of the people after the Boston Port Act was published here.' This meeting, convoked by advertisement, was held May 16th, at the house of Samuel Francis, 'to consult on the measures proper to be pursued.' . . . A committee of fifty, Jay among them, instead of one of twenty five, as at first suggested, was nominated 'for the approbation of the public,' 'to correspond with our sister colonies on all matters of moment.' Three days later these nominations were confirmed by a public meeting held at the Coffee House, but not until a fifty-first member was added, Francis Lewis, as a representative of the radical party which had been as much as possible ignored . . . At the Coffee House again, on May 23d, the Committee of Fifty-one met and organized, they repudiated the letter to Boston from the Committee of Vigilance as unofficial," and prepared a response to another communication just received from Boston, by the famous messenger, Paul Revere. In this reply it was "urged that 'a Congress of Deputies from the Colonies in General is of the utmost moment,' to form 'some unanimous resolutions . . not only respecting your [Boston's] deplorable circumstances, but for the security of our common rights;' and that the advisability of a non-importation agreement should be left to the Congress. . . . The importance of this letter can hardly be exaggerated, for it was the first serious authoritative suggestion of a General Congress to consider 'the common rights' of the colonies in general. . . . The advice of New York was followed gradually by the other colonies, but even before a Continental Congress was a certainty, the Committee of Fifty-one, with singular confidence, resolved that delegates to it should be chosen, and called a meeting for that purpose for July 19th. . . . Philip Livingston, John Alsop, James Duane, and John Jay were nominated as delegates to be submitted to the public meeting, July 19th. The people met accordingly at the Coffee House, and after a stormy debate elected the committee's candidates in spite of a strong effort to substitute for Jay, McDougall, the hero of the Liberty Boys." This election, however, was not thought to be an adequate expression of the popular will, and polls were subsequently opened in each ward, on the 28th of July. The result was a unanimous vote for Jay and his colleagues. "Thus, fortunately, at the very inception of the Revolution, before the faintest clatter of arms, the popular movement was placed in charge of the 'Patricians' as they were called, rather than of the 'Tribunes,' as respectively represented by Jay and McDougall."—G. Pellew, *John Jay, ch* 2.—"The New York Committee of Fifty-One, having accomplished its object, appointed a day for the choice, by the freeholders of the city, of a 'Committee of Observation,' numbering sixty, to enforce in New York the Non-Importation Act of the late Congress; and when this new committee was duly elected and organized, with Isaac Low as chairman, the Fifty-One was dissolved "—Mrs. M J. Lamb, *Hist. of the City of N Y*, *v* 1, *p* 768

Also in: I. Q. Leake, *Life and Times of Gen. John Lamb, ch.* 6.—J. A. Stevens, *The Second Non-importation Agreement* (*Memorial Hist of the City of N. Y*, *v.* 2, *ch.* 11).

A. D. 1774.—The Boston Port Bill, the Massachusetts Act, and the Quebec Act.—The First Continental Congress. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1774

A. D. 1775 (April).—Disadvantages experienced by the patriots.—The first provincial Convention held.—"The republicans of the province of New York, composing by far the greater portion of the inhabitants, labored under severe disabilities. Acting Governor Colden was a Loyalist, and his council held office by the King's will. The assembly, though chosen by the people, continued in existence only by the King's prerogative. They might be dissolved by the representative of the crown (the acting governor) at any moment. There was no legally constituted body to form a rallying point for the patriots, as in Massachusetts, where there was an elective council and an annually elected assembly. In all the other colonies there was some nucleus of power around which the people might assemble and claim to be heard with respect. But in New York they were thrown back upon their own resources, and nobly did they preserve their integrity and maintain their cause, in spite of every obstacle. The whole continent was now moving in the direction of rebellion. . . The excitement in New York was equally intense. Toward the close of the preceding December, the Liberty Boys were called to action by the seizure of arms and ammunition, which some of them had imported, and had consigned to Walter Franklin, a well known merchant. These were seized by order of the collector, because, as he alleged, of the want of cockets, or custom-house warrants, they having been in store several days without them. While they were on their way to the custom-house, some of the Sons of Liberty rallied and seized them, but before they could be concealed they were retaken by government officials and sent on board a man-of-war in the harbor. . . . The republicans failed in their efforts, in the New York Assembly, to procure the appointment of delegates to the second Continental Congress, to be convened at Philadelphia in May. Nothing was left for them to do but to appeal to the people. The General Committee of sixty members, many of them of the loyal majority in the assembly, yielding to

the pressure of popular sentiment, called a meeting of the freeholders and freemen of the city at the Exchange, to take into consideration the election of delegates to a convention of representatives from such of the counties of the province as should adopt the measure, the sole object of such convention being the choice of proper persons to represent the colony in the Continental Congress. This movement was opposed by the loyalists. . . . At first there was confusion. This soon subsided, and the meeting proceeded with calmness and dignity to nominate eleven persons to represent the city in a provincial convention to be held in New York on the 20th [April], who were to be instructed to choose delegates to the Continental Congress. On the following day the chairman of the Committee of Sixty gave notice of the proposed convention on the 20th to the chairmen of the committees of correspondence in the different counties, advising them to choose delegates to the same. There was a prompt response. . . . The convention assembled at the Exchange, in New York, on the 20th, and consisted of 43 members [representing seven counties outside of New York city]. Colonel Schuyler was at the head of the delegation from Albany, and took a leading part in the convention. Philip Livingston was chosen president of the convention, and John M'Kesson, secretary. This was the first provincial convention in New York—the first positive expression of the doctrine of popular sovereignty in that province. They remained in session three days, and chose for delegates to the Continental Congress Philip Livingston, James Duane, John Alsop, John Jay, Simon Boerum, William Floyd, Henry Wisner, Philip Schuyler, George Clinton, Lewis Morris, Francis Lewis, and Robert R. Livingston, to whom were given full power, 'or any five of them, to meet the delegates from other colonies, and to concert and determine upon such measures as shall be judged most effectual for the preservation and reëstablishment of American rights and privileges, and for the restoration of harmony between Great Britain and her colonies.' While this convention was in session intelligence of the bloodshed at Lexington was on its way, but it did not reach New York until the day after the adjournment."—B. J. Lossing, *Life and Times of Philip Schuyler, v.* 1, *ch.* 17-18.

ALSO IN: W. Dunlap, *Hist. of New York, v.* 1, *ch.* 29.

A. D. 1775 (April—May).—The Beginning of the War of the American Revolution.—Lexington.—Concord.—Action upon the news.—Ethan Allen at Ticonderoga.—Siege of Boston.—Bunker Hill.—The Second Continental Congress. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775.

A. D. 1775 (April—September).—The Sons of Liberty take control of the city.—The end of royal government.—Flight of Governor Tryon.—"On Sunday, the 24th of April, 1775, the news of the battle of Lexington reached the city. This was the signal for open hostilities. Business was at once suspended; the Sons of Liberty assembled in large numbers, and, taking possession of the City Hall, distributed the arms that were stored in it, together with a quantity which had been deposited in the arsenal for safe keeping, among the citizens, a party of whom formed themselves into a voluntary corps under the command of Samuel Broome, and assumed the temporary government of the city. This done, they demanded and obtained the keys of the custom house, closed the building and laid an embargo upon the vessels in port destined for the eastern colonies. . . . It now became necessary to organize some provisional government for the city, and for this purpose, on the 5th of May, a meeting of the citizens was called at the Coffee-House, at which a Committee of One Hundred was chosen and invested with the charge of municipal affairs, the people pledging themselves to obey its orders until different arrangements should be made by the Continental Congress. This committee was composed in part of men inclined to the royalist cause, yet, such was the popular excitement at the time, that they were carried away by the current and forced to acquiesce in the measures of their more zealous colleagues. . . . The committee at once assumed the command of the city, and, retaining the corps of Broome as their executive power, prohibited the sale of weapons to any persons suspected of being hostile to the patriotic party. . . . The moderate men of the committee succeeded in prevailing on their colleagues to present a placable address to Lieutenant-Governor Colden, explanatory of their appointment, and assuring him that they should use every effort to preserve the public peace; yet ominous precautions were taken to put the arms of the city in a serviceable condition, and to survey the neighboring grounds with a view to erecting fortifications. . . . On the 25th of June, Washington entered New York on his way from Mount Vernon to Cambridge to take command of the army assembled there. The Provincial Congress received him with a cautious address. Despite their patriotism, they still clung to the shadow of loyalty; fearing to go too far, they acted constantly under protest that they desired nothing more than to secure to themselves the rights of true-born British subjects. The next morning Washington quitted the city, escorted on his way by the provincial militia. Tryon [Governor Tryon, who had been absent in England since the spring of 1774, leaving the government in the hands of Lieutenant-Governor Colden, and who now returned to resume it] had entered it the night before, and thus had been brought almost face to face with the rebel who was destined to work such a transformation in his majesty's colonies of America. The mayor and corporation received the returning governor with expressions of joy, and even the patriot party were glad of the change which relieved them from the government of Colden. . . . Meanwhile, the colony of New York had been ordered by the Continental Congress to contribute her quota of 8,000 men to the general defence, and four regiments were accordingly raised. . . . The city now presented a curious spectacle, as the seat of two governments, each issuing its own edicts, and denouncing those of the other as illegal authority. It was not long before the two powers came into collision." This was brought about by an order from the Provincial Congress, directing the removal of guns from the Battery. Shots were exchanged between the party executing this order and a boat from the ship of war "Asia"; whereupon the "Asia" cannonaded the town, riddling houses and wounding three citizens. "Hitherto, the governor had remained firm at his post, but finding his position daily growing more perilous,

despite the pledges of the corporation for his personal safety, he determined to abandon the city, and took refuge on board the 'Asia.'"—Mary L. Booth, *Hist. of the City of New York, ch.* 16.

ALSO IN: I. Q. Leake, *Life and Times of Gen.' John Lamb, ch.* 7.

A. D. 1776 (January—August).—Flight of Governor Tryon.—New York City occupied by Washington.—Battle of Long Island.—Defeat of the American army. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D 1776 (AUGUST).

A. D. 1776 (September — November).—The struggle for the city.—Washington's retreat.—The British in possession. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776 (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER).

A. D. 1776-1777.—The Jersey Prison-ship and the Sugar-house Prisons. See UNITED STATES OF AM.. A D 1776–1777 PRISONERS AND EXCHANGES.

A. D. 1776-1777.—The campaigns in New Jersey and Pennsylvania. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A D. 1776–1777. WASHINGTON'S RETREAT, and 1777 (JANUARY—DECEMBER)

A. D. 1777.—Adoption of a Constitution and organization of a State government.—Religious freedom established.—"After the Declaration of Independence, the several colonies proceeded to form State governments, by adopting constitutions. In that business New York moved early. On the 1st of August, 1776, a committee of the 'Convention of the Representatives of New York,' as the provisional government was called, sitting at White Plains, in Westchester County, were appointed to draw up and report a constitution. The committee consisted of the following named gentlemen John Jay, John Sloss Hobart, William Smith, William Duer, Gouverneur Morris, Robert R. Livingston, John Broome, John Morin Scott, Abraham Yates, Jr, Henry Wisner, Sen., Samuel Townsend, Charles De Witt and Robert Yates John Jay was the chairman, and to him was assigned the duty of drafting the Constitution. The Convention was made migratory by the stirring events of the war during the ensuing autumn and winter. First they held their sessions at Harlem Heights; then at White Plains; afterward at Fishkill, in Dutchess County, and finally at Kingston, in Ulster County, where they continued from February till May, 1777. There undisturbed the committee on the Constitution pursued their labors, and on the 12th of March, 1777, reported a draft of that instrument. It was under consideration in the Convention for more than a month after that, and was finally adopted on the 20th of April. Under it a State government was established by an ordinance of the Convention, passed in May, and the first session of the Legislature was appointed to meet at Kingston in July." The election of State officers was held in June. Jay and others issued a circular recommending General Schuyler for Governor and General George Clinton for Lieutenant Governor. But Schuyler "declined the honor, because he considered the situation of affairs in his Department too critical to be neglected by dividing his duties. The elections were held in all the Counties excepting New York, Kings, Queens, and Suffolk, then occupied by the British, and Brigadier General George Clinton was elected Governor, which office he held, by successive elections, for eighteen years, and afterward for three years Pierre Van Courtlandt, the President of the Senate, became Lieutenant Governor. Robert R. Livingston was appointed Chancellor; John Jay Chief Justice; Robert Yates and John Sloss Hobart judges of the Supreme Court, and Egbert Benson attorney-general. So it was that the great State of New York was organized and put into operation at a time when it was disturbed by formidable invasions on its northern, southern, and western frontiers"—B J. Lossing, *Life and Times of Philip Schuyler, v* 2, *ch* 9—The framers of this first constitution of the State of New York "proceeded at the outset to do away with the established church, repealing all such parts of the common law and all such statutes of the province 'as may be construed to establish or maintain any particular denomination of Christians or their ministers' Then followed a section which, it is believed, entitles New York to the honor of being the first organized government of the world to assert by constitutional provision the principle of perfect religious freedom. It reads as follows 'And whereas, we are required by the benevolent principles of rational liberty, not only to expel civil tyranny, but also to guard against that spiritual oppression and intolerance wherewith the bigotry and ambition of weak and wicked priests and princes have scourged mankind, this convention doth further, in the name and by the authority of the good people of this state, ordain, determine, and declare that the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever hereafter be allowed within this state to all mankind.' Thomas Jefferson, to whom Virginia is chiefly indebted for her religious liberty [embodied in her Declaration of Rights, in 1776] derived his religious as well as his political ideas from the philosophers of France But the men who framed this constitutional provision for New York, which has since spread over most of the United States, and lies at the base of American religious liberty, were not freethinkers, although they believed in freedom of thought Their Dutch ancestors had practised religious toleration, they expanded toleration into liberty, and in this form transmitted to posterity the heritage which Holland had sent across the sea a century and a half before."—D Campbell, *The Puritan in Holland, Eng and Am*, *v* 2, *pp.* 251–252.

ALSO IN W. Jay, *Life of John Jay, ch* 3 (*v* 1).—T. Roosevelt, *Gouverneur Morris, ch.* 3.—B. F. Butler, *Outline of Const. Hist. of N. Y* (*N. Y. Hist Soc Coll's, series* 2, *v.* 2).—See, also, UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D 1776–1779.

A. D. 1777.—Opposition to the recognition of the State independence of Vermont. See VERMONT: A. D. 1777–1778.

A. D. 1777-1778.—Burgoyne's invasion from Canada and his surrender.—The Articles of Confederation.—The alliance with France. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777 (JULY—OCTOBER), to 1778 (FEBRUARY).

A. D. 1778.—Fortifying West Point. See WEST POINT.

A. D. 1778.—The war on the Indian Border.—Activity of Tories and Savages.—The Massacre at Cherry Valley. See UNITED STATES OF AM: A. D. 1778 (JUNE—NOVEMBER). and (JULY).

A. D. 1778-1779.—Washington's ceaseless guard upon the Hudson. See UNITED STATES OF AM . A. D. 1778–1779 WASHINGTON GUARDING THE HUDSON.

A. D. 1779.—Sullivan's expedition against the Senecas. See UNITED STATES OF AM A. D. 1779 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER)

A. D. 1780.—Arnold's attempted betrayal of West Point. See UNITED STATES OF AM · A. D. 1780 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER)

A. D. 1780-1783.—The war in the South.—The surrender of Cornwallis.—Peace with Great Britain. See UNITED STATES OF AM A. D 1780, to 1783

A. D. 1781.—Western territorial claims and their cession to the United States. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D 1781–1786

A. D. 1783.—Flight of the Tories, or Loyalists. See TORIES OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A. D. 1783.—Evacuation of New York City by the British. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D 1783 (NOVEMBER—DECEMBER)

A. D. 1784.—Founding of the Bank of New York. See MONEY AND BANKING A D 1780–1784

A. D. 1786.—Rejection of proposed amendments to the Articles of Confederation. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D 1783–1787

A. D. 1786-1799.—Land-fee of Western New York ceded to Massachusetts.—The Phelps and Gorham Purchase.—The Holland Purchase.—The founding of Buffalo.—The conflicting territorial claims of New York and Massachusetts, caused by the overlapping grants of the English crown, were not all settled by the cession of western claims to the United States which New York made in 1781 and Massachusetts in 1785 (see UNITED STATES OF AM . A. D 1781–1786) "Although the nominal amount in controversy, by these acts, was much diminished, it still left some 19,000 square miles of territory in dispute, but this controversy was finally settled by a convention of Commissioners appointed by the parties, held at Hartford, Conn., on the 16th day of December, 1786 According to the stipulations entered into by the convention, Massachusetts ceded to the state of New York all her claim to the government, sovereignty, and jurisdiction of all the territory lying west of the present east line of the state of New York, and New York ceded to Massachusetts the pre emption right or fee of the land subject to the title of the natives, of all that part of the state of New York lying west of a line beginning at a point in the north line of Pennsylvania, 82 miles west of the north-east corner of said state, and running from thence due north through Seneca lake to lake Ontario; excepting and reserving to the state of New York a strip of land east of and adjoining the eastern bank of Niagara river, one mile wide and extending its whole length. The land. the pre-emption right of which was thus ceded, amounted to about 6,000,000 of acres. In April, 1788, Massachusetts contracted to sell to Nathaniel Gorham of Charlestown, Middlesex county, and Oliver Phelps of Granville, Hampshire county, of said state, their pre-emption right to all the lands in Western New York, amounting to about 6,000,000 acres, for the sum of $1,000,000, to be paid in three annual instalments, for which a kind of scrip Massachusetts had issued, called consolidated securities, was to be received, which was then in market much below par. In July, 1788, Messrs. Gorham and Phelps purchased of the Indians by treaty, at a convention held at Buffalo, the Indian title to about 2,600,000 acres of the eastern part of their purchase from Massachusetts. This purchase of the Indians being bounded west by a line beginning at a point in the north line of the state of Pennsylvania, due south of the corner or point of land made by the confluence of the Kanahasgwaicon (Cannaseraga) creek with the waters of Genesee river; thence north on said meridian line to the corner or point at the confluence aforesaid, thence northwardly along the waters of said Genesee river to a point two miles north of Kanawageras (Cannewagus) village; thence running due west 12 miles, thence running northwardly, so as to be 12 miles distant from the westward bounds of said river, to the shore of lake Ontario On the 21st day of November, 1788, the state of Massachusetts conveyed and forever quitclaimed to N Gorham and O Phelps, their heirs and assigns forever, all the right and title of said state to all that tract of country of which Messrs Phelps and Gorham had extinguished the Indian title This tract, and this only, has since been designated as the Phelps and Gorham Purchase . . So rapid were the sales of the proprietors that before the 18th day of November, 1790, they had disposed of about 50 townships [each six miles square], which were mostly sold by whole townships or large portions of townships, to sundry individuals and companies of farmers and others, formed for that purpose On the 18th day of November, 1790, they sold the residue of their tract (reserving two townships only), amounting to upwards of a million and a quarter acres of land, to Robert Morris of Philadelphia, who soon sold the same to Sir William Pultney, an English gentleman . This property, or such part of it as was unsold at the time of the decease of Sir William, together with other property which he purchased in his lifetime in its vicinity, is now [1849] called the Pultney Estate . . Messrs Phelps and Gorham, who had paid about one third of the purchase money of the whole tract purchased of Massachusetts, in consequence of the rise of the value of Massachusetts consolidated stock (in which the payments for the land were to be received) from 20 per cent. to par, were unable further to comply with their engagements" After long negotiations they were permitted to relinquish to the state of Massachusetts all that western section of their purchase of which they had not acquired the Indian title, and this was resold in March, 1791, by Massachusetts, to Samuel Ogden, acting for Robert Morris Morris made several sales from the eastern portion of his purchase, to the state of Connecticut (investing its school fund) and to others, in large blocks known subsequently as the Ogden Tract, the Cragie Tract, the Connecticut Tract, etc. The remainder or most of it, covering the greater part of western New York, was disposed of to certain gentlemen in Holland, and came to be generally known as the Holland Purchase.—O. Turner, *Pioneer Hist. of the Holland Purchase, pp.* 325 *and* 396–424.—"Much has been written and more has been said about the 'Holland Company.' When people wished to be especially precise, they called it the 'Holland Land Company.'. . . Yet there never was any

such thing as the Holland Company or the Holland Land Company. Certain merchants and others of the city of Amsterdam placed funds in the hands of friends who were citizens of America to purchase several tracts of land in the United States, which, being aliens, the Hollanders could not hold in their own name at that time. One of these tracts, comprising what was afterwards known as the Holland Purchase, was bought from Robert Morris. . . . In the forepart of 1798 the legislature of New York authorized those aliens to hold land within the State, and in the latter part of that year the American trustees conveyed the Holland Purchase to the real owners." The great territory covered by the Purchase surrounded several Indian "Reservations"—large blocks of land, that is, which the aboriginal Seneca proprietors reserved for their own occupancy when they parted with their title to the rest, which they did at a council held in 1797. One of these Reservations embraced the site now occupied by the city of Buffalo. Joseph Ellicott, the agent of the Holland proprietors, quickly discerned its prospective importance, and made an arrangement with his Indian neighbors by which he secured possession of the ground at the foot of Lake Erie and the head of Niagara River, in exchange for another piece of land six miles away Here, in 1799, Ellicott began the founding of a town which he called New Amsterdam, but which subsequently took the name of the small stream, Buffalo Creek, on which it grew up, and which, by deepening and enlargement, became its harbor — C. Johnson, *Centennial Hist of Erie Co , N Y , ch.* 18.

ALSO IN: O. Turner, *Hist. of the Pioneer Settlement of Phelps' and Gorham's Purchase, pt.* 2 — The same, *Pioneer Hist of the Holland Purchase, pp.* 401-424.—H L Osgood, *The Title of the Phelps and Gorham Purchase (Rochester Hist. Soc Publications, v.* 1).

A. D. 1787-1788.—The formation and adoption of the Federal Constitution.—The chief battle ground of the contest. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1787, and 1787-1789.

A. D. 1789.—Inauguration of President Washington in New York City. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1789-1792.

A. D. 1789.—The beginnings of Tammany. See TAMMANY SOCIETY.

A. D. 1790.—Renunciation of claims to Vermont. See VERMONT: A. D 1790-1791

A. D. 1799.—Gradual emancipation of Slaves enacted.—During the session of the legislature in April, 1799, "emancipation was at last enacted. It was provided that all children born of slave parents after the ensuing 4th of July should be free, subject to apprenticeship, in the case of males till the age of 28, in the case of females till the age of 25, and the exportation of slaves was forbidden. By this process of gradual emancipation there was avoided that question of compensation which had been the secret of the failure of earlier bills. At that time the number of slaves was only 22,000, small in proportion to the total population of nearly a million. So the change was effected peacefully and without excitement."—G. Pellew, *John Jay, p.* 338.

A. D. 1795-1803.—Beginnings of the State School System. See EDUCATION, MODERN: AMERICA: A. D. 1776-1880.

A. D. 1807.—Fulton's first steamboat on the Hudson. See STEAM NAVIGATION. THE BEGINNINGS.

A. D. 1812-1815.—The war on the Canadian frontier. See UNITED STATES OF AM: A D 1812 (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER), 1813 (OCTOBER—NOVEMBER); 1813 (DECEMBER); 1814 (JULY—SEPTEMBER); 1814 (SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1817-1819.—The Clintonians and Bucktails.—During the first term of De Witt Clinton as governor of the State, the feud in the Democratic Republican party, between his supporters and his opponents, which began in 1812 when he audaciously sought to attain the Presidency, against Madison, assumed a fixed and definite form "Clinton's Republican adversaries were dubbed 'Bucktails,' from the ornaments worn on ceremonial occasions by the Tammany men, who had long been Clinton's enemies The Bucktails and their successors were the 'regular' Republicans, or the Democrats as they were later called; and they kept their regularity until, long afterwards, the younger and greater Bucktail leader [Martin Van Buren], when venerable and laden with honors, became the titular head of the Barnburner defection. The merits of the feud between Bucktails and Clintonians it is now difficult to find. Each accused the other of coquetting with the Federalists, and the accusation of one of them was nearly always true" —E M Shepard, *Martin Van Buren, p.* 56.

ALSO IN. J Schouler, *Hist. of the U. S., v.* 3, *p* 227 —J D Hammond, *Hist. of Political Parties in the State of New York, v.* 1, *p.* 450.

A. D. 1817-1825.—Construction of the Erie Canal.—"History will assign to Gouverneur Morris the merit of first suggesting a direct and continuous communication from Lake Erie to the Hudson. In 1800, he announced this idea from the shore of the Niagara river to a friend in Europe. . . . The praise awarded to Gouverneur Morris must be qualified by the fact, that the scheme he conceived was that of a canal with a uniform declination, and without locks, from Lake Erie to the Hudson. Morris communicated his project to Simeon De Witt in 1803, by whom it was made known to James Geddes in 1804. It afterward became the subject of conversation between Mr. Geddes and Jesse Hawley, and this communication is supposed to have given rise to the series of essays written by Mr. Hawley, under the signature of 'Hercules,' in the 'Genesee Messenger,' continued from October, 1807, until March, 1808, which first brought the public mind into familiarity with the subject. These essays, written in a jail, were the grateful return, by a patriot, to a country which punished him with imprisonment for being unable to pay debts owed to another citizen, and displayed deep research, with singular vigor and comprehensiveness of thought, and traced with prophetic accuracy a large portion of the outline of the Erie canal. In 1807, Albert Gallatin, then secretary of the treasury, in pursuance of a recommendation made by Thomas Jefferson, president of the United States, reported a plan for appropriating all the surplus revenues of the general government to the construction of canals and turnpike roads; and it embraced in one grand and comprehensive view, nearly without exception, all the works which have since been executed or attempted by the several states in

the Union. . . . In 1808, Joshua Forman, a representative in the assembly from Onondaga county, submitted his memorable resolution," referring to the recommendation made by President Jefferson to the federal congress, and directing that "'a joint committee be appointed to take into consideration the propriety of exploring and causing an accurate survey to be made of the most eligible and direct route for a canal, to open a communication between the tide waters of the Hudson river and Lake Erie, to the end that Congress may be enabled to appropriate such sums as may be necessary to the accomplishment of that great national object.'" The committee was appointed, its report was favorable, and the survey was directed to be made. "There was then no civil engineer in the state. James Geddes, a land surveyor, who afterward became one of our most distinguished engineers, by the force of native genius and application in mature years, levelled and surveyed, under instructions from the surveyor-general," several routes to Lake Ontario and to Lake Erie. "Mr. Geddes' report showed that a canal from Lake Erie to the Hudson was practicable, and could be made without serious difficulty. In 1810, on motion of Jonas Platt, of the senate, who was distinguished throughout a pure and well-spent life by his zealous efforts to promote this great undertaking, Gouverneur Morris, De Witt Clinton, Stephen Van Rensselaer, Simeon De Witt, William North, Thomas Eddy, and Peter B. Porter, were appointed commissioners 'to explore the whole route for inland navigation from the Hudson river to Lake Ontario and to Lake Erie.' Cadwallader D. Colden, a contemporary historian, himself one of the earliest and ablest advocates of the canals, awards to Thomas Eddy the merit of having suggested this motion to Mr. Platt, and to both these gentlemen that of engaging De Witt Clinton's support, he being at that time a member of the senate. . . . The commissioners in March, 1811, submitted their report written by Gouverneur Morris, in which they showed the practicability and advantages of a continuous canal from Lake Erie to the Hudson, and stated their estimate of the cost at $5,000,000. . . . On the presentation of this report, De Witt Clinton introduced a bill, which became a law on the 8th of April, 1811, under the title of 'An act to provide for the improvement of the internal navigation of this state.'. . . The act added Robert R. Livingston and Robert Fulton to the board of commissioners, and authorized them to consider all matters relating to such inland navigation, with powers to make application in behalf of the state to Congress, or to any state or territory, to cooperate and aid in the undertaking. . . . Two of the commissioners, Mr. Morris and Mr. Clinton, repaired to the federal capital, and submitted the subject to the consideration of the President (Mr. Madison) and of Congress. In 1812, the commissioners reported that, although it was uncertain whether the national government would do anything, it certainly would do nothing which would afford immediate aid to the enterprise. . . . The commissioners then submitted that, having offered the canal to the national government, and that offer having virtually been declined, the state was now at liberty to consult and pursue the maxims of policy, and these seemed to demand imperatively that the canal should be made by herself, and for her own account, as soon as the circumstances would permit. . . . On the 19th of June, 1812, a law was enacted, reappointing the commissioners and authorizing them to borrow money and deposite it in the treasury, and to take cessions of land, but prohibiting any measures to construct the canals. . . . From 1812 to 1815, the country suffered the calamities of war, and projects of internal improvement necessarily gave place to the patriotic efforts required to maintain the national security and honor." But after peace had returned, the advocates of the enterprise prevailed with considerable difficulty over its opponents, and "ground was broken for the construction of the Erie canal on the 4th day of July, 1817, at Rome, with ceremonies marking the public estimation of that great event. De Witt Clinton, having just before been elected to the chief magistracy of the state, and being president of the board of canal commissioners, enjoyed the high satisfaction of attending, with his associates, on the auspicious occasion. . . . On the 26th of October, 1825, the Erie canal was in a navigable condition throughout its entire length, affording an uninterrupted passage from Lake Erie to tidewater in the Hudson. . . . This auspicious consummation was celebrated by a telegraphic discharge of cannon, commencing at Lake Erie [at Buffalo], and continued along the banks of the canal and of the Hudson, announcing to the city of New York the entrance on the bosom of the canal of the first barge [bearing Governor Clinton and his coadjutors] that was to arrive at the commercial emporium from the American Mediterraneans." —W. H. Seward, *Notes on New York* (*Works*, v. 2), *pp.* 88–117.

ALSO IN: D. Hosack, *Memoir of De Witt Clinton, pp.* 82–119 *and* 245–504.—J. Renwick, *Life of De Witt Clinton, ch.* 10–19.—C. D. Colden, *Memoir: Celebration of the Completion of the N. Y. Canals.*—M. S. Hawley, *Origin of the Erie Canal.*

A. D. 1821.—Revision of the Constitution. —"The Constitution did not meet the expectations of its framers. The cumbrous machinery by which it was sought to insure the control of the People, through the supremacy of the Assembly, had only resulted in fortifying power practically beyond their reach. The Council of Revision was objected to because it had exercised the veto power contrary to the spirit of the Constitution, which was in harmony with the traditions of the Colony from the earliest conflict with the executive power; and because the officers who thus interposed their objections to the will of the Legislature, holding office for good behavior (except the Governor), were beyond the reach of the People. It was seen that this power was a dangerous one, in a Council so constituted; but it was thought that it could be safely intrusted to the Governor alone, as he was directly responsible to the People. The Council of Appointment, although not vested with any judicial authority, and in fact disclaiming it, nevertheless at an early day summoned its appointees before it, for the purpose of hearing accusations against them, and proving their truth or falsity. At a later day, more summary proceedings were resorted to. The office thus became very unpopular. Nearly every civil, military, and judicial officer of the commonwealth was appointed by this Council. In 1821,

8,987 military and 6,663 civil officers held their commissions from it, and this vast system of centralized power was naturally very obnoxious. The Legislature, in 1820, passed 'an act recommending a Convention of the People of this State,' which came up for action in the Council of Revision, on November 20th of the same year; present, Governor Clinton, Chancellor Kent, Chief Justice Spencer, and Justices Yates and Woodworth, on which day the Council, by the casting vote of the Governor, adopted two objections to it; first, because it did not provide for taking the sense of the People on the question; and second, because it submitted the new Constitution to the People in toto, instead of by sections. These objections were referred to a select committee, Michael Ulshoeffer, chairman, who submitted their report January 9, 1821, in opposition to the opinion of the Council, which was adopted by the Assembly. The bill, however, failed to pass, not receiving a two-third vote. Immediately thereupon a committee was appointed to draft a new bill. The committee subsequently introduced a bill for submitting the question to the people, which passed both Houses, received the sanction of the Council of Revision on the 13th of March, and was subsequently amended, the amendments receiving the sanction of the Council on the third of April The popular vote on holding the Convention was had in April, and resulted as follows: 'For Convention' 109,346. 'For No Convention' 34,901. The Convention assembled in Albany, August 28, and adjourned November 10, 1821 The Council of Revision was abolished, and its powers transferred to the Governor The Council of Appointment was abolished without a dissenting voice. The principal department officers were directed to be appointed on an open separate nomination by the two Houses, and subsequent joint ballot. Of the remaining officers not made elective, the power of appointment was conferred upon the Governor, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In 1846, two hundred and eighty-nine offices were thus filled. The elective franchise was extended The Constitution was adopted at an election held in February, 1822, by the following vote Constitution—For, 74,732: Against, 41,402. . . . The People took to themselves a large portion of the power they had felt it necessary, in the exercise of a natural conservatism, to intrust to the Assembly. They had learned that an elective Governor and an elective Senate are equally their agents, and interests which they thought ought to be conserved, they intrusted to them, subject to their responsibility to the People. The entire Senate were substituted in the place of the members who chanced to be the favorites with a majority in the Assembly, as a Council to the Governor, and thus the People of all the State were given a voice in appointments. The Supreme Judicial Tribunal remained the same. The direct sovereignty of the People was thus rendered far more effective, and popular government took the place of parliamentary administration."—E. A. Werner, *Civil List and Const. Hist. of N. Y.*, 1887, *pp.* 126-128.

A. D. 1823.—The rise of the Albany Regency.—"The adoption of the new constitution in 1822 placed the political power of the State in the hands of Mr. Van Buren, the recognised representative leader of the Democratic party. Governor Clinton, as the end of his term of service approached, became as powerless as he was in 1816 . . . William L. Marcy was then State Comptroller, Samuel L. Talcott, Attorney-General; Benjamin Knower, Treasurer; and Edwin Crosswell, editor of the 'Argus' and state printer. These gentlemen, with Mr Van Buren as their chief, constituted the nucleus of what became the Albany Regency. After adding Silas Wright, Azariah C. Flagg, John A. Dix, James Porter, Thomas W. Olcott, and Charles E. Dudley to their number, I do not believe that a stronger political combination ever existed at any state capital. . . . Their influence and power for nearly twenty years was almost as potential in national as in state politics "—T. Weed, *Autobiography, v.* 1, *ch.* 11.—"Even to our own day, the Albany Regency has been a strong and generally a sagacious influence in its party. John A Dix, Horatio Seymour, Dean Richmond and Samuel J. Tilden long directed its policy, and from the chief seat in its councils the late secretary of the treasury, Daniel Manning, was chosen in 1885."—E. M. Shepard, *Martin Van Buren, p.* 96.

A. D. 1826-1832.—Anti-Masonic excitement.—The abduction of Morgan.—"The society of free masons included a large number of the foremost citizens in all walks of life, and the belief existed that they used their secret ties to advance their ambitions. . . This belief was used to create prejudice among those who were not members, and it added fuel to the fires of faction. At this juncture, September 11, 1826, William Morgan, of Batavia, a free-mason, who had announced his intention to print a pamphlet exposing the secrets of masonry, was arrested on a charge of larceny, made by the master of a masonic lodge, but found not guilty, and then arrested for debt, and imprisoned in jail at Canandaigua. He was taken secretly from that jail and conveyed to Fort Niagara, where he was kept until September, when he disappeared. The masons were charged with his abduction, and a body found in the Niagara River was produced as proof that he was drowned to put him out of the way. Thurlow Weed, then an editor in Rochester, was aggressive in charging that Morgan was murdered by the masons, and as late as 1882 he published an affidavit rehearsing a confession made to him by John Whitney, that the drowning was in fact perpetrated by himself and four other persons whom he named, after a conference in a masonic lodge. In 1827, Weed, who was active in identifying the drowned body, was charged with mutilating it, to make it resemble Morgan, and the imputation was often repeated; and the abduction and murder were in turn laid at the door of the anti-masons. The disappearance became the chief topic of partisan discussion. De Witt Clinton was one of the highest officers in the masonic order, and it was alleged that he commanded that Morgan's book should be 'suppressed at all hazards,' thus instigating the murder; but the slander was soon exposed. The state was flooded with volumes portraying masonry as a monstrous conspiracy, and the literature of the period was as harrowing as a series of sensational novels."—E. H. Roberts, *New York, v.* 2, *ch.* 38.—"A party soon grew up in Western New York pledged to oppose the election of any Free Mason to public office. The Anti-Masonic Party acquired influence

in other States, and began to claim rank as a national political party On most points its principles were those of the National Republicans. But Clay, as well as Jackson, was a Free Mason, and consequently to be opposed by this party. . . . In 1832 it even nominated a Presidential ticket of its own, but, having no national principle of controlling importance, it soon after declined."—A. Johnston, *Hist of Am Politics, ch.* 12, *sect* 3, *with foot-note*

ALSO IN. T Weed, *Autobiography, ch* 20-30, 36, *and* 40

A. D. 1827.—The last of Slavery in the state.—"On the 28th of January, 1817, the governor sent a message to the legislature recommending the entire abolition of slavery in the State of New York, to take place on the fourth day of July, 1827 By an act passed some years before, all persons born of parents who were slaves after July 1799, were to be free, males at twenty eight and females at twenty-five years of age. The present legislature adopted the recommendation of the governor. This great measure in behalf of human rights, which was to obliterate forever the black and foul stain of slavery from the escutcheon of our own favored state, was produced by the energetic action of Cadwallader D. Colden, Peter A Jay, William Jay, Daniel D Tompkins and other distinguished philanthropists, chiefly residing in the city of New York. The Society of Friends, who never slumber when the principles of benevolence and a just regard to equal rights call for their action, were zealously engaged in this great enterprise" —J D. Hammond, *Hist of Political Parties in the State of N. Y., v* 1, *ch* 22

ALSO IN. E H. Roberts, *New York, v* 2, *p* 565.

A. D. 1835-1837.—The Loco-focos.—"The Van Buren party began to be called the Loco-focos, in derision of the fancied extravagance of their financial doctrines The Loco foco or Equal Rights party proper was originally a division of the Democrats, strongly anti-monopolist in their opinions, and especially hostile to banks,—not only government banks but all banks,—which enjoyed the privileges then long conferred by special and exclusive charters In the fall of 1835 some of the Democratic candidates in New York were especially obnoxious to the anti-monopolists of the party. When the meeting to regularly confirm the nominations made in committee was called at Tammany Hall, the anti-monopolist Democrats sought to capture the meeting by a rush up the main stairs The regulars, however, showed themselves worthy of their regularity by reaching the room up the back stairs. In a general scrimmage the gas was put out. The anti-monopolists, perhaps used to the devices to prevent meetings which might be hostile, were ready with candles and loco-foco matches. The hall was quickly illuminated, and the anti-monopolists claimed that they had defeated the nominations. The regulars were successful, however, at the election; and they and the Whigs dubbed the anti-monopolists the Loco-foco men. . . . The hatred which Van Buren after his message of September, 1837, received from the banks commended him to the Loco-focos; and in October, 1837, Tammany Hall witnessed their reconciliation with the regular Democrats upon a moderate declaration for equal rights."—E. M. Shepard, *Martin Van Buren, pp.* 293-295.

A. D. 1838.—Passage of the Free Banking Act. See MONEY AND BANKING: A. D. 1838

A. D. 1839-1846.—The Anti-rent disturbances. See LIVINGSTON MANOR

A. D. 1840-1841.—The McLeod Case. See CANADA. A. D 1840-1841

A. D. 1845-1846.—Schism in the Democratic party over Slavery extension.—Hunkers and Barnburners. See UNITED STATES OF AM. A D. 1845-1846.

A. D. 1846.—Constitutional revision.—During the twenty-five years of the existence of the constitution of 1821, "ten different proposals for amendments were submitted to the electors, who decided against choosing presidential electors by districts, but in favor of extending the franchise, in favor of electing mayors by the people, and in 1846 for no license except in the city of New York. The commonwealth grew not only in population, but in all the elements of progress and prosperity and power, and by the census of 1845 was shown to contain 2,604,495 inhabitants Legislation had tended to the substitution of rights for privileges granted as favors The tenure of land, especially under the claims of the patroons, had caused difficulties for which remedies were sought, and the large expenditures for internal improvements, involving heavy indebtedness, prompted demands for safe-guards for the creditor and the taxpayer. The judiciary system had confessedly become independent, and required radical reformation. When, therefore, in 1845, the electors were called upon to decide whether a convention should be held to amend the State constitution, 213,257 voted in the affirmative, against 33,860 in the negative. The convention met June 1, 1846, but soon adjourned until October 9, when it proceeded with its task John Tracy of Chenango presided, and among the members were Ira Harris of Albany, George W Patterson of Chautauqua, Michael Hoffman and Arphaxed Loomis of Herkimer, Samuel J Tilden of New York, Samuel Nelson of Otsego, and others eminent at home and in State affairs. The convention dealt radically with the principles of government. The new constitution gave to the people the election of many officers before appointed at Albany It provided for the election of members of both houses of the legislature by separate districts. Instead of the cumbrous court for the correction of errors, it established an independent court of appeals. It abolished the court of chancery and the circuit courts, and merged both into the supreme court, and defined the jurisdiction of county courts. All judges were to be elected by the people. Feudal tenures were abolished, and no leases on agricultural lands for a longer period than twelve years were to be valid, if any rent or service were reserved The financial articles established sinking funds for both the canal and general fund debt, forbade the loan of the credit of the State, and limited rigidly the power of the legislature to create debts, except to repel invasion or suppress insurrection, and declared the school and literature funds inviolate. Provision was made for general laws for the formation of corporations. The constitution required the submission to the people once every twenty years of the question whether a convention shall be called or not."—E. H. Roberts, *New York, v.* 2, *pp.* 557-569.

A. D. 1848.—The Free Soil movement.—The Buffalo Convention. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1848.

A. D. 1848.—Legal Emancipation of Women. See LAW, COMMON: A D. 1839–1848

A. D. 1848.—Adoption of the Code of Civil Procedure. See LAW, COMMON. A. D 1848–1888

A. D. 1861 (April).—The speeding of the Seventh Regiment to the defense of Washington. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D 1861 (APRIL—MAY: MARYLAND).

A. D. 1862-1886.—The founding and growth of Cornell University. See EDUCATION, MODERN: AMERICA. A D 1862–1886

A. D. 1863.—The Draft Riots in New York City.—"A new levy of 300,000 men was called for in April, 1863, with the alternative of a draft, if the quotas were not filled by volunteering. The quota of the city of New York was not filled, and a draft was begun there on Saturday, the 11th of July. There had been premonitions of trouble when it was attempted to take the names and addresses of those subject to call, and in the tenement-house districts some of the marshals had narrowly escaped with their lives On the morning when the draft was to begin, several of the most widely read Democratic journals contained editorials that appeared to be written for the very purpose of inciting a riot. They asserted that any draft at all was unconstitutional and despotic, and that in this case the quota demanded from the city was excessive, and denounced the war as a 'mere abolition crusade' It is doubtful if there was any well formed conspiracy, including any large number of persons, to get up a riot, but the excited state of the public mind, especially among the laboring population, inflammatory handbills displayed in the grog shops, the presence of the dangerous classes, whose best opportunity for plunder was in time of riot, and the absence of the militia that had been called away to meet the invasion of Pennsylvania, all favored an outbreak It was unfortunate that the draft was begun on Saturday, and the Sunday papers published long lists of the names that were drawn—an instance of the occasional mischievous results of journalistic enterprise . When the draft was resumed on Monday, the serious work began One provost-marshal's office was at the corner of Third Avenue and Forty Sixth street It was guarded by sixty policemen, and the wheel was set in motion at ten o'clock The building was surrounded by a dense, angry crowd, who were freely cursing the draft, the police, the National Government, and 'the nigger.' The drawing had been in progress, but a few minutes when there was a shout of 'stop the cars!' and at once the cars were stopped, the horses released, the conductors and passengers driven out, and a tumult created. Then a great human wave was set in motion, which bore down everything before it and rolled into the marshal's office, driving out at the back windows the officials and the policemen, whose clubs, though plied rapidly and knocking down a rioter at every blow, could not dispose of them as fast as they came on The mob destroyed everything in the office, and then set the building on fire. The firemen came promptly, but were not permitted to throw any water upon the flames. At this moment Superintendent John A. Kennedy, of the police, approaching incautiously and unarmed, was recognized and set upon by the crowd, who gave him half a hundred blows with clubs and stones, and finally threw him face downward into a mud-puddle, with the intention of drowning him. When rescued, he was bruised beyond recognition, and was lifted into a wagon and carried to the police headquarters. The command of the force now devolved upon Commissioner Thomas C. Acton and Inspector Daniel Carpenter, whose management during three fearful days was worthy of the highest praise Another marshal's office, where the draft was in progress, was at Broadway and Twenty-Ninth street, and here the mob burned the whole block of stores on Broadway between Twenty-Eighth and Twenty-Ninth streets In the afternoon a small police force held possession of a gun-factory in Second Avenue for four hours, and was then compelled to retire before the persistent attacks of the rioters, who hurled stones through the windows and beat in the doors Toward evening a riotous procession passed down Broadway, with drums, banners, muskets, pistols, pitchforks, clubs, and boards inscribed 'No Draft! Inspector Carpenter, at the head of two hundred policemen, marched up to meet it. His orders were, 'Take no prisoners, but strike quick and hard' The mob was met at the corner of Amity (or West Third) street. The police charged at once in a compact body, Carpenter knocking down the foremost rioter with a blow that cracked his skull, and in a few moments the mob scattered and fled, leaving Broadway strewn with their wounded and dying. From this time, the police were victorious in every encounter During the next two days there was almost constant rioting, mobs appearing at various points, both up-town and down-town The rioters set upon every negro that appeared—whether man, woman, or child—and succeeded in murdering eleven of them. . . . This phase of the outbreak found its worst expression in the sacking and burning of the Colored Orphan Asylum, at Fifth Avenue and Forty Fourth street The two hundred helpless children were with great difficulty taken away by the rear doors while the mob were battering at the front . One of the saddest incidents of the riot was the murder of Colonel Henry J. O'Brien of the 11th N. Y. Volunteers, whose men had dispersed one mob with a deadly volley. An hour or two later the Colonel returned to the spot alone, when he was set upon and beaten and mangled and tortured horribly for several hours, being at last killed by some frenzied women.

. Three days of this vigorous work by the police and the soldiers brought the disturbance to an end About fifty policemen had been injured, three of whom died; and the whole number of lives destroyed by the rioters was eighteen. The exact number of rioters killed is unknown, but it was more than 1,200 The mobs burned about 50 buildings, destroying altogether between $2,000,000 and $3,000,000 worth of property. Governor Seymour incurred odium by a speech to the rioters, in which he addressed them as his friends, and promised to have the draft stopped; and by his communications to the President, in which he complained of the draft, and asked to have it suspended till the question of its constitutionality could be tested in the courts."—R. Johnson, *Short Hist. of the War of Secession*, ch. 18.

ALSO IN: J. C. Nicolay and J. Hay, *Abraham Lincoln, v. 7, ch. 1.*—H. Greeley, *The American Conflict, v. 2, ch. 21.*—D. M. Barnes, *The Draft Riots in N. Y.*

A. D. 1863-1871.—The Tweed Ring.—Between 1863 and 1871 the city of New York, and, to a considerable extent, the state at large, fell under the control and into the power of a combination of corrupt politicians commonly known as the Tweed Ring. Its chief was one William Marcy Tweed, of Scotch parentage, who first appeared in public life as an alderman of the city, in 1850. Working himself upward, in the Democratic party, to which he adhered, he attained in 1863 the powerful dignity of Grand Sachem of the Tammany Society and chairman or "Boss" of the general committee of Tammany Hall. "At this time, however, the Tammany 'Ring,' as it afterwards was called, was not completely formed, and Tammany Hall, though by far the most important political organization in the city, was not absolute even in the Democratic party. It had a bitter enemy in Mozart Hall, a political organization led by Fernando Wood, a former mayor of the city. The claims of Mozart Hall were satisfied in this same year, 1863, by granting to its leader the Democratic nomination to Congress . . Soon afterwards Tweed was appointed deputy-commissioner of streets. The 'Ring' was now fast consolidating. The enormous patronage possessed by its members enabled them to control almost all the nominations of the Democratic party to positions in the city. They provided their adherents with places in the city government, and when the supply of places became inadequate, they enlarged the city pay-roll to create new places. By means of the political influence they exerted over the Democratic party in the State, they packed the State legislature with their followers, and placed upon the bench judges on whom they could rely. . . . In 1865 the Ring obtained control of the mayoralty. Its candidate, John T. Hoffman, was a man of much higher character than his supporters and associates. He was personally honest, but his ambition blinded him to the acts of his political friends. . . . In 1868 . . . Hoffman was nominated for governor and was elected. His election was secured by the grossest and most extensive frauds ever perpetrated in the city, e. g. illegal naturalization of foreigners, false registration, repeating of votes, and unfair counting. The mayoralty, left vacant by the promotion of Hoffman, was filled by the election of Hall [A. Oakey Hall], who took his seat on the 1st day of January 1869. As Samuel J. Tilden said, by this election 'the Ring became completely organized and matured.' It controlled the common council of the city and the legislature of the State, and its nominee sat in the gubernatorial chair. Hall was mayor; Sweeny [Peter B. Sweeny, 'the great schemer of the Ring'] was city chamberlain or treasurer of both city and county; Tweed was practically supreme in the street department, Connolly [Richard B.] was city comptroller, and thus had charge of the city finances; the city judiciary was in sympathy with these men." But great as were the power and the opportunities of the Ring, it obtained still more of both through its well-paid creatures in the State legislature, by amendments of the city charter and by acts which gave Tweed and his partners free swing in debt-making for the city. In 1871, the last year of the existence of the Ring, it had more than $48,000,000 of money at its disposal. Its methods of fraud were varied and numerous. "But all the other enterprises of the Ring dwindle into insignificance when compared with the colossal frauds that were committed in the building of the new court-house for the county. When this undertaking was begun, it was stipulated that its total cost should not exceed $250,000; but before the Ring was broken up, upwards of $8,000,000 had been expended, and the work was not completed. . . . Whenever a bill was brought in by one of the contractors, he was directed to increase largely the total of his charge. . . . A warrant was then drawn for the amount of the bill as raised, the contractor was paid, perhaps the amount of his original bill, perhaps a little more; and the difference between the original and the raised bills was divided between the members of the Ring. It is said that about 65 per cent of the bills actually paid by the county represented fraudulent addition of this sort." The beginning of the end of the reign of the Ring came in July, 1871, when copies of some of the fraudulent accounts, made by a clerk in the auditor's office, came into the possession of the New York Times and were published. "The result of these exposures was a meeting of citizens early in September . . It was followed by the formation of a sort of peaceable vigilance committee, under the imposing title of the 'Committee of Seventy.' This committee, together with Samuel J. Tilden (long a leading Democratic politician, and afterwards candidate for the presidency of the United States), went to work at once, and with great energy, to obtain actual proof of the frauds described by the 'Times.' It was owing mainly to the tireless endeavours of Mr. Tilden . . . that this work was successful, and that prosecutions were brought against several members of the Ring." The Tammany leaders attempted to make a scapegoat of Connolly; but the latter came to terms with Mr Tilden, and virtually turned over his office to Mr. Andrew H. Green, of the Committee of Seventy, appointing him deputy comptroller, with full powers. "This move was a tremendous step forward for the prosecution. The possession of the comptroller's office gave access to papers which furnished almost all the evidence afterwards used in the crusade against the Ring." At the autumn election of 1871 there was a splendid rally of the better citizens, in the city and throughout the state, and the political power of the Ring was broken. "None of the leading actors in the disgraceful drama failed to pay in some measure the penalty of his deeds. Tweed, after a chequered experience in eluding the grasp of justice, died in jail. Connolly passed the remainder of his life in exile. Sweeny left the country and long remained abroad. . . . Hall was tried and obtained a favourable verdict, but he has chosen to live out of America. Of the judges whose corrupt decisions so greatly aided the Ring, Barnard and M'Cunn were impeached and removed from the bench, while Cardozo resigned his position in time to avoid impeachment. The following figures will give an approximate idea of the amount the Ring cost the city of New York. In 1860, before Tweed came into power, the debt of the city was reported as

amounting only to $20,000,000 while the tax rate was about 1.60 per cent. on the assessed valuation of the property in the city liable to taxation. In the middle of the year 1871, the total debt of the city and the county — which were coterminous, and for all practical purposes the same — amounted to $100,953,333.33, and the tax rate had risen to over 2 per cent. During the last two years and a half of the government of the Ring the debt increased at the rate of $28,652,000 a year."—F. J. Goodnow, *The Tweed Ring in New York City* (*ch.* 88 *of Bryce's "American Commonwealth," v.* 2).

ALSO IN: S. J. Tilden, *The New York City "Ring": its Origin, Maturity and Fall.*—C. F. Wingate, *An episode in Municipal Gov't* (*N. A. Rev., Oct.* 1874, *Jan. and July*, 1875, *Oct.* 1876).

A. D. 1867.—The Public Schools made entirely free. See EDUCATION, MODERN: AMERICA: A. D. 1867.

A. D. 1867-1882.—Amendments of the Constitution.—The constitution of 1846 having provided for its own revision at the end of twenty years, if so willed by the people, the calling of a constitutional convention was approved by popular vote in 1866, and the convention of elected delegates assembled June 4, in the following year. Its final adjournment was not reached until February 28, 1868. The constitution proposed by the convention was submitted to the people in 1869, and rejected, with the exception of the judiciary article, which reorganized the Court of Appeals, and provided for a temporary Commission of Appeals, to determine the cases pending in the Court, where business in arrears had accumulated to a serious extent. The rejection of the constitution framed in 1867 led, in 1872, to the creation by the governor and legislature of a Commission for the revision of the constitution, which met at Albany, December 4, 1872, and adjourned March 15, 1873. Several amendments proposed by the Commission were submitted to popular vote in 1874 and 1876, and were adopted. By the more important of these amendments, colored citizens were admitted to the franchise without property qualifications; a strong, specific enactment for the prevention and punishment of bribery and corruption at elections was embodied in the constitution itself; some changes were made in the provisions for districting the state, after each census, and the pay of members of the legislature was increased to $1,500 per annum; the power of the legislature to pass private bills was limited; the term of the governor was extended from two years to three; the governor was empowered to veto specific items in bills which appropriate money, approving the remainder; the governor was allowed thirty days for the consideration of bills left in his hands at the adjournment of the legislature, which bills become law only upon his approval within that time; a superintendent of public works was created to take the place of the Canal Commissioners previously existing, and a superintendent of state prisons to take the place of the three inspectors of state prisons; a selection of judges from the bench of the Supreme Court of the state to act as Associate Judges of the Court of Appeals was authorized; the loaning or granting of the credit or money of the state, or that of any county, city, town, or village to any association, corporation, or private undertaking was forbidden; corrupt conduct in office was declared to be felony. By an amendment of the constitution submitted by the legislature to the people in 1882, the canals of the state were made entirely free of tolls.

A. D. 1869.—Black Friday.—"During the war gold had swollen in value to 285, when the promise of the nation to pay a dollar on demand was only worth thirty-five cents. Thence it had gradually sunk. . . . All our purchases from foreign nations, all duties on those purchases, and all sales of domestic produce to other nations are payable in gold. There is therefore a large and legitimate business in the purchase and sale of gold, especially in New York, the financial centre of the nation. But a much larger business of a gambling nature had gradually grown up around that which was legitimate. . . . These gambling operations were based on the rise and fall of gold, and these in turn depended on successful or unsuccessful battles, or on events in foreign nations that could be neither foreseen nor guarded against. The transactions were therefore essentially gambling. . . . So large was the amount of this speculative business, gathering up all the gold-betting of the nation in a single room, that it more than equalled the legitimate purchase and sale of gold. There were large and wealthy firms who made this their chief business; and prominent among them was the firm of Smith, Gould, Martin & Co., four gentlemen under one partnership name, all wealthy and all accustomed to this business for years. Their joint wealth and business skill made them a power in Wall street. The leading mind of the firm, though not the first named, was Mr. Jay Gould, President of the Erie Railway, joint owner with Colonel James Fisk Jr., of two lines of steamboats, and largely interested in a number of railroads and other valuable properties. Mr. Gould looked upon gold, railroads, and steamboats as the gilded dice wherewith to gamble. . . . During the spring of 1869 he was a buyer of gold. There was perhaps fifteen millions of that rare currency in New York outside the Sub-Treasury; and he had bought half that amount, paying therefor a bonus of a little more than two millions of dollars. As fast as he had purchased the precious metal he had loaned it out to those who needed it for the payment of duties, and who hoped to repurchase it at a lower rate. And so, though the owner of seven millions, he had none of it in hand; he merely possessed the written acknowledgment of certain leading merchants and brokers that they owed him that amount of specie, which they would repay with interest on demand. Having this amount obtainable at any moment, Mr. Gould had the mercantile community at his mercy. But there was some hundred millions of gold in the Treasury, more or less, and the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Treasury might at any time throw it on the market. On this point it was very desirable to ascertain the opinion of President Grant; more desirable to have constant access to his private ear." In various ways, argumentative influences were brought to bear on President Grant and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Boutwell, to persuade them that it was desirable for the country, while the crops were being moved, to hold up the price of gold. One important channel for such influences was supplied by the President's brother-in-law, a retired New York

merchant, named Corbin, who was drawn into the speculation and given a share in Gould's gold purchases. By strenuous exertions, Gould and his associates pushed up the price till "in May it stood at 144¼, but as soon as they ceased to buy, the price began to recede until in the latter part of June it again stood at 136 The others were then frightened and sold out 'All these other fellows deserted me like rats from a ship,' said Gould. But for him to sell out then would involve a heavy loss, and he preferred a gain. He therefore called upon his friend and partner Fisk to enter the financial arena. It is but justice to Mr. Fisk to say that for some time he declined; he clearly saw that the whole tendency of gold was downward But when Gould made the proposition more palatable by suggesting corruption, Fisk immediately swallowed the bait . . He entered the market and purchased twelve millions There is an old adage that there is honor among thieves. This appears not to be true on the Gold Exchange. All Mr Gould's statements to his own partner were false, except those relating to Corbin and Butterfield And Mr Corbin did his best He not only talked and wrote to the President himself, not only wrote for the New York 'Times,' but when General Grant visited him in New York, he sent Gould to see him so often that the President, unaware of the financial trap set for him, rebuked the door servant for giving Mr Gould such ready access But it is worthy of note that neither Corbin, Gould, nor Fisk ever spoke to the President of their personal interest in the matter They were only patriots urging a certain course of conduct for the good of the country. These speculations as to the advantage to the country of a higher price of gold seem to have had some effect on the Presidential mind, for early in September he wrote to Mr Boutwell, then at his Massachusetts home, giving his opinion of the financial condition of the country, and suggesting that it would not be wise to lower the price of gold by sales from the Treasury while the crops were moving to the seaboard Mr Boutwell therefore telegraphed to the Assistant Secretary at Washington only to sell gold sufficient to buy bonds for the sinking fund Through Mr. Corbin or in some other way this letter came to the knowledge of the conspirators, for they at once began to purchase and the price began to rise . On the 13th of September, gold, swelling and falling like the tide, stood at 135¼. The clique then commenced their largest purchases, and within nine days had bought enough to hold sixty-six millions — nearly every cent of it fictitious, and only included in promises to pay On the evening of Wednesday, September 22, the price was 140½; but it had taken the purchase of thirty or forty millions to put it up that five cents. Could it be forced five cents higher, and all sold, the profits would be over ten millions of dollars! It was a stake worth playing for. But the whole mercantile community was opposed to them, bountiful harvests were strong arguments against them; and more than all else, there stood the Sub-Treasury of the United States, with its hundred millions of dollars in its vaults, ready at any time to cast its plethora of wealth on their unfortunate heads. . . . Corbin, while assuring Gould that there was no danger of any Government sale, and yet himself greatly in trepidation, addressed a letter to General Grant urging him not to interfere with the warfare then raging between the bulls and the bears, nor to allow the Secretary of the Treasury to do so. . . . The letter would probably have had some effect, but unfortunately the ring overdid their business in the way in which they sent it." The letter was conveyed by a private messenger. The messenger, "Mr. Chapin, delivered his letter, asked General Grant if there was any reply, and being told there was none, started for his home, first telegraphing to his employer, 'Letter delivered all right' It was a most unfortunate telegraphic message he sent back He swears that his meaning was that the letter was delivered all right; and so the despatch reads. But the gold gamblers, blinded by the greatness of the stake at risk, interpreted the 'all right' of the message as an answer to the contents of Mr Corbin's letter — that the President thought the letter all right; and on the strength of that reading Fisk rushed into the market and made numerous purchases of gold. But that very letter, which was intended to be their governmental safeguard, led to their ruin. Carried by special messenger for a day and a half, its urgency that the Administration should sell no gold, coupled with frequent assertions in the newspapers that Mr Corbin was a great bull in gold, excited General Grant's suspicions He feared that Corbin was not actuated by patriotic motives alone in this secret correspondence At the President's suggestion, therefore, Mrs Grant wrote to her sister, Mrs Corbin, telling her that rumors had reached them that Mr Corbin was connected with speculators in New York, and that she hoped if this was so he would at once disengage himself from them, that the President was much distressed at such rumors On the receipt of this letter, Mr Corbin was greatly excited" Corbin showed the letter to Gould, and got himself let out of the game, so that he might be able to say to President Grant that he had no interest in gold, but Fisk was not told of the President's suspicions "On the evening of Wednesday, September 21, it was determined to close the corner within two days." A desperate attack on the market began next morning. Gold opened that day at 39½, it closed at 44 The next day was "Friday, September 24, commonly called Black Friday, either from the black mark it caused on the characters of dealers in gold, or, as is more probable, from the ruin it brought to both sides. The Gold Room was crowded for two hours before the time of business. . . . Fisk was there, gloating over the prospect of great gains from others' ruin His brokers were there, noisy and betting on the rapid rise of gold and the success of the corner. All alike were greatly excited, palpitating between hope and fear, and not knowing what an hour might bring forth. . . . Gold closed on Thursday at 144; Speyers [principal broker of the conspirators] commenced his work on Friday by offering 145, one per cent. higher than the last purchase. Receiving no response, he offered to buy at 146, 147, 148, and 149 respectively, but without takers. Then 150 was offered, and half a million was sold him by Mr. James Brown, who had quietly organized a band of prominent merchants who were determined to meet the gold gamblers on their own ground. . . . Amid the most tremendous confusion the voices of the excited brokers could be heard slowly bidding up the value of

their artificial metal. Higher and higher rose the tide of speculation; from 156 to 159 there was no offer whatever; amid deep silence Speyers called out, 'Any part of five millions for 160.' 'One million taken at 160,' was the quiet response of James Brown. Further offers were made by the brokers of the clique all the way from 160 to 163¼. But Mr. Brown preferred to grapple the enemy by the throat, and he sold Speyers five millions more, making seven millions of gold sold that hour for which Speyers agreed to pay eleven millions in currency. Such figures almost stagger one to read of them! But Speyers continued to buy till before noon he had purchased nearly sixty millions. . . . As the price rose cent by cent, men's hearts were moved within them as the trees are shaken by the swelling of the wind. But when the first million was taken at 160 a great load was removed, and when the second million was sold there was such a burst of gladness, such a roar of multitudinous voices as that room, tumultuous as it had always been, never heard before. Everybody instantly began to sell, desiring to get rid of all their gold before it had tumbled too deep And just as the precious metal was beginning to flow over the precipice, the news was flashed into the room that Government had telegraphed to sell four millions. Instantly the end was reached; gold fell to 140, and then down, down, down, to 133 There were no purchasers at any price . The gold ring had that day bought sixty millions of gold, paying or rather agreeing to pay therefor ninety-six millions of dollars in currency!" But Gould, Fisk & Co , who owned several venal New York judges, placed injunctions and other legal obstacles in the way of a settlement of claims against themselves "Of course these judicious and judicial orders put an end to all business except that which was favorable to Fisk and Gould. They continued to settle with all parties who owed them money; they were judicially enjoined from settling with those to whom, if their own brokers may be believed, they were indebted, and they have not yet settled with them. . . . As the settlements between the brokers employed by the ring and their victims were all made in private, there is no means of knowing the total result. But it is the opinion of Mr. James B. Hodskin, Chairman of the Arbitration Committee of the Exchange, and therefore better acquainted with its business than any one else, that the two days' profits of the clique from the operations they acknowledged and settled for were not less than twelve millions of dollars; and that the losses on those transactions which they refused to acknowledge were not less than twenty millions. The New York 'Tribune' a day or two afterward put the gains of the clique at eleven million dollars. Some months after 'Black Friday' had passed away, Congress ordered an investigation into its causes. . . . For two or three days the whole business of New York stood still awaiting the result of the corner. . . . In good-will with all the world, with grand harvests, with full markets on both sides the Atlantic, came a panic that affected all business. Foreign trade came to a stand-still. The East would not send to Europe; the West could not ship to New York. Young men saw millions of dollars made in a few days by dishonesty; they beheld larger profits result from fraud than from long lives of honesty. Old men saw their best-laid plans frustrated by the operations of gamblers. Our national credit was affected by it. Europe was told that our principal places of business were nests of gamblers, and that it was possible for a small clique, aided by our banking institutions, to get possession of all the gold there was in the land; and that when one firm had gone through business transactions to the amount of over one hundred millions of dollars, the courts of the United States would compel the completion of those bargains which resulted in a profit, while those that ended in a loss were forbidden. For two or three months the sale of bonds in Europe was affected by the transactions of that day; and not until the present generation of business men has passed away will the evil influence of Black Friday be entirely lost."—W. R. Hooper, *Black Friday* (*The Galaxy, Dec* , 1871).

A. D. 1875-1881. — Stalwarts and Half-breeds. See STALWARTS.

A. D. 1881.—Adoption of the Code of Criminal Procedure. See LAW, COMMON: A. D. 1848–1883

A. D. 1892.— Restored Tammany government in the City.—The Tammany organization was greatly discredited and crippled for a time by the exposure and overthrow of Tweed and his "ring," in 1871, but after a few years, under the chieftainship of John Kelly and Richard Croker, successive "grand sachems," it recovered its control of the city government so completely that, in 1892, Dr. Albert Shaw was justified in describing the latter as follows "There is in New York no official body that corresponds with the London Council. The New York Board of Aldermen, plus the Mayor, plus the Commissioners who are the appointive heads of a number of the working departments such as the Excise, Park, Health and Police departments, plus the District Attorney, the Sheriff, the Coroners, and other officials pertaining to the county of New York as distinct from the city of New York, plus a few of the head Tammany bosses and the local Tammany bosses of the twenty-four Assembly Districts—all these men and a few other officials and bosses, taken together, would make up a body of men of about the same numerical strength as the London Council; and these are the men who now dominate the official life of the great community of nearly eighteen hundred thousand souls. In London the 137 councillors fight out every municipal question in perfectly open session upon its actual merits before the eyes of all London, and of the whole British empire. In New York, the governing group discusses nothing openly. The Board of Aldermen is an obscure body of twenty-five members, with limited power except for mischief, its members being almost to a man high Tammany politicians who are either engaged directly in the liquor business or are in one way or another connected with that interest. So far as there is any meeting in which the rulers of New York discuss the public affairs of the community, such meetings are held in the Tammany wigwam in Fourteenth Street. But Tammany is not an organization which really concerns itself with any aspects of public questions, either local or general, excepting the 'spoils' aspect. It is organized upon what is a military rather than a political basis, and its machinery extends through all the assembly districts and voting precincts

of New York, controlling enough votes to hold and wield the balance of power, and thus to keep Tammany in the possession of the offices Its local hold is maintained by the dispensing of a vast amount of patronage The laborers on public works, the members of the police force and the fire brigades, the employees of the Sanitary Department, of the Excise Department, of the Street Cleaning and Repair Department and of the Water and Dock and Park Departments, the teachers in the public schools and the nurses in the public hospitals, all are made to feel that their livelihood depends on the favor of the Tammany bosses, and they must not only be faithful to Tammany themselves, but all their friends and relatives to the remotest collateral degree must also be kept subservient to the Tammany domination The following characterization of Tammany leadership and method is from the New York Evening Post 'None of the members occupy themselves with any legislation, except such as creates salaried offices and contracts in this city, to be got hold of either by capture at the polls or "deals" with the Republican politicians here or in Albany When such legislation has been successful, the only thing in connection with it which Tammany leaders consider is how the salaries shall be divided and what "assessments" the places or contracts can stand If any decent outsider could make his way into the inner conferences at which these questions are settled, he would hear not the grave discussion of the public interests, how to keep streets clean, or how to repave them, or how to light them or police them, or how to supply the city with water, but stories of drunken or amorous adventure, larded freely with curious and original oaths, ridicule of reformers and "silk-stockinged" people generally, abuse of "kickers," and examination of the claims of gamblers, liquor-dealers, and pugilists to more money out of the public treasury. In fact, as we have had of late frequent occasion to observe, the society is simply an organization of clever adventurers, most of them in some degree criminal, for the control of the ignorant and vicious vote of the city in an attack on the property of the tax-payers There is not a particle of politics in the concern any more than in any combination of Western brigands to "hold up" a railroad train and get at the express packages. Its sole object is plunder in any form which will not attract the immediate notice of the police.'" —A Shaw, *Municipal Problems of New York and London* (*Review of Reviews, April* 1892)

A. D. 1894.—Constitutional Convention.— A bill passed by the legislature of 1892, calling a convention to revise the constitution of the State, provided for the election of 128 delegates by Assembly districts, and 32 at large, but added 9 more whom the Governor should appoint, 3 to represent labor interests, 3 woman-suffrage claims and 3 the advocates of prohibition By the legislature of 1893 this act was set aside and a new enactment adopted, making the total number of delegates to the Constitutional Convention 165, all elective, and apportioning five to each senatorial district The convention assembled at Albany, May 9, 1894 Its labors are unfinished at the time this volume goes to press Questions of reform in municipal government have claimed the greatest attention.

NEW YORK SOCIETY LIBRARY. See LIBRARIES, MODERN UNITED STATES OF AM

NEW ZEALAND: The aborigines.— "The traditions of these people [the Maoris] lead to the conclusion that they first came to New Zealand about 600 years ago, from some of the islands between Samoa and Tahiti, but some ethnologists put the migration as far back as 3,000 years Their language is a dialect of the Polynesian, most resembling that of Rarotonga, but their physical characters vary greatly. Some are fair, with straight hair, and with the best type of Polynesian features, others are dusky brown, with curly or almost frizzly hair, and with the long and broad arched nose of the Papuan, while others have the coarse thick features of the lower Melanesian races Now these variations of type cannot be explained unless we suppose the Maoris to have found in the islands an indigenous Melanesian people, of whom they exterminated the men, but took the better-looking of the women for wives, and as their traditions decidedly state that they did find such a race when they first arrived at New Zealand, there seems no reason whatever for rejecting these traditions, which accord with actual physical facts, just as the tradition of a migration from 'Hawaiki,' a Polynesian island, accords with linguistic facts."—Hellwald-Wallace, *Australasia* (*Stanford's Compendium, new issue,* 1893), *ch.* 14, *sect.* 9 (*v.* 1).

ALSO IN: E. Shortland, *Traditions and Superstitions of the New Zealanders.*—J. S. Polack, *Manners and Customs of the New Zealanders.*—Lady Martin, *Our Maoris.*—W. D. Hay, *Brighter Britain, v* 2, *ch* 3–5 —See, also, MALAYAN RACE

A. D. 1642-1856.—Discovery.—Colonization. —Early dealings with Natives.—Constitutional organization.—"The honour of the actual discovery of New Zealand must be accorded to the Dutch Navigator, Tasman, who visited it in 1642, discovering Van Dieman's Land during the same voyage As, however, he does not appear to have landed, the knowledge of the country derived by Europeans from his account of it must have been of very limited extent. . . It was our own countryman, Captain Cook, to whom we are so largely indebted for what we now know of the geography of the Pacific, who made us acquainted with the nature of the country and the character of its inhabitants The aborigines were evidently of a much higher type than those of the Australian continent. They are a branch of the Polynesian race, and according to their own traditions came about 600 years ago from 'Hawaiki,' which ethnologists interpret to mean either Hawaii (the Sandwich Islands), or Savaii in the Samoa group. They are divided into some twenty clans, analogous to those of the Scottish Highlands. Cook's first visit was paid in 1769, but he touched at the islands on several occasions during his subsequent voyages, and succeeded in making, before his final departure, a more or less complete exploration of its coasts. The aborigines were divided into numerous tribes, which were engaged in almost constant wars one with another. . . . As has been the case in so many distant lands, the first true pioneers of civilization were the missionaries. In 1814, thirty-seven years after

Captain Cook's last visit to New Zealand, a few representatives of the English Church Missionary Society landed in the North Island, less with the intention of colonising than with the hope of converting the natives to Christianity. The first practical steps in the direction of settlement were taken by the New Zealand Land Company, composed of a very strong and influential body of gentlemen headed by Lord Durham, and having much the same ideas as those which actuated the South Australian Colonisation Society. The proposal to found a new Colony was at first bitterly opposed by the Government of the day, but in consequence of the energetic action of the Company, who sent out agents with large funds to purchase land of the natives, the Government ultimately gave way, and despatched as Consul Captain Hobson, who arrived in January 1840. One of his first steps on assuming office was to call a meeting of the natives and explain to them the object of his mission, with the view of entering into a treaty for placing the sovereignty of their island in Her Majesty the Queen. He was not at first successful, the natives fearing that if they acceded to the proposal, their land would be taken from them, but being reassured on this point, the majority of the chiefs ultimately signed the treaty in February of the same year. By the terms of this treaty, called the Treaty of Waitangi, the chiefs, in return for their acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Queen of England, were guaranteed for themselves and their people the exclusive possession of their lands so long as they wished to retain them, and they, on their side, accorded to the Crown the exclusive right of pre emption over such lands as might, from time to time, come into the market. It will thus be seen that the acquisition of land in New Zealand by European settlers was effected in a manner entirely different from that which obtained in other colonies, for, although the right of pre-emption by the Crown was subsequently waived, no land could be obtained from natives unless they were perfectly willing to part with it. It is true that lands have in some instances been confiscated as a punishment for native insurrections, but, with this exception, all lands have passed from natives to Europeans by the ordinary processes of bargain and sale. Captain Hobson's next action was to place himself in communication with the New Zealand Company's agents, and ascertain what they were doing in the way of colonisation. He found that besides acquiring various blocks of land in the North and South Islands, they had formed a permanent settlement at Wellington, at which they were organising a system of government incompatible with the Queen's authority, which he therefore promptly suppressed. . . . In June of 1840 the settlement was made a colony by Charter under the Great Seal, Captain Hobson naturally becoming the first Governor. This eminent public servant died at his post in September 1842, being succeeded by Captain R. Fitzroy, who, however, did not reach the Colony till a year afterwards. In the interval occurred that lamentable incident, the massacre of white settlers by the natives at Wairu, in the South Island. Shortly after this the Company made strenuous efforts to obtain a share in the Executive Government, but this was twice disallowed by the Home authorities. Captain Fitzroy's term of office was in all respects a stormy one, the native chiefs rising in rebellion, open and covert, against the terms of the Waitangi treaty. With only 150 soldiers, and destitute of any military facilities, this governor deemed it prudent to come to a compromise with the rebels, fearing the effect upon the minds of the natives generally of the certain defeat which he must sustain in active warfare. Receiving, however, reinforcements from Sidney, Captain Fitzroy took the field sustaining in his first expedition a decided defeat. Two other expeditions followed this, and at length the success of the British arms was assured, Captain Fitzroy suffering from the irony of fate, since, having been neglected in his peril, he was recalled in the moment of victory. Captain (afterwards Sir George) Grey succeeded to the Governorship in November 1845, having the good fortune to be surrounded by ministers of exceptional ability, and arriving in the Colony at a fortunate turn in its affairs, he takes his place among the successful Governors of New Zealand. Colonel Gore Browne — after an interregnum of nearly two years — succeeded to power, and during his viceroyalty in 1853, responsible government, which, however, did not provide for ministerial responsibility, was inaugurated. The Home Government shortly afterwards (May 1856) . . established responsible government in its fullest form, but unfortunately without any special provisions for the representation of the native races.

Up to 1847 New Zealand remained a Crown Colony, the Government being administered by a Governor appointed by the Crown, an Executive Council, and a Legislative Council. Under this system, the Governor had very large powers, since the only control over him was that exercised by the Home Government. The Executive Council consisted of the Governor and three official members, while the Legislative Council was made up of the Executive Council and three non official members nominated by the Governor. At that time Auckland was the seat of Government, which has since been moved to Wellington. In 1852, before the expiration of the period over which the provisional charter granted in 1847 was to extend, the Imperial Parliament granted a new constitution to New Zealand (15 & 16 Vic. cap. 72), and in the following year it came into force and is still [1886] operative. The Legislature, under this Constitution, consists of a Governor, a Legislative Council, composed of life members nominated by the Crown, and a House of Representatives elected by the people, under a franchise which practically amounts to household suffrage."— *Her Majesty's Colonies (Colonial and Ind. Exhibition, 1886), pp.* 245–248.

ALSO IN G. W. Rusden, *Hist. of New Zealand, v.* 1.—G. Tregarthen, *Story of Australasia.*

A. D. 1853-1883.—Land questions with the Natives.—The King movement.—The Maori War.—"In the course of years, as it was evident to the natives that the Europeans were the coming power in the land, suspicion and distrust were excited, and at last the tocsin sounded. . . . It was considered that a head was needed to initiate a form of Government among the tribes to resist the encroachments daily made by the Europeans, and which seemed to threaten the national extinction of the native race. The first to endeavour to bring about a new order of things was a native chief named Matene Te Whiwi, of Otaki. In 1858 he marched to Taupo and Rotorua, accompanied by a number of

followers, to obtain the consent of the different tribes to the election of a king over the central parts of the island, which were still exclusively Maori territory, and to organize a form of government to protect the interests of the native race. Matene . . met with little success . The agitation, however, did not stop, the fire once kindled rapidly spread, ardent followers of the new idea sprang up, and their numbers soon increased, until finally, in 1854, a tribal gathering was convened at Manawapou After many points had been discussed, a resolution was come to among the assembled tribes that no more land should be sold to Europeans A solemn league was entered into by all present for the preservation of the native territory, and a tomahawk was passed round as a pledge that all would agree to put the individual to death who should break it In 1854 another bold stand was made, and Te Heuheu, who exercised a powerful sway over the tribes of the interior, summoned a native council at Taupo, when the King movement began in earnest It was there decided that the sacred mountain of Tongariro should be the centre of a district in which no land was to be sold to the government, and that the districts of Hauraki, Waikato, Kawhia, Mokau, Taranaki, Whanganui, Rangitikei, and Titiokura, should form the outlying portions of the boundary, that no roads should be made by the Europeans within the area, and that a king should be elected to reign over the Maoris In 1857 Kingite meetings were held, . . . at which it was agreed that Potatau Te Wherowhero, the most powerful chief of Waikato, should be elected king, under the title of Potatau the First, and finally, in June, 1858, his flag was formally hoisted at Ngaruawahia Potatau, who was far advanced in life when raised to this high office, soon departed from the scene, and was succeeded by his son Matutaera Te Wherowhero, under the title of Potatau the Second. The events of the New Zealand war need not here be recited, but it may be easily imagined that during the continuance of the fighting the extensive area of country ruled over by the Maori monarch was kept clear of Europeans But in 1863 and 1864 General Cameron, at the head of about 20,000 troops, composed of Imperial and Colonial forces, invaded the Waikato district, and drove the natives southward and westward, till his advanced corps were at Alexandra and Cambridge. Then followed the Waikato confiscation of Maori lands and the military settlements. The King territory was further broken into by the confiscations at Taranaki and the East Coast. . . . Since the termination of the lamentable war between the two races, the King natives have, on all occasions, jealously preserved their hostile spirit to Europeans. . . . The New Zealand war concluded, or rather died out, in 1865, when the confiscated line was drawn, the military settlements formed, and the King natives isolated themselves from the Europeans. For ten years it may be said that no attempt was made to negotiate with them. They were not in a humour to be dealt with. About 1874 and 1875, however, it became evident that something would have to be done. The colony had greatly advanced in population, and a system of public works had been inaugurated, which made it intolerable that large centres of population should be cut off from each other by vast spaces of country which Europeans were not allowed even to traverse." Then began a series of negotiations, which, up to 1883, had borne no fruit.—J. H. Kerry-Nicholls, *The King Country, introd.*

ALSO IN: G. W. Rusden, *Hist. of New Zealand.*

A. D. 1885-1892.—Movements toward federation. See AUSTRALIA: A. D. 1885-1892.

A. D. 1887-1893.—Maori representation.—Women Suffrage.—An act passed in 1887 created four districts in each of which the Maoris elect a member of the House of Representatives. Every adult Maori has a vote in this election. By an act passed in 1893 the elective franchise was extended to women

NEWAB-WUZEER, OR NAWAB-VIZIER, of Oude. See OUDE; also NABOB.

NEWARK, N. J.: The founding of the city by migration from New Haven (1666-1667). See NEW JERSEY: A D 1664-1667.

NEWBERN, N. C.: Capture by the national forces. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JANUARY—APRIL: NORTH CAROLINA)

NEWBURGH, Washington's headquarters at.—"At the close of 1780, the army was cantoned at three points at Morristown and at Pompton, in New Jersey, and at Phillipstown, in the Hudson Highlands Washington established his head-quarters at New Windsor in December, 1780, where he remained until June, 1781, when the French, who had quartered during the winter at Newport and Lebanon, formed a junction with the Americans on the Hudson In April, 1782, he established his head quarters at Newburgh, two miles above the village of New Windsor, where he continued most of the time until November, 1783, when the Continental army was disbanded."—B J. Lossing, *Field-book of the Revolution, v 1, p 671*

NEWBURGH ADDRESSES, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D. 1782-1783

NEWBURN, Battles of. See ENGLAND. A. D. 1640

NEWBURY, First Battles of. See ENGLAND: A. D 1643 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER). .. **Second Battle.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1644 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER)

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE, Origin of. See PONS ÆLII

NEWCOMEN, and the invention of the steam engine. See STEAM ENGINE: THE BEGINNINGS.

NEWFOUNDLAND: Aboriginal inhabitants. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: BEOTHUKAN FAMILY.

A. D. 1000.—Supposed identity with the Helluland of Norse Sagas. See AMERICA: 10-11TH CENTURIES.

A. D. 1498.—Discovery by Sebastian Cabot. See AMERICA: A. D. 1498.

A. D. 1500.—Visited by Cortereal, the Portuguese explorer. See AMERICA: A. D. 1500.

A. D. 1501-1578.—The Portuguese, Norman, Breton and Basque fisheries.—"It is a very curious circumstance, that the country in which the Cabots started their idea for a navigation to the north-west, and in which they at first proclaimed their discovery of the rich fishing banks near their New-found-Isles, did not at once profit by it so much as their neighbors, the French and the Portuguese. . . . During the first half of the 16th century we hear little of

English fishing and commercial expeditions to the great banks; although they had a branch of commerce and fishery with Iceland. . . . 'It was not until the year 1548 that the English government passed the first act for the encouragement of the fisheries on the banks of Newfoundland, after which they became active competitors in this profitable occupation.'" In Portugal, Cortereal's discovery had revealed "the wealth to be derived from the fish, particularly cod-fish, which abounded on that coast. The fishermen of Portugal and of the Western Islands, when this news was spread among them, made preparations for profiting by it, and soon extended their fishing excursions to the other side of the ocean. According to the statement of a Portuguese author, very soon after the discoveries by the Cortereals, a Portuguese Fishing Company was formed in the harbors of Vianna, Aveiro and Terceira, for the purpose of colonizing Newfoundland and making establishments upon it Nay, already, in 1506, three years after the return of the last searching expedition for the Cortereals, Emanuel gave order, 'that the fishermen of Portugal, at their return from Newfoundland, should pay a tenth part of their profits at his custom-houses' It is certain, therefore, that the Portuguese fishermen must, previous to that time, have been engaged in a profitable business And this is confirmed by the circumstance that they originated the name of 'tierra de Bacalhas' [or Bacalhao] (the Stock-fish-country) and gave currency to it; though the word, like the cod-fishery itself, appears to be of Germanic origin. . . The nations who followed them in the fishing business imitated their example, and adopted the name 'country of the Bacalhas' (or, in the Spanish form, Baccallaos), though sometimes interchanging it with names of their own invention, as the 'Newfoundland,' 'Terre neuve,' etc. . . They [the Portuguese] continued their expeditions to Newfoundland and its neighborhood for a long time They were often seen there by later English and other visitors during the course of the 16th century; for instance, according to Herrera, in 1519; again by the English in 1527; and again by Sir Humphrey Gilbert in 1583 The Portuguese engaged in this fishery as early as 1501, according to good authorities, and perhaps under the charter of Henry VII. In 1578, they had 50 ships employed in that trade, and England as many more, and France 150 . . . The inhabitants of the little harbors of Normandy and Brittany, the great peninsulas of France, . . . were also among the first who profited by the discoveries of the Cabots and Cortereals, and who followed in the wake of the Portuguese fishermen toward the north-west cod-fish country. . . . The first voyages of the Bretons of St. Malo and the Normans of Dieppe to Newfoundland, are said to have occurred as early as 1504. . . . They probably visited places of which the Portuguese had not taken possession; and we therefore find them at the south of Newfoundland, and especially at the island of Cape Breton, to which they gave the name, still retained,—the oldest French name on the American north-east coast. . . . The Spaniards, and more particularly the mariners and fishermen of Biscay, have pretended, like those of Brittany and Normandy, that they and their ancestors, from time immemorial, had sailed to Newfoundland; and, even before Columbus, had established their fisheries there. But the Spanish historian Navarette, in more modern times, does not sustain this pretension of his countrymen. . . . We may come to the conclusion that, if the fisheries of the Spanish Basques on the Banks of Newfoundland and in the vicinity, did not begin with the voyage of Gomez [in 1525], they received from it a new impulse . . . From this time, for more than a century, they [the Basques] appeared in these waters every year with a large fleet, and took their place upon the banks as equals by the side of the Bretons, Normans, and Basques of France, until the middle of the 17th century, when rival nations dispossessed them of their privileges."—J. G. Kohl, *Hist. of the Discovery of Maine* (*Maine Hist. Soc Colls., series* 2, *v.* 1), *ch* 6 *and* 8, *with footnote.*

Also in R. Brown, *Hist. of Cape Breton, ch* 1–2

A. D. 1534.—Visited by Jacques Cartier. See America. A D. 1534–1535.

A. D. 1583.—Formal possession taken for England by Sir Humphrey Gilbert. See America A D 1583

A. D. 1610-1655.—Early English attempts at colonization.—The grants to Lord Baltimore and Sir David Kirke.—"For 27 years after the failure of the Gilbert expedition no fresh attempt was made to establish a colony in the island During this interval fishermen of various nationalities continued to frequent its shores . . . The French were actively engaged in the prosecution of the fisheries in the neighboring seas. Their success in this direction strengthened their desire to gain possession of Newfoundland. Hence it is that in the history of the country France has always been an important factor. Having from time to time held possession of various points of the land, England's persistent rival in these latitudes has given names to many towns, villages, creeks, and harbors. To this day Newfoundland has not completely shaken off French influence. . . . In 1610 another attempt was made to plant a colony of Englishmen in Newfoundland John Guy, a merchant, and afterwards mayor of Bristol, published in 1609 a pamphlet on the advantages which would result to England from the establishment of a colony in the island. This publication made such a deep impression on the public mind that a company was formed to carry out the enterprise it suggested. The most illustrious name on the roll was that of Lord Bacon. . . . The importance of Newfoundland as a site for an English colony did not escape the wide-ranging eye of Bacon. He pronounced its fisheries 'more valuable than all the mines of Peru,' a judgment which time has amply verified. . . . To this company James I., by letters patent dated April, 1610, made a grant of all the part of Newfoundland which lies between Cape Bonavista in the north and Cape St. Mary. Mr. Guy was appointed governor, and with a number of colonists he landed at Mosquito Harbor, on the north side of Conception Bay, where he proceeded to erect huts. . . . We have no authentic account of the progress of this settlement, begun under such favourable auspices, but it proved unsuccessful from some unexplained cause. Guy and a number of the settlers returned to England, the rest remaining to settle

elsewhere in the New World. Five years afterwards, in 1615, Captain Richard Whitbourne, mariner, of Exmouth, Devonshire, received a commission from the Admiralty of England to proceed to Newfoundland for the purpose of establishing order among the fishing population and remedying certain abuses which had grown up. . . It was shown that there were upwards of 250 English vessels, having a tonnage of 1,500 tons, engaged in the fisheries along the coast. Fixed habitations extended at intervals along the shore from St John's to Cape Race . Having done what he could during the active part of his life to promote its interests, on his return to England, in his advanced years, he [Whitbourne] wrote an account of the country, entitled 'A Discourse and Discovery of Newfoundland' . His book made a great impression at the time So highly did King James think of the volume that he ordered a copy to be sent to every parish in the kingdom The Archbishops of Canterbury and York issued a letter recommending it, with the view of encouraging emigration to Newfoundland A year after the departure of Whitbourne, in 1623, by far the most skilfully-organized effort to carry out the settlement of Newfoundland was made, under the guidance of Sir George Calvert, afterwards Lord Baltimore . When Secretary of State he obtained a patent conveying to him the lordship of the whole southern peninsula of Newfoundland, together with all the islands lying within ten leagues of the eastern shores, as well as the right of fishing in the surrounding waters, all English subjects having, as before, free liberty of fishing Being a Roman Catholic, Lord Baltimore had in view to provide an asylum for his co-religionists who were sufferers from the intolerant spirit of the times The immense tract thus granted to him extended from Trinity Bay to Placentia, and was named by him Avalon, from the ancient name of Glastonbury, where, it is believed, Christianity was first preached in Britain . . Lord Baltimore called his Newfoundland province Avalon and his first settlement Verulam. The latter name, in course of time, became corrupted into Ferulam, and then into the modern Ferryland At this spot, on the eastern coast of Newfoundland, about 40 miles north of Cape Race, Lord Baltimore planted his colony, and built a noble mansion, in which he resided with his family during many years." But after expending some £30,000 upon the establishment of his colony, Lord Baltimore abandoned it, on account of the poor quality of the soil and its exposure to the attacks of the French. Not long afterwards he obtained his Maryland grant [see MARYLAND: A. D 1632] and resumed the enterprise under more favorable conditions. "Soon after the departure of Lord Baltimore, Viscount Falkland, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, hoping to permanently increase the scanty population of Newfoundland, sent out a number of emigrants from that country At a later date, these were so largely reinforced by settlers from Ireland that the Celtic part of the population at this day is not far short of equality in numbers with the Saxon portion. In 1638, Sir David Kirke, one of Britain's bravest sea-captains, arrived in Newfoundland and took up his abode at Ferryland, where Lord Baltimore had lived. Sir David was armed with the powers of a Count Palatine over the island, having obtained from Charles I. a grant of the whole." This was by way of reward for his exploit in taking Quebec — see CANADA. A. D. 1628–1635. Kirke "governed wisely and used every effort to promote the colonization of the country. His settlement prospered greatly The Civil War, however, broke out in England, and, Kirke being a staunch loyalist, all his possessions in Newfoundland were confiscated by the victorious Commonwealth. By the aid of Claypole, Cromwell's son-in law, Kirke eventually got the sequestration removed, and, returning to Ferryland, died there in 1655, at the age of 56. At this time Newfoundland contained a population of 350 families, or nearly 2,000 inhabitants, distributed in 15 small settlements along the eastern coast "—J. Hatton and M Harvey, *Newfoundland, ch* 2

ALSO IN: H Kirke, *The First English Conquest of Canada, ch* 3-4

A. D. 1660-1688.—The French gain their footing.—"With the possession of Cape Breton, Acadia, and the vast regions stretching from the gulf of the River St Lawrence, and the mighty lakes, Newfoundland obtained a new value in the estimation of the government of France, as it formed one side of the narrow entrance to its transatlantic dependencies consequently the pursuit of the fishery by its seamen was encouraged, and every opportunity was improved to gain a footing in the country itself This encroaching tendency could not, however, be manifested without a protest on the part of the somewhat sluggish English, both by private individuals and by the government Charles I. . . imposed a tribute of five per cent. on the produce taken by foreigners in this fishery, to which exaction the French, as well as others, were forced to submit During the distracted time of the Commonwealth, it does not appear that the struggling government at home found leisure to attend to these distant affairs, though the tribute continued to be levied The Restoration brought to England a sovereign who owed much to the monarch of France, to whom he was therefore attached by the ties of gratitude, and by the desire to find a counterpoise to the refractory disposition of which he was in continual apprehension among his own subjects It was not until 1675 that Louis XIV. prevailed on Charles to give up the duty of five per cent, and by that time the French had obtained a solid footing on the southern coast of Newfoundland, so that, with Cape Breton in their possession, they commanded both sides of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Over a territory of some 200 miles in extent, belonging to the British sovereignty, they had built up imperceptibly an almost undisputed dominion. At Placentia, situated in the bay of that name, a strong fort was erected, sustained by other forts standing at intervals along the shore, and at the same place a royal government was established. How real was the authority assumed, and how completely was the English sovereignty ignored, needs no better proof than is furnished in an ordinance issued by Louis in the year 1681, concerning the marine of France. 'In this state paper, Newfoundland is reckoned as situate in those seas which are free and common to all French subjects, provided that they take a license from the admiral for every voyage. . . . Thus that period which is regarded as among the most humiliating in the annals of our nation,— when the king was a pen-

sioner of France, and his ministers received bribes from the same quarter, witnessed the partial sliding under this alien power of the most ancient of the colonial possessions of the Crown. Not less than half of the inhabited coast of Newfoundland was thus taken under that despotic rule, which, while swaying the councils of England to the furtherance of its ambitious designs, was labouring for the subjugation of the European continent The revolution of 1688 broke the spell of this encroaching autocracy "—C Pedley, *Hist. of Newfoundland, ch* 2

A. D. 1694-1697.—French success in the war with England.—The Treaty of Ryswick and its unsatisfactory terms.—"On the accession of William III. to the throne of England hostilities broke out between the rival nations In William's declaration of war against the French, Newfoundland holds a prominent place among the alleged causes which led to the rupture of pacific relations The grievance was tersely set forth in the royal manifesto 'It was not long since the French took license from the Governor of Newfoundland to fish upon that coast, and paid a tribute for such licenses as an acknowledgement of the sole right of the Crown of England to that island, but of late the encroachments of the French, and His Majesty's subjects trading and fishing there, had been more like the invasions of an enemy than becoming friends, who enjoyed the advantages of that trade only by permission' Newfoundland now became the scene of military skirmishes, naval battles, and sieges by land and water" In 1692 the English made an unsuccessful attack on Placentia In 1694, a French fleet, under the Chevalier Nesmond, intended for an attack upon Boston and New York, stopped at Newfoundland on the way and made a descent on the harbor and town of St John's Nesmond "was repulsed, and instead of going on to Boston he returned to France A more determined effort at conquest was made later in the same year The new expedition was under the command of Iberville and Brouillan, the former being at the head of a Canadian force The garrison of St John's was weak in numbers, and, in want of military stores, could only make a feeble resistance, capitulating on easy terms, the troops were shipped to England. The fort and town were burned to the ground, and the victors next proceeded to destroy all the other adjacent English settlements; Carbonear and Bonavista alone proved too strong for them. The English Government at once commenced dispositions for dislodging the invaders; but before anything was attempted the treaty of Ryswick was signed, in 1697. This treaty proved most unfortunate for Newfoundland. It revived in the island the same state of division between France and England which had existed at the beginning of the war. The enemy retired from St. John's and the other settlements which they had forcibly occupied. Their claims upon Placentia and all the other positions on the south-west coast were, however, confirmed. The British inhabitants of Newfoundland were, therefore, once more left open to French attacks, should hostilities be again renewed between the rival powers."—J. Hatton and M. Harvey, *Newfoundland, pt.* 1, *ch.* 2.

Also in: F. Parkman, *Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV., ch.* 18.—W. Kingsford, *Hist. of Canada, bk.* 4, *ch.* 7 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1705.—English settlements destroyed by the French. See New England A D 1702-1710

A. D. 1713.—Relinquished to Great Britain by the Treaty of Utrecht.—French fishing rights reserved.—In the 12th and 13th articles of the Treaty signed at Utrecht, April 11, 1713, which terminated the War of the Spanish Succession (commonly known in American history as Queen Anne's War) it was stipulated that "All Nova Scotia or Acadié, with its ancient boundaries, as also the city of Port Royal, now called Annapolis Royal, . . the island of Newfoundland, with the adjacent islands, . . the town and fortress of Placentia, and whatever other places in the island are in possession of the French, shall from this time forward belong of right wholly to Great Britain . That the subjects of France should be allowed to catch fish and dry them on that part of the island of Newfoundland which stretches from Cape Bonavista to the northern point of the island, and from thence down the western side as far as Point Riché, but that no fortifications or any buildings should be erected there, besides Stages made of Boards, and Huts necessary and usual for drying fish . . But the island of Cape Breton, as also all others, both in the mouth of the river of St Lawrence and in the gulf of the same name, shall hereafter belong of Right to the King of France, who shall have liberty to fortify any place or places there "—R. Brown, *Hist of the Island of Cape Breton, letter* 9

Also in J Hatton and M Harvey, *Newfoundland, pt* 1, *ch* 3-4 and *pt* 3, *ch* 7.—See, also, Utrecht A. D 1712-1714

A. D. 1744.—Attack on Placentia by the French. See New England A D 1744.

A. D. 1748.—The islands of St. Pierre and Michelon ceded to France. See New England A D 1745-1748

A. D. 1763.—Ceded to England by the Treaty of Paris, with rights of fishing reserved to France. See Seven Years War: The Treaties, also Fisheries, North American: A D 1763

A. D. 1778.—French fishery rights on the banks recognized in the Franco-American Treaty. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1778 (February).

A. D. 1783.—American fishing rights conceded in the Treaty of Peace with the United States. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1783 (September)

A. D. 1818.—Fisheries Treaty between Great Britain and the United States. See Fisheries, North American: A. D. 1814-1818.

A. D. 1854-1866.—Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. See Tariff Legislation (United States and Canada). A. D. 1854-1866.

A. D. 1871.—The Treaty of Washington. See Alabama Claims. A D. 1871.

A. D. 1877.—The Halifax Fishery award.—Termination of the Fishery Articles of the Treaty of Washington.—Renewed fishery disputes. See Fisheries, North American. A. D. 1877-1888.

NEWNHAM HALL. See Education, Modern: Reforms, &c.: A. D. 1865-1883.

NEWPORT, Eng., The Treaty at. See England: A. D. 1648 (September—November), and (November—December).

NEWPORT, R. I.: A. D. 1524.—Visited by Verrazano. See AMERICA: A. D. 1523-1524

A. D. 1639.—The first settlement. See RHODE ISLAND: A. D. 1638-1640.

A. D. 1778.—Held by the British.—Failure of French-American attack. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778 (JULY—NOVEMBER)

NEWSPAPERS. See PRINTING AND THE PRESS: A. D. 1612-1650, and after

NEWTON BUTLER, Battle of (1689). See IRELAND, A. D. 1688-1689.

NEWTONIA, Battles of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JULY—SEPTEMBER MISSOURI—ARKANSAS), and 1864 (MARCH—OCTOBER: ARKANSAS—MISSOURI)

NEY, Marshal, Campaigns and execution of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1806 (OCTOBER), 1806-1807, 1807 (FEBRUARY—JUNE), SPAIN: A. D. 1809; RUSSIA: A. D. 1812, GERMANY: A. D. 1813, FRANCE: A. D. 1815, and 1815-1830.

NEZ PERCÉS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: NEZ PERCES

NIAGARA: The name and its original applications.—"Colden wrote it [the name] 'O ni-ag a-ra,' in 1741, and he must have received it from the Mohawks or Oneidas. It was the name of a Seneca village at the mouth of the Niagara river; located as early as 1650, near the site of Youngstown. It was also the place where the Marquis de Nonville constructed a fort in 1687, the building of which brought this locality under the particular notice of the English. The name of this Indian village in the dialect of the Senecas was 'Ne-ah'-gä,' in Tuscarora 'O-ne-ä'-kars,' in Onondaga 'O-ne-ah'-gä,' in Oneida 'O-ne-ah'-gäle,' and in Mohawk 'O ne-ä.-gä-rä.' These names are but the same word under dialectical changes. It is clear that Niagara was derived from some one of them, and thus came direct from the Iroquois language. The signification of the word is lost, unless it is derived, as some of the present Iroquois suppose, from the word which signifies 'neck,' in Seneca 'O-ne ah'-ä,' in Onondaga 'O-ne-yä'-ä,' and in Oneida 'O-ne-arle.' The name of this Indian village was bestowed by the Iroquois upon Youngstown; upon the river Niagara, from the falls to the Lake; and upon Lake Ontario" —L. H. Morgan, *League of the Iroquois, bk. 3, ch. 3.*—"It [the name Niagara] is the oldest of all the local geographical terms which have come down to us from the aborigines. It was not at first thus written by the English, for with them it passed through almost every possible alphabetical variation before its present orthography was established. We find its germ in the 'On-gui-aah-ra' of the Neutral Nation, as given by Father L'Allemant in a letter dated in 1641, at the mission station of Sainte Marie, on Lake Huron. . . . The name of the river next occurs on Sanson's map of Canada, published in Paris in 1656, where it is spelled 'Ongiara.' Its first appearance as Niagara is on Coronelli's map, published in Paris in 1688. From that time to the present, the French have been consistent in their orthography, the numerous variations alluded to occurring only among English writers. The word was probably derived from the Mohawks, through whom the French had their first intercourse with the Iroquois. The Mohawks pronounced it Nyah-ga-rah', with the primary accent on the first syllable, and the secondary on the last. . . . The corresponding Seneca name, Nyah'-gaah, was always confined by the Iroquois to the section of the river below the Falls, and to Lake Ontario. That portion of the river above the Falls being sometimes called Gaigwäăh-gëh,—one of their names for Lake Erie." —O. H. Marshall, *The Niagara Frontier* (*Historical Writings, p.* 283).

A. D. 1687-1688.—Fort constructed by De Nonville and destroyed a year later.—"We arrived there [at Niagara] on the morning of the 30th [of July, 1687]. We immediately set about choosing a place, and collecting stakes for the construction of the Fort which I had resolved to build at the extremity of a tongue of land, between the river Niagara and Lake Ontario, on the Iroquois side. On the 31st of July and 1st of August we continued this work, which was the more difficult from there being no wood on the place suitable for making palisades, and from its being necessary to draw them up the height. We performed this labor so diligently that the fort was in a state of defence on the last mentioned day. . . . The 2d day of August, the militia having performed their allotted task, and the fort being in a condition of defence in case of assault, they set out at noon, in order to reach the end of the lake on their return to their own country. On the morning of the 3d, being the next day, I embarked for the purpose of joining the militia, leaving the regular troops under the direction of M. de Vaudreuil to finish what was the most essential, and to render the fort not only capable of defence, but also of being occupied by a detachment of 100 soldiers, which are to winter there under the command of M Troyes"—Marquis de Nonville, *Journal of Expedition against the Senecas* (*tr. in Hist. Writings of O. H. Marshall, p.* 173)—"De Nonville's journal removes the doubt which has been entertained as to the location of this fortress, some having supposed it to have been first built at Lewiston. . . . It occupied the site of the present fort on the angle formed by the junction of the Niagara with Lake Ontario. . . . De Nonville left De Troyes with provisions and munitions for eight months. A sickness soon after broke out in the garrison, by which they nearly all perished, including their commander. . . . They were so closely besieged by the Iroquois that they were unable to supply themselves with fresh provisions. The fortress was soon after abandoned and destroyed [1688], much to the regret of De Nonville."—*Foot-notes to the above.*

ALSO IN: F. Parkman, *Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV., pp* 155 *and* 166.

A. D. 1725-1726.—The stone fort built.—How the French gained their footing.—Joncaire's wigwam.—Captain Joncaire "had been taken prisoner when quite young by the Iroquois, and adopted into one of their tribes. This was the making of his fortune. He had grown up among them, acquired their language, adapted himself to their habits, and was considered by them as one of themselves. On returning to civilized life he became a prime instrument in the hands of the Canadian government, for managing and cajoling the Indians. . . . When the French wanted to get a commanding site for a post on the Iroquois lands, near Niagara, Joncaire was the man to manage it. He craved a situation where he might put up a wigwam, and

dwell among his Iroquois brethren. It was granted, of course, 'for was he not a son of the tribe — was he not one of themselves?' By degrees his wigwam grew into an important trading post; ultimately it became Fort Niagara."—W Irving, *Life of Washington*, *v* 1, *ch* 5 —"In 1725 the Fort of Niagara was commenced by Chaussegross de Léry, on the spot where the wooden structure of de Denonville formerly stood, it was built of stone and completed in 1726 "—W. Kingsford, *Hist of Canada*, *v* 2, *p* 516

A. D. 1755.—Abortive expedition against the fort, by the English. See CANADA A D 1755 (AUGUST—OCTOBER)

A. D. 1756.—The fort rebuilt by Pouchot. See CANADA A D 1756

A. D. 1759.—The fort taken by the English. See CANADA A D 1759 (JULY—AUGUST)

A. D. 1763.—The ambuscade and massacre at Devil's Hole. See DEVIL'S HOLE

A. D. 1764.—Sir William Johnson's treaty with the Indians.—Cession of the Four Mile Strip along both banks of the river. See PONTIAC'S WAR.

A. D. 1783.—Retention of the Fort by Great Britain after peace with the United States. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D 1784-1788

A D. 1796.—Surrender of the fort by Great Britain. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D 1794-1795

A. D. 1813.—Surprise and capture of the fort by the British. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D 1813 (DECEMBER)

NIAGARA, OR LUNDY'S LANE, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D 1814 (JULY—SEPTEMBER)

NIAGARA FRONTIER: A D. 1812-1814.—The War.—Queenstown.—Buffalo.—Chippewa.—Lundy's Lane.—Fort Erie. See UNITED STATES OF AM . A D 1812 (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER), 1813 (DECEMBER), 1814 (JULY—SEPTEMBER)

NIAGARA PEACE MISSION, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D 1864 (JULY)

NIAGARA RIVER, Navigated by La Salle (1679). See CANADA A D 1669-1687

NIBELUNGEN LIED, The.—"Of the bequests made to us of the [German] Popular Poetry of the time of the Hohenstauffen, by far the most important, in fact the most important literary memorial of any kind, is the epic of between nine and ten thousand lines known as the Nibelungen Lied The manuscripts which have preserved for us the poem come from about the year 1200. For full a thousand years before that, however, many of the lays from which it was composed had been in existence, some indeed proceed from a still remoter antiquity, sung by primitive minstrels when the Germans were at their wildest, untouched by Christianity or civilization These lays had been handed down orally, until at length a poet of genius elaborated them and intrusted them to parchment."—J K. Hosmer, *Short History of German Literature*, *pt.* 1, *ch* 1. —"In the year 1757, the Swiss Professor Bodmer printed an ancient poetical manuscript, under the title of Chriemhilden Rache und die Klage (Chriemhilde's Revenge, and the Lament); which may be considered as the first of a series, or stream of publications and speculations still rolling on, with increased current, to the present day. . . Some fifteen years after Bodmer's publication, which, for the rest, is not celebrated as an editorial feat, one C H. Müller undertook a Collection of German Poems from the Twelfth, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries, wherein, among other articles, he reprinted Bodmer's Chriemhilde and Klage, with a highly remarkable addition prefixed to the former, essential indeed to the right understanding of it, and the whole now stood before the world as one Poem, under the name of the Nibelungen Lied, or Lay of the Nibelungen It has since been ascertained that the Klage is a foreign inferior appendage, at best related only as epilogue to the main work. meanwhile out of this Nibelungen, such as it was, there soon proceeded new inquiries and kindred enterprises. For much as the Poem, in the shape it here bore, was defaced and marred, it failed not to attract observation to all open-minded lovers of poetry, especially where a strong patriotic feeling existed, the singular antique Nibelungen was an interesting appearance Johannes Müller, in his famous Swiss History, spoke of it in warm terms. subsequently, August Wilhelm Schlegel, through the medium of the Deutsche Museum, succeeded in awakening something like a universal popular feeling on the subject, and, as a natural consequence, a whole host of Editors and Critics, of deep and of shallow endeavour, whose labours we yet see in progress The Nibelungen has now been investigated, translated, collated, commented upon, with more or less result, to almost boundless lengths Apart from its antiquarian value, and not only as by far the finest monument of old German art, but intrinsically, and as a mere detached composition, this Nibelungen has an excellence that cannot but surprise us. With little preparation, any reader of poetry, even in these days, might find it interesting. It is not without a certain Unity of interest and purport, an internal coherence and completeness, it is a Whole, and some spirit of Music informs it these are the highest characteristics of a true Poem Considering farther what intellectual environment we now find it in, it is doubly to be prized and wondered at, for it differs from those Hero books, as molten or carved metal does from rude agglomerated ore, almost as some Shakspeare from his fellow Dramatist, whose Tamburlaines and Island Princesses, themselves not destitute of merit, first show us clearly in what pure loftiness and loneliness the Hamlets and Tempests reign The unknown Singer of the Nibelungen, though no Shakspeare, must have had a deep poetic soul, wherein things discontinuous and inanimate shaped themselves together into life, and the Universe with its wondrous purport stood significantly imaged; overarching, as with heavenly firmaments and eternal harmonies, the little scene where men strut and fret their hour His Poem, unlike so many old and new pretenders to that name, has a basis and organic structure, a beginning, middle and end; there is one great principle and idea set forth in it, round which all its multifarious parts combine in living union. . . . With an instinctive art, far different from acquired artifice, this Poet of the Nibelungen, working in the same province with his contemporaries of the Heldenbuch [Herobook] on the same material of tradition, has, in a wonderful degree, possessed himself of what

these could only strive after; and with his 'clear feeling of fictitious truth,' avoid as false the errors and monstrous perplexities in which they vainly struggled. He is of another species than they; in language, in purity and depth of feeling, in fineness of invention, stands quite apart from them. The language of the Heldenbuch . . . was a feeble half-articulate child's speech, the metre nothing better than a miserable doggerel; whereas here in the old Frankish (Oberdeutsch) dialect of the Nibelungen, we have a clear decisive utterance, and in a real system of verse not without essential regularity, great liveliness, and now and then even harmony of rhythm. . . . No less striking than the verse and language is the quality of the invention manifested here Of the Fable or narrative material of the Nibelungen we should say that it had high, almost the highest merit, so daintily yet firmly is it put together, with such felicitous selection of the beautiful, the essential, and no less felicitous rejection of whatever was unbeautiful or even extraneous The reader is no longer afflicted with that chaotic brood of Fire-drakes, Giants, and malicious turbaned Turks, so fatally rife in the Heldenbuch all this is swept away, or only hovers in faint shadows afar off, and free field is open for legitimate perennial interests. Yet neither is the Nibelungen without its wonders, for it is poetry and not prose; here too, a supernatural world encompasses the natural, and, though at rare intervals and in calm manner, reveals itself there. . . The whole story of the Nibelungen is fateful, mysterious, guided on by unseen influences, yet the actual marvels are few, and done in the far distance; those Dwarfs, and Cloaks of Darkness, and charmed Treasure caves, are heard of rather than beheld, the tidings of them seem to issue from unknown space. Vain were it to inquire where that Nibelungen land specially is its very name is Nebel-land or Nift land, the land of Darkness, of Invisibility. The 'Nibelungen Heroes' that muster in thousands and tens of thousands, though they march to the Rhine or Danube, and we see their strong limbs and shining armour, we could almost fancy to be children of the air."—T. Carlyle, *The Nibelungen Lied* (*Critical and Miscellaneous Essays*, v. 3).—"The traditions of German heroic poetry extend over more than 300 years, and are drawn from various German tribes. King Ostrogotha reigned over the Goths about the year 250, and was the contemporary of the emperors Philip and Decius Ermanaric governed the Ostrogoths about 100 years later, and was a very warlike king, ruling over a large extent of territory. The invasion of the Huns drove him to despair, and he fell by his own hand before the year 374. Soon after the year 400 the Burgundians founded a mighty empire in the most fertile part of the Upper Rhine, where Cæsar had already fought with the Germans, near Spiers, Worms, and Mayence. The Roman Aëtius, who ruled Gaul with the aid of his Hun allies, defeated the Burgundians by means of these barbarians in a terrible battle about the year 437; 20,000 men fell, amongst them their king Gundicarius (Gunther). The Burgundians seemed to be annihilated, and soon after retreated to Savoy. About the same time Attila was king of the Huns and Ostrogoths to the terror of the world. His name is Gothic, the arrangements of his court were Gothic, and he reckoned among his knights Theodomer, the king of the Ostrogoths. The West had just learnt all the terror of this 'Scourge of God,' when news came of his sudden death (453), and in the following year his followers succumbed to the attacks of the Germans (454). Twenty-two years later, Odoacer deposed the last shadow of a Roman emperor; and again, twelve years later, Theodoric led the Ostrogoths into Italy and Odoacer fell by his hand About the same period the Merovingian Clovis founded the kingdom of the Franks; about the year 530 his sons destroyed the Thuringian empire, and his grandson Theodebert extended his kingdom so far, that, starting from Hungary, he planned an attack on the Byzantine emperor. The Merovingians also offered a successful resistance to the Vikings, who were the terror of the North Sea, and who appeared even at the mouths of the Rhine. From another quarter the Longobards in little more than a century reached Italy, having started from Lüneburg, in the neighbourhood of Brunswick, and their King Alboin took possession of the crown of Italy in 568. These wonderful transferences of power, and this rapid founding of new empires, furnished the historical background of the German hero-legends. The fact that the movement was originally against Rome was forgotten, the migration was treated as a mere incident in the internal history of the German nation There is no trace of chronology . . . Legend adheres to the fact of the enmity between Odoacer and Theodoric, but it really confuses Theodoric with his father Theodomer, transplants him accordingly to Attila's court, and supposes that he was an exile there in hiding from the wrath of Odoacer Attila becomes the representative of everything connected with the Huns He is regarded as Ermanaric's and Gunther's enemy, and as having destroyed the Burgundians These again are confused with a mythical race, the Nibelungen, Siegfried's enemies, and thus arose the great and complicated scheme of the Nibelungen legend. . . . This Middle High-German Epic is like an old church, in the building of which many architects have successively taken part. . . . Karl Lachmann attempted the work of restoring the Nibelungenlied and analysing its various elements, and accomplished the task, not indeed faultlessly, yet on the whole correctly. He has pointed out later interpolations, which hide the original sequence of the story, and has divided the narrative which remains after the removal of these accretions into twenty songs, some of which are connected, while others embody isolated incidents of the legend. Some of them, but certainly only a few, may be by the same author . . . We recognise in most of these songs such differences in conception, treatment, and style, as point to separate authorship. The whole may have been finished in about twenty years, from 1190–1210. Lachmann's theory has indeed been contested. Many students still believe that the poem, as we have it, was the work of one hand; but on this hypothesis no one has succeeded in explaining the strange contradictions which pervade the work, parts of which show the highest art, while the rest is valueless."—W. Scherer, *History of German Literature*, *ch.* 2 *and* 5 (*c*, 1).

ALSO IN: B. Taylor, *Studies in German Literature*, *ch.* 4.

NICÆA OR NICE: The founding of the city.—Nicæa, or Nice, in Bithynia, was founded by Antigonus, one of the successors of Alexander the Great, and received originally the name Antigonea. Lysimachus changed the name to Nicæa, in honor of his wife.

Capture by the Goths. See GOTHS A. D. 258–267.

A. D. 325.—The First Council.—"Constantine . . . determined to lay the question of Arianism [see ARIANISM] before an Œcumenical council. . . . The council met [A D 325] at Nicæa—the 'City of Victory'—in Bithynia, close to the Ascanian Lake, and about twenty miles from Nicomedia . It was an Eastern council, and, like the Eastern councils, was held within a measurable distance from the seat of government . . . Of the 318 bishops who subscribed its decrees, only eight came from the West, and the language in which the Creed was composed was Greek, which scarcely admitted of a Latin rendering The words of the Creed are even now recited by the Russian Emperor at his coronation. Its character, then, is strictly Oriental . . . Of the 318 members of the Council, we are told by Philostorgius, the Arian historian, that 22 espoused the cause of Arius, though other writers regard the minority as still less, some fixing it at 17, others at 15, others as low as 13 But of those 318 the first place in rank, though not the first in mental power and energy of character, was accorded to the aged bishop of Alexandria. He was the representative of the most intellectual diocese in the Eastern Church He alone, of all the bishops, was named 'Papa,' or 'Pope' The 'Pope of Rome' was a phrase which had not yet emerged in history, but 'Pope of Alexandria' was a well known title of dignity"—R W. Bush, *St. Athanasius, ch* 6

ALSO IN A P. Stanley, *Lects. on the Hist of the Eastern Church, lect* 3–5

A. D. 1080.—Acquired by the Turks.—The capital of the Sultan of Roum. See TURKS (THE SELJUK). A D 1073–1092

A. D. 1096-1097.—Defeat and slaughter of the First Crusaders.—Recovery from the Turks. See CRUSADES. A D 1096–1099

A. D. 1204-1261.—Capital of the Greek Empire. See GREEK EMPIRE OF NICÆA

A. D. 1330.—Capture by the Ottoman Turks. See TURKS (OTTOMAN) A D 1326–1359

A. D. 1402.—Sacked by Timour. See TIMOUR.

NICARAGUA: The Name.—Nicaragua was originally the name of a native chief who ruled in the region on the Lake when it was first penetrated by the Spaniards, under Gil Gonzalez, in 1522. "Upon the return of Gil Gonzalez, the name Nicaragua became famous, and besides being applied to the cacique and his town, was gradually given to the surrounding country, and to the lake"—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States, v.* 1, *p.* 489, *foot-note.*

A. D. 1502.—Coasted by Columbus. See AMERICA: A. D. 1498–1505.

A. D. 1821-1871.—Independence of Spain.—Brief annexation to Mexico.—Attempted federations and their failure. See CENTRAL AMERICA: A. D. 1821–1871.

A. D. 1850.—The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty.—Joint protectorate of the United States and Great Britain over the proposed inter-oceanic canal.—"The acquisition of California in May, 1848, by the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, and the vast rush of population, which followed almost immediately on the development of the gold mines, to that portion of the Pacific coast, made the opening of interoceanic communication a matter of paramount importance to the United States. In December, 1846, had been ratified a treaty with New Granada (which in 1862 assumed the name of Colombia) by which a right of transit over the isthmus of Panama was given to the United States, and the free transit over the isthmus 'from the one to the other sea' guaranteed by both of the contracting powers Under the shelter of this treaty the Panama Railroad Company, composed of citizens of the United States, and supplied by capital from the United States, was organized in 1850 and put in operation in 1855. In 1849, before, therefore, this company had taken shape, the United States entered into a treaty with Nicaragua for the opening of a ship-canal from Greytown (San Juan), on the Atlantic coast, to the Pacific coast, by way of the Lake of Nicaragua. Greytown, however, was then virtually occupied by British settlers, mostly from Jamaica, and the whole eastern coast of Nicaragua, so far at least as the eastern terminus of such a canal was concerned, was held, so it was maintained by Great Britain, by the Mosquito Indians, over whom Great Britain claimed to exercise a protectorate. That the Mosquito Indians had no such settled territorial site, that, if they had, Great Britain had no such protectorate or sovereignty over them as authorized her to exercise dominion over their soil, even if they had any, are positions which the United States has repeatedly affirmed But the fact that the pretension was set up by Great Britain, and that, though it were baseless, any attempt to force a canal through the Mosquito country might precipitate a war, induced Mr Clayton, Secretary of State in the administration of General Taylor, to ask through Sir H L Bulwer British minister at Washington, the administration of Lord John Russell (Lord Palmerston being then foreign secretary) to withdraw the British pretensions to the coast so as to permit the construction of the canal under the joint auspices of the United States and of Nicaragua This the British Government declined to do, but agreed to enter into a treaty for a joint protectorate over the proposed canal." This treaty, which was signed at Washington April 19, 1850, and of which the ratifications were exchanged on the 4th of July following, is commonly referred to as the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty Its language in the first article is that "the Governments of the United States and of Great Britain hereby declare that neither the one nor the other will ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over the said ship-canal; agreeing that neither will ever erect or maintain any fortifications commanding the same, or in the vicinity thereof, or occupy, or fortify, or colonize, or assume or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America; nor will either make use of any protection which either affords, or may afford, or any alliance which either has or may have to or with any state or people, for the purpose of erecting or maintaining any such fortifications, or of occu-

pying, fortifying, or colonizing Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America, or of assuming or exercising dominion over the same; nor will the United States or Great Britain take advantage of any intimacy, or use any alliance, connection, or influence that either may possess, with any State or Government through whose territory the said canal may pass, for the purpose of acquiring or holding, directly or indirectly, for the citizens or subjects of the one, any rights or advantages in regard to commerce or navigation through the said canal which shall not be offered on the same terms to the citizens or subjects of the other." Since the execution of this treaty there have been repeated controversies between the two governments respecting the interpretation of its principal clauses. Great Britain having maintained her dominion over the Belize, or British Honduras, it has been claimed by the United States that the treaty is void, or has become voidable at the option of the United States, on the grounds (in the language of a dispatch from Mr Frelinghuysen, Secretary of State, dated July 19, 1884) "first, that the consideration of the treaty having failed, its object never having been accomplished, the United States did not receive that for which they covenanted, and, second, that Great Britain has persistently violated her agreement not to colonize the Central American coast." —F. Wharton, *Digest of the International Law of the U. S., ch* 6, *sect* 150*f*. (*v* 2).

Also in: *Treaties and Conventions between the U. S and other Powers* (*ed. of* 1889), *p* 440.

A. D. 1855-1860.—The invasion of Walker and his Filibusters.—"Its geographical situation gave . . importance to Nicaragua It contains a great lake, which is approached from the Atlantic by the river San Juan, and from the west end of the lake there are only 20 miles to the coast of the Pacific Ever since the time of Cortes there have been projects for connecting the two oceans through the lake of Nicaragua . . . Hence Nicaragua has always been thought of great importance to the United States. The political struggles of the state, ever since the failure of the confederation, had sunk into a petty rivalry between the two towns of Leon and Granada. Leon enjoys the distinction of being the first important town in Central America to raise the cry of independence in 1815, and it had always maintained the liberal character which this disclosed. Castellon, the leader of the Radical party, of which Leon was the seat, called in to help him an American named William Walker. Walker, who was born in 1824, was a young roving American who had gone during the gold rush of 1850 to California, and become editor of a newspaper in San Francisco. In those days it was supposed in the United States that the time for engulfing the whole of Spanish America had come. Lopez had already made his descent on Cuba; and Walker, in July, 1853, had organized a band of filibusters for the conquest of Sonora, and the peninsula of California, which had been left to Mexico by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. This wild expedition . . . was a total failure; but when Walker came back to his newspapers after an absence of seven months, he found himself a hero. His fame, as we see, had reached Central America; and he at once accepted Castellon's offer. In 1855, having collected a band of 70 adventurers in California, he landed in the country, captured the town of Granada, and, aided by the intrigues of the American consul, procured his own appointment as General-in-Chief of the Nicaraguan army. Walker was now master of the place: and his own provisional President, Rivas, having turned against him, he displaced him, and in 1856 became President himself. He remained master of Nicaragua for nearly two years, levying arbitrary customs on the traffic of the lake, and forming plans for a great military state to be erected on the ruins of Spanish America One of Walker's first objects was to seize the famous gold-mines of Chontales, and the sudden discovery that the entire sierra of America is a gold-bearing region had a good deal to do with his extraordinary enterprise. Having assured himself of the wealth of the country, he now resolved to keep it for himself, and this proved in the end to be his ruin. The statesmen of the United States, who had at first supposed that he would cede them the territory, now withdrew their support from him. the people of the neighbouring states rose in arms against him, and Walker was obliged to capitulate, with the remains of his filibustering party, at Rivas in 1857. Walker, still claiming to be President of Nicaragua, went to New Orleans, where he collected a second band of filibusters, at the head of whom he again landed near the San Juan river towards the end of the year· this time he was arrested and sent back home by the American commodore. His third and last expedition, in 1860, was directed against Honduras, where he hoped to meet with a good reception at the hands of the Liberal party Instead of this he fell into the hands of the soldiers of Guardiola, by whom he was tried as a pirate and shot, September 12, 1860"—E J Payne, *Hist of European Colonies, ch* 21, *sect*. 8—"Though he never evinced much military or other capacity, Walker, so long as he acted under color of authority from the chiefs of the faction he patronized, was generally successful against the pitiful rabble styled soldiers by whom his progress was resisted. . . . But his very successes proved the ruin of the faction to which he had attached himself, by exciting the natural jealousy and alarm of the natives who mainly composed it, and his assumption . . . of the title of President of Nicaragua, speedily followed by a decree reëstablishing Slavery in that country, exposed his purpose and insured his downfall. As if madly bent on ruin, he proceeded to confiscate the steamboats and other property of the Nicaragua Transit Company, thereby . . . cutting himself off from all hope of further recruiting his forces from the throngs of sanguine or of baffled gold seekers. . . . Yet he maintained the unequal contest for about two years"—H. Greeley, *The American Conflict, v.* 1, *ch.* 19.

Also in: H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States, v.* 8, *ch.* 16-17—J. J. Roche, *The Story of the Filibusters, ch.* 5-18.

A. D. 1871-1894.—Later History. See Central America: A. D. 1871-1885; and 1886-1894.

A. D. 1894.—The Mosquito Country.—The sovereignty of Nicaragua over the Mosquito country was affirmed by a convention concluded in November, 1894. Great Britain at the same time gave assurances to the United States that she asserts no rights over the country in question.

NICE (NICÆA), Asia Minor. See NICÆA.

NICE (NIZZA), France: A. D. 1388.—Acquisition by the House of Savoy. See SAVOY: 11–15TH CENTURIES.

A. D. 1542.—Siege by the French and the Turks.—Capture of the town.—Successful resistance of the citadel. See FRANCE: A. D. 1532–1547.

A. D. 1792.—Annexation to the French Republic. See FRANCE: A. D. 1792 (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1860.—Cession to France. See ITALY: A. D. 1859–1861.

NICHOLAS, Czar of Russia, A. D. 1825–1855. **Nicholas I., Pope,** 858–867. **Nicholas II., Pope,** 1058–1061. **Nicholas III., Pope,** 1277–1280. **Nicholas IV., Pope,** 1288–1292. **Nicholas V., Pope,** 1447–1455. **Nicholas Swendson, King of Denmark,** 1103–1134.

NICIAS (NIKIAS), and the Siege of Syracuse. See SYRACUSE: B. C. 415–413.

NICIAS (NIKIAS), The Peace of. See GREECE: B. C. 424–421.

NICOLET, Jean, Explorations of. See CANADA: A. D. 1634–1673.

NICOMEDIA: A. D. 258.—Capture by the Goths. See GOTHS: A. D. 258–267.

A. D. 292-305.—The court of Diocletian.—"To rival the majesty of Rome was the ambition . . . of Diocletian, who employed his leisure, and the wealth of the east, in the embellishment of Nicomedia, a city placed on the verge of Europe and Asia, almost at an equal distance between the Danube and the Euphrates. By the taste of the monarch, and at the expense of the people, Nicomedia acquired, in the space of a few years, a degree of magnificence which might appear to have required the labour of ages, and became inferior only to Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, in extent or populousness. . . . Till Diocletian, in the twentieth year of his reign, celebrated his Roman triumph, it is extremely doubtful whether he ever visited the ancient capital of the empire."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 13.—See ROME: A. D. 284–305.

A. D. 1326.—Capture by the Turks.—See TURKS (OTTOMAN): A. D. 1326–1359.

NICOPOLIS.—Augustus gave this name to a city which he founded, B. C. 31, in commemoration of the victory at Actium, on the site of the camp which his army occupied.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch.* 28.

NICOPOLIS, Armenia, Battle of (B. C. 66).—The decisive battle in which Pompeius defeated Mithridates and ended the long Mithridatic wars was fought, B. C. 66, in Lesser Armenia, at a place near which Pompeius founded a city called Nicopolis, the site of which is uncertain.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 3, *ch.* 8.

Battle of (B. C. 48). See ROME: B. C. 47–46.

NICOPOLIS, Bulgaria, Battle of (A. D. 1396). See TURKS (THE OTTOMAN): A. D. 1389–1403.

NICOSIA: Taken and sacked by the Turks (1570). See TURKS: A. D. 1566–1571.

NIGER COMPANY, The Royal. See AFRICA: A. D. 1884–1891.

NIGHTINGALE, FLORENCE, in the Crimea. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1854 (OCT.—NOV.).

NIHILISM.—NIHILISTS.—"In Tikomirov's work on Russia seven or eight pages are devoted to the severe condemnation of the use of the expressions 'nihilism' and 'nihilist.' Nevertheless . . . they are employed universally, and all the world understands what is meant by them in an approximate and relative way. . . . It was a novelist who first baptized the party who called themselves at that time 'new men.' It was Ivan Turguenief, who by the mouth of one of the characters in his celebrated novel, 'Fathers and Sons,' gave the young generation the name of nihilists. But it was not of his coinage; Royer-Collard first stamped it; Victor Hugo had already said that the negation of the infinite led directly to nihilism, and Joseph Lemaistre had spoken of the nihilism, more or less sincere, of the contemporary generations; but it was reserved for the author of 'Virgin Soil' to bring to light and make famous this word, which after making a great stir in his own country attracted the attention of the whole world. The reign of Nicholas I. was an epoch of hard oppression. When he ascended the throne, the conspiracy of the Decembrists broke out, and this sudden revelation of the revolutionary spirit steeled the already inflexible soul of the Czar. Nicholas, although fond of letters and an assiduous reader of Homer, was disposed to throttle his enemies, and would not have hesitated to pluck out the brains of Russia; he was very near suppressing all the universities and schools, and inaugurating a voluntary retrocession to Asiatic barbarism. He did mutilate and reduce the instruction, he suppressed the chair of European political laws, and after the events of 1848 in France he seriously considered the idea of closing his frontiers with a cordon of troops to beat back foreign liberalism like the cholera or the plague. . . . However, it was under his sceptre, under his systematic oppression, that, by confession of the great revolutionary statesman Herzen, Russian thought developed as never before; that the emancipation of the intelligence, which this very statesman calls a tragic event, was accomplished, and a national literature was brought to light and began to flourish. When Alexander II. succeeded to the throne, when the bonds of despotism were loosened and the blockade with which Nicholas vainly tried to isolate his empire was raised, the field was ready for the intellectual and political strife. . . . Before explaining how nihilism is the outcome of intelligence, we must understand what is meant by intelligence in Russia. It means a class composed of all those, of whatever profession or estate, who have at heart the advancement of intellectual life, and contribute in every way toward it. It may be said, indeed, that such a class is to be found in every country; but there is this difference,—in other countries the class is not a unit; there are factions, or a large number of its members shun political and social discussion in order to enjoy the serene atmosphere of the world of art, while in Russia the intelligence means a common cause, a homogeneous spirit, subversive and revolutionary withal. . . . Whence came the revolutionary element in Russia? From the Occident, from France, from the negative,

materialist, sensualist philosophy of the Encyclopædia, imported into Russia by Catherine II; and later from Germany, from Kantism and Hegelianism, imbibed by Russian youth at the German universities, and which they diffused throughout their own country with characteristic Sclav impetuosity By 'Pure Reason' and transcendental idealism, Herzen and Bakunine, the first apostles of nihilism, were inspired But the ideas brought from Europe to Russia soon allied themselves with an indigenous or possibly an Oriental element, namely, a sort of quietist fatalism, which leads to the darkest and most despairing pessimism On the whole, nihilism is rather a philosophical conception of the sum of life than a purely democratic and revolutionary movement Nihilism had no political color about it at the beginning During the decade between 1860 and 1870 the youth of Russia was seized with a sort of fever for negation, a fierce antipathy toward everything that was,—authorities institutions customary ideas, and old fashioned dogmas In Turguenief's novel, 'Fathers and Sons' we meet with Bazarof a froward ill mannered, intolerable fellow, who represents the type After 1871 the echo of the Paris Commune and emissaries of the Internationals crossed the frontier and the nihilists began to bestir themselves, to meet together clandestinely, and to send out propaganda Seven years later they organized an era of terror assassination and explosions Thus three phases have followed upon one another,—thought, word, and deed,—along that road which is never so long as it looks, the road that leads from the word to the act, from Utopia to crime And yet nihilism never became a political party as we understand the term It has no defined creed or official programme The fulness of its despair embraces all negatives and all acute revolutionary forms Anarchists, federalists, cantonalists, covenanters, terrorists, all who are unanimous in a desire to sweep away the present order, are grouped under the ensign of nihil"—E P. Bazan, *Russia, its People and its Literature, bk* 2, *ch* 1-2—"Out of Russia, an already extended list of revolutionary spirits in this land has attracted the attention and kept curiosity on the alert We call them Nihilists,—of which the Russian pronunciation is neegilist, which, however, is now obsolete Confined to the terrorist group in Europe, the number of these persons is certainly very small Perhaps, as is thought in Russia, there are 500 in all, who busy themselves, even if reluctantly, with thoughts of resorting to bombs and murderous weapons to inspire terror But it is not exactly this group that is meant when we speak of that nihilistic force in society which extends everywhere, into all circles, and finds support and strongholds at widely spread points It is indeed not very different from what elsewhere in Europe is regarded as culture, advanced culture· the profound scepticism in regard to our existing institutions in their present form, what we call royal prerogative, church, marriage, property"—Georg Brandes, *Impressions of Russia, ch.* 4.—"The genuine Nihilism was a philosophical and literary movement, which flourished in the first decade after the Emancipation of the Serfs, that is to say, between 1860 and 1870. It is now [1883] absolutely extinct, and only a few traces are left of it, which are rapidly disappearing. . . . Nihilism was a struggle for the emancipation of intelligence from every kind of dependence, and it advanced side by side with that for the emancipation of the labouring classes from serfdom. The fundamental principle of Nihilism, properly so-called, was absolute individualism. It was the negation, in the name of individual liberty, of all the obligations imposed upon the individual by society, by family life, and by religion. Nihilism was a passionate and powerful reaction, not against political despotism, but against the moral despotism that weighs upon the private and inner life of the individual But it must be confessed that our predecessors, at least in the earlier days, introduced into this highly pacific struggle the same spirit of rebellion and almost the same fanaticism that characterises the present movement"—Stepniak *Underground Russia*

ALSO IN I. Tikhomirov, *Russia, Political and Social, bk* 6 7 (*v* 2)—E Noble *The Russian Revolt*—A Leroy Beaulieu, *The Empire of the Tsars, pt* 1 *bk* 3 *ch* 4—See, also, RUSSIA A D 1879-1881, ANARCHISTS, and SOCIAL MOVEMENTS A D 1860-1870

NIKA SEDITION, The. See CIRCUS

NIKIAS. See NICIAS

NILE, Exploration of the sources of the See AFRICA A D 1768 1773 and after

NILE, Naval Battle of the. See FRANCE: A D 1798 (MAY—AUGUST)

NIMEGUEN: Origin. See BATAVIANS.

A. D. 1591.—Siege and capture by Prince Maurice. See NETHERLANDS A D 1588-1598.

NIMEGUEN, The Peace of (1678-1679).—The war which Louis XIV began in 1672 by attacking Holland, with the co operation of his English pensioner, Charles II, and which roused against him a defensive coalition of Spain, Germany and Denmark with the Dutch (see NETHERLANDS: A D. 1672-1674, and 1674-1678), was ended by a series of treaties negotiated at Nimeguen in 1678 and 1679 The first of these treaties, signed August 10, 1678, was between France and Holland. "France and Holland kept what was in their possession, except Maestricht and its dependencies which were restored to Holland. France therefore kept her conquests in Senegal and Guiana. This was all the territory lost by Holland in the terrible war which had almost annihilated her The United Provinces pledged themselves to neutrality in the war which might continue between France and the other powers, and guaranteed the neutrality of Spain, after the latter should have signed the peace. France included Sweden in the treaty; Holland included in it Spain and the other allies who should make peace within six weeks after the exchange of ratifications To the treaty of peace was annexed a treaty of commerce, concluded for twenty-five years."—H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV.* (*trans by M. L. Booth*), *v* 1, *ch* 6.—The peace between France and Spain was signed September 17. France gave back, in the Spanish Netherlands and elsewhere, "Charleroi, Binch, Ath, Oudenarde, and Courtrai, which she had gained by the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle; the town and duchy of Limburg, all the country beyond the Meuse, Ghent, Rodenhus, and the district of the Waes, Leuze, and St. Ghislain, with Puycerda in Catalonia, these having been taken since that peace. But she retained Franche

Comté, with the towns of Valenciènnes, Bouchain, Condé, Cambrai and the Cambrésis, Aire, St. Omer, Ypres, Werwick, Warneton, Poperinge, Bailleul, Cassel, Baval, and Maubeuge. . . . On February 2, 1679, peace was declared between Louis, the Emperor, and the Empire. Louis gave back Philippsburg, retaining Freiburg with the desired liberty of passage across the Rhine to Breisach; in all other respects the Treaty of Munster, of October 24, 1648, was re-established. . . . The treaty then dealt with the Duke of Lorraine To his restitution Louis annexed conditions which rendered Lorraine little more than a French province Not only was Nancy to become French, but, in conformity with the treaty of 1661, Louis was to have possession of four large roads traversing the country, with half a league's breadth of territory throughout their length, and the places contained therein . . To these conditions the Duke refused to subscribe, preferring continual exile until the Peace of Ryswick in 1697, when at length his son regained the ancestral estates" Treaties between the Emperor and Sweden, between Brandenburg and France and Sweden, between Denmark and the same, and between Sweden, Spain and Holland, were successively concluded during the year 1679 "The effect of the Peace of Nimwegen was, . . speaking generally, to reaffirm the Peace of Westphalia But . . it did not, like the Peace of Westphalia, close for any length of time the sources of strife'—O Airy, *The English Restoration and Louis XIV*, *ch* 22

Also in: Sir W Temple, *Memoirs*, *pt* 2 (*Works*, *v* 2).

NINE WAYS The. See Amphipolis, also, Athens, B C 466–454.

NINETY-FIVE THESES OF LUTHER, The. See Papacy A D. 1517.

NINETY-TWO, The. See United States of Am.: A D 1767–1768

NINEVEH.—"In or about the year before Christ 606, Nineveh, the great city, was destroyed. For many hundred years had she stood in arrogant splendor, her palaces towering above the Tigris and mirrored in its swift waters, army after army had gone forth from her gates and returned laden with the spoils of conquered countries; her monarchs had ridden to the high place of sacrifice in chariots drawn by captive kings. But her time came at last. The nations assembled and encompassed her around [the Medes and the Babylonians, with their lesser allies]. Popular tradition tells how over two years lasted the siege; how the very river rose and battered her walls; till one day a vast flame rose up to heaven; how the last of a mighty line of kings, too proud to surrender, thus saved himself, his treasures and his capital from the shame of bondage. Never was city to rise again where Nineveh had been." The very knowledge of the existence of Nineveh was lost so soon that, two centuries later, when Xenophon passed the ruins, with his Ten Thousand retreating Greeks, he reported them to be the ruins of a deserted city of the Medes and called it Larissa. Twenty-four centuries went by, and the winds and the rains, in their slow fashion, covered the bricks and stones of the desolated Assyrian capital with a shapeless mound of earth. Then came the searching modern scholar and explorer, and began to excavate the mound, to see what lay beneath it. First the French Consul, Botta, in 1842; then the Englishman Layard, in 1845; then the later English scholar, George Smith, and others; until buried Nineveh has been in great part brought to light Not only the imperishable monuments of its splendid art have been exposed, but a veritable library of its literature, written on tablets and cylinders of clay, has been found and read. The discoveries of the past half-century, on the site of Nineveh, under the mound called Koyunjik, and elsewhere in other similarly-buried cities of ancient Babylonia and Assyria, may reasonably be called the most extraordinary additions to human knowledge which our age has acquired —Z. A Ragozin, *Story of Chaldea*, *introd.*, *ch.* 1–4.

Also in: A. H. Layard, *Nineveh and its Remains;* and *Discoveries among the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon* —G. Smith, *Assyrian Discoveries* —See, also, Assyria, and Libraries, Ancient

NINEVEH, Battle of (A. D. 627). See Persia A D 226–627.

NINFEO, Treaty of. See Genoa. A. D 1261–1299

NINIQUIQUILAS, The. See American Aborigines Pampas Tribes.

NIPAL, OR NEPAUL: English war with the Ghorkas. See India. A. D. 1805–1816.

NIPMUCKS, OR NIPNETS, The. See American Aborigines. Algonquian Family; also, New England A. D 1674–1675, 1675, and 1676–1678 King Philip's War.

NISÆAN PLAINS, The.—The famous horse pastures of the ancient Medes. "Most probably they are to be identified with the modern plains of Khawah and Alishtar, between Behistun and Khorramabad, which are even now considered to afford the best summer pasturage in Persia. . . . The proper Nissea is the district of Nishapur in Khorasan, whence it is probable that the famous breed of horses was originally brought."—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Media*, *ch.* 1, *with foot-note.*

NISCHANDYIS. See Sublime Porte.

NISHAPOOR: Destruction by the Mongols (1221). See Khorassan. A. D. 1220–1221.

NISIB, Battle of (1839). See Turks: A. D. 1831–1840.

NISIBIS, Battle of. See Parthia.

NISIBIS, Sieges of (A. D. 338-350). See Persia: A D 226–627.

NISIBIS, School of. See Nestorians.

NISMES: Origin. See Volcæ.

A. D. 752-759.—Recovery from the Moslems. See Mahometan Conquest: A. D. 752–759.

NISSA, Siege and battle (1689-1690). See Hungary: A D. 1683–1699.

NITIOBRIGES, The.—These were a tribe in ancient Gaul whose capital city was Aginnum, the modern town of Agen on the Garonne.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, *v.* 4, *ch.* 17.

NIVELLE, Battle of the (1813). See Spain: A. D. 1812–1814.

NIVÔSE, The month. See France: A. D. 1793 (October) The new republican calendar.

NIZAM.—Nizam's dominions. See India. A. D. 1662–1748.

NIZZA. See Nice.

NO.—NO AMON. See Thebes, Egypt.

NO MAN'S LAND, Africa. See Griquas.

NO MAN'S LAND, England.—In the open or common field system which prevailed in early England, the fields were divided into long, narrow strips, wherever practicable. In some cases, "little odds and ends of unused land remained, which from time immemorial were called 'no man's land,' or 'any one's land,' or 'Jack's land,' as the case might be."—F. Seebohm, *Eng Vil lage Community, ch.* 1

NO POPERY RIOTS, The. See ENGLAND, A. D 1778–1780.

NOBLES, Roman: Origin of the term.—"When Livy in his first six books writes of the disputes between the Patres or Patricians and the Plebs about the Public Land, he sometimes designates the Patricians by the name Nobiles, which we have in the form Nobles A Nobilis is a man who is known A man who is not known is Ignobilis, a nobody In the later Republic a Plebeian who attained to a curule office elevated his family to a rank of honour, to a nobility, not acknowledged by any law, but by usage. . . . The Patricians were a nobility of antient date. . . . The Patrician nobility was therefore independent of all office, but the new Nobility and their Jus Imaginum originated in some Plebeian who first of his family attained a curule office. . The true conclusion is that Livy in his first six books uses the word Nobiles improperly, for there is no evidence that this name was given to the Patres before the consulship of L. Sextius "—G Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v* 1, *ch* 11 —See, also, ROME, B C 146.

NOËTIANS AND SABELLIANS.—"At the head of those in this century [the 3d] who explained the scriptural doctrine of the Father, Son, and holy Spirit, by the precepts of reason, stands Noëtus of Smyrna; a man little known, but who is reported by the ancients to have been cast out of the church by presbyters (of whom no account is given), to have opened a school, and to have formed a sect. It is stated that, being wholly unable to comprehend how that God, who is so often in Scripture declared to be one and undivided, can, at the same time, be manifold, Noëtus concluded that the undivided Father of all things united himself with the man Christ, was born in him, and in him suffered and died. On account of this doctrine his followers were called Patripassians. . . . After the middle of this century, Sabellius, an African bishop, or presbyter, of Ptolemais, the capital of the Pentapolitan province of Libya Cyrenaica, attempted to reconcile, in a manner somewhat different from that of Noëtus, the scriptural doctrine of Father, Son, and holy Spirit, with the doctrine of the unity of the divine nature." Sabellius assumed "that only an energy or virtue, emitted from the Father of all, or, if you choose, a particle of the person or nature of the Father, became united with the man Christ. And such a virtue or particle of the Father, he also supposed, constituted the holy Spirit."—J. L. von Mosheim, *Historical Commentaries, 3d century, sects.* 32–33.

NÖFELS, OR NAEFELS, Battle of (1388). See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1386–1388. . . . . **Battle of (1799).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1799 (AUGUST—DECEMBER).

NOLA, Battle of (B. C. 88). See ROME: B. C. 90–88.

NOMBRE DE DIOS: Surprised and plundered by Drake (1572). See AMERICA: A. D. 1572–1580.

NOMEN, COGNOMEN, PRÆNOMEN. See GENS.

NOMES.—A name given by the Greeks to the districts into which Egypt was divided from very ancient times.

NOMOPHYLAKES.—In ancient Athens, under the constitution introduced by Pericles, seven magistrates called Nomophylakes, or "Law-Guardians," "sat alongside of the Prodri, or presidents, both in the senate and in the public assembly, and were charged with the duty of interposing whenever any step was taken or any proposition made contrary to the existing laws. They were also empowered to constrain the magistrates to act according to law."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt* 2, *ch.* 46.

NOMOTHETÆ, The.—A legislative commission, elected and deputed by the general assembly of the people, in ancient Athens, to amend existing laws or enact new ones.—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, pt.* 3, *ch* 3

NONCONFORMISTS, OR DISSENTERS, English: First bodies organized.—Persecutions under Charles II. and Anne.—Removal of Disabilities. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1559–1566, 1662–1665, 1672–1673, 1711–1714; 1827–1828

NONES. See CALENDAR, JULIAN

NONINTERCOURSE LAW OF 1809, The American. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D 1804–1809, and 1808–1810.

NONJURORS, The. See ENGLAND A D. 1689 (APRIL–AUGUST).

NOOTKAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES WAKASHAN FAMILY.

NOPH. See MEMPHIS

NÖRDLINGEN, Siege and Battle (1634). See GERMANY A D 1634–1639 . . **Second Battle, or Battle of Allerheim (1645).** See GERMANY, A D 1640–1645

NORE, Mutiny at the. See ENGLAND, A. D. 1797

NOREMBEGA. See NORUMBEGA

NORFOLK, Va.: A. D. 1776.—Bombardment and destruction. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1775–1776

A. D. 1779.—Pillaged by British marauders. See UNITED STATES OF AM., A. D. 1778–1779 WASHINGTON GUARDING THE HUDSON.

A. D. 1861 (April).—Abandoned by the United States commandant.—Destruction of ships and property.—Possession taken by the Rebels. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (APRIL).

A. D. 1862 (February).—Threatened by the Federal capture of Roanoke Island. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JANUARY—APRIL: NORTH CAROLINA).

A. D. 1862 (May).—Evacuated by the Confederates. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (MAY: VIRGINIA) EVACUATION OF NORFOLK.

NORFOLK ISLAND PENAL COLONY. See TASMANIA.

NORICUM. See PANNONIA; also, RHÆTIANS.

NORMANDY: A. D. 876–911.—Rollo's conquest and occupation. See NORMANS.—NORTHMEN: A. D. 876–911.

A. D. 911-1000.—The solidifying of Rollo's duchy.—The Normans become French.—The first century which passed after the settlement of the Northmen along the Seine saw "the steady growth of the duchy in extent and power. Much of this was due to the ability of its rulers, to the vigour and wisdom with which Hrolf forced order and justice on the new community, as well as to the political tact with which both Hrolf and William Longsword [son and successor of Duke Rollo or Hrolf, A. D. 927-943] clung to the Karolings in their strife with the dukes of Paris. But still more was owing to the steadiness with which both these rulers remained faithful to the Christianity which had been imposed on the northmen as a condition of their settlement, and to the firm resolve with which they trampled down the temper and traditions which their people had brought from their Scandinavian homeland, and welcomed the language and civilization which came in the wake of their neighbours' religion. The difficulties that met the dukes were indeed enormous. . . They were girt in by hostile states, they were threatened at sea by England, under Æthelstan a network of alliances menaced them with ruin. Once a French army occupied Rouen, and a French king held the pirates' land at his will, once the German lances were seen from the walls of their capital Nor were their difficulties within less than those with out The subject population which had been trodden under foot by the northern settlers were seething with discontent. The policy of Christianization and civilization broke the Normans themselves into two parties . The very conquests of Hrolf and his successor, the Bessin, the Cotentin, had to be settled and held by the new comers, who made them strongholds of heathendom. . . . But amidst difficulties from within and from without the dukes held firm to their course, and their stubborn will had its reward . . By the end of William Longsword's days all Normandy, save the newly settled districts of the west, was Christian, and spoke French . The work of the statesman at last completed the work of the sword As the connexion of the dukes with the Karoling kings had given them the land, and helped them for fifty years to hold it against the House of Paris, so in the downfall of the Karolings the sudden and adroit change of front which bound the Norman rulers to the House of Paris in its successful struggle for the Crown secured the land for ever to the northmen. The close connexion which France was forced to maintain with the state whose support held the new royal line on its throne told both on kingdom and duchy. The French dread of the 'pirates' died gradually away, while French influence spread yet more rapidly over a people which clung so closely to the French crown."—J. R. Green, *The Conquest of England, ch.* 8.

A. D. 1035-1063.—Duke William establishes his authority.—Duke Robert, of Normandy, who died in 1035, was succeeded by his young son William, who bore in youth the opprobrious name of "the Bastard," but who extinguished it in later life under the proud appellation of "the Conqueror." By reason of his bastardy he was not an acceptable successor, and being yet a boy, it seemed little likely that he would maintain himself on the ducal throne. Normandy, for a dozen years, was given up to lawless strife among its nobles. In 1047 a large part of the duchy rose in revolt, against its objectionable young lord. "It will be remembered that the western part of Normandy, the lands of Bayeux and Coutances, were won by the Norman dukes after the eastern part, the lands of Rouen and Evreux. And it will be remembered that these western lands, won more lately, and fed by new colonies from the North, were still heathen and Danish some while after eastern Normandy had become Christian and French-speaking. Now we may be sure that, long before William's day, all Normandy was Christian, but it is quite possible that the old tongue may have lingered on in the western lands. At any rate there was a wide difference in spirit and feeling between the more French and the more Danish districts, to say nothing of Bayeux, where, before the Normans came, there had been a Saxon settlement. One part of the duchy in short was altogether Romance in speech and manners, while more or less of Teutonic character still clave to the other. So now Teutonic Normandy rose against Duke William, and Romance Normandy was faithful to him. The nobles of the Bessin and Cotentin made league with William's cousin Guy of Burgundy, meaning, as far as one can see, to make Guy Duke of Rouen and Evreux, and to have no lord at all for themselves . . . When the rebellion broke out, William was among them at Valognes, and they tried to seize him But his fool warned him in the night; he rode for his life, and got safe to his own Falaise. All eastern Normandy was loyal, but William doubted whether he could by himself overcome so strong an array of rebels So he went to Poissy, between Rouen and Paris, and asked his lord King Henry [of France] to help him. So King Henry came with a French army, and the French and those whom we may call the French Normans met the Teutonic Normans in battle at Val ès-dunes, not far from Caen. It was William's first pitched battle," and he won a decisive victory. "He was now fully master of his own duchy; and the battle of Val ès-dunes finally fixed that Normandy should take its character from Romance Rouen and not from Teutonic Bayeux. William had in short overcome Saxons and Danes in Gaul before he came to overcome them in Britain. He had to conquer his own Normandy before he could conquer England . . . But before long King Henry got jealous of William's power, and he was now always ready to give help to any Norman rebels And the other neighbouring princes were jealous of him as well as the King. His neighbours in Britanny, Anjou, Chartres, and Ponthieu, were all against him. But the great Duke was able to hold his own against them all, and before long to make a great addition to his dominions." Between 1053 and 1058 the French King invaded Normandy three times and suffered defeat on every occasion. In 1063 Duke William invaded the county of Maine, and reduced it to entire submission. "From this time he ruled over Maine as well as over Normandy," although its people were often in revolt. "The conquest of Maine raised William's power and fame to a higher pitch than it reached at any other time before his conquest of England."—E. A. Freeman, *Short Hist. of the Norman Conquest, ch.* 4.

ALSO IN: The same, *Hist. of the Norman Conq., ch.* 8.—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and Eng., bk.* 2, *ch.* 4.

A. D. 1066.—Duke William becomes King of England. See ENGLAND. A. D 1042-1066, 1066; and 1066-1071.

A. D. 1087-1135.—Under Duke Robert and Henry Beauclerc. See ENGLAND: A. D 1087-1135.

A. D. 1096.—The Crusade of Duke Robert. See CRUSADES A D 1096-1099

A. D. 1203-1205.—Wrested from England and restored to France. See FRANCE A D 1180-1224; and ENGLAND A D 1205

A. D. 1419.—Conquest by Henry V. of England. See FRANCE A D 1417-1422

A. D. 1449.—Recovery from the English. See FRANCE A. D 1431-1453

16th Century.—Spread of the Reformation. —Strength of Protestantism. See FRANCE A D. 1559-1561

NORMANS.—NORTHMEN: Name and Origin.—"The northern pirates, variously called Danes or Normans according as they came from the islands of the Baltic Sea or the coast of Norway, descended from the same primitive race with the Anglo Saxons and the Franks, their language had roots identical with the idioms of these two nations but this token of an ancient fraternity did not preserve from their hostile incursions either Saxon Britain or Frankish Gaul, nor even the territory beyond the Rhine, then exclusively inhabited by Germanic tribes The conversion of the southern Teutons to the Christian faith had broken all bond of fraternity between them and the Teutons of the north In the 9th century the man of the north still gloried in the title of son of Odin, and treated as bastards and apostates the Germans who had become children of the church . . A sort of religious and patriotic fanaticism was thus combined in the Scandinavian with the fiery impulsiveness of their character, and an insatiable thirst for gain They shed with joy the blood of the priests, were especially delighted at pillaging the churches, and stabled their horses in the chapels of the palaces . . In three days, with an east wind, the fleets of Denmark and Norway, two-sailed vessels, reached the south of Britain. The soldiers of each fleet obeyed in general one chief, whose vessel was distinguished from the rest by some particular ornament. . . . All equal under such a chief, bearing lightly their voluntary submission and the weight of their mailed armour, which they promised themselves soon to exchange for an equal weight of gold, the Danish pirates pursued the 'road of the swans,' as their ancient national poetry expressed it Sometimes they coasted along the shore, and laid wait for the enemy in the straits, the bays, and smaller anchorages, which procured them the surname of Vikings, or 'children of the creeks'; sometimes they dashed in pursuit of their prey across the ocean."—A Thierry, *Conquest of England by the Normans, bk.* 2 (*v.* 1).

ALSO IN: T. Carlyle, *The Early Kings of Norway.*

8-9th Centuries.—The Vikings and what sent them to sea.—"No race of the ancient or modern world have ever taken to the sea with such heartiness as the Northmen. The great cause which filled the waters of Western Europe with their barks was that consolidation and centralization of the kingly power all over Europe which followed after the days of Charlemagne, and which put a stop to those great invasions and migrations by land which had lasted for centuries. Before that time the north and east of Europe, pressed from behind by other nationalities, and growing straitened within their own bounds, threw off from time to time bands of emigrants which gathered force as they slowly marched along, until they appeared in the west as a fresh wave of the barbarian flood. As soon as the west, recruited from the very source whence the invaders came, had gained strength enough to set them at defiance, which happened in the time of Charlemagne, these invasions by land ceased after a series of bloody defeats, and the north had to look for another outlet for the force which it was unable to support at home Nor was the north itself slow to follow Charlemagne's example Harold Fairhair, no inapt disciple of the great emperor, subdued the petty kings in Norway one after another, and made himself supreme king At the same time he invaded the rights of the old freeman, and by taxes and tolls laid on his allodial holding drove him into exile We have thus the old outlet cut off and a new cause for emigration added No doubt the Northmen even then had long been used to struggle with the sea, and sea roving was the calling of the brave, but the two causes we have named gave it a great impulse just at the beginning of the tenth century, and many a freeman who would have joined the host of some famous leader by land, or have lived on a little king at home, now sought the waves as a birthright of which no king could rob him. Either alone, or as the follower of some sea king, whose realm was the sea's wide wastes, he went out year after year, and thus won fame and wealth The name given to this pursuit was Viking, a word which is in no way akin to king It is derived from 'Vik,' a bay or creek, because these sea rovers lay moored in bays and creeks on the look-out for merchant ships, the 'ing' is a well known ending, meaning, in this case, occupation or calling. Such a sea-rover was called 'Vikingr,' and at one time or another in his life almost every man of note in the North had taken to the sea and lived a Viking life"—G. W. Dasent, *Story of Burnt Nyal, v.* 2, *app.*—"Western viking expeditions have hitherto been ascribed to Danes and Norwegians exclusively. Renewed investigations reveal, however, that Swedes shared widely in these achievements, notably in the acquisition of England, and that, among other famous conquerors, Rolf, the founder of the Anglo-Norman dynasty, issued from their country. . . . Norwegians, like Swedes, were, in truth, merged in the terms Northmen and Danes, both of which were general to all Scandinavians abroad. . . . The earlier conversion of the Danes to Christianity and their more immediate contact with Germany account for the frequent application of their name to all Scandinavians."—W. Roos, *The Swedish Part in the Viking Expeditions* (*Eng Hist. Rev., April*, 1892).

ALSO IN: S. Laing, *Preliminary Dissertation to Heimskringla.*—C. F. Keary, *The Vikings of Western Christendom, ch.* 5.—P. B. Du Chaillu, *The Viking Age.*—See, also, SCANDINAVIAN STATES.

8-9th Centuries.—The island empire of the Vikings.—"We have hitherto treated the Norwegians, Swedes, and Danes under the common

appellation of Northmen; and this is in many ways the most convenient, for it is often impossible to decide the nationality of the individual settlement Indeed, it would appear probable that the devastating bands were often composed indiscriminately of the several nationalities Still, in tracing the history of their conquests, we may lay it down as a general rule that England was the exclusive prey of the Danes, that Scotland and the islands to the north as far as Iceland, and to the south as far as Anglesea and Ireland, fell to the Norwegians, and Russia to the Swedes, while Gaul and Germany were equally the spoil of the Norwegians and the Danes While England had been overcome by the Danes the Norwegians had turned their attention chiefly to the north of the British Isles and the islands of the West Their settlements naturally fell into three divisions, which tally with their geographical position 1 The Orkneys and Shetlands, lying to the N E of Scotland 2 The isles to the west as far south as Ireland 3 Iceland and the Faroe Isles The Orkneys and Shetlands Here the Northmen first appear as early as the end of the 8th century, and a few peaceful settlements were made by those who were anxious to escape from the noisy scenes which distracted their northern country In the reign of Harald Harfagr [the Fairhaired] they assumed new importance, and their character is changed Many of those driven out by Harald sought a refuge here and betaking themselves to piracy periodically infested the Norwegian coast in revenge for their defeat and expulsion These ravages seriously disturbing the peace of his newly acquired kingdom, Harald fitted out an expedition and devoted a whole summer to conquering the Vikings and extirpating the brood of pirates The country being gained, he offered it to his chief adviser, Rögnwald, Jarl of Möri in Norway, father of Rollo of Normandy, who, though refusing to go himself held it during his life as a family possession and sent Sigurd, his brother, there Rögnwald next sent his son Einar, and from his time [A D 875] we may date the final establishment of the Jarls of Orkney, who henceforth owe a nominal allegiance to the King of Norway The close of the 8th century also saw the commencement of the incursions of the Northmen in the west of Scotland, and the Western Isles soon became a favourite resort of the Vikings. In the Keltic annals these unwelcome visitors had gained the name of Fingall, 'the white strangers,' from the fairness of their complexion, and Dugall, the black strangers, probably from the iron coats of mail worn by their chiefs By the end of the 9th century a sort of naval empire had arisen, consisting of the Hebrides, parts of the western coasts of Scotland, especially the modern Argyllshire, Man, Anglesea, and the eastern shores of Ireland This empire was under a line of sovereigns who called themselves the Hy-Ivar (grandsons of Ivar), and lived now in Man, now in Dublin Thence they often joined their kinsmen in their attacks on England, and at times aspired to the position of Jarls of the Danish Northumbria "—A H Johnson, *The Normans in Europe, ch* 2 —"Under the government of these Norwegian princes [the Hy Ivar] the Isles appear to have been very flourishing. They were crowded with people, the arts were cultivated, and manufactures were carried to a degree of perfection which was then thought excellence This comparatively advanced state of society in these remote isles may be ascribed partly to the influence and instructions of the Irish clergy, who were established all over the island before the arrival of the Norwegians, and possessed as much learning as was in those ages to be found in any part of Europe, except Constantinople and Rome, and partly to the arrival of great numbers of the provincial Britons flying to them as an asylum when their country was ravaged by the Saxons, and carrying with them the remains of the science, manufactures, and wealth introduced among them by their Roman masters Neither were the Norwegians themselves in those ages destitute of a considerable portion of learning and of skill in the useful arts, in navigation, fisheries, and manufactures, nor were they in any respect such barbarians as those who know them only by the declamations of the early English writers may be apt to suppose them The principal source of their wealth was piracy, then esteemed an honourable profession in the exercise of which these islanders laid all the maritime countries of the west part of Europe under heavy contributions —D Macpherson, *Geog Illustrations of Scottish Hist* (Quoted by J H Burton, *Hist of Scotland ch* 15 *c* 2, *foot note*) —See, also, IRELAND 9-10TH CENTURIES.

A. D 787-880 —The so-called Danish invasions and settlements in England.—' In our own English chronicles, 'Dena' or Dane is used as the common term for all the Scandinavian invaders of Britain, though not including the Swedes, who took no part in the attack, while Northman generally means 'man of Norway.' Asser however uses the words as synonymous, 'Nordmanni sive Dani' Across the channel 'Northman' was the general name for the pirates, and 'Dane' would usually mean a pirate from Denmark The distinction however is partly a chronological one, as, owing to the late appearance of the Danes in the middle of the ninth century, and the prominent part they then took in the general Wiking movement, their name tended from that time to narrow the area of the earlier term of 'Nordmanni' "—J R. Green, *The Conq. of Eng*, *p* 68, *foot note* —Prof Freeman divides the Danish invasions of England into three periods 1 The period of merely plundering incursions, which began A D 787 2 The period of actual occupation and settlement, from 866 to the Peace of Wedmore, 880 3 The later period of conquest, within which England was governed by Danish kings, A. D 980–1042.—See ENGLAND A D 855–880

ALSO IN C F Keary, *The Vikings in Western Christendom, ch* 6 *and* 12

A. D. 841.—First expedition up the Seine. —In May, A D 841, the Seine was entered for the first time by a fleet of Norse pirates, whose depredations in France had been previously confined to the coasts The expedition was commanded by a chief named Osker, whose plans appear to have been well laid He led his pirates straight to the rich city of Rouen, never suffering them to slacken oar or sail, or to touch the tempting country through which they passed, until the great prize was struck. "The city was fired and plundered Defence was wholly impracticable, and great slaughter ensued. . . Osker's three days' occupation of Rouen was

remuneratingly successful. Their vessels loaded with spoil and captives, gentle and simple, clerks, merchants, citizens, soldiers, peasants, nuns, dames, damsels, the Danes dropped down the Seine, to complete their devastation on the shores. . . . The Danes then quitted the Seine, having formed their plans for renewing the encouraging enterprize,—another time they would do more. Normandy dates from Osker's three days' occupation of Rouen "—Sir F Palgrave, *Hist of Normandy and England, bk* 1, *ch* 2 (*v.* 1).

ALSO IN: C. F Keary, *The Vikings in Western Christendom, ch* 9

A. D. 845-861.—Repeated ravages in the Seine.—Paris thrice sacked. See PARIS A D 845; and 857–861

A. D. 849-860.—The career of Hasting.—"About the year of Alfred s birth [849] they laid siege to Tours, from which they were repulsed by the gallantry of the citizens, assisted by the miraculous aid of Saint Martin. It is at this siege that Hasting first appears as a leader His birth is uncertain In some accounts he is said to have been the son of a peasant of Troyes, the capital of Champagne and to have forsworn his faith, and joined the Danes in his early youth, from an inherent lust of battle and plunder In others he is called the son of the jarl Atte But, whatever his origin, by the middle of the century he had established his title to lead the Northern hordes in those fierce forays which helped to shatter the Carlovingian Empire to fragments . . . When the land was bare, leaving the despoiled provinces he again put to sea, and, sailing southwards still, pushed up the Tagus and Guadalquiver, and ravaged the neighbourhoods of Lisbon and Seville But no settlement in Spain was possible at this time The Peninsula had lately had for Caliph Abdalrahman the Second, called El Mouzaffer, 'The Victorious,' and the vigour of his rule had made the Arabian kingdom in Spain the most efficient power for defence in Europe Hasting soon recoiled from the Spanish coasts, and returned to his old haunts. The leaders of the Danes in England, the Sidrocs and Hinguar and Hubba, had, as we have seen, a special delight in the destruction of churches and monasteries, mingling a fierce religious fanaticism with their thirst for battle and plunder This exceeding bitterness of the Northmen may be fairly laid in great measure to the account of the thirty years of proselytising warfare, which Charlemagne had waged in Saxony, and along all the northern frontier of his empire. . . . Hasting seems to have been filled with a double portion of this spirit, which he had indulged throughout his career in the most inveterate hatred to priests and holy places. It was probably this, coupled with a certain weariness—commonplace murder and sacrilege having grown tame, and lost their charm—which incited him to the most daring of all his exploits, a direct attack on the head of Christendom, and the sacred city. Hasting then, about the year 860, planned an attack on Rome, and the proposal was well received by his followers Sailing again round Spain, and pillaging on their way both on the Spanish and Moorish coasts, they entered the Mediterranean, and, steering for Italy, landed in the bay of Spezzia, near the town of Luna. Luna was the place where the great quarries of the Carrara marble had been worked ever since the times of the Cæsars. The city itself was, it is said, in great part built of white marble, and the 'candentia mœnia Lunæ' deceived Hasting into the belief that he was actually before Rome. so he sat down before the town which he had failed to surprise. The hope of taking it by assault was soon abandoned, but Hasting obtained his end by guile. . . . The priests were massacred, the gates thrown open, and the city taken and spoiled. Luna never recovered its old prosperity after the raid of the Northmen, and in Dante's time had fallen into utter decay But Hasting's career in Italy ended with the sack of Luna, and, giving up all hope of attacking Rome, he re-embarked with the spoil of the town, the most beautiful of the women, and all the youths who could be used as soldiers or rowers His fleet was wrecked on the south coasts of France on its return westward, and all the spoil lost, but the devil had work yet for Hasting and his men, who got ashore in sufficient numbers to recompense themselves for their losses by the plunder of Provence."—T Hughes, *Alfred the Great, ch* 20

A. D. 860-1100.—The discovery and settlement of Iceland.—Development of the Saga literature.—The discovery of Iceland is attributed to a famous Norse Viking named Naddodd, and dated in 860, at the beginning of the reign, in Norway, of Harald Haarfager, who drove out so many adventurers, to seek fortune on the seas He is said to have called it Snowland, but others who came to the cold island in 870 gave it the harsher name which it still bears "Within sixty years after the first settlement by the Northmen the whole was inhabited, and, writes Uno Von Troil (p 64), 'King Harold, who did not contribute a little towards it by his tyrannical treatment of the petty kings and lords in Norway, was obliged at last to issue an order, that no one should sail to Iceland without paying four ounces of fine silver to the Crown, in order to stop those continual emigrations which weakened his kingdom' . . Before the tenth century had reached its half way period, the Norwegians had fully peopled the island with not less, perhaps, than 50,000 souls. A census taken about A D 1100 numbered the franklins who had to pay Thing tax at 4,500, without including cotters and proletarians."—R F Burton, *Ultima Thule, introd., sect.* 3 (*v.* 1)—"About sixty years after the first settlement of the island, a step was taken towards turning Iceland into a commonwealth, and giving the whole island a legal constitution, and though we are ignorant of the immediate cause which led to this, we know enough of the state of things in the island to feel sure, that it could only have been with the common consent of the great chiefs, who, as Priests, presided over the various local Things [see THING]. The first want was a man who could make a code of laws." The man was found in one Ulfljót, who came from a Norwegian family long famous for knowledge of the customary law, and who was sent to the mother country to consult the wisest of his kin. "Three years he stayed abroad; and when he returned, the chiefs, who, no doubt, day by day felt more strongly the need of a common centre of action as well as of a common code, lost no time in carrying out their scheme. . . . The time of the annual meeting was fixed at first for the middle of the month of June, but

in the year 999 it was agreed to meet a week later, and the Althing then met when ten full weeks of summer had passed. It lasted fourteen days. . . . In its legal capacity it [the Althing] was both a deliberative and executive assembly; both Parliament and High Court of Justice in one. . . . With the establishment of the Althing we have for the first time a Commonwealth in Iceland."—G W. Dasent, *The Story of Burnt Njal, introd* (v 1).—"The reason why Iceland, which was destitute of inhabitants at the time of its discovery, about the middle of the 9th century, became so rapidly settled and secured so eminent a position in the world's history and literature, must be sought in the events which took place in Norway at the time when Harald Hárfragi (Fairhair), after a long and obstinate resistance, succeeded in usurping the monarchical power. . . . The people who emigrated to Iceland were for the most part the flower of the nation They went especially from the west coast of Norway, where the peculiar Norse spirit had been most perfectly developed Men of the noblest birth in Norway set out with their families and followers to find a home where they might be as free and independent as their fathers had been before them No wonder then that they took with them the cream of the ancient culture of the fatherland . Toward the end of the 11th century it is expressly stated that many of the chiefs were so learned that they with perfect propriety might have been ordained to the priesthood [Christianity having been formally adopted by the Althing in the year 1000], and in the 12th century there were, in addition to those to be found in the cloisters, several private libraries in the island On the other hand, secular culture, knowledge of law and history, and of the skaldic art, were, so to speak, common property. And thus, when the means for committing a literature to writing were at hand, the highly developed popular taste for history gave the literature the direction which it afterward maintained The fact is, there really existed a whole literature which was merely waiting to be put in writing . . Many causes contributed toward making the Icelanders preëminently a historical people. The settlers were men of noble birth, who were proud to trace their descent from kings and heroes of antiquity, nay, even from the gods themselves, and we do not therefore wonder that they assiduously preserved the memory of the deeds of their forefathers But in their minds was developed not only a taste for the sagas of the past; the present also received its full share of attention. . . . Nor did they interest themselves for and remember the events that took place in Iceland only. Reports from foreign lands also found a most hearty welcome, and the Icelanders had abundant opportunity of satisfying their thirst for knowledge in this direction. As vikings, as merchants, as courtiers and especially as skalds accompanying kings and other distinguished persons, and also as varanglans in Constantinople, many of them found splendid opportunities of visiting foreign countries. . . . Such were then the conditions and circumstances which produced that remarkable development of the historical taste with which the people were endowed, and made Iceland the home of the saga."—F. W. Horn, *Hist. of the Literature of the Scandinavian North, pt.* 1, *ch.* 1.

—"The Icelanders, in their long winter, had a great habit of writing, and were, and still are, excellent in penmanship, says Dahlmann It is to this fact that any little history there is of the Norse Kings and their old tragedies, crimes, and heroisms, is almost all due The Icelanders, it seems, not only made beautiful letters on their paper or parchment, but were laudably observant and desirous of accuracy, and have left us such a collection of narratives (Sagas, literally 'Says') as, for quantity and quality, is unexampled among rude nations "—T Carlyle, *Early Kings of Norway, Preface* —See, also, THINGS — THINGVALLA

A. D. 876-911.—Rollo's acquisition of Normandy.—"One alone among the Scandinavian settlements in Gaul was destined to play a real part in history. This was the settlement of Rolf or Rollo at Rouen [The genuine name is Hrolfr, Rolf, in various spellings The French form is Rou, sometimes Rous . . , the Latin is Rollo. —Foot note] This settlement, the kernel of the great Norman Duchy, had, I need hardly say, results of its own and an importance of its own, which distinguish it from every other Danish colony in Gaul But it is well to bear in mind that it was only one colony among several, and that, when the cession was made, it was probably not expected to be more lasting or more important than the others But, while the others soon lost any distinctive character, the Rouen settlement lasted, it grew, it became a power in Europe, and in Gaul it became even a determining power The lasting character of his work at once proves that the founder of the Rouen colony was a great man, but he is a great man who must be content to be judged in the main by the results of his actions The authentic history of Rolf, Rollo, or Rou, may be summed up in a very short space We have no really contemporary narrative of his actions, unless a few meagre and uncertain entries in some of the Frankish annals may be thought to deserve that name . . . I therefore do not feel myself at all called upon to narrate in detail the exploits which are attributed to Rolf in the time before his final settlement He is described as having been engaged in the calling of a Wiking both in Gaul and in Britain for nearly forty years before his final occupation of Rouen. . . . The exploits attributed to Rolf are spread over so many years, that we cannot help suspecting that the deeds of other chieftains have been attributed to him, perhaps that two leaders of the same name have been confounded Among countless expeditions in Gaul, England, and Germany, we find Rolf charged with an earlier visit to Rouen [A. D. 876], with a share in the great siege of Paris [A. D. 885], and with an occupation or destruction of Bayeux But it is not till we have got some way into the reign of Charles the Simple, not till we have passed several years of the tenth century, that Rolf begins clearly to stand out as a personal historic reality. He now appears in possession of Rouen, or of whatever vestiges of the city had survived his former ravages, and from that starting-point he assaulted Chartres. Beneath the walls of that city he underwent a defeat [A. D. 911] at the hands of the Dukes Rudolf of Burgundy and Robert of Paris, which was attributed to the miraculous powers of the great local relic, the under-garment of the Virgin. But this victory, like most victories over the

Northmen, had no lasting effect. Rolf was not dislodged from Rouen, nor was his career of devastation and conquest at all seriously checked But, precisely as in the case of Guthrum in England, his evident disposition to settle in the country suggested an attempt to change him from a devastating enemy into a peaceable neighbour The Peace of Clair on Epte [A D 911] was the duplicate of the Peace of Wedmore, and King Charles and Duke Robert of Paris most likely had the Peace of Wedmore before their eyes A definite district was ceded to Rolf for which he became the King's vassal he was admitted to baptism and received the king's natural daughter in marriage And just as in the English case the territory ceded was not part of the King's immediate dominions The grant to Rolf was made at the cost not of the Frankish King at Laon but of the French Duke at Paris The district ceded to Rolf was part of the great Neustrian March or Duchy which had been granted to Odo [or Eudes] of Paris and which was now held by his brother Duke Robert

It must not be thought that the district now ceded to Rolf took in the whole of the later Duchy of Normandy Rouen was the heart of the new state, which took in lands on both sides of the Seine From the Epte to the sea was its undoubted extent from the south-east to the north But the western frontier is much less clearly defined On the one hand, the Normans always claimed a certain not very well defined superiority over Britanny as part of the original grant On the other hand, it is quite certain that Rolf did not obtain immediate possession of what was afterwards the noblest portion of the heritage of his descendants The Bessin, the district of Bayeux, was not won till several years later, and the Côtentin the peninsula of Coutances, was not won till after the death of Rolf The district granted to Rolf had — sharing therein the fate of Germany and France — no recognized geographical name Its inhabitants were the Northmen the Northmen of the Seine, the Northmen of Rouen The land itself was, till near the end of the century, simply the Land of the Northmen' — the Terra Northmannorum — E A Freeman *Hist Norman Conquest of Eng.*, *ch* 4 (*v* 1)

ALSO IN Sir F Palgrave, *Hist of Normandy and England*, *bk* 1, *ch* 3-5 — A Thierry, *Norman Conquest of England*, *bk* 2 — See, also, FRANCE A D 877-987

A. D. 876-984. — Discovery and settlement of Greenland. — "The discovery of Greenland was a natural consequence of the settlement of Iceland, just as the discovery of America afterward was a natural consequence of the settlement of Greenland Between the western part of Iceland and the eastern part of Greenland there is a distance of only 45 geographical miles Hence, some of the ships that sailed to Iceland, at the time of the settlement of this island and later, could in case of a violent east wind, which is no rare occurrence in those regions, scarcely avoid approaching the coast of Greenland sufficiently to catch a glimpse of its Jokuls, — nay, even to land on its islands and promontories. Thus it is said that Gunnbjorn, Ulf Krage's son, saw land lying in the ocean at the west of Iceland, when, in the year 876, he was driven out to the sea by a storm. Similar reports were heard, from time to time, by other mariners. About a century later a certain man, by name Erik the Red, . . resolved to go in search of the land in the west that Gunnbjorn and others had seen. He set sail in the year 984, and found the land as he had expected, and remained there exploring the country for two years At the end of this period he returned to Iceland, giving the newly-discovered country the name of Greenland, in order, as he said, to attract settlers, who would be favorably impressed with so pleasing a name The result was that many Icelanders and Norsemen emigrated to Greenland, and a flourishing colony was established, with Gardar for its capital city, which, in the year 1261, became subject to the crown of Norway The Greenland colony maintained its connection with the mother countries for a period of no less than 400 years, yet it finally disappeared and was almost forgotten. Torfæus gives a list of seventeen bishops who ruled in Greenland "— R B Anderson, *America not Discovered by Columbus*, *ch* 7

ALSO IN D Crantz, *Hist of Greenland*, *bk* 4, *ch* 1

A. D. 885-886. — The Great Siege of Paris. See PARIS A D 885-886

9-10th Centuries. — The Danish conquests and settlements in Ireland. See IRELAND. 9-10TH CENTURIES, and A D 1014

9-10th Centuries — The ravages of the Vikings on the Continent. — "Take the map and colour with vermilion the provinces, districts and shores which the Northmen visited The colouring will have to be repeated more than ninety times successively before you arrive at the conclusion of the Carlovingian dynasty Furthermore, mark by the usual symbol of war, two crossed swords, the localities where battles were fought by or against the pirates, where they were defeated or triumphant or where they pillaged, burned or destroyed, and the valleys and banks of Elbe, Rhine and Moselle, Scheldt, Meuse, Somme and Seine, Loire, Garonne and Adour the inland Allier, and all the coasts and coast lands between estuary and estuary and the countries between the river streams, will appear bristling as with chevaux de frise. The strongly-fenced Roman cities, the venerated Abbeys and their dependent bourgades, often more flourishing and extensive than the ancient seats of government, the opulent seaports and trading towns, were all equally exposed to the Danish attacks, stunned by the Northmen's approach, subjugated by their fury. . They constitute three principal schemes of naval and military operations, respectively governed and guided by the great rivers and the intervening sea-shores. . . The first scheme of operations includes the territories between Rhine and Scheldt, and Scheldt and Elbe the furthest southern point reached by the Northmen in this direction was somewhere between the Rhine and the Neckar. Eastward, the Scandinavians scattered as far as Russia, but we must not follow them there. The second scheme of operations affected the countries between Seine and Loire, and again from the Seine eastward towards the Somme and Oise. These operations were connected with those of the Rhine Northmen. The third scheme of operations was prosecuted in the countries between Loire and Garonne, and Garonne and Adour, frequently flashing towards Spain, and expanding inland as far as the Allier and central France, nay, to the very centre, to Bourges."— Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist of Normandy and Eng.*, *bk.* 1, *ch.* 3 (*v.* 1).

ALSO IN: C. F. Keary, *The Vikings in Western Christendom, ch.* 9-15.

A. D. 979-1016.—The Danish conquest of England. See ENGLAND: A. D. 979-1016.

A. D. 986-1011.—Supposed voyages to America. See AMERICA: 10-11TH CENTURIES.

10-13th Centuries.—The breaking up of the Norse island empire.—"At the close of the 10th and beginning of the 11th century the battles of Tara and Clontarf overthrew the power of these Norsemen (or Ostmen as they were called) in Ireland, and restored the authority of the native Irish sovereign About this time they [the 'Hy-Ivar,' or sovereigns of the island-empire of the Northmen—see above 8-9TH CENTURIES] became Christians, and in the year 1066 we find one of their princes joining Harald Hardrada of Norway in his invasion of England, which ended so disastrously in the battle of Stamford Bridge Magnus of Norway, thirty-two years later, after subduing the independent Jarls of Shetland and the Orkneys, attempted to reassert his supremacy along the western coast But after conquering Anglesea, whence he drove out the Normans [from England] who had just made a settlement there, he crossed to Ireland to meet his death in battle The sovereignty of the Isles was then restored to its original owners, but soon after split into two parts—the Suderies and Norderies (whence the term Sodor and Man), north and south of Ardnamurchan Point The next glimpse we have of these dominions is at the close of the 12th century, when we find them under a chief named Somarled, who exercised authority in the islands and Argyleshire, and from him the clans of the Highlands and the Western Isles love to trace their ancestry After his death, according to the Highland traditions, the islands and Argyleshire were divided amongst his three sons Thus the old Norse empire was finally broken up, and in the 13th century, after another unsuccessful attempt by Haco, King of Norway, to re-establish the authority of the mother kingdom over their distant possessions, an attempt which ended in his defeat at the battle of Largs by the Scottish king, Alexander III., they were ceded to the Scottish kings by Magnus IV., his son, and an alliance was cemented between the two kingdoms by the marriage of Alexander's daughter, Margaret, to Eric of Norway" At the north of Scotland the Jarls of Orkney, in the 11th century, "conquered Caithness and Sutherland, and wrested a recognition of their claim from Malcolm II of Scotland Their influence was continually felt in the dynastic and other quarrels of Scotland, the defeat of Duncan, in 1040, by the Jarl of Orkney, contributing not a little to Duncan's subsequent overthrow by Macbeth They fostered the independence of the north of Scotland against the southern king, and held their kingdom until, in 1355, it passed by the female line to the house of Sinclair. The Sinclairs now transferred their allegiance to their natural master, the King of Scotland; and finally the kingdom of the Orkneys was handed over to James III. as the dowry of his bride, Margaret of Norway."—A. H. Johnson, *The Normans in Europe, ch.* 2.

ALSO IN: J. H. Burton, *Hist of Scotland, ch.* 15 (v. 2).—See, also, IRELAND: A. D. 1014.

A. D. 1000-1063.—The Northmen in France become French. See NORMANDY: A. D. 911-1060; and 1035-1063.

A. D. 1000-1194.—Conquests and settlement in Southern Italy and Sicily. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1000-1090; and 1081-1194.

A. D. 1016-1042.—The reign of the Danish kings in England. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1016-1042.

A. D. 1066-1071.—Conquest of England by Duke William of Normandy. See ENGLAND. A. D 1042-1066, 1066; and 1066-1071.

A. D. 1081-1085.—Attempted conquest of the Byzantine Empire. See BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A. D. 1081-1085.

A. D. 1084.—The sack and burning of Rome. See ROME. A D. 1081-1084.

A. D. 1146.—Ravages in Greece. See BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A. D. 1146.

A. D. 1504.—Early enterprise on the Newfoundland fishing banks. See NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1501-1578

NORTH, Lord, Administration of. See ENGLAND. A. D 1770, to 1782-1783.

NORTH ANNA, The passage of the. See UNITED STATES OF AM · A. D. 1864 (MAY: VIRGINIA)

NORTH BRITON, No. 45, The. See ENGLAND. A. D 1762-1764.

NORTH CAROLINA: The aboriginal inhabitants. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, CHEROKEES, IROQUOIS TRIBES OF THE SOUTH, SHAWANESE, and TIMUQUANAN FAMILY

A. D. 1524.—Discovery of the coast by Verrazano. See AMERICA A D. 1523-1524.

A. D. 1585-1587.—Raleigh's attempted settlements at Roanoke. See AMERICA. A. D. 1584-1586, and 1587-1590

A. D. 1629.—The grant to Sir Robert Heath. See AMERICA · A D. 1629.

A. D. 1639-1663.—Pioneer and unorganized colonization.—"An abortive attempt at colonization was made in 1639, and a titular governor appeared in Virginia; but this, and a number of conflicting claims originating in this patent [to Sir Robert Heath], and sufficiently troublesome to the proprietaries of a later time, were the only results of the grant of Charles I. This action on the part of the Crown, and the official information received, did not, however, suffice to prevent the Virginia Assembly lending itself to a scheme by which possession might be obtained of the neighboring territory, or at least substantial benefits realized therefrom by their constituents With this object, they made grants to a trading company, which led, however, only to exploration and traffic. Other grants of a similar nature followed for the next ten years, at the expiration of which a company of Virginians made their way from Nansemond to Albemarle, and established a settlement there. The Virginian Burgesses granted them lands, and promised further grants to all who would extend these settlements to the southward. Emigration from Virginia began. Settlers, singly and in companies, crossed the border, and made scattered and solitary clearings within the wilds of North Carolina. Many of these people were mere adventurers; but some of them were of more substantial stuff, and founded permanent settlements on the Chowan and elsewhere. Other eyes, however, as watchful as those of the Virginians, were also turned to the rich regions of the South. New

England enterprise explored the American coast from one end to the other, in search of lucrative trade and new resting places After a long acquaintance with the North Carolina coast, they bought land of the Indians, near the mouth of Cape Fear River, and settled there For some unexplained cause — possibly on account of the wild and dangerous character of the scattered inhabitants, who had already drifted thither from Virginia, possibly from the reason which they themselves gave — the New England colonists abandoned their settlement and departed, leaving a written opinion of the poor character of the country expressed in very plain language and pinned to a post Here it was found by some wanderers from Barbadoes who were of a different opinion from the New Englanders as to the appearance of things and they accordingly repurchased the land from the Indians and began a settlement At this date [1663] therefore there was in North Carolina this infant settlement of the Barbadoes men on the extreme southeastern point of the present State and in the north eastern corner the Virginia settlers scattered about with here a solitary plantation and there a little group of farms and always a restless van of adventurers working their way down the coast and into the interior Whatever rights the North Carolina settlers may have had in the eyes of the Virginians who had granted them land, or in those of the Indians who had sold it, they had none recognized by the English King, who claimed to own all that vast region It may be doubted whether anything was known of these early colonists in England, and their existence was certainly not regarded in the least when Charles II lavished their territory, and much besides upon a band of his courtiers and ministers '— H C Lodge, *Short Hist of the English Colonies ch* 5

Also in J W Moore, *Hist of N C*, *r* 1, *ch* 2

A. D. 1663-1670.—The grant to Monk, Clarendon, Shaftesbury and others.—The organized colonies — On the 24th March, 1663, King Charles II granted to Edward, Earl of Clarendon, George [Monk], Duke of Albemarle, William, Earl of Craven, John, Lord Berkeley, Anthony, Lord Ashley [Earl of Shaftesbury], Sir George Carteret, Sir John Colleton, and Sir William Berkeley, all the country between the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, between 31° and 36° parallels of latitude, called Carolina, in honor of Charles. [The grant embraced the present States of Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi, as well as the two Carolinas] In 1663, Sir William Berkeley, Governor of the Colony of Virginia, visited the province, and appointed William Drummond Governor of the Colony of Carolina Drummond, at his death in 1667, was succeeded by Stevens as governor The first assembly that made laws for Carolina, assembled in the fall of 1669 A form of government, magnificent in design, and labored in detail, called '*The fundamental constitutions* of Carolina,' were drawn up by the celebrated author of the Essay on the Human Understanding, John Locke. On the death of Governor Stevens, who died in the colony full of years and wealth, the assembly chose Carteret for their governor, and on his return to England soon after, Eastchurch, who then was in England, was appointed governor, and Miller secretary."—J H. Wheeler, *Historical Sketches of North Carolina, ch* 4.—"The earliest grant made to the lords proprietors did not include the whole of the present State of North Carolina Its northern line fell short of the southern boundary of Virginia by half a degree of latitude Notwithstanding this, an unwarranted exhibition of authority established virtually the proprietary dominion over this unappropriated territory Colonel Byrd of Virginia, who was born not long after the charter of 1665 was made, and who lived during the administration of Berkeley, states, and no doubt truly, that 'Sir William Berkeley, who was one of the grantees, and at that time governor of Virginia, finding a territory of 31 miles in breadth between the inhabited part of Virginia and the above mentioned boundary of Carolina [36°], advised the Lord Clarendon of it And his lordship had interest enough with the king to obtain a second patent to include it dated June 30th, 1665' By this patent very large powers were granted, so large that, as Chalmers has remarked, no one prerogative of the crown was preserved except only the sovereign dominion The existence of the colony from Barbadoes under Sir John Yeamans, that settled in the old county of Clarendon from its inception in 1665 to its abandonment in 1690, forms but an episode in the proprietary history of North Carolina The colony, like all others similarly situated sought at first to make provision for the supply of bodily wants, in securing food and shelter only but having done this it next proceeded to make profitable the gifts of Heaven that were around it Yeamans had brought with him negro slaves from Barbadoes, and so inviting was the new settlement deemed, that in the second year of its existence it contained 800 inhabitants But with all this prosperity the colony on the Cape Fear was not destined to be permanent The action of the lords proprietors themselves caused its abandonment In 1670 the lords proprietors, who seem to have been anxious to proceed more and more to the southward sent out a considerable number of emigrants to form a colony at Port Royal, now Beaufort, in the present State of South Carolina The individual who led the expedition was William Sayle, 'a man of experience,' says Chalmers, 'who had been appointed governor of that part of the coast lying southwestward of Cape Carteret' Scarcely however, had Sayle carried out his instructions and made his colonists somewhat comfortable, before his constitution yielded to a new and insalubrious climate, and he died It was not easy for the proprietors immediately to find a fit successor, and, even had such been at hand, some time must necessarily have elapsed before he could safely reach the scene of his labors. But Sir John Yeamans was near the spot: his long residence had acclimated him, and, as the historian states, he 'had hitherto ruled the plantation around Cape Fear with a prudence which precluded complaint' He therefore was directed to extend his command from old Clarendon, on the Cape Fear, to the territory which was southwest of Cape Carteret This was in August, 1671. The shores with the adjacent land, and the streams making into the sea, were by this time very well known to all the dwellers in Carolina, for the proprietors had caused them to be surveyed with accuracy. On the banks of

Ashley River there was good pasturage, and land fit for tillage The planters of Clarendon, therefore, turned their faces southward, while those from Port Royal travelled northward, and so the colonists from both settlements met on the banks of the Ashley, as on a middle ground, and here in the same year (1671) they land, 'on the first high land' the foundations of 'old Charlestown' In 1679, it was found that 'Oyster Point,' formed by the confluence of Ashley and Cooper rivers, was more convenient for a town than the spot previously selected, and the people, with the encouragement of the lords proprietors, began to remove thither In the next year (1680) were laid the foundations of the present city of Charleston; thirty houses were built, and it was declared to be the capital of the southern part of the province, and also the port for all commercial traffic. This gradually depopulated old Clarendon . . We now return to trace the fortunes of the settlement on Albemarle, under Stephens As before stated he entered upon his duties as governor in October, 1667 His instructions were very full and explicit The Assembly was to be composed of the governor, a council of twelve, and twelve delegates chosen by the freeholders Of the twelve councillors, whose advice, by the way, the governor was required always to take and follow, one half was to be appointed by the Assembly, the other half by himself To this Assembly belonged not only the power to make laws, but a large share of the executive authority also In 1669, the first legislature under this constitution assembled And it is worthy of remark, that at this period, when the province may be said to have had, for the first time, a system of regular government, there was in it a recognition of two great principles which are now part of the political creed of our whole country, without distinction of party These are, first, that the people are entitled to a voice in the selection of their law makers, and secondly, that they cannot rightfully be taxed but by their own representatives The people, we have reason to believe, were contented and happy during the early part of Stephens' administration But this quiet condition of affairs was not to last We have now reached a period in our history which illustrates the fact, that whatever wisdom may be apparent in the constitution given to the Albemarle colony by the proprietors, on the accession of Stephens, was less the result of deliberation than of a happy accident. But the time had now come for the proprietors to carry out their magnificent project of founding an empire, and disregarding alike the nature of man, the lessons of experience, and the physical obstacles of an unsubdued wilderness (even not yet entirely reclaimed), they resolved that all should yield to their theories of government, and invoked the aid of philosophy to accomplish an impossibility Locke was employed to prepare 'the fundamental constitutions.'"—F. L Hawks *Hist of N Carolina, v.* 2, *pp.* 441-462.

ALSO IN: W. C. Bryant and S H Gay, *Popular Hist. of the U. S., v.* 2, *ch.* 12

A. D. 1669-1693.—The Fundamental Constitutions of John Locke, and their failure.—The royal grant of the Carolinas to Monk, Shaftesbury, Clarendon, and their associates invested them with "all the rights, jurisdiction, royalties, privileges, and liberties within the bounds of their province, to hold, use, and enjoy the same, in as ample a manner as the bishop of Durham did in that county-palatine in England . . Agreeably to these powers, the proprietors proceeded to frame a system of laws for the colony which they projected Locke, the well known philosopher, was summoned to this work, and the largest expectations were entertained in consequence of his co operation. Locke, though subsequently one of the proprietors, was, at the beginning, simply the secretary of the earl of Shaftesbury The probability is that, in preparing the constitution for the Carolinas, he rather carried out the notions of that versatile nobleman than his own The code of laws called the 'Fundamental Constitutions,' which was devised, and which subsequently became unpopular in the colony, is not certainly the work of his hands It is ascribed by Oldmixon, a contemporary, to the earl of Shaftesbury, one of the proprietors The most striking feature in this code provided for the creation of a nobility, consisting of landgraves, cassiques, and barons These were to be graduated by the landed estates which were granted with the dignity, the eldest of the proprietary lords was to be the superior, with the title of Palatine, and the people were to be serfs" The tenants, and the issue of the tenants, "were to be transferred with the soil, and not at liberty to leave it, but with the lord's permission, under hand and seal The whole system was rejected after a few years' experiment It has been harshly judged as . the crude conception of a mind conversant rather with books than men — with the abstract rather than the practical in government and society And this judgment is certainly true of the constitutions in the case in which they were employed They did not suit the absolute conditions of the country, or the class of people which subsequently made their way to it But contemplating the institution of domestic slavery, as the proprietors had done from the beginning — a large villanage and a wealthy aristocracy, dominating almost without restraint or responsibility over the whole — the scheme was not without its plausibilities But the feudal tenures were everywhere dying out The time had passed, even in Europe, for such a system

The great destitution of the first settlers left them generally without the means of procuring slaves, and the equal necessities, to which all are subject who peril life and fortune in a savage forest and on a foreign shore, soon made the titular distinctions of the few a miserable mockery, or something worse"—W G Simms, *Hist of S Carolina, bk* 2, *ch* 1 —"The constitutions were signed on the 21st of July, 1669," but subsequently revised by the interpolation of a clause, against the wishes of Locke, establishing the Church of England "This revised copy of 'the model' was not signed till March, 1670 To a colony of which the majority were likely to be dissenters, the change was vital, it was scarcely noticed in England, where the model became the theme of extravagant applause . . As far as depended upon the proprietaries, the government was immediately organized with Monk, duke of Albemarle, as palatine." But, meantime, the colonists in the northern part of the Carolina province had instituted a simple form of government for themselves, with a council of twelve, and an assembly

composed of the governor, the council, and twelve delegates from the freeholders of the incipient settlements The assembly had already met and had framed some important laws, which remained "valid in North Carolina for more than half a century Hardly had these laws been established when the new constitution was forwarded to Albemarle Its promulgation did but favor anarchy by invalidating the existing system, which it could not replace The proprietaries, contrary to stipulations with the colonists, superseded the existing government, and the colonists resolutely rejected the substitute" Much the same state of things appeared in the South Carolina settlements (not yet separately named), and successive disorders and revolutionary changes made up the history of the pseudo palatinate for many years —G Bancroft, *Hist of the U. S. (Author's last rev.), pt* 2, *ch* 7 (v 1) —In 1693, "to conciliate the colonists, and to get rid of the dispute which had arisen as to the binding force of the 'Grand Model,' the proprietors voted that, 'as the people have declared they would rather be governed by the powers granted by the charter, without regard to the fundamental constitutions, it will be for their quiet, and the protection of the well disposed, to grant their request' This abrogation of the labors of Locke removed one bone of contention, but as the 'Grand Model' had never been actually carried into effect, the government went on much as before Each of the proprietaries continued to have his special delegate in the colony, or rather two delegates, one for South Carolina, the other for Albemarle, the eight together constituting the council in either province, over which the governor presided as delegate of the palatine, to whom his appointment belonged"—R Hildreth, *Hist of the U S*, *ch* 21 (v 2) —The text of the "fundamental constitutions" is printed in volume 9 of the 12th edition of Locke's complete works, and in volume 10 of several prior editions

A. D. 1688-1729.—Slow progress and unprosperous state of the colony.—End of the Proprietary Government.—In 1688, Carolina (the northern province) being afflicted with a governor, one Seth Sothel, who is accused of every variety of extortion and rapacity, the colonists rose up against him, tried him before their assembly, deposed him from his office and drove him into exile. "The Proprietors demurred to the form of this procedure, but acquiesced in the substance of it, and thereby did something to confirm that contempt for government which was one of the leading characteristics of the colony. During the years which followed, the efforts of the Proprietors to maintain any authority over their Northern province, or to connect it in any way with their Southern territory, were little more than nominal. For the most part the two settlements were distinguished by the Proprietors as 'our colony north-east of Cape Fear,' and 'our colony south-west of Cape Fear' As early as 1691 we find the expression North Carolina once used. After that we do not meet with it till 1696. From that time onward both expressions are used with no marked distinction, sometimes even in the same document At times the Proprietors seem to have aimed at establishing a closer connexion between the two colonies by placing them under a single Governor. But in nearly all these cases provision was made for the appointment of separate Deputy-Governors, nor does there seem to have been any project for uniting the two legislative bodies. . . . In 1720 the first event occurred which throws any clear light from without on the internal life of the colony. In that year boundary disputes arose between Virginia and her southern neighbour and it was found necessary to appoint representatives on each side to settle the boundary line. The chief interest of the matter lies in the notes left to us by one of the Virginia Commissioners [Colonel William Byrd] . . . After making all . . . deductions and checking Byrd's report by that of graver writers, there remains a picture of poverty, indolence, and thriftlessness which finds no counterpart in any of the other southern colonies That the chief town contained only some fifty poor cottages is little or nothing more than what we find in Maryland or Virginia But there the import trade with England made up for the deficiencies of colonial life North Carolina, lacking the two essentials of trade, harbours and a surplus population, had no commercial dealings with the mother country. . . . The only possessions which abounded were horses and swine, both of which could be reared in droves without any care or attention. The evils of slavery existed without its counterbalancing advantages There was nothing to teach those habits of administration which the rich planters of Virginia and South Carolina learnt as part of their daily life At the same time the colony suffered from one of the worst effects of slavery, a want of manual skill . . In 1729 the faint and meaningless shadow of proprietary government came to an end The Crown bought up first the shares of seven Proprietors, then after an interval that of the eighth In the case of other colonies the process of transfer had been effected by a conflict and by something approaching to revolution In North Carolina alone it seems to have come about with the peaceful assent of all parties . Without a struggle, North Carolina cast off all traces of its peculiar origin and passed into the ordinary state of a crown colony"—J A Doyle, *The English in America: Virginia, Maryland and the Carolinas, ch.* 12

A. D. 1710.—Palatine colonization at New Berne. See PALATINES

A. D. 1711-1714.—Indian rising and massacre of colonists.—Subjugation and expulsion of the Tuscaroras. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: IROQUOIS TRIBES OF THE SOUTH.

A. D. 1740.—War with the Spaniards in Florida. See GEORGIA: A. D 1738-1743.

A. D. 1759-1761.—The Cherokee War. See SOUTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1759-1761.

A D. 1760-1766.—The question of taxation by Parliament.—The Stamp Act.—The First Continental Congress.—The repeal of the Stamp Act and the Declaratory Act. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1760-1775; 1763-1764; 1765; and 1766.

A. D. 1766-1768.—The Townshend Duties.—The Circular Letter of Massachusetts. See UNITED STATES OF AM: A. D. 1766-1767; and 1767-1768.

A. D. 1766-1771.—The insurrection of the Regulators.—Battle of Alamance.—Complaints of official extortion, which were loud in several of the colonies at about the same period, led to serious results in North Carolina. "Complaints were most rife in the middle counties, a

very barren portion of the province, with a population generally poor and ignorant. These people complained, and not without reason — for the poor and ignorant are ever most exposed to oppression — not only that excessive fees were extorted, but that the sheriffs collected taxes of which they rendered no account They seem also to have held the courts and lawyers — indeed, the whole system for the collection of debts — in great detestation Presently, under the name of 'Regulators,' borrowed from South Carolina, they formed associations which not only refused the payment of taxes, but assaulted the persons and property of lawyers, judges, sheriffs, and other obnoxious individuals, and even proceeded so far as to break up the sessions of the courts. The common name of Regulators designated, in the two Carolinas combinations composed of different materials, and having different objects in view The Assembly of the province took decided ground against them, and even expelled one of their leaders, who had been elected a member After negotiations and delays, and broken promises to keep the peace, Governor Tryon, at the head of a body of volunteers, marched into the disaffected counties The Regulators assembled in arms, and an action was fought at Alamance, on the Haw, near the head waters of Cape Fear River, in which some 200 were left dead upon the field Out of a large number taken prisoners, six were executed for high treason Though the Regulators submitted, they continued to entertain a deadly hatred against the militia of the lower counties, which had taken part against them Tryon was presently removed from North Carolina to New York His successor, Joseph Martin, anxious to strengthen himself against the growing discontents of the province, promised to redress the grievances, and sedulously cultivated the good will of the Regulators, and with such success that they became, in the end, staunch supporters of the royal authority "—R Hildreth, *Hist of the U S., ch* 29 (*v* 2)

Also in, F X Martin, *Hist. of N Carolina, ch* 7-8 —J H. Wheeler, *Hist of N Carolina, ch* 8 —F L. Hawks, *Battle of the Alamance* (*Rev Hist of N. C*)

A. D. 1768-1774.—Opening events of the Revolution. See Boston A D 1768, to 1773, and United States of Am. A D 1770, to 1774.

A. D. 1769-1772.—The first settlement of Tennessee.—The Watauga Association. See Tennessee: A. D 1769–1772

A. D. 1775.—The beginning of the War of the American Revolution.—Lexington.—Concord.—Action on the news.—Ticonderoga.—The Siege of Boston.—Bunker Hill.—The Second Continental Congress. See United States of Am.: A. D. 1775.

A. D. 1775 (May).—The Mecklenburg Declaration.—"It has been strenuously claimed and denied that, at a meeting of the people of Mecklenburg County, in North Carolina, on May 20, 1775, resolutions were passed declaring their independence of Great Britain. The facts in the case appear to be these:—On the 31st of May, 1775, the people of this county did pass resolutions quite abreast of the public sentiment of that time, but not venturing on the field of independency further than to say that these resolutions were to remain in force till Great Britain resigned its pretensions. These resolutions were well written, attracted notice, and were copied into the leading newspapers of the colonies, North and South, and can be found in various later works (Lossing's 'Field Book,' ii, 619, etc.). A copy of the 'S Carolina Gazette' containing them was sent by Governor Wright, of Georgia, to Lord Dartmouth, and was found by Bancroft in the State Paper Office, while in the Sparks MSS (no. lvi) is the record of a copy sent to the home government by Governor Martin of North Carolina, with a letter dated June 30, 1775 Of these resolutions there is no doubt (Frothingham's 'Rise of the Republic,' 422) In 1793, or earlier, some of the actors in the proceeding, apparently ignorant that the record of these resolutions had been preserved in the newspapers, endeavored to supply them from memory, unconsciously intermingling some of the phraseology of the Declaration of July 4th, in Congress, which gave them the tone of a pronounced independency Probably through another dimness of memory they affixed the date of May 20, 1775, to them These were first printed in the 'Raleigh Register,' April 30, 1819. They are found to resemble in some respects the now known resolves of May 31st, as well as the national Declaration in a few phrases. In 1829 Martin printed them, much altered, in his 'North Carolina' (ii, 272) but it is not known where this copy came from In 1831 the State printed the text of the 1819 copy, and fortified it with recollections and certificates of persons affirming that they were present when the resolutions were passed on the 20th "—J. Winsor, *Note in Narrative and Critical Hist of Am*, *v.* 6, *p* 256.—"We are inclined to conjecture that there was a popular meeting at Charlottetown on the 19th and 20th of May, where discussion was had on the subject of independence, and probably some more or less explicit understanding arrived at, which became the basis of the committee's action on the 31st If so, we make no doubt that J. McN Alexander was secretary of that meeting. He, probably, in that case, recorded the proceedings, and among them some resolution or resolutions in regard to the propriety of throwing off the British yoke It was in attempting to remember the records of that meeting, destroyed by fire, that John McN Alexander, then an old man, fell into the errors" which led him, in 1800, to certify, as Secretary, a copy of the document called the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence —H S Randall, *Life of Jefferson*, *v.* 3, *app* 2

Also in W. A Graham, *Address on the Mecklenburg Declaration*, 1875.—F L. Hawks, *The Mecklenburg Declaration* (*Rev. Hist. of Georgia*).

A. D. 1775-1776.—The arming of the loyalist Highlanders and their defeat at Moore's Creek.—The first colony vote for independence.—"North Carolina was the first colony to act as a unit in favor of independence. It was the fourth in importance of the United Colonies. Its Provincial Congress had organized the militia, and vested the public authority in a provincial council for the whole colony, committees of safety for the districts, and county and town committees. A large portion of the people were adherents of the crown,—among them a body of Highland emigrants, and most of the party of regulators. Governor Martin represented, not without grounds, that, if these loyalists were supported by a British force, the colony might be

gained to the royal side. The loyalists were also numerous in Georgia and South Carolina. Hence it was determined by the King to send an expedition to the Southern Colonies in the winter, to restore the royal authority. This was put under the command of Sir Henry Clinton, and ordered to rendezvous at Cape Fear. 'I am clear,' wrote George III., 'the first attempt should be made on North Carolina, as the Highland settlers are said to be well inclined.' Commissions were issued to men of influence among them, one being Allan McDonald, the husband of the chivalrous Flora McDonald, who became famous by romantic devotion to Prince Charles Edward. Donald McDonald was appointed the commander. These officers, under the direction of the governor, after much secret consultation, enrolled about 1,500 men. The popular leaders, however, were *informed of their designs*. The militia were summoned, and took the field under Colonel James Moore. At length, when Sir Henry Clinton was expected at Cape Fear, General McDonald erected the royal standard at Cross Creek, now Fayetteville, and moved forward to join Clinton. Colonel Moore ordered parties of the militia to take post at Moore's Creek Bridge, over which McDonald would be obliged to pass. Colonel Richard Caswell was at the head of one of these parties; hence the force here was under his command, and this place on the 27th of February [1776] became a famous battle-field. The Provincials were victorious. They captured a great quantity of military supplies, nearly 900 men, and their commander. This was the Lexington and Concord of that region. The newspapers circulated the details of this brilliant result. The spirit of the Whigs run high . . . A strong force was soon ready and anxious to meet Clinton. Amidst these scenes, the people elected delegates to a Provincial Congress, which met, on the 4th of April [1776], at Halifax. . . . Attempts were made to ascertain the sense of the people on independence. . . . The subject was referred to a committee, of which Cornelius Harnett was the chairman. They reported an elaborate preamble . . . and a resolution to empower the delegates in the General Congress 'to concur with the delegates in the other colonies in declaring independency and forming foreign alliances,— reserving to the colony the sole and exclusive right of forming a constitution and laws for it,' also 'of appointing delegates in a general representation of the colonies for such purposes as might be agreed upon.' This was unanimously adopted on the 12th of April. Thus the popular party carried North Carolina as a unit in favor of independence, when the colonies, from New England to Virginia, were in solid array against it. The example was warmly welcomed by the patriots, and commended for imitation."— R. Frothingham, *The Rise of the Republic, ch.* 11.

ALSO IN: J. W. Moore, *Hist. of N. C., v.* 1, *ch.* 10.— D. L. Swain, *British Invasion of N. Carolina in* 1776 (*Rev. Hist. of N. C.*).—See, also, UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776 (JUNE).

A. D. 1776.— Annexation of the Watauga settlements (Tennessee). See TENNESSEE: A. D. 1776-1784.

A. D. 1776-1780.—Independence declared.— Adoption of State Constitution.— The war in the North.—British conquest of Georgia. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776, to 1780.

A. D. 1780-1783.—The war in the South.— Greene's campaign.—King's Mountain.—The Cowpens.—Guilford Court House.—Hobkirk's Hill.— Eutaw Springs.— Yorktown.— Peace. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1780, to 1783.

A. D. 1784.—Revolt of the Tennessee settlements against their cession to Congress. See TENNESSEE, A. D. 1776-1784.

A. D. 1785-1788.—The state of Franklin organized by the Tennessee settlers.— Its brief and troubled history. See TENNESSEE: A. D. 1785, and 1785-1796.

A. D. 1786.— Importation of Negroes discouraged. See SLAVERY, NEGRO: A. D. 1776-1808.

A. D. 1787-1789.—Formation and adoption of the Federal Constitution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1787; and 1787-1789.

A. D. 1790.— Renewed cession of western Territory (Tennessee) to the United States. See TENNESSEE: A. D. 1785-1796, also, UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1781-1786.

A. D. 1861 (January—May).— The difficult dragging of the state into Secession.— "A large majority of the people of North Carolina were opposed to secession. They did not regard it as a constitutional right. They were equally opposed to a separation from the Union in resentment of the election of Mr. Lincoln. But the Governor, John W. Ellis, was in full sympathy with the secessionists. He spared no pains to bring the state into line with South Carolina [which had passed her ordinance of Secession December 20, 1860.— see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1860 (NOVEMBER—DECEMBER)] The legislature met on the 20th of November. The governor, in his message, recommended that the legislature should invite a conference with the Southern States, or send delegates to them for the purpose of securing their co-operation. He also recommended the reorganization of the militia, and the call of a state convention. Bills were introduced for the purpose of carrying these measures into effect . . . On the 30th of January, a bill for calling a state convention was passed. It provided that no secession ordinance, nor one connecting the state with the Southern Confederacy, would be valid until it should be ratified by a majority of the qualified voters of the state. The vote of the people was appointed to take place on the 28th of February. The delegates were elected on the day named. A large majority of them were Unionists. But, at the same time, the convention itself was voted down. The vote for a convention was 46,671; against a convention, 47,333. The majority against it was 662. This majority against a convention, however, was no criterion of popular sentiment in regard to secession. The true test was the votes received, respectively, by the Union and secession delegates. The former received a majority of nearly 30,000. But the indefatigable governor was not to be balked by the popular dislike for secession. The legislature was called together in extra session on May 1. On the same day they voted to have another election for delegates to a state convention on the 13th of the month. The election took place accordingly, and the delegates convened on the 20th. On the following day the secession ordinance was adopted, and the Confederate Constitution ratified. To save time, and avoid further

obstructions, the question of popular approval was taken for granted."—S. S. Cox, *Three Decades of Federal Legislation, pp.* 119–120.

ALSO IN: J. W. Moore, *Hist. of N. Carolina, v.* 2, *ch.* 5.—See, also, UNITED STATES OF AM: A D 1861 (MARCH—APRIL).

A. D. 1861 (April).—Governor Ellis' reply to President Lincoln's call for troops. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (APRIL) PRESIDENT LINCOLN'S CALL TO ARMS

A. D. 1861 (August).—Hatteras Inlet taken by the Union forces. See UNITED STATES OF AM A. D. 1861 (AUGUST: NORTH CAROLINA)

A. D. 1862 (January — April). — Capture of Roanoke Island, Newbern and Beaufort by the Union forces. See UNITED STATES OF AM A. D. 1862 (JANUARY — APRIL NORTH CAROLINA)

A. D. 1862 (May).—Appointment of a Military Governor. See UNITED STATES OF AM A. D. 1862 (MARCH—JUNE).

A. D. 1864 (April—May).—Exploits of the ram Albemarle.—Confederate capture of Plymouth. See UNITED STATES OF AM . A D 1864 (APRIL—MAY: NORTH CAROLINA)

A. D. 1864 (October).—Destruction of the ram Albemarle. See UNITED STATES OF AM. A. D. 1864 (OCTOBER: NORTH CAROLINA).

A. D. 1864-1865 (December—January).—The capture of Fort Fisher. See UNITED STATES OF AM : A. D 1864–1865 (DECEMBER—JANUARY NORTH CAROLINA).

A. D. 1865 (February—March).—Sherman's March.—The Battle of Bentonsville. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A D 1865 (FEBRUARY —MARCH: THE CAROLINAS)

A. D. 1865 (February—March).—Federal occupation of Wilmington.—Battle of Kinston. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D 1865 (FEBRUARY—MARCH NORTH CAROLINA)

A. D. 1865 (May).—Provisional government under President Johnson's Plan of Reconstruction. See UNITED STATES OF AM A. D 1865 (MAY—JULY)

A. D. 1865-1868. — Reconstruction. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D 1865 (MAY—JULY), and after, to 1868–1870

NORTH DAKOTA: Admission to the Union (1889). See UNITED STATES OF AM A. D 1889–1890

NORTH GERMAN CONFEDERATION. See GERMANY: A. D. 1866.

NORTH RIVER, The. See SOUTH RIVER

NORTHAMPTON, Battle of.—One of the battles in the English civil wars of the 15th century called the Wars of the Roses, fought July 10, 1460. See ENGLAND A D 1455-1471

NORTHAMPTON, Peace of. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1328

NORTHBROOK, LORD, The Indian administration of. See INDIA . A D 1862–1876

NORTHEAST AND NORTHWEST PASSAGE, Search for the. See POLAR EXPLORATION.

NORTHEASTERN BOUNDARY QUESTION, Settlement of the. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1842.

NORTHERN CIRCARS, OR SIRKARS. See INDIA: A. D. 1753–1761.

NORTHERN MARITIME LEAGUE, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1801–1802.

NORTHMEN. See NORMANS.

NORTHUMBRIA, Kingdom of. — The northernmost of the kingdoms formed by the Angles in Britain in the 6th century It embraced the two kingdoms of Bernicia and Deira, sometimes ruled by separate princes, sometimes united, as Northumbria, under one, and extending from the Humber to the Forth See ENGLAND. A. D. 547–633.

10-11th Centuries.—Lothian joined to Scotland. See SCOTLAND: 10–11TH CENTURIES

NORTHWEST FUR COMPANY. See CANADA: A. D 1869–1873

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES OF CANADA.—"The North West Territories comprise all lands [of the Dominion of Canada] not within the limits of any province or of the District of Keewatin. The area of the Territories is about 3,000,000 square miles or four times as great as the area of all the provinces together The Territories were ceded to Canada by an Order in Council dated the 24th June 1870 [see CANADA. A D. 1869–1873]. . . The southern portion of the territories between Manitoba and British Columbia has been formed into four provisional districts, viz Assiniboia, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Athabasca . By the Dominion Act 38 Vic c 49 executive and legislative powers were conferred on a Lieutenant-Governor and a Council of five members subject to instructions given by Order in Council or by the Canadian Secretary of State "—J E C Munro, *The Const. of Canada, ch* 2

NORTHWEST TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, The Old.—"This northwestern land lay between the Mississippi, the Ohio, and the Great Lakes. It now constitutes five of our large States and part of a sixth [namely, western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan]. But when independence was declared it was quite as much a foreign territory, considered from the standpoint of the old thirteen colonies, as Florida or Canada. the difference was that, whereas during the war we failed in our attempts to conquer Florida and Canada, we succeeded in conquering the Northwest The Northwest formed no part of our country as it originally stood, it had no portion in the declaration of independence It did not revolt, it was conquered. . We made our first important conquest during the Revolution itself "—T. Roosevelt, *The Winning of the West, v.* 1, *pp.* 32–33.

A. D. 1673-1751.—Early French exploration and occupation. See CANADA: A. D. 1634–1673; 1669–1687, 1700–1735, also ILLINOIS: A. D. 1700–1750, and 1751

A. D. 1748-1763.—Struggle of the French and English for possession. See OHIO (VALLEY). A D. 1748–1754, 1754, 1755; and CANADA: A D 1758.

A. D. 1763.—Cession to Great Britain by the Treaty of Paris.—Possession taken. See SEVEN YEARS WAR: THE TREATIES; and ILLINOIS. A D. 1765.

A. D. 1763.—The king's proclamation excluding settlers, and reserving the whole interior of the continent for the Indians.—"On the 7th of October, 1763, George III. issued a proclamation, providing for four new governments or colonies, namely: Quebec, East Florida, West Florida, and Grenada [the latter embracing 'the island of that name, together with the

Grenadines, and the islands of Dominico, St. Vincent and Tobago'], and defining their boundaries. The limits of Quebec did not vary materially from those of the present province of that name, and those of East and West Florida comprised the present State of Florida and the country north of the Gulf of Mexico to the parallel of 31° latitude. It will be seen that no provision was made for the government of nine tenths of the new territory acquired by the Treaty of Paris, and the omission was not an oversight, but was intentional The purpose was to reserve as crown lands the Northwest territory, the region north of the great lakes, and the country between the Alleghanies and the Mississippi, and to exclude them from settlement by the American colonies They were left, for the time being, to the undisputed possession of the savage tribes. The king's 'loving subjects' were forbidden making purchases of land from the Indians, or forming any settlements 'westward of the sources of the rivers which fall into the sea from the West and Northwest,' 'and all persons who have wilfully or inadvertently seated themselves upon any lands' west of this limit were warned 'forthwith to remove themselves from such settlements. Certain reasons for this policy were assigned in the proclamation, such as, 'preventing irregularities in the future, and that the Indians may be convinced of our justice,' etc , but the real explanation appears in the Report of the Lords Commissioners for Trade and Plantations, in 1772, on the petition of Thomas Walpole and others for a grant of land on the Ohio The report was drawn by Lord Hillsborough, the president of the board The report states: 'We take leave to remind your lordships of that principle which was adopted by this Board, and approved and confirmed by his Majesty, immediately after the Treaty of Paris, viz.: the confining the western extent of settlements to such a distance from the sea-coasts as that those settlements should lie within reach of the trade and commerce of this kingdom, . . . and also of the exercise of that authority and jurisdiction which was conceived to be necessary for the preservation of the colonies in a due subordination to, and dependence upon, the mother country. And these we apprehend to have been the two capital objects of his Majesty's proclamation of the 7th of October, 1763. . . . The great object of colonizing upon the continent of North America has been to improve and extend the commerce, navigation, and manufactures of this kingdom. . . . It does appear to us that the extension of the fur trade depends entirely upon the Indians being undisturbed in the possession of their hunting-grounds, and that all colonizing does in its nature, and must in its consequences, operate to the prejudice of that branch of commerce. . . . Let the Savages enjoy their deserts in quiet. Were they driven from their forests the peltry-trade would decrease.'. . . Such in clear and specific terms was the cold and selfish policy which the British crown and its ministers habitually pursued towards the American colonies; and in a few years it changed loyalty into hate, and brought on the American Revolution."—W. F. Poole, *The West, from* 1763 *to* 1783 (*Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v.* 6, *ch.* 9).—"The king's proclamation [of 1763] shows that, in the construction put upon the treaty by the crown authorities, the ceded territory was a new acquisition by conquest. The proclamation was the formal appropriation of it as the king's domain, embracing all the country west of the heads or sources of the rivers falling into the Atlantic."—R. King, *Ohio, ch.* 5.—The text of the Proclamation of 1763 is in Force's *American Archives, series* 4, *v.* 1, *p.* 172.

A. D. 1763-1764.—Pontiac's War. See PONTIAC'S WAR.

A. D. 1765-1768.—The Indian Treaties of German Flats and Fort Stanwix.—Boundary arrangement with the Six Nations. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D 1765–1768.

A. D. 1774.—The territorial claims of Virginia.—Lord Dunmore's War. See OHIO (VALLEY): A D. 1774; also UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1781–1786.

A. D. 1774.—Embraced in the Province of Quebec. See CANADA: A. D. 1763–1774.

A. D. 1778-1779.—Its conquest from the British by the Virginian General Clark, and its organization under the jurisdiction of Virginia. See UNITED STATES OF AM.. A D 1778–1779 CLARK'S CONQUEST.

A. D. 1781-1786.—Cession of the conflicting territorial claims of the States to the United States. See UNITED STATES OF AM : A. D 1781–1786.

A. D. 1784.—Jefferson's plan for new States.—"The condition of the northwestern territory had long been under the consideration of the House [the Congress of the Confederation] Several committees had been appointed, and several schemes listened to, for laying out new States, but it was not till the middle of April [1784], that a resolution was finally reached. One plan was to divide the ceded and purchased lands into seventeen States. Eight of these were to be between the banks of the Mississippi and a north and south line through the falls of the Ohio Eight more were to be marked out between this line and a second one parallel to it, and passing through the western bank of the mouth of the Great Kanawha. What remained was to form the seventeenth State. But few supporters were found for the measure, and a committee, over which Jefferson presided, was ordered to place before Congress a new scheme of division. Chase and Howe assisted him, and the three devised a plan whereby the prairie-lands were to be parted out among ten new States The divisions then marked down have utterly disappeared, and the names given to them become so forgotten that nine tenths of the population which has, in our time, covered the whole region with wealthy cities and prosperous villages, and turned it from a waste to a garden, have never in their lives heard the words pronounced. Some were borrowed from the Latin and some from the Greek; while others were Latinized forms of the names the Indians had given to the rivers. The States were to be, as far as possible, two degrees of latitude in width and arranged in three tiers. The Mississippi and a meridian through the falls of the Ohio included the western tier. The meridian through the falls of the Ohio and a second through the mouth of the Great Kanawha were the boundaries of the middle tier. Between this and the Pennsylvania West Line lay the third tier. That vast tract stretching from the 45th parallel of latitude to the Lake of the Woods, and dense with forests

of pine, of hickory, and of oak, they called Sylvania. It was the northern State of the western tier To the long tongue of land separating the water of Michigan from the waters of Erie and Huron they gave the name Cherronesus. A narrow strip, not more than two degrees of latitude in width, and stretching from Lake Michigan to the Mississippi, was called Michigania. As marked down on their rude maps, Michigania lay under Sylvania, in the very heart of what is now Wisconsin. South of this to the 41st parallel of latitude was Assenisipia, a name derived from Assenisipi, the Indian title of the river now called the Rock. Eastward, along the shore of Lake Erie, the country was named Metropotamia It took the name Mother of Rivers from the belief that within its boundary were the fountains of many rivers, the Muskingum, the two Miamis of Ohio, the Wabash, the Illinois, the Sandusky, and the Miami of the Lake That part of Illinois between the 39th and 41st parallels was called, from the river which waters it, Illinoia On to the east was Saratoga, and beyond this lay Washington, a broad and level tract shut in by the Ohio river, the waters of the lake, and the boundaries of Pennsylvania Under Illinois and Saratoga, and stretching along the Ohio, was the ninth State Within its confines the waters of the Wabash, the Sawane, the Tanissee, the Illinois, and the Ohio were mingled with the waters of the Mississippi and Missouri The committee therefore judged that a fitting name would be Polypotamia Pelisipia was the tenth State It lay to the east of Polypotamia, and was named from Pelisipi a term the Cherokees often applied to the river Ohio At the same time that the boundaries of the new States were defined, a code of laws was drawn up which should serve as a constitution for each State, till 20,000 free inhabitants acquired the right of self government The code was in no wise a remarkable performance, yet there were among its articles two which cannot be passed by in silence One provided for the abolition of slavery after the year 1800 The other announced that no one holding an hereditary title should ever become a citizen of the new States Each was struck out by the House Yet each is deserving of notice The one because it was the first attempt at a national condemnation of slavery, the other because it was a public expression of the dread with which our ancestors beheld the growth of the Society of the Cincinnati"—J B McMaster, *Hist. of the People of the U. S., ch. 2 (v. 1)*—The report of Jefferson's committee "was recommitted to the same committee on the 17th of March, and a new one was submitted on the 22d of the same month. The second report agreed in substance with the first. The principal difference was the omission of the paragraph giving names to the States to be formed out of the Western Territory." After striking out the clauses prohibiting slavery after the year 1800 and denying citizenship to all persons holding hereditary titles, the Congress adopted the report, April 23, 1784. "Thus the substance of the report of Mr. Jefferson of a plan for the government of the Western Territory (without restrictions as to slavery) became a law, and remained so during 1784 to 1787, when these resolutions were repealed in terms by the passage of the ordinance for the government of the 'Territory of the United States northwest of the river Ohio.'"—T. Donaldson, *The Public Domain: its History, pp* 148–149.

A. D. 1786-1788.—The Ohio Company of Revolutionary soldiers and their land purchase.—The settlement at Marietta.—"The Revolutionary War had hardly closed before thousands of the disbanded officers and soldiers were looking anxiously to the Western lands for new homes, or for means of repairing their shattered fortunes In June, 1783, a strong memorial was sent to Congress asking a grant of the lands between the Ohio and Lake Erie Those who lived in the South were fortunate in having immediate access to the lands of Kentucky, Tennessee, and the back parts of Georgia. The strife in Congress over the lands of the Northwest delayed the surveys and the bounties so long that the soldiers of the North almost lost hope" Finally, there "was a meeting of officers and soldiers, chiefly of the Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut lines, at Boston, March 1, 1786, when they formed a new Ohio Company for the purchase and settlement of Western lands, in shares of $1,000. General Putnam [Rufus], General Samuel H. Parsons, and the Rev. Manasseh Cutler, were made the directors, and selected for their purchase the lands on the Ohio River situated on both sides of the Muskingum, and immediately west of the Seven Ranges The treasury board in those days were the commissioners of public lands, but with no powers to enter into absolute sales unless such were approved by Congress Weeks and months were lost in waiting for a quorum of that body to assemble This was effected on the 11th of July, and Dr Cutler, deputed by his colleagues, was in attendance, but was constantly baffled in pursuing his objects . . . The members were disposed to insert conditions which were not satisfactory to the Ohio Company. But the doctor carried his point by formally intimating that he should retire, and seek better terms with some of the States, which were offering their lands at half the price Congress was to receive The grant to the Ohio Company, upon the terms proposed, was voted by Congress, and the contract formally signed October 27, 1787, by the treasury board, and by Dr. Cutler and Winthrop Sargent, as agents of the Ohio Company Two companies, including surveyors, boat-builders, carpenters, smiths, farmers and laborers, 48 persons in all, with their outfit, were sent forward in the following months of December and January, under General Putnam as leader and superintendent. They united in February on the Youghiogheny River and constructed boats . . . Embarking with their stores they descended the Ohio, and on the 7th of April, 1788, landed at the Muskingum. On the upper point, opposite Fort Harmar, they founded their town, which at Boston had first been named Adelphia At the first meeting of the directors, held on the ground July 2d, the name of Marietta was adopted, in honor of the French Queen Marie Antoinette, and compounded of the first and last syllables."—R. King, *Ohio, ch.* 8.

Also in: W. P. and J. P. Cutler, *Life, Journals and Cor. of Rev. Manasseh Cutler, v. 1, ch. 4–7 and* 9.—C. M. Walker, *Hist. of Athens County, Ohio, ch.* 2.

A. D. 1787.—The great Ordinance for its government.—Perpetual Exclusion of Slavery.—"Congress at intervals discussed the future of

this great domain, but for a while little progress was made except to establish that Congress could divide the territory as might seem best Nathan Dane came forward with a motion for a committee to plan some temporary scheme of government. A committee on this point reported (May 10, 1786) that the number of States should be from two to five, to be admitted as States according to Jefferson's proposition, but the question of slavery in them was left open. Nothing definite was done till a committee—Johnson of Connecticut, Pinckney of South Carolina, Smith of New York, Dane of Massachusetts, and Henry of Maryland—reported on April 26, 1787, 'An ordinance for the government of the Western territory,' and after various amendments it was fairly transcribed for a third reading, May 10th. Further consideration was now delayed until July. It was at this point that Manasseh Cutler appeared in New York, commissioned to buy land for the Ohio Company in the region whose future was to be determined by this ordinance, and it was very likely, in part, by his influence that those features of the perfected ordinance as passed five days later, and which has given it its general fame, were introduced. On July 9th the bill was referred to a new committee, of which a majority were Southern men, Carrington of Virginia taking the chairmanship from Johnson, Dane and Smith were retained, but Richard Henry Lee and Kean of South Carolina supplanted Pinckney and Henry This change was made to secure the Southern support, on the other hand, acquiescence in the wishes of Northern purchasers of lands was essential in any business outcome of the movement 'Up to this time,' says Poole, 'there were no articles of compact in the bill, no anti-slavery clause, nothing about liberty of conscience or of the press, the right of habeas corpus, or of trial by jury, or the equal distribution of estates The clause that, "religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged," was not there.' These omissions were the New England ideas, which had long before this been engrafted on the Constitution of Massachusetts This new committee reported the bill, embodying all these provisions except the anti slavery clause, on the 11th, and the next day this and other amendments were made. On the 13th, but one voice was raised against the bill on its final passage, and that came from Yates of New York. Poole intimates that it was the promise of the governorship of the territory under the ordinance which induced St. Clair, then President of Congress, to lend it his countenance. The promise, if such it was, was fulfilled, and St. Clair became the first governor."—J. Winsor and E. Channing, *Territorial Acquisitions and Divisions* (*Narrative and Crit. Hist. of Am., v. 7, app.*).

Also in: B. A. Hinsdale, *The Old Northwest, ch.* 15.—W. F. Poole, *Doctor Cutler and the Ordinance of* 1787 (*North Am. Rev., Apr.*, 1876.—W. P. and J. P. Cutler, *Life of Manasseh Cutler, v.* 1, *ch.* 8.—J. P. Dunn, Jr., *Indiana, ch.* 5.—T. Donaldson, *The Public Domain, pp.* 149–159.—J. A. Barrett, *Evolution of the Ordinance of* 1787 (*Univ. of Nebraska, Seminary Papers*, 1891).—J. P. Dunn, ed., *Slavery Petitions* (*Ind. Hist. Soc., v.* 2, *no.* 12).—See, also, Education, Modern. America: A. D. 1785–1880.

The following is the text of the "Ordinance for the Government of the Territory of the United States Northwest of the River Ohio," commonly known as the "Ordinance of 1787": "Be it ordained by the United States in Congress assembled, That the said territory, for the purposes of temporary government, be one district, subject, however, to be divided into two districts, as future circumstances may, in the opinion of Congress, make it expedient. Be it ordained by the authority aforesaid, That the estates, both of resident and non-resident proprietors in the said territory, dying intestate, shall descend to, and be distributed among, their children, and the descendants of a deceased child, in equal parts; the descendants of a deceased child or grandchild to take the share of their deceased parent in equal parts among them: And where there shall be no children or descendants, then in equal parts to the next of kin in equal degree; and, among collaterals, the children of a deceased brother or sister of the intestate shall have, in equal parts among them, their deceased parents' share, and there shall, in no case, be a distinction between kindred of the whole and half blood; saving, in all cases, to the widow of the intestate her third part of the real estate for life, and one third part of the personal estate, and this law, relative to descents and dower, shall remain in full force until altered by the legislature of the district. And, until the governor and judges shall adopt laws as hereinafter mentioned, estates in the said territory may be devised or bequeathed by wills in writing, signed and sealed by him or her, in whom the estate may be (being of full age,) and attested by three witnesses, and real estates may be conveyed by lease and release, or bargain and sale, signed, sealed, and delivered by the person, being of full age, in whom the estate may be, and attested by two witnesses, provided such wills be duly proved, and such conveyances be acknowledged, or the execution thereof duly proved, and be recorded within one year after proper magistrates, courts, and registers shall be appointed for that purpose; and personal property may be transferred by delivery, saving, however to the French and Canadian inhabitants, and other settlers of the Kaskaskias, St. Vincents, and the neighboring villages who have heretofore professed themselves citizens of Virginia, their laws and customs now in force among them, relative to the descent and conveyance of property. Be it ordained by the authority aforesaid, That there shall be appointed, from time to time, by Congress, a governor, whose commission shall continue in force for the term of three years, unless sooner revoked by Congress; he shall reside in the district, and have a freehold estate therein in 1,000 acres of land, while in the exercise of his office. There shall be appointed, from time to time, by Congress, a secretary, whose commission shall continue in force for four years unless sooner revoked; he shall reside in the district, and have a freehold estate therein in 500 acres of land, while in the exercise of his office; it shall be his duty to keep and preserve the acts and laws passed by the legislature, and the public records of the district, and the proceedings of the governor in his Executive department; and transmit authentic copies of such acts and proceedings, every six months, to the Secretary of Congress: There

shall also be appointed a court to consist of three judges, any two of whom to form a court, who shall have a common law jurisdiction, and reside in the district, and have each therein a freehold estate in 500 acres of land while in the exercise of their offices; and their commissions shall continue in force during good behavior. The governor and judges, or a majority of them, shall adopt and publish in the district such laws of the original States, criminal and civil, as may be necessary and best suited to the circumstances of the district, and report them to Congress from time to time: which laws shall be in force in the district until the organization of the General Assembly therein, unless disapproved of by Congress; but, afterwards, the legislature shall have authority to alter them as they shall think fit. The governor, for the time being, shall be commander in-chief of the militia, appoint and commission all officers in the same below the rank of general officers, all general officers shall be appointed and commissioned by Congress. Previous to the organization of the General Assembly, the governor shall appoint such magistrates and other civil officers, in each county or township, as he shall find necessary for the preservation of the peace and good order in the same. After the General Assembly shall be organized, the powers and duties of the magistrates and other civil officers, shall be regulated and defined by the said assembly, but all magistrates and other civil officers, not herein otherwise directed, shall, during the continuance of this temporary government, be appointed by the governor For the prevention of crimes and injuries, the laws to be adopted or made shall have force in all parts of the district, and for the execution of process, criminal and civil, the governor shall make proper divisions thereof, and he shall proceed, from time to time, as circumstances may require, to lay out the parts of the district in which the Indian titles shall have been extinguished, into counties and townships, subject, however, to such alterations as may thereafter be made by the legislature So soon as there shall be 5,000 free male inhabitants of full age in the district, upon giving proof thereof to the governor, they shall receive authority, with time and place, to elect representatives from their counties or townships to represent them in the General Assembly: Provided, That, for every 500 free male inhabitants, there shall be one representative, and so on progressively with the number of free male inhabitants, shall the right of representation increase, until the number of representatives shall amount to 25; after which, the number and proportion of representatives shall be regulated by the legislature: Provided, That no person be eligible or qualified to act as a representative unless he shall have been a citizen of one of the United States three years, and be a resident in the district, or unless he shall have resided in the district three years, and, in either case, shall likewise hold in his own right, in fee simple, 200 acres of land within the same: Provided, also, That a freehold in 50 acres of land in the district, having been a citizen of one of the States, and being resident in the district, or the like freehold and two years residence in the district, shall be necessary to qualify a man as an elector of a representative. The representatives thus elected, shall serve for the term of two years, and, in case of the death of a representative, or removal from office, the governor shall issue a writ to the county or township for which he was a member, to elect another in his stead, to serve for the residue of the term The General Assembly, or Legislature, shall consist of the governor, legislative council, and a house of representatives The legislative council shall consist of five members, to continue in office five years, unless sooner removed by Congress, any three of whom to be a quorum: and the members of the council shall be nominated and appointed in the following manner, to wit. As soon as representatives shall be elected, the governor shall appoint a time and place for them to meet together, and, when met, they shall nominate ten persons, residents in the district, and each possessed of a freehold in 500 acres of land, and return their names to Congress, five of whom Congress shall appoint and commission to serve as aforesaid, and, whenever a vacancy shall happen in the council, by death or removal from office, the house of representatives shall nominate two persons, qualified as aforesaid, for each vacancy, and return their names to Congress; one of whom Congress shall appoint and commission for the residue of the term. And every five years, four months at least before the expiration of the time of service of the members of council, the said house shall nominate ten persons, qualified as aforesaid, and return their names to Congress, five of whom Congress shall appoint and commission to serve as members of the council five years, unless sooner removed. And the governor, legislative council, and house of representatives, shall have authority to make laws in all cases, for the good government of the district, not repugnant to the principles and articles in this ordinance established and declared And all bills, having passed by a majority in the house, and by a majority in the council, shall be referred to the governor for his assent, but no bill, or legislative act whatever, shall be of any force without his assent. The governor shall have power to convene, prorogue, and dissolve the General Assembly, when, in his opinion, it shall be expedient. The governor, judges, legislative council, secretary, and such other officers as Congress shall appoint in the district, shall take an oath or affirmation of fidelity and of office, the governor before the President of Congress, and all other officers before the governor As soon as a legislature shall be formed in the district, the council and house assembled in one room, shall have authority, by joint ballot, to elect a delegate to Congress, who shall have a seat in Congress, with a right of debating but not of voting during this temporary government And, for extending the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty, which form the basis whereon these republics, their laws and constitutions are erected; to fix and establish those principles as the basis of all laws, constitutions, and governments, which forever hereafter shall be formed in the said territory: to provide also for the establishment of States, and permanent government therein, and for their admission to a share in the federal councils on an equal footing with the original States, at as early periods as may be consistent with the general interest: It is hereby ordained and declared by the authority aforesaid, That the following articles shall be considered as

articles of compact between the original States and the people and States in the said territory and forever remain unalterable, unless by common consent, to wit: **Art. 1st.** No person, demeaning himself in a peaceable and orderly manner, shall ever be molested on account of his mode of worship or religious sentiments, in the said territory. **Art. 2d.** The inhabitants of the said territory shall always be entitled to the benefits of the writ of habeas corpus, and of the trial by jury; of a proportionate representation of the people in the legislature; and of judicial proceedings according to the course of the common law. All persons shall be bailable, unless for capital offences, where the proof shall be evident or the presumption great. All fines shall be moderate; and no cruel or unusual punishments shall be inflicted. No man shall be deprived of his liberty or property, but by the judgment of his peers or the law of the land; and, should the public exigencies make it necessary, for the common preservation, to take any person's property, or to demand his particular services, full compensation shall be made for the same. And, in the just preservation of rights and property, it is understood and declared, that no law ought ever to be made, or have force in the said territory, that shall in any manner whatever, interfere with or affect private contracts or engagements, bona fide, and without fraud, previously formed. **Art. 3d.** Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged. The utmost good faith shall always be observed towards the Indians; their lands and property shall never be taken from them without their consent, and, in their property, rights, and liberty, they shall never be invaded or disturbed, unless in just and lawful wars authorized by Congress; but laws founded in justice and humanity, shall, from time to time, be made for preventing wrongs being done to them, and for preserving peace and friendship with them. **Art. 4th.** The said territory, and the States which may be formed therein, shall forever remain a part of this confederacy of the United States of America, subject to the Articles of Confederation, and to such alterations therein as shall be constitutionally made; and to all the acts and ordinances of the United States in Congress assembled, conformable thereto. The inhabitants and settlers in the said territory shall be subject to pay a part of the federal debts contracted or to be contracted, and a proportional part of the expenses of government, to be apportioned on them by Congress according to the same common rule and measure by which apportionments thereof shall be made on the other States; and the taxes, for paying their proportion, shall be laid and levied by the authority and direction of the legislatures of the district or districts, or new States, as in the original States, within the time agreed upon by the United States in Congress assembled. The legislatures of those districts or new States, shall never interfere with the primary disposal of the soil by the United States in Congress assembled, nor with any regulations Congress may find necessary for securing the title in such soil to the bona fide purchasers. No tax shall be imposed on lands the property of the United States; and, in no case, shall non-resident proprietors be taxed higher than residents. The navigable waters leading into the Mississippi and St. Lawrence, and the carrying places between the same, shall be common highways, and forever free, as well to the inhabitants of the said territory as to the citizens of the United States, and those of any other States that may be admitted into the Confederacy, without any tax, impost, or duty, therefor. **Art. 5th.** There shall be formed in the said territory, not less than three nor more than five States; and the boundaries of the States, as soon as Virginia shall alter her act of cession, and consent to the same, shall become fixed and established as follows, to wit: The Western State in the said territory, shall be bounded by the Mississippi, the Ohio, and Wabash rivers, a direct line drawn from the Wabash and Post St. Vincent's, due North, to the territorial line between the United States and Canada, and, by the said territorial line, to the Lake of the Woods and Mississippi. The middle State shall be bounded by the said direct line, the Wabash from Post Vincents, to the Ohio, by the Ohio, by a direct line, drawn due North from the mouth of the Great Miami, to the said territorial line, and by the said territorial line. The Eastern State shall be bounded by the last mentioned direct line, the Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the said territorial line. Provided, however, and it is further understood and declared, that the boundaries of these three States shall be subject so far to be altered, that, if Congress shall hereafter find it expedient, they shall have authority to form one or two States in that part of the said territory which lies North of an East and West line drawn through the Southerly bend or extreme of lake Michigan. And, whenever any of the said States shall have 60,000 free inhabitants therein, such State shall be admitted, by its delegates, into the Congress of the United States, on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever, and shall be at liberty to form a permanent constitution and State government: Provided, the constitution and government so to be formed, shall be republican, and in conformity to the principles contained in these articles; and, so far as it can be consistent with the general interest of the confederacy, such admission shall be allowed at an earlier period, and when there may be a less number of free inhabitants in the State than 60,000. **Art. 6th.** There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said territory, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted: Provided, always, That any person escaping into the same, from whom labor or service is lawfully claimed in any one of the original States, such fugitive may be lawfully reclaimed and conveyed to the person claiming his or her labor or service as aforesaid. Be it ordained by the authority aforesaid, That the resolutions of the 23d of April, 1784, relative to the subject of this ordinance, be, and the same are hereby, repealed and declared null and void. Done by the United States, in Congress assembled, the 13th day of July, in the year of our Lord 1787, and of their sovereignty and independence the twelfth."

A. D. 1788-1802.—Extinguished by divisions.—Creation of the Territory of Indiana and the State of Ohio.—"Arthur St. Clair was appointed governor by the Congress [of the Confederation] February 1, 1788, and Winthrop Sargent secretary. August 7th, 1789, Congress

[under the federal constitution], in view of the new method of appointment of officers as provided in the Constitution, passed an amendatory act to the Ordinance of 1787, providing for the nomination of officers for the Territory by the President. . . . August 8, 1789, President Washington sent to the Senate the names of Arthur St. Clair for governor, Winthrop Sargent for secretary, and Samuel Holden Parsons, John Cleves Symmes, and William Barton, for judges. . . . They were all confirmed. President Washington in this message designated the country as 'The Western Territory.' The supreme court was established at Cincinnati (. named by St. Clair in honor of the Society of the Cincinnati, he having been president of the branch society in Pennsylvania) St Clair remained governor until November 22, 1802 Winthrop Sargent afterwards, in 1798, went to Mississippi as governor of that Territory William Henry Harrison became secretary in 1797, representing it in Congress in 1799-1800, and he became governor of the Territory of Indiana in 1800 May 7, 1800, Congress, upon petition, divided this [Northwest] Territory into two separate governments. Indiana Territory was created with its capital at St Vincennes, and from that portion of the Northwest Territory west of a line beginning opposite the mouth of the Kentucky River in Kentucky, and running north to the Canada line. The eastern portion now became the 'Territory Northwest of the river Ohio,' with its capital at Chillicothe This portion, Nov 29, 1802, was admitted into the Union The territory northwest of the river Ohio ceased to exist as a political division after the admission of the State of Ohio into the Union, Nov 29, 1802, although in acts of Congress it was frequently referred to and its forms affixed by legislation to other political divisions "—T Donaldson, *The Public Domain, pp* 159-160

ALSO IN: J. Burnet, *Notes on the Settlement of the N. W. Territory, ch* 14-20 —C Atwater, *Hist of Ohio, period* 2 —J. B Dillon, *Hist of Indiana, ch.* 19-31.—W. H Smith, *The St. Clair Papers, v.* 1, *ch* 6-9.

A. D. 1790-1795.—Indian war.—The disastrous expeditions of Harmar and St. Clair and Wayne's decisive victory.—The Greenville Treaty.—"The Northwestern Indians, at Washington's installation, numbered, according to varying estimates, from 20,000 to 40,000 souls Of these the Wabash tribes had for years been the scourge of the new Kentucky settlers So constant, indeed, was bloodshed and retaliation, that the soil of this earliest of States beyond the mountains acquired the name of 'the dark and bloody ground.' A broad river interposed no sufficient barricade to these deadly encounters . . . What with their own inadmissable claims to territory, and this continuous war to the knife, all the tribes of the Northwestern country were now so maddened against the United States that the first imperative necessity, unless we chose to abandon the Western settlements altogether, was to chastise the Indians into submission. . . . Brigadier-General Harmar, who commanded the small force of United States regulars in the Territory, was . . . a Revolutionary veteran. Our frontier military stations extended as far as Vincennes, on the Wabash, which Major Hamtranck, a Canadian Frenchman, commanded. The British commandant was at Detroit, whence he communicated constantly with the Governor-General of the provinces, Lord Dorchester, by whose instigation the Northwestern Indians at this period were studiously kept at enmity with the United States. . . . A formidable expedition against the Indians was determined upon by the President and St. Clair [Governor of the Northwest Territory]; and in the fall of the year [1790] General Harmar set out from Fort Washington for the Miami country, with a force numbering somewhat less than 1,500, near three-fourths of whom were militia raised in Western Pennsylvania and Kentucky." Successful at first, the campaign ended in a disastrous defeat on the Maumee.—J Schouler, *Hist. of the U S, ch* 2, *sect* 1 (*v.* 1) —"The remnant of his army which Harmar led back to Cincinnati [Fort Washington] had the unsubdued savages almost continually at their heels. As a rebuke to the hostile tribes the expedition was an utter failure, a fact which was soon made manifest. Indian attacks on the settlers immediately became bolder. . . . Every block house in the territory was soon almost in a state of siege . . Washington was authorized to raise an army of 3,000 men for the protection of the Northwest The command of this army was given to St Clair. At the same time a corps of Kentucky volunteers was selected and placed under General Charles Scott. The Kentuckians dashed into the Wabash country, scattered the Indians, burned their villages and returned with a crowd of prisoners. The more pretentious expedition of St Clair was not to be accomplished with so fine a military flourish. Like Harmar's army, that led by St. Clair was feeble in discipline, and disturbed by jealousies. The agents of the Government equipped the expedition in a shameful manner, delivering useless muskets, supplying powder that would scarcely burn, and neglecting entirely a large number of necessary supplies, so that after St. Clair with his 2 300 regulars and 600 militia had marched from Ludlow's Station, north of Cincinnati, he found himself under the necessity of delaying the march to secure supplies The militia deserted in great numbers For the purpose of capturing deserters and bringing up belated supplies, one of the best regiments in the army was sent southward. While waiting on one of the branches of the Wabash for the return of this regiment the main force was on the fourth of November, 1791, surrounded and attacked by the lurking Indians. At the first yell of the savages scores of the terrified militia dropped their guns and bolted. St. Clair, who for some days had been too ill to sit upon a horse, now exerted all his strength in an effort to rally the wavering troops. His horses were all killed, and his hat and clothing were ripped by the bullets. But the lines broke, the men scattered and the artillery was captured. Those who stood their ground fell in their tracks till the fields were covered by 600 dead and dying men. At last a retreat was ordered. . . . For many miles, over a track littered with coats, hats, boots and powder horns, the whooping victors chased the routed survivors of St. Clair's army. It was a ghastly defeat. The face of every settler in Ohio blanched at the news. Kentucky was thrown into excitement and even Western Pennsylvania nervously petitioned for protection. St. Clair was criticised and insulted. A committee of Congress found him without blame. But he had been defeated, and no

amount of reasoning could unlink his name from the tragedy of the dark November morning. Every effort was made to win over the Indians before making another use of force. The Government sent peace messengers into the Northwest. In one manner or another nearly every one of the messengers was murdered The Indians who listened at all would hear of no terms of peace that did not promise the removal of the whites from the northern side of the Ohio The British urged the tribes to make this extreme demand Spain also sent mischief-makers into the camps of the exultant red men More bloodshed became inevitable, and in execution of this last resort came one of the most popular of the Revolutionary chieftains—'Mad Anthony' Wayne Wayne led his army from Cincinnati in October of 1793 He advanced carefully in the path taken by St Clair, found and buried the bones of St Clair's 600 lost, wintered at Greenville, and in the summer of 1794 moved against the foe with strong reinforcements from Kentucky. After a preliminary skirmish between the Indians and the troops, Wayne, in accordance with his instructions, made a last offer of peace The offer was evasively met, and Wayne pushed on. On the morning of Wednesday the twentieth of August, 1794, the 'legion' came upon the united tribes of Indians encamped on the north bank of the Maumee and there, near the rapids of the Maumee, the Indians were forced to face the most alert and vigorous enemy they had yet encountered. The same daring tactics that had carried Stony Point and made Anthony Wayne historic were here directed against the Indian's timber coverts . . . Encouraging and marshaling the Indians were painted Canadian white men bearing British arms. Many of these fell in the heaps of dead and some were captured When Wayne announced his victory he declared that the Indian loss was greater than that incurred by the entire Federal army in the war with Great Britain. Thus ended the Indian reign of terror. After destroying the Indian crops and possessions, in sight of the British fort, Wayne fell back to Greenville and there made the celebrated treaty by which on August 3, 1795, the red men came to a permanent peace with the Thirteen Fires. From Cincinnati to Campus Martius Wayne's victory sent a thrill of relief The treaty, ceding to the Union two thirds of the present State, guaranteed the safety of all settlers who respected the Indians' rights, and set in motion once more the machinery of immigration" —A. Black, *The Story of Ohio, ch.* 6.

ALSO IN: A. St. Clair, *Narrative of Campaign.* —C. W. Butterfield, *Hist. of the Girtys, ch.* 23–30.—W H. Smith, *The St. Clair Papers, v.* 2 — W. L. Stone, *Life of Brant, v.* 2, *ch.* 10–12.

A. D. 1811.—Harrison's campaign against Tecumseh and his League.—Battle of Tippecanoe. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1811.

NORTHWESTERN BOUNDARY QUESTIONS, Settlement of the. See OREGON: A. D. 1844–1846, and ALABAMA CLAIMS: A. D. 1871; also, SAN JUAN WATER-BOUNDARY QUESTION.

NORTHWESTERN PROVINCES OF INDIA, English Acquisition of the. See INDIA: A. D. 1798–1805.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY. See EDUCATION, MODERN: AMERICA: A.D.1769–1884.

NORUMBEGA.—"Norembega, or Norumbega, more properly called Arambec (Hakluyt, III. 167), was, in Ramusio's map, the country embraced within Nova Scotia, southern New Brunswick, and a part of Maine. De Laet confines it to a district about the mouth of the Penobscot Wytfleit and other early writers say that it had a capital city of the same name: and in several old maps this fabulous metropolis is laid down, with towers and churches, on the river Penobscot The word is of Indian origin." —F. Parkman, *Pioneers of France in the New World: Champlain, ch* 1, *foot-note* —On Gastaldi's map, of New France, made in 1550, "the name 'La Nuova Francia' is written in very large letters, indicating probably that this name is meant for the entire country. The name 'Terra de Nurumbega' is written in smaller letters, and appears to be attached only to the peninsula of Nova Scotia. Crignon, however, the author of the discourse which this map is intended to illustrate, gives to this name a far greater extent. He says 'Going beyond the cape of the Bretons, there is a country contiguous to this cape, the coast of which trends to the west a quarter southwest to the country of Florida, and runs along for a good 500 leagues, which coast was discovered fifteen years ago by Master Giovanni da Verrazano, in the name of the king of France and of Madame la Regente, and this country is called by many 'La Francese,' and even by the Portuguese themselves, and its end is toward Florida under 78° W, and 38° N . . The country is named by the inhabitants 'Nurumbega', and between it and Brazil is a great gulf, in which are the islands of the West Indies, discovered by the Spaniards. From this it would appear that, at the time of the discourse, the entire east coast of the United States, as far as Florida, was designated by the name of Nurumbega Afterwards, this name was restricted to New England; and, at a later date, it was applied only to Maine, and still later to the region of the Penobscot . . The name 'Norumbega,' or 'Arambec,' in Hakluyt's time, was applied to Maine, and sometimes to the whole of New England."—J G Kohl, *Hist of the Discovery of Maine* (*Maine Hist. Soc Coll., series* 2, *v.* 1), *pp.* 231 *and* 283 —"The story of Norumbega is invested with the charms of fable and romance. The name is found in the map of Hieronimus da Verrazano of 1529, as 'Aranbega,' being restricted to a definite and apparently unimportant locality. Suddenly, in 1539, Norumbega appears in the narrative of the Dieppe Captain as a vast and opulent region, extending from Cape Breton to the Cape of Florida. About three years later Allefonsce described the 'River of Norumbega,' now identified with the Penobscot, and treated the capital of the country as an important market for the trade in fur. Various maps of the period of Allefonsce confine the name of Norumbega to a distinct spot; but Gastaldi's map, published by Ramusio in 1556,—though modelled after Verrazano's, of which indeed it is substantially an extract,—applies the name to the region lying between Cape Breton and the Jersey coast. From this time until the seventeenth century Norumbega was generally regarded as embracing all New England, and sometimes portions of Canada, though occasionally the country was known by other names. Still, in 1582, Lok seems to have thought that the Penobscot formed the

southern boundary of Norumbega, which he shows on his map as an island, while John Smith, in 1620, speaks of Norumbega as including New England and the region as far south as Virginia. On the other hand Champlain, in 1605, treated Norumbega as lying within the present territory of Maine. He searched for its capital on the banks of the Penobscot, and as late as 1669 Heylin was dreaming of the fair city of Norumbega. Grotius, for a time at least, regarded the name as of Old Northern origin and connected with 'Norbergia.' It was also fancied that a people resembling the Mexicans once lived upon the banks of the Penobscot Those who have labored to find an Indian derivation for the name say that it means 'the place of a fine city' At one time the houses of the city were supposed to be very splendid, and to be supported upon pillars of crystal and silver."—B F. De Costa, *Norumbega and its English Explorers* (*Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am.*, *v* 3, *ch* 6)

ALSO IN: J. Winsor, *Cartography of N E Coast of Am.* (*N. and C. Hist. of Am*, *v* 4, *ch* 2).

NORWAY. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES

NOSE MONEY.—A poll tax, supposed to have been so called by the ancient Scandinavians because a defaulting tax payer might lose his nose —T Moore, *Hist of Ireland*, *v* 2, *ch* 17

NOTABLES, The Assembly of the. See FRANCE. A D 1774-1788.

NOTIUM, Battle of (B. C. 407). See GREECE B. C 411-407

NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY. See EDUCATION, MODERN AMERICA A D 1769-1884

NOTTOWAYS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: IROQUOIS TRIBES OF THE SOUTH

NOVA SCOTIA: The aboriginal inhabitants. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES ABNAKIS, and ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

A. D. 1000.—Supposed identity with the Markland of Norse sagas. See AMERICA, 10-11TH CENTURIES.

16th century.—Embraced in the Norumbega of the old geographers. See NORUMBEGA, also CANADA: NAMES

A. D. 1603-1608.—The first French settlements, at Port Royal (Annapolis). See CANADA: A. D. 1603-1605; and 1606-1608.

A. D. 1604.—Origin of the name Acadia.—In 1604, after the death of De Chastes, who had sent out Champlain on his first voyage to Canada, Pierre du Guast, Sieur de Monts, took the enterprise in hand and "petitioned the king for leave to colonize La Cadie, or Acadie, a region defined as extending from the 40th to the 46th degree of north latitude, or from Philadelphia to beyond Montreal. . . . De Monts gained his point. He was made Lieutenant-General in Acadia. . . . This name is not found in any earlier public document. It was afterwards restricted to the peninsula of Nova Scotia, but the dispute concerning the limits of Acadia was a proximate cause of the war of 1755. The word is said to be derived from the Indian Aquoddiauke, or Aquoddie, supposed to mean the fish called a pollock. 'The Bay of Passamaquoddy, 'Great Pollock Water,' if we may accept the same authority, derives its name from the same origin. Potter in 'Historical Magazine,' I. 84. This derivation is doubtful. The Micmac word, 'Quoddy,' 'Kady,' or 'Cadie,' means simply a place or region, and is properly used in conjunction with some other noun, as, for example, 'Katakady,' the Place of Eels . Dawson and Rand, in 'Canadian Antiquarian and Numismatic Journal.'"—F. Parkman, *Pioneers of France in the New World. Champlain*, *ch* 2, *and foot-note*.

A. D. 1610-1613.—The Port Royal colony revived, but destroyed by the English of Virginia. See CANADA: A D 1610-1613

A. D. 1621-1668.—English grant to Sir William Alexander.—Cession to France.—Quarrels of La Tour and D'Aulnay.—English reconquest and recession to France.—"In 1621, Sir William Alexander, a Scotchman of some literary pretensions, had obtained from King James [through the Council for New England, or Plymouth Company — see NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1621-1631] a charter, (dated Sept. 10, 1621) for the lordship and barony of New Scotland, comprising the territory now known as the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Under this grant he made several unsuccessful attempts at colonization; and in 1625 he undertook to infuse fresh life into his enterprise by parcelling out the territory into baronetcies. Nothing came of the scheme, and by the treaty of St Germains, in 1632, Great Britain surrendered to France all the places occupied by the English within these limits. Two years before this, however, Alexander's rights in a part of the territory had been purchased by Claude and Charles de la Tour; and shortly after the peace the Chevalier Razilly was appointed by Louis XIII. governor of the whole of Acadia. He designated as his lieutenants Charles de la Tour for the portion east of the St. Croix, and Charles de Menou, Sieur d'Aulnay Charnisé, for the portion west of that river. The former established himself on the River St. John, where the city of St. John now stands, and the latter at Castine, on the eastern shore of Penobscot Bay. Shortly after his appointment, La Tour attacked and drove away a small party of Plymouth men who had set up a trading-post at Machias; and in 1635 D'Aulnay treated another party of the Plymouth colonists in a similar way. In retaliation for this attack, Plymouth hired and despatched a vessel commanded by one Girling, in company with their own barque, with 20 men under Miles Standish, to dispossess the French; but the expedition failed to accomplish anything. Subsequently the two French commanders quarrelled, and, engaging in active hostilities, made efforts (not altogether unsuccessful) to enlist Massachusetts in their quarrel For this purpose La Tour visited Boston in person in the summer of 1643, and was hospitably entertained. He was not able to secure the direct cooperation of Massachusetts, but he was permitted to hire four vessels and a pinnace to aid him in his attack on D'Aulnay. The expedition was so far successful as to destroy a mill and some standing corn belonging to his rival. In the following year La Tour made a second visit to Boston for further help; but he was able only to procure the writing of threatening letters from the Massachusetts authorities to D'Aulnay. Not long after La Tour's departure from Boston, envoys from D'Aulnay arrived here, and after considerable delay a treaty was signed pledging the colonists to neutrality, which was ratified by the Commissioners of the United Colonies in the following year; but it was not until two years later that it

was ratified by new envoys from the crafty Frenchman. In this interval D'Aulnay captured by assault La Tour's fort at St. John, securing booty to a large amount, and a few weeks afterward Madame la Tour, who seems to have been of a not less warlike turn than her husband, and who had bravely defended the fort, died of shame and mortification La Tour was reduced to the last extremities, but he finally made good his losses, and in 1653 he married the widow of his rival, who had died two or three years before. In 1654, in accordance with secret instructions from Cromwell, the whole of Acadia was subjugated by an English force from Boston under the command of Major Robert Sedgwick, of Charlestown, and Captain John Leverett, of Boston To the latter the temporary government of the country was intrusted. Ineffectual complaints of this aggression were made to the British government, but by the treaty of West minster, *in the following year, England was left* in possession, and the question of title was referred to commissioners. In 1656 it was made a province by Cromwell, who appointed Sir Thomas Temple governor, and granted the whole territory to Temple and to one William Crown and Stephen de la Tour, son of the late governor The rights of the latter were purchased by the other two proprietors, and Acadia remained in possession of the English until the treaty of Breda, in 1668, when it was ceded to France with undefined limits. Very little was done by the French to settle and improve the country."—C C. Smith, *Acadia* (*Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v. 4, ch. 4*).

A. D. 1690-1692.—Temporary conquest by the Massachusetts colonists.—Recovery by the French. See CANADA: A. D. 1689-1690, and 1692-1697.

A. D. 1710.—Final conquest by the English and change of name. See NEW ENGLAND. A. D. 1702-1710.

A. D. 1713.—Relinquished to Great Britain. See UTRECHT: A D. 1712-1714; NEWFOUNDLAND. A. D. 1713; and CANADA. A. D. 1711-1713.

A. D. 1713-1730.—Troubles with the French inhabitants—the Acadians.—Their refusal to swear allegiance.—Hostilities with the Indians.—"It was evident from the first that the French intended to interpret the cession of Acadia in as restricted a sense as possible, and that it was their aim to neutralize the power of England in the colony, by confining it within the narrowest limits. The inhabitants numbered some 2,500 at the time of the treaty of Utrecht, divided into three principal settlements at Port Royal, Mines, and Chignecto. The priests at these settlements during the whole period from the treaty of Utrecht to the expulsion of the Acadians were, with scarcely an exception, agents of the French Government, in their pay, and resolute opponents of English rule. The presence of a powerful French establishment at Louisburg, and their constant communications with Canada, gave to the political teachings of those priests a moral influence, which went far towards making the Acadians continue faithful to France. They were taught to believe that they might remain in Acadia, in an attitude of scarcely concealed hostility to the English Government, and hold their lands and possessions as neutrals, on the condition that they should not take up arms either for the French or English. . . . By the 14th article of the treaty of Utrecht, it was stipulated 'that the subjects of the King of France may have liberty to remove themselves within a year to any other place, with all their movable effects. But those who are willing to remain, and to be subject to the King of Great Britain, are to enjoy the free exercise of their religion according to the usages of the church of Rome, as far as the laws of Great Britain do allow the same' . . . It was never contemplated that the Acadians should establish themselves in the country a colony of enemies of British power, ready at all times to obstruct the authority of the government, and to make the possession of Acadia by England merely nominal . . . Queen Anne died in August, 1714, and in January, 1715, Messrs. Capoon and Button were commissioned by Governor Nicholson to proceed in the sloop of war Caulfield to Mines, Chignecto, *River St. John, Passamaquoddy and Penobscot*, to proclaim King George, and to tender and administer the oaths of allegiance to the French inhabitants. The French refused to take the oaths, and some of the people of Mines made the pretence that they intended to withdraw from the colony . . . A year later the people of Mines notified Caulfield [Lieutenant-Governor] that they intended to remain in the country, and at this period it would seem that most of the few French inhabitants who actually left the Province had returned Caulfield then summoned the inhabitants of Annapolis, and tendered them the oath of allegiance, but with no better success than his deputies had met at Mines and Chignecto. . . . General Phillips, who became Governor of Nova Scotia in 1717, and who arrived in the Province early in 1720, had no more success than his predecessors *in persuading the Acadians to* take the oaths Every refusal on their part only served to make them more bold in defying the British authorities. . . . They held themselves in readiness to take up arms against the English the moment war was declared between the two Crowns, and to restore Acadia to France. But, as there was a peace of thirty years duration between France and England after the treaty of Utrecht, there was no opportunity of carrying this plan into effect. Vaudreuil, Governor of Canada, however, continued to keep the Acadians on the alert by means of his agents, and the Indians were incited to acts of hostility against the English, both in Acadia and Maine. The first difficulty occurred at Canso in 1720, by a party of Indians assailing the English fishermen there. . . . The Indians were incited to this attack by the French of Cape Breton, who were annoyed at one of their vessels being seized at Canso by a British war vessel for illegal fishing. . . . The Indians had indeed some reason to be disquieted, for the progress of the English settlements east of the Kennebec filled them with apprehensions. Unfortunately the English had not been always so just in their dealings with them that they could rely entirely on their forbearance. The Indians claimed their territorial rights in the lands over which the English settlements were spreading; the French encouraged them in this claim, alleging that they had never surrendered this territory to the English. While these questions were in controversy the Massachusetts authorities were guilty of an act which did not tend to allay the distrust of the Indians. This

was nothing less than an attempt to seize the person of Father Ralle, the Jesuit missionary at Norridgewock. He, whether justly or not, was blamed for inciting the Indians to acts of hostility, and was therefore peculiarly obnoxious to the English." The attempt to capture Father Ralle, at Norridgewock, which was made in December, 1721, and which failed, exasperated the Indians, and "in the summer of 1722 a war commenced, in which all the Indian tribes from Cape Canso to the Kennebec were involved. The French could not openly take part in the war, but such encouragement and assistance as they could give the Indians secretly they freely supplied." This war continued until 1725, and cost the lives of many of the colonists of New England and Nova Scotia. Its most serious event was the destruction of Norridgewock and the barbarous murder of Father Ralle, by an expedition from Massachusetts in the summer of 1724. In November, 1725, a treaty of peace was concluded, the Indians acknowledging the sovereignty of King George. After the conclusion of the Indian war, the inhabitants of Annapolis River took a qualified oath of allegiance, with a clause exempting them from bearing arms. At Minas and Chignecto they still persisted in their refusal, and when, on the death of George I. and the accession of George II., the inhabitants of Annapolis were called upon to renew their oath, they also refused again. In 1729 Governor Phillips returned to the province and had great success during the next year in persuading the Acadians, with a few exceptions only through out the French settlements, to take an oath of allegiance without any condition as to the bearing or not bearing of arms. "The Acadians afterwards maintained that when they took this oath of allegiance, it was with the understanding that a clause was to be inserted, relieving them from bearing arms. The statement was probably accurate, for that was the position they always assumed, but the matter seems to have been lost sight of, and so for the time the question of oaths, which had been such a fertile cause of discord in the Province, appeared to be set at rest."—J. Hannay, *Hist. of Acadia, ch.* 17

Also in: F. Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe*, v. 1, *ch* 4.—P. H. Smith, *Acadia, pp* 114-121.

A. D. 1744-1748.—The Third Intercolonial War (King George's War). See New England: A. D. 1744; 1745, and 1745-1748.

A. D. 1749-1755. — Futile discussion of boundary questions.—The Acadian "Neutrals" and their conduct.—The founding of Halifax.—Hostilities renewed.—"During the nominal peace which followed the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, the representatives of the two governments were anxiously engaged in attempting to settle by actual occupation the question of boundaries, which was still left open by that treaty. It professed to restore the boundaries as they had been before the war; and before the war the entire basin of the Mississippi, as well as the tract between the St. Lawrence River and Gulf, the Bay of Fundy, and the Kennebec, was claimed by both nations, with some show of reason, as no convention between them had ever defined the rights of each. Names had been given to vast tracts of land whose limits were but partly defined, or at one time defined in one way, at another time in another, and when these names were mentioned in treaties they were understood by each party according to its own interest. The treaty of 1748, therefore, not only left abundant cause for future war, but left occasion for the continuance of petty border hostilities in time of nominal peace. Commissioners were appointed, French and English, to settle the question of the disputed territory, but the differences were too wide to be adjusted by anything but conquest. While the most important question was that of the great extent of territory at the west, and . . . both nations were devising means for establishing their claims to it, Acadia, or Nova Scotia, was the scene of a constant petty warfare. The French were determined to restrict the English province to the peninsula now known by that name. The Governor of Canada sent a few men under Boishebert to the mouth of the St. John's to hold that part of the territory. A little old fort built by the Indians had stood for fifty years on the St. John's at the mouth of the Nerepis, and there the men established themselves. A larger number was sent under La Corne to keep possession of Chignecto, on the isthmus which, according to French claims, formed the northern boundary of English territory. In all the years that England had held nominal rule in Acadia, not a single English settlement had been formed, and apparently not a step of progress had been taken in gaining the loyalty of the inhabitants. A whole generation had grown up during the time; but they were no less devoted to France than their fathers had been. It was said that the king of England had not one truly loyal subject in the peninsula, outside of the fort at Annapolis. . . . Among the schemes suggested for remedying this state of affairs, was one by Governor Shirley [of Massachusetts], to place strong bands of English settlers in all the important towns, in order that the Government might have friends and influence throughout the country. Nothing came of this, but in 1749 Parliament voted £40,000 for the purpose of settling a colony. . . . Twenty-five hundred persons being ready to go in less than two months from the time of the first advertisement, the colony was entrusted to Colonel Edward Cornwallis (uncle of the Cornwallis of the Revolutionary War), and he was made Governor of Nova Scotia. Chebucto was selected as the site of the colony, and the town was named Halifax in honor of the president of the Lords of Trade and Plantations [see, also, Halifax: A. D. 1749]. . . . In July, a council was held at Halifax, when Governor Cornwallis gave the French deputies a paper declaring what the Government would allow to the French subjects, and what would be required of them." They were called upon to take the oath of allegiance, so often refused before. They claimed the privilege of taking a qualified oath, such as had been formerly allowed in certain cases, and which exempted them from bearing arms. "They wished to stand as neutrals, and, indeed, were often called so. Cornwallis replied that nothing less than entire allegiance would be accepted. . . . About a month later the people sent in a declaration with a thousand signatures, stating that they had resolved not to take the oath, but were determined to leave the country. Cornwallis took no steps to coerce them, but wrote to England for instructions." Much of the trouble with the Acadians was attributed to a French missionary, La Loutre, who was also

accused of inciting the Indians to hostilities In 1750, Major Lawrence was sent to Chignecto, with 400 men, to build a block-house on the little river Messagouche, which the French claimed as their southern boundary "On the southern bank was a prosperous village called Beaubassin, and La Corne [the French commander] had compelled its inhabitants to take the oath of allegiance to the King of France When Lawrence arrived, all the inhabitants of Beaubassin, about 1,000, having been persuaded by La Loutre, set fire to their houses, and, leaving behind the fruits of years of industry, turned their backs on their fertile fields, and crossed the river, to put themselves under the protection of La Corne's troops Many Acadians from other parts of the peninsula also left their homes, and lived in exile and poverty under the French dominion, hoping for a speedy change of masters in Nova Scotia . In the same year a large French fort, Beau Séjour, was built on the northern side of the Messagouche, and a smaller one, Gaspereaux, at Baie Verte Other stations were also planted, forming a line of fortified posts from the Gulf of St Lawrence to the mouth of the St. John's . . . The commission appointed to settle the question of boundaries had broken up without accomplishing any results, and it was resolved by the authorities in Nova Scotia and Massachusetts [1754] that an expedition should be sent against Fort Beau Séjour. . . . Massachusetts . . . raised about 2,000 troops for the contemplated enterprise, who were under the command of Lieutenant-Colonel John Winslow. To this force were added about 300 regulars, and the whole was placed under the command of Lieutenant-Colonel Moncton. They reached Chignecto on the 2d of June," 1755. The French were found unprepared for long resistance, and Beau Séjour was surrendered on the 16th "After Beau Séjour, the smaller forts were quickly reduced. Some vessels sent to the mouth of the St. John's found the French fort deserted and burned. The name of Beau Séjour was changed to Cumberland."—R. Johnson, *Hist. of the French War, ch.* 10.

ALSO IN: J. G Palfrey, *Hist. of N. Eng., bk.* 5, *ch.* 11 (*v.* 5).—W. Kingsford, *Hist. of Canada, bk.* 11, *ch.* 3 *and* 6 (*v.* 3).—See, also, CANADA. A. D. 1750–1753, and ENGLAND: A. D 1754–1755.

A. D. 1755.—Frustrated naval expedition of the French. See CANADA: A. D. 1755 (JUNE).

A. D. 1755.—The removal of the Acadians and their dispersion in exile.—"The campaign of the year 1755, which had opened in Nova Scotia with so much success, and which promised a glorious termination, disappointed the expectations and awakened the fears of the Colonists. The melancholy and total defeat of the army under General Braddock, while on his march against Fort du Quesnè, threw a gloom over the British Provinces Niagara and Crown-point were not only unsubdued, but it was evident that Governor Shirley would have to abandon, for this year at least, the attempt; while Louisburg was reinforced, the savages let loose upon the defenceless settlements of the English, and the tide of war seemed ready to roll back upon the invaders. Amidst this general panic, Governor Lawrence and his Council, aided by Admirals Boscawen and Moystyn, assembled to consider the necessary measures that were to be adopted towards the Acadians, whose character and situation were so peculiar as to distinguish them from every other people who had suffered under the scourge of war. . . . It was finally determined, at this consultation, to remove and disperse this whole people among the British Colonies; where they could not unite in any offensive measures, and where they might be naturalized to the Government and Country. The execution of this unusual and general sentence was allotted chiefly to the New England Forces, the Commander of which [Colonel Winslow], from the humanity and firmness of his character, was well qualified to carry it into effect. It was, without doubt, as he himself declared, disagreeable to his natural make and temper, and his principles of implicit obedience as a soldier were put to a severe test by this ungrateful kind of duty, which required an ungenerous, cunning, and subtle severity. . . . They were kept entirely ignorant of their destiny until the moment of their captivity, and were overawed, or allured, to labour at the gathering in of their harvest, which was secretly allotted to the use of their conquerors."—T. C. Haliburton, *Account of Nova Scotia*, v 1, *pp.* 170–175.—"Winslow prepared for the embarkation. The Acadian prisoners and their families were divided into groups answering to their several villages, in order that those of the same village might, as far as possible, go in the same vessel. It was also provided that the members of each family should remain together, and notice was given them to hold themselves in readiness. 'But even now,' he writes, 'I could not persuade the people I was in earnest' Their doubts were soon ended The first embarkation took place on the 8th of October [1755] . . . When all, or nearly all, had been sent off from the various points of departure, such of the houses and barns as remained standing were burned, in obedience to the orders of Lawrence, that those who had escaped might be forced to come in and surrender themselves. The whole number removed from the province, men, women, and children, was a little above 6,000. Many remained behind; and while some of these withdrew to Canada, Isle St. Jean, and other distant retreats, the rest lurked in the woods, or returned to their old haunts, whence they waged for several years a guerilla warfare against the English Yet their strength was broken, and they were no longer a danger to the province. Of their exiled countrymen, one party overpowered the crew of the vessel that carried them, ran her ashore at the mouth of the St. John, and escaped. The rest were distributed among the colonies from Massachusetts to Georgia, the master of each transport having been provided with a letter from Lawrence addressed to the Governor of the province to which he was bound, and desiring him to receive the unwelcome strangers. The provincials were vexed at the burden imposed upon them; and though the Acadians were not in general ill-treated, their lot was a hard one. Still more so was that of those among them who escaped to Canada. . . . Many of the exiles eventually reached Louisiana, where their descendants now form a numerous and distinct population. Some, after incredible hardship, made their way back to Acadia, where, after the peace, they remained unmolested. . . . In one particular the authors of the deportation were disappointed in its results. They had hoped to substitute a loyal population for a disaffected

one; but they failed for some time to find settlers for the vacated lands. . . . New England humanitarianism, melting into sentimentality at a tale of woe, has been unjust to its own. Whatever judgment may be passed on the cruel measure of wholesale expatriation, it was not put in execution till every resource of patience and persuasion had been tried in vain."—F. Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe*, *v.* 1, *ch* 8 —"The removal of the French Acadians from their homes was one of the saddest episodes in modern history, and no one now will attempt to justify it; but it should be added that the genius of our great poet [Longfellow in 'Evangeline'] has thrown a somewhat false and distorted light over the character of the victims They were not the peaceful and simple-hearted people they are commonly supposed to have been; and their houses, as we learn from contemporary evidence, were by no means the picturesque, vine clad, and strongly built cottages described by the poet The people were notably quarrelsome among themselves, and to the last degree superstitious They were wholly under the influence of priests appointed by the French bishops . . Even in periods when France and England were at peace, the French Acadians were a source of perpetual danger to the English colonists. Their claim to a qualified allegiance was one which no nation then or now could sanction. But all this does not justify their expulsion in the manner in which it was executed"—C. C Smith, *The Wars on the Seaboard* (*Narrative and Critical Hist of Am*, *v* 5, *ch.* 7) —"We defy all past history to produce a parallel case, in which an unarmed and peaceable people have suffered to such an extent as did the French Neutrals of Acadia at the hands of the New England troops."—P. H Smith, *Acadia*, *p.* 216

Also in: W. B Reed, *The Acadian Exiles in Pennsylvania* (*Penn Hist Soc. Memoirs*, *v* 6, *pp* 283–316)

A. D. 1763.—Cession by France to England confirmed in the Treaty of Paris. See Seven Years War: The Treaties

A. D. 1763.—Cape Breton added to the government. See Canada A. D 1763–1774.

A. D. 1782-1784.—Influx of Refugee Loyalists from the United States. See Tories of the American Revolution.

A. D. 1820-1837.—The Family Compact. See Canada: A. D. 1820–1837.

A. D. 1854-1866.—The Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. See Tariff Legislation (United States and Canada) A. D 1854–1866.

A. D. 1867.—Embraced in the Confederation of the Dominion of Canada. See Canada: A. D. 1867.

A. D. 1871.—The Treaty of Washington. See Alabama Claims: A. D. 1871.

A. D. 1877-1888.—The Halifax Fishery Award.—Termination of the Fishery Articles of the Treaty of Washington.—Renewed Fishery disputes. See Fisheries, North American: A. D. 1877–1888.

NOVANTÆ, The.—A tribe which, in Roman times, occupied the modern counties of Kirkcudbright and Wigtown, Scotland. See Britain: Celtic Tribes.

NOVARA, Battle of (1513). See Italy: A. D. 1510–1513....**Battle of (1821).** See Italy: A. D. 1820–1821....**Battle of (1849).** See Italy: A. D. 1848–1849.

NOVELS OF JUSTINIAN. See Corpus Juris Civilis.

NOVEMBER FIFTH. See Guy Fawkes' Day.

NOVGOROD: Origin. See Russia.—Russians: A. D. 862.

11th Century.—Rise of the Commonwealth. See Russia: A. D. 1054–1237.

A. D. 1237-1478.—Prosperity and greatness of the city as a commercial republic. See Russia: A. D. 1237–1480.

14-15th Centuries.—In the Hanseatic League. See Hansa Towns.

NOVI, Battle of. See France: A. D. 1799 (April—September).

NOVIOMAGUS.—Modern Nimeguen. See Batavians

NOYADES. See France: A. D. 1793–1794 (October—April)

NOYON, Treaty of. See France: A. D. 1516–1517

NUBIANS, The. See Africa: The inhabiting races

NUITHONES, The. See Aviones.

NULLIFICATION: First assertion of the doctrine in the United States of Am. See United States of Am. A. D. 1798.

Doctrine and Ordinance in South Carolina. See United States of Am. A. D. 1828–1833.

NUMANTIAN WAR, The.—"In 143 B. C. the Celtiberians again appeared in the field [resisting the Romans in Spain]; and when, on the death of Viriathus, D. Junius Brutus had pushed the legions to the Atlantic in 137 B C., and practically subdued Lusitania, the dying spirit of Spanish independence still held out in the Celtiberian fortress city of Numantia. Perched on a precipitous hill by the banks of the upper Douro, occupied only by eight thousand men, this little place defied the power of Rome as long as Troy defied the Greeks. . . . In 137 B. C. the consul, C. Hostilius Mancinus, was actually hemmed in by a sortie of the garrison, and forced to surrender. He granted conditions of peace to obtain his liberty; but the senate would not ratify them, though the young quæstor, Tiberius Gracchus, who had put his hand to the treaty, pleaded for faith and honour. Mancinus, stripped and with manacles on his hands, was handed over to the Numantines, who, like the Samnite Pontius, after the Caudine Forks, refused to accept him. In 134 B. C the patience of the Romans was exhausted; Scipio was sent. . . . The mighty destroyer of Carthage drew circumvallations five miles in length around the stubborn rock, and waited for the result. The Virgilian picture of the fall of Troy is not more moving than are the brave and ghastly facts of the fall of Numantia. The market-place was turned into a funeral pyre for the gaunt, famine-stricken citizens to leap upon. . When the surrender was made only a handful of men marched out."—R. F. Horton, *Hist. of the Romans*, *ch.* 18.

Also in: G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, *ch.* 6–7.—See, also, Lusitania; and Spain: B. C. 218–25.

NUMERIANUS, Roman Emperor, A. D. 283–284.

NUMIDIA: The Country and People. See NUMIDIANS.

B. C. 204.—Alliance with Carthage.—Subjection to Rome. See PUNIC WAR, THE SECOND.

B. C. 118-104.—The Jugurthine War.—The Numidian kingdom, over which the Romans, at the end of the second Punic War, had settled their friend Masinissa, passed at his death to his son Micipsa In 118 B C. Micipsa died, leaving two young sons, and also a bastard nephew, Jugurtha, whom he feared. He divided the kingdom between these three, hoping to secure the fidelity of Jugurtha to his sons It was a policy that failed. Jugurtha made sure of what was given to him, and then grasped at the rest One of his young cousins was soon cleared from his path by assassination; on the other he opened war. This latter, Adherbal by name, appealed to Rome, but Jugurtha despatched agents with money to bribe the senate, and a commission sent over to divide Numidia gave him the western and better half. The commissioners were no sooner out of Africa than he began war upon Adherbal afresh, shut him up in his strong capital, Cirta [B. C. 112], and placed the city under siege. The Romans again interfered, but, he captured Cirta, notwithstanding, and tortured Adherbal to death. The corrupt party at Rome which Jugurtha kept in his pay made every effort to stifle discussion of his nefarious doings; but one bold tribune, C. Memmius, roused the people on the subject and forced the senate to declare war against him. Jugurtha's gold, however, was still effectual, and it paralyzed the armies sent to Africa, by corrupting the venial officers who commanded them. Once, Jugurtha went to Rome, under a safe conduct, invited to testify as a witness against the men whom he had bribed, but really expecting to be able to further his own cause in the city. He found the people furious against him and he only saved himself from being forced to criminate his Roman senatorial mercenaries by buying a tribune, who brazenly vetoed the examination of the Numidian king. Jugurtha being, then, ordered out of Rome the war proceeded again, and in 109 B. C. the command passed to an honest general Q. Metellus, who took with him Caius Marius the most capable soldier of Rome, whose capability was at that time not half understood. Under Metellus the Romans penetrated Numidia to Zama, but failed to take the town, and narrowly escaped a great disaster on the Muthul, where a serious battle was fought. In 107 B. C. Metellus was superseded by Marius, chosen consul for that year and now really beginning his remarkable career. Meantime Jugurtha had gained an ally in Bocchus, king of Mauretania, and Marius, after two campaigns of doubtful result, found more to hope from diplomacy than from war. With the help of Sulla,—his future great rival—who had lately been sent over to his army, in command of a troop of horse, he persuaded the Mauretanian king to betray Jugurtha into his hands. The dreaded Numidian was taken to Rome [B. C. 104], exhibited in the triumph of Marius, and then brutally thrust into the black dungeon called the Tullianum to die of slow starvation. Bocchus was rewarded for his treachery by the cession to him of part of Numidia; Marius, intoxicated with the plaudits of Rome, first saved it from the Cimbri and then stabbed it with his own sword; Sulla, inexplicable harbinger of the coming Cæsars, bided his time.—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 7, *ch.* 8.

ALSO IN: G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 1, *ch.* 26–29 —Sallust, *Jugurthine War.*

B. C. 46.—The kingdom extinguished by Cæsar and annexed to Rome. See ROME: B. C. 47–46

A. D. 374-398.—Revolts of Firmus and Gildo. See ROME: A. D. 396–398.

NUMIDIANS AND MAURI, The.—"The union of the Aryan invaders [of North Africa] with the ancient populations of the coast sprung from Phut gave birth to the Mauri, or Maurusii, whose primitive name it has been asserted was Medes, probably an alteration of the word Amazigh. The alliance of the same invaders with the Getulians beyond the Atlas produced the Numidians The Mauri were agriculturists, and of settled habits; the Numidians, as their Greek appellation indicates, led a nomadic life."—F. Lenormant, *Manual of Ancient Hist. of the East, bk.* 6, *ch* 5 (*v* 2) —In northern Africa, "on the south and west of the immediate territory of the Carthaginian republic, lived various races of native Libyans who are commonly known by the name of Numidians But these were in no way, as their Greek name ('Nomads') would seem to imply, exclusively pastoral races Several districts in their possession, especially in the modern Algeria, were admirably suited for agriculture Hence they had not only fixed and permanent abodes, but a number of not unimportant cities, of which Hippo and Cirta, the residences of the chief Numidian princes, were the most considerable."—W Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk.* 4, *ch.* 1 (*v* 2) —The various peoples of North Africa known anciently and modernly as Libyans, Numidians, or Nomades, Mauri, Mauritanians or Moors, Gaetulians and Berbers, belong ethnographically to one family of men, distinguished alike from the negroes and the Egyptians —T Mommsen, *Hist of Rome, bk.* 8, *ch.* 13 —See, also, LIBYANS, CARTHAGE: B C. 146; PUNIC WAR, THE SECOND; and NUMIDIA: B C. 118-104.

NUNCOMAR AND WARREN HASTINGS. See INDIA. A. D. 1773–1785

NUR MAHAL, OR NUR JAHAN, Empress of India. See INDIA: A. D. 1605–1658

NUREMBERG.—"Nuremberg (Nürnberg) (Norimberga) is situated on the Regnitz, in the centre of Middle Franconia, about 90 miles northwest of Munich, to which it is second in size and importance, with a population of about 90,000. The name is said to be derived from the ancient inhabitants of Noricum, who migrated hither about the year 451, on being driven from their early settlements on the Danube by the Huns. Here they distinguished themselves by their skill in the working of metals, which abound in the neighbouring mountains. Before the eleventh century the history of Nuremberg is enveloped in a mist of impenetrable obscurity, from which it does not emerge until the time of the Emperor Henry III., who issued an edict, dated July 16, 1050, 'ad castrum Norembere,' a proof that it was a place of considerable impor-

tance even at this early period Nuremberg afterwards became the favourite residence of the Emperor Henry IV."—W. J. Wyatt, *Hist. of Prussia*, *v.* 2, *p.* 456

A. D. 1417.—Office of Burgrave bought by the city. See BRANDENBURG. A. D 1417–1640

A. D. 1522-1524.—The two diets, and their recesses in favor of the Reformation. See PAPACY: A. D. 1522–1525

A. D. 1525.—Formal establishment of the Reformed Religion. See PAPACY A D 1522–1525.

A. D. 1529.—Joined in the Protest which gave rise to the name Protestants. See PAPACY A D 1525–1529

A. D. 1532.—Pacification of Charles V. with the Protestants. See GERMANY A D 1530–1532.

A. D. 1632.—Welcome to Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden—Siege by Wallenstein.—Battle on the Fürth. See GERMANY A D 1631–1632.

A. D. 1801-1803.—One of six free cities which survived the Peace of Luneville. See GERMANY. A. D 1801–1803

A. D. 1806.—Loss of municipal freedom.—Absorption in the kingdom of Bavaria. See GERMANY: A. D. 1805–1806

NUYS, The Siege of.—In 1474 Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, with 60,000 men wasted months in a fruitless siege of the town of Nuys, and became involved in the quarrel with the Swiss (see BURGUNDY: A. D 1476–1477) which brought about his downfall The abortive siege of Nuys was the beginning of his disasters—C M Davies, *Hist of Holland*, *pt.* 2, *ch* 2

NYANTICS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

NYASSALAND.—A region south and west of Lake Nyassa, explored by Dr Livingstone. Scottish missions were established in the country in 1875 and trade opened in 1878 by an "African Lakes Company," formed in Glasgow. In 1890 a British Protectorate over the region was declared In 1894 its administration was transferred to the British South Africa Company, then controlling the contiguous region.

NYSTAD, Peace of. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1719–1721.

O.

O. S.—Old Style See GREGORIAN CALENDAR

OAK BOYS. See IRELAND A D 1760–1798

OATES, Titus, and the "Popish Plot." See ENGLAND A D 1678–1679

OBELISKS, Egyptian. See EGYPT ABOUT B C 1700–1400

OBERLIN COLLEGE. See EDUCATION MODERN AMERICA A D 1832

OBERPFALZ. See FRANCONIA THE DUCHY AND THE CIRCLE

OBES, The. See GERUSIA, and SPARTA THE CONSTITUTION, &c

OBLATES, The.—"The Oblates, or Volunteers, established by St Charles Borromeo in 1578 are a congregation of secular priests Their special aim was to give edification to the diocese, and to maintain the integrity of religion by the purity of their lives by teaching and by zealously discharging the duties committed to them by their bishop These devoted ecclesiastics were much loved by St Charles"—J Alzog, *Manual of Universal Church Hist*, *v* 3, *p* 456

OBNUNTIATIO. See ÆLIAN AND FUFIAN LAWS

OBOLLA. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST A D 632–651

OBOLUS. See TALENT

OBOTRITES, The. See SAXONY A D 1178–1188.

OBRENOVITCH DYNASTY, The. See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES. 14–19TH CENTURIES (SERVIA).

OC, Langue d'. See LANGUE D'OC

OCANA, Battle of. See SPAIN: A. D. 1809 (AUGUST—NOVEMBER).

OCCASIONAL CONFORMITY BILL. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1711–1714.

OCEAN STEAM NAVIGATION, The beginnings of. See STEAM NAVIGATION: ON THE OCEAN.

OCHLOCRACY.—This term was applied by the Greeks to an unlimited democracy, where rights were made conditional on no gradations of property, and where "provisions were made, not so much that only a proved and worthy citizen should be elected, as that every one, without distinction, should be eligible for everything"—G Schömann, *Antiq of Greece: The State*, *pt* 1, *ch* 3

O'CONNELL, Daniel, The political agitations of. See IRELAND A D 1811–1829, to 1841–1848

OCTAETĒRIS, The. See METON, THE YEAR OF

OCTAVIUS, Caius (afterwards called Augustus), and the founding of the Roman Empire. See ROME B C 44, after Cæsar's death, to B C 31—A D 14

OCTOBER CLUB, The. See CLUBS.

ODD FELLOWS. See INSURANCE.

ODAL. See ADIL

ODELSRET. See CONSTITUTION OF NORWAY, TITLE V, ART 16

ODELSTHING. See CONSTITUTION OF NORWAY

ODENATHUS, The rule at Palmyra of. See PALMYRA THE RISE AND THE FALL OF.

ODEUM AT ATHENS, The.—"Pericles built, at the south eastern base of the citadel, the Odeum, which differed from the neighbouring theatre in this, that the former was a covered space, in which musical performances took place before a less numerous public. The roof, shaped like a tent, was accounted an imitation of the gorgeous tent pitched of old by Xerxes upon the soil of Attica"—E Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, *bk.* 3, *ch.* 3

ODOACER, and the end of the line of Roman Emperors in the West. See ROME: A. D. 455–476, and 488–526.

ODYSSEY, The. See HOMER.

ŒA. See LEPTIS MAGNA.

ŒCUMENICAL, OR ECUMENICAL, COUNCIL.—A general or universal council of the entire Christian Church. Twenty such councils are recognized by the Roman Catholic Church. See COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH.

ŒKIST.—The chief-founder of a Greek colonial city,—the leader of a colonizing settlement,—was so entitled.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt. 2, ch. 47.*

OELAND, Naval battle of (1713). See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1707–1718.

ŒNOË, Battle of.—A battle of some importance in the Corinthian War, fought about B. C. 888, in the valley of the Charander, on the road from Argos to Mantinea The Lacedæmonians were defeated by the Argives and Athenians.—E. Curtius, *Hist of Greece, bk. 5, ch. 4.*

ŒNOPHYTA, Battle of (B. C. 456). See GREECE B C 458–456

ŒNOTRIANS, The.—"The territory [in Italy] known to Greek writers of the fifth century B C. by the names of Œnotria on the coast of the Mediterranean, and Italia on that of the Gulfs of Tarentum and Squillace, included all that lies south of a line drawn across the breadth of the country, from the Gulf of Poseidonia (Pæstum) and the river Silarus on the Mediterranean Sea, to the north-west corner of the Gulf of Tarentum. It was bounded northwards by the Iapygians and Messapians, who occupied the Salentine peninsula and the country immediately adjoining to Tarentum, and by the Peuketians on the Ionic Gulf. . This Œnotrian or Pelasgian race were the population whom the Greek colonists found there on their arrival. They were known apparently under other names, such as the Sikels [Sicels], (mentioned even in the Odyssey, though their exact locality in that poem cannot be ascertained) the Italians, or Itali, properly so called—the Morgetes,—and the Chaones,—all of them names of tribes either cognate or subdivisional. The Chaones or Chaonians are also found, not only in Italy, but in Epirus, as one of the most considerable of the Epirotic tribes . . . From hence, and from some other similarities of name, it has been imagined that Epirots, Œnotrians, Sikels, &c, were all names of cognate people, and all entitled to be comprehended under the generic appellation of Pelasgi. That they belonged to the same ethnical kindred there seems fair reason to presume, and also that in point of language, manners, and character, they were not very widely separated from the ruder branches of the Hellenic race. It would appear, too (as far as any judgment can be formed on a point essentially obscure) that the Œnotrians were ethnically akin to the primitive population of Rome and Latium on one side, as they were to the Epirots on the other; and that tribes of this race, comprising Sikels and Itali properly so called, as sections, had at one time occupied most of the territory from the left bank of the river Tiber southward between the Appenines and the Mediterranean."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt. 2, ch. 22.*

OERSTED, and the Electro-Magnet. See ELECTRICAL DISCOVERY: A. D. 1820–1825

OESTERREICH. See AUSTRIA.

OFEN, Sieges and capture of (1684-1686). See HUNGARY: A. D 1683–1699.

OFFA'S DYKE.—An earthen rampart which King Offa, of Mercia, in the eighth century, built from the mouth of the Wye to the mouth of the Tee, to divide his kingdom from Wales and protect it from Welsh incursions. A few remains of it are still to be seen.—J. Rhys, *Celtic Britain.*

OGALALAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SIOUAN FAMILY.

OGAM. See OGHAM.

OGDEN TRACT, The. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1786–1799.

OGHAM INSCRIPTIONS.—"In the south and south-western counties of Ireland are to be found, in considerable numbers, a class of inscribed monuments, to which the attention of Irish archæologists has been from time to time directed, but with comparatively little result. . . They [the inscriptions] are found engraved on pillar stones in that archaic character known to Irish philologists as the Ogham, properly pronounced Oum, and in an ancient dialect of the Gaedhelic (Gaelic). These monuments are almost exclusively found in the counties of Kerry, Cork, and Waterford, numbering, as far as I have been able to ascertain, 147, the rest of Ireland supplies 13. . . . Again it is worthy of remark, that while 29 Irish counties cannot boast of an Ogham monument, they have been found in England, Wales, and Scotland In Devonshire, at Fardel, a stone has been discovered bearing not only a fine and well-preserved Ogham inscription, but also one in Romano-British letters. It is now deposited in the British Museum . . . The Ogham letters, as found on Megalithic monuments, are formed by certain combinations of a simple short line, placed in reference to one continuous line, called the fleasg, or stem line, these combinations range from one to five, and their values depend upon their being placed above, across, or below the stem line, there are five consonants above, five consonants below, and five consonants across the line, two of which, NG and ST are double, and scarcely ever used. The vowels are represented by oval dots, or very short lines across the stem line. . . . The characters in general use on the monuments are 18 in number . . . It may be expected from me that I should offer some conjecture as to the probable age of this mode of writing This, I honestly acknowledge, I am unable to do, even approximately . . . I am however decided in one view, and it is this, that the Ogham was introduced into Ireland long anterior to Christianity, by a powerful colony who landed on the south west coast, who spread themselves along the southern and round the eastern shores, who ultimately conquered or settled the whole island, imposing their language upon the aborigines, if such preceded them."—R R. Brash, *Trans. Int. Cong of Prehistoric Archæology*, 1868.

ALSO IN: Same, *Ogam Inscribed Monuments.*

OGLETHORPE'S GEORGIA COLONY. See GEORGIA: A. D 1732–1739.

OGULNIAN LAW, The. See ROME: B. C. 300.

OGYGIA. See IRELAND: THE NAME.

OHIO: The Name.—"The words Ohio, Ontario, and Onontio (or Yonnondio)—which should properly be pronounced as if written 'Oheeyo,' 'Ontareeyo,' and 'Ononteeyo'—are commonly rendered 'Beautiful River,' 'Beautiful Lake,' 'Beautiful Mountain.' This, doubtless, is the meaning which each of the words conveys to an Iroquois of the present day, unless he belongs to the Tuscarora tribe. But there can be no doubt that the termination 'io' (otherwise written 'iyo,' 'ilo,' 'eeyo,' etc.) had originally

the sense, not of 'beautiful,' but of 'great.' . . . Ontario is derived from the Huron 'yontare,' or 'ontare,' lake (Iroquois, 'oniatare'), with this termination. . . . Ohio, in like manner, is derived, as M. Cuoq in the valuable notes to his Lexicon (p. 159) informs us, from the obsolete 'ohia,' river, now only used in the compound form 'ohionha.'"—H. Hale, *The Iroquois Book of Rites, app., note B.*

(Valley): The aboriginal inhabitants. See AMERICA, PREHISTORIC; AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, ALLEGHANS, DELAWARES, SHAWANESE.

(Valley): A. D. 1700-1735.—The beginnings of French Occupation. See CANADA A. D. 1700–1735.

(Valley): A. D. 1748-1754.—The first movements of the struggle of French and English for possession.—"The close of King George's War was marked by an extraordinary development of interest in the Western country. The Pennsylvanians and Virginians had worked their way well up to the eastern foot hills of the last range of mountains separating them from the interior. Even the Connecticut men were ready to overleap the province of New York and take possession of the Susquehanna The time for the English colonists to attempt the Great Mountains in force had been long in coming, but it had plainly arrived. In 1748 the Ingles Draper settlement, the first regular settlement of English speaking men on the Western waters, was made at 'Draper's Meadow,' on the New River, a branch of the Kanawha The same year Dr Thomas Walker, accompanied by a number of Virginia gentlemen and a party of hunters, made their way by Southwestern Virginia into Kentucky and Tennessee . The same year the Ohio company, consisting of thirteen prominent Virginians and Marylanders, and one London merchant, was formed Its avowed objects were to speculate in Western lands, and to carry on trade on an extensive scale with the Indians. It does not appear to have contemplated the settlement of a new colony. The company obtained from the crown a conditional grant of 500,000 acres of land in the Ohio Valley, to be located mainly between the Monongahela and Kanawha Rivers, and it ordered large shipments of goods for the Indian trade from London . . . In 1750 the company sent Christopher Gist, a veteran woodsman and trader living on the Yadkin, down the northern side of the Ohio, with instructions, as Mr. Bancroft summarizes them, 'to examine the Western country as far as the Falls of the Ohio; to look for a large tract of good level land; to mark the passes in the mountains; to trace the courses of the rivers; to count the falls, to observe the strength of the Indian nations.' Under these instructions, Gist made the first English exploration of Southern Ohio of which we have any report. The next year he made a similar exploration of the country south of the Ohio, as far as the Great Kanawha . . . Gist's reports of his explorations added to the growing interest in the over-mountain country. At that time the Ohio Valley was waste and unoccupied, save by the savages, but adventurous traders, mostly Scotch-Irish, and commonly men of reckless character and loose morals, made trading excursions as far as the River Miami. The Indian town of Pickawillany, on the upper waters of that stream, became a great centre of English trade and influence Another evidence of the growing interest in the West is the fact that the colonial authorities, in every direction, were seeking to obtain Indian titles to the Western lands, and to bind the Indians to the English by treaties. The Iroquois had long claimed, by right of conquest, the country from the Cumberland Mountains to the Lower Lakes and the Mississippi, and for many years the authorities of New York had been steadily seeking to gain a firm treaty-hold of that country In 1684, the Iroquois, at Albany, placed themselves under the protection of King Charles and the Duke of York [see NEW YORK: A. D. 1684]; in 1726, they conveyed all their lands in trust to England [see NEW YORK A. D 1726], to be protected and defended by his Majesty to and for the use of the grantors and their heirs, which was an acknowledgment by the Indians of what the French had acknowledged thirteen years before at Utrecht. In 1744, the very year that King George's War began, the deputies of the Iroquois at Lancaster, Pa. confirmed to Maryland the lands within that province, and made to Virginia a deed that covered the whole West as effectually as the Virginian interpretation of the charter of 1609 [see VIRGINIA A D. 1744]. . . . This treaty is of the greatest importance in subsequent history; it is the starting point of later negotiations with the Indians concerning Western lands. It gave the English their first real treaty-hold upon the West, and it stands in all the statements of the English claim to the Western country, side by side with the Cabot voyages. . . . There was, indeed, no small amount of dissension among the colonies, and it must not be supposed that they were all working together to effect a common purpose. The royal governors could not agree. There were bitter dissensions between governors and assemblies Colony was jealous of colony. . . Fortunately, the cause of England and the colonies was not abandoned to politicians. The time had come for the Anglo Saxon column, that had been so long in reaching them, to pass the Endless Mountains; and the logic of events swept everything into the Westward current. In the years following the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle the French were not idle. Galissonière, the governor of Canada, thoroughly comprehended what was at stake. In 1749 he sent Cèloron de Bienville into the Ohio Valley, with a suitable escort of whites and savages, to take formal possession of the valley in the name of the King of France, to propitiate the Indians, and in all ways short of actual warfare to thwart the English plans. Bienville crossed the portage from Lake Erie to Lake Chautauqua, the easternmost of the portages from the Lakes to the southern streams ever used by the French, and made his way by the Alleghany River and the Ohio as far as the Miami, and returned by the Maumee and Lake Erie to Montreal. His report to the governor was anything but reassuring. He found the English traders swarming in the valley, and the Indians generally well disposed to the English. Nor did French interests improve the two or three succeeding years. The Marquis Duquesne, who succeeded Galissonière, soon discovered the drift of events. He saw the necessity of action; he was clothed with power to act, and he was a man of action. And so, early in the year 1753, while the English governors and assemblies were still hesitating and disputing, he sent a strong

force by Lake Ontario and Niagara to seize and hold the northeastern branches of the Ohio This was a master stroke unless recalled, it would lead to war, and Duquesne was not the man to recall it This force, passing over the portage between Presque Isle and French Creek, constructed Forts Le Bœuf and Venango, the second at the confluence of French Creek and the Alleghany River '—B A Hinsdale *The Old Northwest, ch* 5

Also in J H Perkins *Annals of the West, ch* 2 —B Fernow, *The Ohio Valley in Colonial Days, ch* 5 —See, also Canada A D 1750–1753 —O H Marshall *De Celoron's Expedition to the Ohio in* 1749 (*Hist Writings pp* 237–274) —N B Craig, *The Olden Time, v* 1 *pp* 1–10.

(Valley): A D. 1754 —The opening battle. —Washington's first campaign.—The planting of the French at Forts Le Bœuf and Venango "put them during high water in easy communication by boat with the Alleghany River French tact conciliated the Indians, and where that failed arrogance was sufficient and the expedition would have pushed on to found new forts but sickness weakened the men and Marin, the commander now dying saw it was all he could do to hold the forts while he sent the rest of his force back to Montreal to recuperate Late in the autumn Legardeur de Saint Pierre arrived at Le Bœuf as the successor of Marin He had not been long there when on the 11th of December [1753] a messenger from Governor Dinwiddie, of Virginia, with a small escort, presented himself at the fort The guide of the party was Christopher Gist, the messenger was George Washington, then adjutant general of the Virginia militia Their business was to inform the French commander that he was building forts on English territory, and that he would do well to depart peaceably At Le Bœuf Washington tarried three days, during which Saint-Pierre framed his reply, which was in effect that he must hold his post, while Dinwiddie's letter was sent to the French commander at Quebec It was the middle of February, 1754, when Washington reached Williamsburg on his return, and made his report to Dinwiddie The result was that Dinwiddie drafted 200 men from the Virginia militia, and despatched them under Washington to build a fort at the forks of the Ohio The Virginia assembly, forgetting for the moment its quarrel with the governor, voted £10,000 to be expended, but only under the direction of a committee of its own Dinwiddie found difficulty in getting the other colonies to assist, and the Quaker element in Pennsylvania prevented that colony from being the immediate helper which it might, from its position, have become Meanwhile some backwoodsmen had been pushed over the mountains and had set to work on a fort at the forks A much larger French force under Contrecœur soon summoned them, and the English retired The French immediately began the erection of Fort Duquesne [on the site now covered by the city of Pittsburgh] While this was doing, Dinwiddie was toiling with tardy assemblies and their agents to organize a regiment to support the backwoodsmen Joshua Fry was to be its colonel, with Washington as second in command. The latter, with a portion of the men, had already pushed forward to Will's Creek, the present Cumberland Later he advanced with 150 men to Great Meadows, where he learned that the French, who had been reinforced, had sent out a party from their new fort, marching towards him Again he got word from an Indian —who, from his tributary character towards the Iroquois, was called Half King, and who had been Washington's companion on his trip to Le Bœuf—that this chieftain with some followers had tracked two men to a dark glen, where he believed the French party were lurking Washington started with forty men to join Half King, and under his guidance they approached the glen and found the French Shots were exchanged The French leader, Jumonville, was killed, and all but one of his followers were taken or slain The mission of Jumonville was to scour for English, by order of Contrecœur, now in command of Duquesne and to bear a summons to any he could find, warning them to retire from French territory The precipitancy of Washington's attack gave the French the chance to impute to Washington the crime of assassination, but it seems to have been a pretence on the part of the French to cover a purpose which Jumonville had of summoning aid from Duquesne, while his concealment was intended to shield him till its arrival Rash or otherwise, this onset of the youthful Washington began the war The English returned to Great Meadows and while waiting for reinforcements from Fry Washington threw up some entrenchments which he called Fort Necessity The men from Fry came without their leader, who had sickened and died and Washington, succeeding to the command of the regiment, found himself at the head of 300 men, increased soon by an independent company from South Carolina Washington again advanced toward Gist's settlement, when, fearing an attack, he sent back for Mackay whom he had left with a company of regulars at Fort Necessity. Rumors thickening of an advance of the French, the English leader again fell back to Great Meadows, resolved to fight there It was now the first of July, 1754 Coulon de Villiers, a brother of Jumonville, was now advancing from Duquesne The attack was made on a rainy day, and for much of the time a thick mist hung between the combatants After dark a parley resulted in Washington's accepting terms offered by the French, and the English marched out with the honors of war The young Virginian now led his weary followers back to Will's Creek Thus they turned their backs upon the great valley, in which not an English flag now waved '—J Winsor, *The Struggle for the Great Valleys of N Am* (*Narrative and Critical Hist of Am, v* 5, *ch* 8)

Also in W Irving, *Life of Washington, v* 1, *ch* 7–12 —H C Lodge, *George Washington, v* 1, *ch* 3 —N B Craig, *The Olden Time, v.* 1, *pp.* 10–62

(Valley): A. D. 1755.—Braddock's defeat.—The French possess the West and devastate the English frontiers.—"Now the English Government awoke to the necessity of vigorous measures to rescue the endangered Valley of the Ohio A campaign was planned which was to expel the French from Ohio, and wrest from them some portions of their Canadian territory. The execution of this great design was intrusted to General Braddock, with a force which it was deemed would overbear all resistance. Braddock was a veteran who had seen the wars of

forty years. . . . He was a brave and experienced soldier, and a likely man, it was thought, to do the work assigned to him. But that proved a sad miscalculation Braddock had learned the rules of war, but he had no capacity to comprehend its principles. In the pathless forests of America he could do nothing better than strive to give literal effect to those maxims which he had found applicable in the well trodden battle-grounds of Europe The failure of Washington in his first campaign had not deprived him of public confidence Braddock heard such accounts of his efficiency that he invited him to join his staff Washington, eager to efface the memory of his defeat, gladly accepted the offer The troops disembarked at Alexandria After some delay, the army, with such reinforcements as the province afforded, began its march Braddock's object was to reach Fort Du Quesne, the great centre of French influence on the Ohio . Fort Du Quesne had been built [or begun] by the English, and taken from them by the French It stood at the confluence of the Alleghany and Monongahela, which rivers, by their union at this point, form the Ohio It was a rude piece of fortification, but the circumstances admitted of no better Braddock had no doubt that the fort would yield to him directly he showed himself before it Benjamin Franklin looked at the project with his shrewd, cynical eye He told Braddock that he would assuredly take the fort if he could only reach it, but that the long slender line which his army must form in its march 'would be cut like thread into several pieces' by the hostile Indians Braddock 'smiled at his ignorance' Benjamin offered no further opinion It was his duty to collect horses and carriages for the use of the expedition, and he did what was required of him in silence The expedition crept slowly forward, never achieving more than three or four miles in a day, stopping, as Washington said, 'to level every mole hill, to erect a bridge over every brook' It left Alexandria on the 20th April On the 9th July Braddock, with half his army, was near the fort There was yet no evidence that resistance was intended No enemy had been seen, the troops marched on as to assured victory So confident was their chief that he refused to employ scouts, and did not deign to inquire what enemy might be lurking near The march was along a road twelve feet wide, in a ravine, with high ground in front and on both sides Suddenly the Indian war-whoop burst from the woods A murderous fire smote down the troops The provincials, not unused to this description of warfare, sheltered themselves behind trees and fought with steady courage Braddock, clinging to his old rules, strove to maintain his order of battle on the open ground. A carnage, most grim and lamentable, was the result His undefended soldiers were shot down by an unseen foe For three hours the struggle lasted, then the men broke and fled in utter rout and panic Braddock, vainly fighting, fell mortally wounded, and was carried off the field by some of his soldiers The poor pedantic man never got over his astonishment at a defeat so inconsistent with the established rules of war. 'Who would have thought it?' he murmured, as they bore him from the field. He scarcely spoke again, and died in two or three days. Nearly 800 men, killed and wounded, were lost in this disastrous encounter —about one-half of the entire force engaged All the while England and France were nominally at peace But now war was declared "—R Mackenzie, *America: a history, bk* 2, *ch* 3 —"The news of the defeat caused a great revulsion of feeling. The highest hopes had been built on Braddock's expedition From this height of expectation men were suddenly plunged into the yawning gulf of gloom and alarm The whole frontier lay exposed to the hatchet and the torch of the remorseless red man The apprehensions of the border settlers were soon fully justified Dumas, who shortly succeeded de Contrecœur in the command at Fort Duquesne, set vigorously to work to put the Indians on the war path against the defenceless settlements 'M de Contrecœur had not been gone a week,' he writes, 'before I had six or seven different war parties in the field at once, always accompanied by Frenchmen Thus far, we have lost only two officers and a few soldiers, but the Indian villages are full of prisoners of every age and sex The enemy has lost far more since the battle than on the day of his defeat' All along the frontier the murderous work went on "—T J Chapman, *The French in the Allegheny Valley, pp* 71–73

Also in F Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe, v* 1, *ch* 7 *and* 10 —W Sargent, *Hist of Braddock's Expedition* (*Penn Hist Soc Mem's, v* 5).—N B Craig, *The Olden Time, v* 1, *pp* 64–133

(Valley): A. D. 1758.—Retirement of the French.—Abandonment of Fort Duquesne. See Canada A D 1758

(Valley): A. D. 1763—Relinquishment to Great Britain by the Treaty of Paris. See Seven Years War The Treaties

(Valley): A. D. 1763.—The king's proclamation excluding settlers. See Northwest Territory A D 1763

(Valley): A. D. 1763-1764.—Pontiac's War. See Pontiac's War

(Valley): A. D. 1765-1768.—Indian Treaties of German Flats and Fort Stanwix.—Pretended cession of lands south of the Ohio.—The Walpole Company and its proposed Vandalia settlement. See United States of Am A. D. 1765–1768

(Valley): A. D. 1772-1782.—The Moravian settlement and mission on the Muskingum. See Moravian Brethren

(Valley): A. D. 1774.—Lord Dunmore's War with the Indians.—The territorial claims of Virginia.—The wrongs of Logan and his famous speech.—"On the eve of the Revolution, in 1774, the frontiersmen had planted themselves firmly among the Alleghanies. Directly west of them lay the untenanted wilderness, traversed only by the war parties of the red men, and the hunting parties of both reds and whites No settlers had yet penetrated it, and until they did so there could be within its borders no chance of race warfare. . . . But in the southwest and the northwest alike, the area of settlement already touched the home lands of the tribes . It was in the northwest that the danger of collision was most imminent; for there the whites and Indians had wronged one another for a generation, and their interests were, at the time, clashing more directly than ever Much the greater part of the western frontier was held or claimed by Virginia, whose royal governor was, at the time, Lord Dunmore. . . The

short but fierce and eventful struggle that now broke out was fought wholly by Virginians, and was generally known by the name of Lord Dunmore's war. Virginia, under her charter, claimed that her boundaries ran across to the South Seas, to the Pacific Ocean. The king of Britain had graciously granted her the right to take so much of the continent as lay within these lines, provided she could win it from the Indians, French, and Spaniards. . . . A number of grants had been made with the like large liberality, and it was found that they sometimes conflicted with one another. The consequence was that while the boundaries were well marked near the coast, where they separated Virginia from the long-settled regions of Maryland and North Carolina, they became exceeding vague and indefinite the moment they touched the mountains Even at the south this produced confusion, . . . but at the north the effect was still more confusing, and nearly resulted in bringing about an intercolonial war between Pennsylvania and Virginia. The Virginians claimed all of extreme western Pennsylvania, especially Fort Pitt and the valley of the Monongahela, and, in 1774, proceeded boldly to exercise jurisdiction therein. Indeed a strong party among the settlers favored the Virginian claim. . . . The interests of the Virginians and Pennsylvanians not only conflicted in respect to the ownership of the land, but also in respect to the policy to be pursued regarding the Indians. The former were armed colonists, whose interest it was to get actual possession of the soil; whereas in Pennsylvania the Indian trade was very important and lucrative . . The interests of the white trader from Pennsylvania and of the white settler from Virginia were so far from being identical that they were usually diametrically opposite. The northwestern Indians had been nominally at peace with the whites for ten years, since the close of Bouquet's campaign. . . . Each of the ten years of nominal peace saw plenty of bloodshed. Recently they had been seriously alarmed by the tendency of the whites to encroach on the great hunting-grounds south of the Ohio. . . . The cession by the Iroquois of the same hunting-grounds, at the treaty of Fort Stanwix [see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1765–1768], while it gave the whites a colorable title, merely angered the northwestern Indians. Half a century earlier they would hardly have dared dispute the power of the Six Nations to do what they chose with any land that could be reached by their war parties; but in 1774 they felt quite able to hold their own against their old oppressors. . . . The savages grew continually more hostile, and in the fall of 1773 their attacks became so frequent that it was evident a general outbreak was at hand. . . . The Shawnees were the leaders in all these outrages; but the outlaw bands, such as the Mingos and Cherokees, were as bad, and parties of Wyandots and Delawares, as well as of the various Miami and Wabash tribes, joined them. Thus the spring of 1774 opened with everything ripe for an explosion. . . . The borderers were anxious for a war; and Lord Dunmore was not inclined to baulk them. . . . Unfortunately the first stroke fell on friendly Indians." Dunmore's agent or lieutenant in the country, one Dr. Conolly, issued an open letter in April which was received by the backwoodsmen as a declaration and authorization of war. One band of these, led by a Maryland borderer, Michael Cresap, proceeded to hostilities at once by ambushing and shooting down some friendly Shawnees who were engaged in trade. This same party then set out to attack the camp of the famous chief Logan, whose family and followers were then dwelling at Yellow Creek, some 50 miles away. Logan was "an Iroquois warrior, who lived at that time away from the bulk of his people, but who was a man of note . . . among the outlying parties of Senecas and Mingos, and the fragments of broken tribes that dwelt along the upper Ohio. . He was greatly liked and respected by all the white hunters and frontiersmen whose friendship and respect were worth having, they admired him for his dexterity and prowess, and they loved him for his straightforward honesty, and his noble loyalty to his friends." Cresap's party, after going some miles toward Logan's camp, "began to feel ashamed of their mission; calling a halt, they discussed the fact that the camp they were preparing to attack consisted exclusively of friendly Indians, and mainly of women and children, and forthwith abandoned their proposed trip and returned home . . But Logan's people did not profit by Cresap's change of heart. On the last day of April a small party of men, women, and children, including almost all of Logan's kin, left his camp and crossed the river to visit Greathouse [another borderer, of a more brutal type], as had been their custom, for he made a trade of selling rum to the savages, though Cresap had notified him to stop. The whole party were plied with liquor, and became helplessly drunk, in which condition Greathouse and his associated criminals fell on and massacred them nine souls in all. . . At once the frontier was in a blaze, and the Indians girded themselves for revenge . . They confused the two massacres, attributing both to Cresap, whom they well knew as a warrior . . . Soon all the back country was involved in the unspeakable horrors of a bloody Indian war," which lasted, however, only till the following October. Governor Dunmore, during the summer, collected some 3,000 men, one division of which he led personally to Fort Pitt and thence down the Ohio, accomplishing nothing of importance. The other division, composed exclusively of backwoodsmen, under General Andrew Lewis, marched to the mouth of the Kanawha River, and there, at Point Pleasant, the cape of land jutting out between the Ohio and the Kanawha, they fought, on the 10th of October, a great battle with the Indians which practically ended the war. This is sometimes called the battle of Point Pleasant, and sometimes the battle of the Great Kanawha. "It was the most closely contested of any battle ever fought with the northwestern Indians; and it was the only victory gained over a large body of them by a force but slightly superior in numbers. . . . Its results were most important. It kept the northwestern tribes quiet for the first two years of the Revolutionary struggle; and above all it rendered possible the settlement of Kentucky, and therefore the winning of the West. Had it not been for Lord Dunmore's War, it is more than likely that when the colonies achieved their freedom they would have found their western boundary fixed at the Alleghany Mountains." For some time after peace had been made with the