


---

This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books


<https://books.google.com>





*The history of  
Waterbury, Connecticut*

Henry Bronson



---

---

*Ex Libris*

JOHN EMERSON MARBLE

---

---

**JOHN E. MARBLE**  
**1313 GARFIELD AVENUE**  
**SOUTH PASADENA, CALIFORNIA**

---



















THE  
1898  
HISTORY  
OF  
WATERBURY,  
CONNECTICUT;

THE ORIGINAL TOWNSHIP EMBRACING PRESENT WATERTOWN AND  
PLYMOUTH, AND PARTS OF OXFORD, WOLCOTT, MIDDLE-  
BURY, PROSPECT AND NAUGATUCK.

WITH AN

APPENDIX

OF

BIOGRAPHY, GENEALOGY AND STATISTICS.

BY HENRY BRONSON, M. D.

---

WATERBURY:

PUBLISHED BY BRONSON BROTHERS.

1858.

974.67

B869

---

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1858,  
By HENRY BRONSON,  
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Connecticut.

---

---

Printed by  
T. J. STAFFORD,  
88 STATE STREET, (STAFFORD BUILDING,)  
*New Haven.*

---

## PUBLISHERS' NOTICE.

---

THE late financial crisis rendered it expedient to defer for a few months the issue of this volume. The publishers would regret this, had not the delay enabled them to add to the number of engravings which had been previously provided. Subscribers and others, it is hoped, will be more than satisfied. Besides the additions referred to, the work contains over one hundred pages of printed matter more than were anticipated when proposals were issued. In point of mechanical execution, the publishers feel assured the book will occasion no disappointment, unless an agreeable one. They have taken pride in it, and have not been actuated wholly by selfish motives. As a work of art, however, they do not take the chief credit to themselves. Unaided, they could have done little towards providing the numerous and expensive engravings which embellish the volume. The greater proportion of these have been furnished by the liberality of others—those taking a deep interest in the success of the undertaking. The author has sacrificed much time and labor, with the object of benefiting his native town, and presenting it with a reliable record of its past history. Of his success, it is unnecessary here to speak. It has been the aim of all interested, to make the book in substance and in form, worthy of the dead, honorable to the living, and acceptable to its immediate patrons.

BRONSON BROTHERS, *Publishers.*

WATERBURY, May, 1858.





## P R E F A C E.

---

It is well known that my father, the late BENNET BRONSON, spent much time in the collection of facts, historical, genealogical and traditional, relating to the early history of Waterbury. He began this work as early as 1820, and prosecuted it at intervals during the remainder of his life. His object was simply information on a subject which had been almost wholly neglected by others. He not only searched the Waterbury records, but he examined the records of Farmington and Hartford, and opened a correspondence with those supposed to have important knowledge of the old families of the town. Thus he gained a large stock of information, and about 1830, wrote a brief historical account of ancient Waterbury, which he delivered to his fellow citizens, as an evening lecture, in the old meeting house. Afterwards, several prominent individuals addressed him a letter, requesting him to write, for publication, a history of the town. He neglected to do this; but when Barber was gathering materials for the Connecticut Historical Collections, he furnished a sketch of the old town, which, with slight alterations and some abridgment, was published in that work. Two or three years before his death, he re-wrote his lecture, amplifying and correcting it, and bringing it down to the close of the Revolutionary

war. As left, it would have made, perhaps, fifteen printed pages. He also added to, and perfected in a certain sense, his genealogical tables.

Two years after my father's death, with a design of preserving more effectually what had been done, I undertook myself to write a fuller historical sketch, using the papers which have been mentioned, and the notes and extracts from records from which these had been prepared. My labors then had no reference to publication. At this stage, the Messrs. BRONSON BROTHERS proposed to publish a History of Waterbury, and applied to me to provide the manuscript. Knowing the labor and time which would be required, I declined. No one else, however, being willing to undertake the task, I reversed my decision, and reluctantly consented. I soon found, however, that in order to understand the subject—to get hold of its spirit and to construe properly the facts—I must begin at the beginning and go over the entire ground anew. I have done this, and the present book is the result. Those who have been engaged in a similar undertaking need not be told the labor it has cost; and those who have not would not comprehend me, though I should attempt to tell them.

Deeming the early events of Waterbury in most need of a historian—in most danger of being lost—I have given much time and space to them. Modern history, particularly that which may be called post-Revolutionary, has not engaged so much of my attention. After 1800, the reader will find only items and fragments, with no attempt at a complete history. What I have neglected it is to be hoped some other person, who is willing to labor in a humble way without reward, will undertake.

In what I have written, I have relied mainly on record evidence, and rejected traditional knowledge as untrustworthy. By pursuing this method, I have sometimes sacrificed popular attraction to truth or, in other words, history. It has been no part of my purpose to furnish en-

tainment for the readers of legendary tales, though I might have done so with comparatively little labor. I have aimed to be correct in all that I have written and quoted. It cannot be, however, that I have made no mistakes. My authorities have sometimes been copies of the originals made by others, which in some cases had been re-written, possibly, more than once. Facts and dates given in letters of correspondence may have been relied on too implicitly. It is easier to criticise error in a work of this kind, than wholly to avoid it. It is common to plead "want of time" as an apology for shortcomings in this regard; but I claim that no man has a right to make a book in haste. In my quotations from early records, I have preferred, in most cases, to give perfect transcripts of the originals, even to the matter of orthography and punctuation. My object in this has been to give the truest history, and to preserve portions of the record which might be lost. Thinking it improbable that any one would again go over the ground of my inquiries, at any rate, with equal advantages, I have endeavored to perpetuate what I could with authentic types. If the reader complains that I have introduced trivial subjects, and have spent too much time on things of little importance, I have only to say, that I have occupied myself with the matters which most interested those whose history I have written. *They* were men who gave their time to their own private affairs—to their individual, social, religious and material interests—and I must needs dwell upon these or be silent.

Of those who have assisted me in the preparation of this work, I must mention particularly Mr. PHILIP M. TROWBRIDGE. He has given me important aid in the examination of records and in furnishing me with extracts. He has had charge of the genealogies contained in the Appendix, and is chiefly responsible for that portion of the work. I have furnished him my own and my father's collections of materials; and from these and the original records, and his own independent inquiries, he has compiled the tables. These extended genealogies were not

contemplated in the original plan of the work. I designed to give a somewhat particular account of the original proprietors of Waterbury and their children, as I have done in Chapters XI and XII; but the continuation of the subject in the Appendix was an afterthought of the publishers and others. This will explain how it happens that the genealogies of particular families are to be sought for in different portions of the work.

Mr. SYLVESTER JUDD of Northampton has given me much information concerning the first settlers of Waterbury. Rev. WILLIAM S. PORTER of New Haven has kindly allowed me the use of his papers on the genealogy of the early settlers of Farmington.

In the preparation of this volume, I have found it difficult to divest myself of the idea that I am still a resident of my native town. Finding this, on the whole, a pleasant delusion, I have taken no pains to dispel it. From many passages in the work, the reader would infer that Waterbury had not ceased to be my dwelling place.

I am mortified to find that there are a few errors which escaped notice till the sheets were printed. They are in part owing to my inexperience in reading proofs. The most important of them, it is hoped, have been corrected in the *errata* at the end.

NEW HAVEN, December, 1857.



## INDEX TO ENGRAVINGS.

---

VIEW OF THE CITY OF WATERBURY,.....	Opposite	Title Page.
PORTRAIT OF BENNET BRONSON,.....	Opposite	Page 1
PLAN OF THE VILLAGE OF MATTATUCK,.....	“	“ 16
PORTRAIT OF SAMUEL HOPKINS, D. D.,.....	“	“ 32
“ MARK LEAVENWORTH,.....	“	“ 48
MAP OF THE OLD TOWNSHIP OF WATERBURY, .....	“	“ 64
PORTRAIT OF J. M. L. SCOVILL,.....	“	“ 80
“ DR. ISAAC BRONSON,.....	“	“ 96
“ ELI TERRY,.....	“	“ 112
FAC-SIMILES,.....	“	“ 128
PORTRAIT OF SAMUEL M. HOPKINS, LL. D.,.....	“	“ 144
“ WILLIAM H. SCOVILL,.....	“	“ 160
“ DEACON JAMES BROWN,.....	“	“ 176
“ JOSIAH BRONSON, .....	“	“ 192
“ DR. AMBROSE IVES,.....	“	“ 208
“ CAPTAIN REUBEN HOLMES, .....	“	“ 224
“ ALMON FARRELL,.....	“	“ 240
“ DEACON AARON BENEDICT,.....	“	“ 256
“ ALVIN BRONSON,.....	“	“ 272
“ SETH THOMAS,.....	“	“ 288
“ JOHN BUCKINGHAM, .....	“	“ 304
“ GREEN KENDRICK,.....	“	“ 320
“ SILAS BRONSON,.....	“	“ 352
“ ISRAEL HOLMES, .....	“	“ 384
VIEW OF BENEDICT AND BURNHAM MANUFACTURING CO'S WORKS, .....	“	“ 432
“ WATERBURY BRASS COMPANY'S WORKS,.....	“	“ 464
“ SCOVILL MANUFACTURING COMPANY'S WORKS,.....	“	“ 496
“ BROWN AND BROTHERS' WORKS,.....	“	“ 528
“ HOLMES, BOOTH AND HAYDENS' WORKS,.....	“	“ 560

## ADDITIONAL CORRECTIONS.

---

THE delay in the publication of this work has given the author an opportunity to add to the corrections which will be found at the end of the volume.

Page 13th, 17th line from bottom, *after* date, *insert* (May 21, 1677.)

Page 19, 2d line from top, *for* country, *read* county.

Page 26, 6th line from top, *for* 1673, *read* 1672.

Page 43, 3d line from bottom, *after* 1686-7, *erase* the period and *insert* a comma.

Page 86th, 4th line from bottom, *erase* the sentence beginning with "It will be noticed."

Page 191, 5th line from top—This John died an infant. A second John Stanley (baptized May 25, 1682,) m. Aug. 1710, Hannah, daughter of Dea. Samuel Porter, and Dec. 9, 1714, Mary Wright. He was made a bachelor proprietor in 1715, (see p. 120,) and died Sep. 8, 1748, having had three children.

Page 191, 24th line from top—The Thomas Stanley who m. Anne Peck was not the son of Lieut. John of Waterbury, but of Capt. John Stanley of Farmington, and died April 14, 1713. It was his widow Anne, and not he, who d. May 23, 1718. (See p. 189.)

Page 239, 13th line from bottom, *for* school and, *read* school land.

Page 326, *add* to the list of those engaged in the old French war, the name of Moses Cook, drummer.

Page 421, 2d and 3d lines from top, *for* Wealthy U. Upson, *read* Mrs. Wealthy Hopkins Norton, (whose maiden name was Upson.)

Page 462, 20th line from top, *for* 1st, Ruth Frisbie, 2d, Olive Warner, *read* 1st, Olive Warner, 2d, Ruth Frisbie.

Page 486, last line, *for* David, *read* Daniel.

Page 487, 15th line from top, *for* Charles, *read* William.

Page 490, 6th line from bottom, *erase* Benjamin and *insert* Alma, m. Eli Curtis; IV. Anna Maria; V. Philomela; VI. Benjamin. Other children d. in childhood.

# CONTENTS.


---

CHAPTER I.	
DISCOVERY OF THE NAUGATUCK VALLEY: PREPARATIONS FOR A SETTLEMENT, . . .	1
CHAPTER II.	
THE SETTLEMENT BEGUN: TOWN CENTER, . . . . .	12
CHAPTER III.	
DELINQUENT SUBSCRIBERS, . . . . .	24
CHAPTER IV.	
SUBSCRIBERS WHO FINALLY SECURED THEIR RIGHTS, . . . . .	31
CHAPTER V.	
THE COMMON FENCE AND COMMON FIELD, . . . . .	47
CHAPTER VI.	
INDIAN PURCHASES: INCORPORATION OF THE TOWN: SEQUESTERED LANDS, . . . .	62
CHAPTER VII.	
MILLS, . . . . .	79
CHAPTER VIII.	
ROADS, BRIDGES, &C., . . . . .	93
CHAPTER IX.	
INDIAN WARS: THE GREAT FLOOD: THE GREAT SICKNESS, . . . . .	101
CHAPTER X.	
BACHELOR PROPRIETORS, . . . . .	113
CHAPTER XI.	
PERSONAL NOTICES OF THE FIRST SETTLERS OF WATERBURY, . . . . .	129

CHAPTER XII.	
PERSONAL NOTICES OF THE FIRST SETTLERS, CONTINUED,.....	167
—————	
CHAPTER XIII.	
ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS: MR. PECK'S MINISTRY,.....	202
—————	
CHAPTER XIV.	
ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS: MR. SOUTHMAYD'S MINISTRY,.....	215
—————	
CHAPTER XV.	
SCHOOLS,.....	234
—————	
CHAPTER XVI.	
POPULATION INCREASES: IMMIGRATION,.....	243
—————	
CHAPTER XVII.	
THE SETTLEMENT EXTENDS: NEW SOCIETIES,.....	260
—————	
CHAPTER XVIII.	
MR. LEAVENWORTH'S MINISTRY: THE THIRD MEETING HOUSE,.....	283
—————	
CHAPTER XIX.	
EPISCOPACY IN WATERBURY,.....	292
—————	
CHAPTER XX.	
CHURCH AND STATE: OLD FRENCH WAR,.....	315
—————	
CHAPTER XXI.	
REVOLUTIONARY HISTORY,.....	329
—————	
CHAPTER XXII.	
AFTER THE WAR: MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS,.....	361
—————	
APPENDIX.	
I. BIOGRAPHY,.....	370
II. GENEALOGY,.....	458
III. LATER ECCLESIASTICAL SOCIETIES: MANUFACTURING: STATISTICS,.....	553








*B. Bronson*

*Henry Foster*





# HISTORY OF WATERBURY.



## CHAPTER I.

### DISCOVERY OF THE NAUGATUCK VALLEY: PREPARATIONS FOR A SETTLEMENT.

MORE than a century and a quarter intervened between the discovery of America and the settlement by Europeans of any part of New England. In 1620, a small band of English Puritans, one hundred and one in number, including women and children, planted themselves at Plymouth, on the eastern shore of Massachusetts. For a long time, this feeble colony struggled for existence. At length, however, the English settlers became firmly established at Plymouth and the Massachusetts Bay. In the course of the years 1634 and 1635, several parties from Watertown, Dorchester and Newtown, (now Cambridge,) in the neighborhood of Boston, made their way through the wilderness to the banks of the Connecticut River, and established themselves at Wethersfield, Windsor and Hartford. Mr. Hooker and his congregation of sixty persons

came from Newtown and settled in Hartford. These towns, in their early infancy, in 1637, waged a successful war with the Pequot Indians, and conquered their country. Soon after the conclusion of this war, or in 1638, a small colony went from Boston, and settled at New Haven, Milford and Guilford. From 1637 to 1675, thirty-eight years, the inhabitants of Connecticut, and indeed of all New England, enjoyed almost uninterrupted peace. During this period of comparative quietness, the settlements in Connecticut were extended through the State, from north to south, on both banks of the Connecticut River, and from east to west in all the towns bordering on the sea-coast. In 1640, the people of Hartford commenced a settlement at Farmington, being the first made in Connecticut away from navigable waters. From this time to 1673, small beginnings of settlements were made at Norwich, Derby, Wallingford, Simsbury, Woodbury and Plainfield. Up to the last named date, with the above exceptions, the whole State, as now constituted, was a wilderness, in the possession of the native Indians. It is believed, however, that no Indian settlement existed, at the time of its discovery, within the limits of ancient Waterbury. The nearest wigwams were in Farmington, Derby and Woodbury, where native tribes existed. The territory of Waterbury was claimed by the tribes of the two former towns. It was used as a hunting ground. It was first visited by white men in the pursuit of game.

It appears that as early as 1657, some of the inhabitants of Farmington had become acquainted with a portion of the Naugatuck Valley, and obtained from some of the native claimants, belonging to the Tunxis or Farmington tribe, a deed of a tract of land which secured to themselves certain rights and privileges therein mentioned. The deed, which is copied from the Farmington record, runs as follows :


This Witnesseth that Wee Kepaquamp and Querrimus and Mataueage have sould to William Lewis and Samuell Steele of Farmington A psell or A tractt of Land called matetacoke that is to Say the hill from whence John Standley and John Andrews: brought the black lead and all the Land within eight: mylle: of that hill: on every side: to dig: and carry away what they will and To build on y<sup>t</sup> for y<sup>e</sup> Vse of them that Labor there: and not otherwise To improve: y<sup>e</sup> Land In witnes whereof wec: have hereunto set our: hands: and those: Indi-

ans above mentioned must free the purchasers from all Claymes: by any other Indnyans:

Witnes John Steel  
february: y<sup>e</sup> 8<sup>th</sup> 1667

WILLIAM LEWIS  
SAMUEL STEELE

The marke  of Kapaquamp:

The mark  of Querrimus

The mark of  Mataneage

The above deed is copied into Mr. Woodruff's sketch of the town of Litchfield, published in 1845. Mr. W. makes the following remarks: "Precisely where the hill referred to in this deed was situated, I have been unable to discover, but from the subsequent claims of the grantees, from tradition, and from the deed itself, it would seem that it was in the southern part of Harwinton, and embraced that town, and also some portion of Plymouth (then Mattatuck or Waterbury) and Litchfield. This purchase was made by the grantees in behalf of themselves and a company composed of certain inhabitants of Farmington." It doubtless proved valueless for the purposes for which it was obtained, as we hear nothing further concerning the black lead.

Another deed, bearing date the 11th day of August, 1718, from Petthuzso and Toxcrunuck, successors of the grantors, conveyed to the Farmington people the whole title to the above lands. The two deeds were the ground of a claim on the part of the grantees to the lands described; but it was truly said that the territory north of Waterbury and west of Farmington had been conveyed by the Colony in Jan., 1686, to

the towns of Hartford and Windsor. Besides, there seems to have been a colonial statute in operation, in 1718, and previously, declaring that "no person or persons in this colony, whether inhabitants or not, shall buy, hire or receive a gift, or mortgage any parcel of Land or Lands, of any Indian or Indians for the future, except he or they do buy or receive the same for the use of the Colony, or for some plantation or village, or with the allowance of the General Court of this Colony." Nevertheless, the Farmington company, in 1718, received from the towns of Hartford and Windsor a grant of one sixth of the township of Litchfield, in consideration of their making over to said towns their interest in the disputed territory.

In process of time, certain hunters or explorers from Farmington, in their excursions into the western forests, discovered the flats or interval on the Naugatuck River, where the city of Waterbury now stands. They told their friends what they had seen. So favorable was their report, and such the disposition of the early settlers to push out further into the forest, that they began at once to think of emigration. But at that period, according to the laws of the Colony, no person could acquire a title to Indian lands, or make a settlement upon them without the permission of the General Court. Having therefore sent out from among themselves a committee to view the place for a new plantation, and obtained from them a favorable report, the Farmington people petitioned the "honored general court" for liberty to make a settlement. This was in the fall of 1673. The following is the petition referred to, preceded by the report of the committee spoken of:—

We whos names are here under wripen partly for our own satisfaction and for the satisfaction of some others haue bene too uieu matitacooke in referans to a plantation doo Judge it capable of the same.

thomas newell Sean<sup>r</sup>

John warner Sean<sup>r</sup>

Richard Semar

October: the 6: 1673

Octob<sup>r</sup> 9, 73

To the honerd generall court now siting In Hartford

Honored gentlemen and fathers we being sensible of our great need of a comfortable Subsistence doe hereby make our address to your selfs In order to the Same

Not Questioning your care and faithfulness In y<sup>e</sup> premisses: also hoping of your freeness and readiness to accomodate your poor suplicants with y<sup>t</sup> which we Judge to be: In your hands: acording to an orderly proceeding we therefore whose names are hereafter Inserted to humbly petition your honors to take cognicance: of our state who want Land to Labor vpon: for our subsistance & now hauing found out a track at a place called by y<sup>e</sup> Indians matitacooke: which we aprihend may susfetiently acomodate to make a small plantation: we are therefore bould hereby to petetion your honors to grant vs y<sup>e</sup> liberty of planting y<sup>e</sup> same with as many others as y<sup>t</sup> may be: capable comfortably to entertain and as for the purchasing of y<sup>e</sup> natives with your allowance we shall take care of: & so not to trouble with father Inlargements \* \* \* \* only desiring your due consideration & a return by our Louing ffreind John Lankton

Thomas Newell	Daniell waner
John Lankton	abraham andrews
John andrews	Thomas hancox
John warner seineo <sup>r</sup>	John Carrington
Daniell porter	Daniell andrews
Edmund scott	Joseph hancox
John Standly Junior	Thomas standly
Abraham brounson	Obadiah richards
Richard semer:	Timothy standly
John waner Junior	william higgenson
Isack brounson	John porter
Samuell hacoX	Thomas barnes
John welton	John Woodruff

[State Records—Towns and Lands, Vol. I, p. 162.]

Here is the action upon this petition :

Oct. 1673

In answer to the petition of Seueral of the Inhabitants of the Town of Farmington that Mattatock that those lands might be granted for a plantation. This Court haue Seen cause to order that those lands may be viewed sometime between this and the Court in may next and that reporte be made to the Court in may next whether it be Judged fitt to make a plantation. The committee appointed are Lnt: Tho: Bull, Lnt: Rob<sup>t</sup> webster and Daniel pratt.

[Nicholas Olmsted was afterwards substituted for Daniel Pratt, as a member of the Committee.]

April 6, 7, 8, 9, 1674.

We whose names are underwritten (according to the desire and appointment of y<sup>e</sup> honoured court) haue ueiewed y<sup>e</sup> lands upon Mattatuck riuer in order to a plantation, we do apprehend that there is about six hundred acres of meadow & plowing land lying on both sides of y<sup>e</sup> riuer besides upland conuenient for a towne plot, with a suitable out let into y<sup>e</sup> woods on y<sup>e</sup> west of y<sup>e</sup> riuer, and good feeding lands for cattell.



The meadow & plowing land above written a considerable part of it lyeth in two peices near y<sup>e</sup> town plot, y<sup>e</sup> rest in smaller parcels, y<sup>e</sup> farthest of which we iudge not aboue fower miles from y<sup>e</sup> towne plot; and our apprehensions are that it may accommodate thirty families

THOMAS BULL  
NICHOLAS OLMSTEAD  
ROBERT WEBSTER

The "two peices near y<sup>e</sup> town plot" alluded in the above report, are probably the level river lands on the east side of the river afterwards called Manhan, or Mahan, Meadow, near which a final settlement was afterwards made, and the tract of meadow on the west side of the river near the mouth of Steel's Brook. The most distant piece "not above fower miles" was most likely the tract which at a later period was called Judd's meadow, now a part of Naugatuck. These natural meadows were looked upon with much favor by the early settlers, and were regarded not only as convenient but necessary to the existence of a new plantation. On them they depended for fodder for their "cattell" during the long and severe winters. Artificial meadows are prepared with difficulty and require much toil and time. They absorb capital, and appear only in the more advanced stages of society.

The foregoing report of the committee showed the reasonableness of the request of the "supplicants." The petition was granted, "and the Court appointed Major John Talcott, Lient. Robert Webster, Lient. Nicholas Olmstead, Ens. Samuel Steel, Ensign John Wadsworth, a committee to regulate and order the settling of a plantation at Mattatuck." This committee was composed of men of note, who bore honorable names, well known in the history of the Colony. Their titles attest the high consideration with which they were regarded.

Major Talcott of Hartford was one of his majesty's justices of the peace, and assistant from 1662 to 1688, and treasurer of the Colony for nineteen years. He was distinguished for his gallantry and success in King Philip's war, in 1676. He commanded a body of five hundred and fifty English and Mohegans in several successful expeditions in that year. He died, leaving children, July 23d, 1688. The inventory of his estate amounted to £2,272.

Lieut. Webster of Middletown and Hartford was a son of Gov. John Webster, and married a ~~sister~~ <sup>daughter</sup> of Gov. Treat, by whom he had many sons and daughters. He was a respectable man, though not distinguished like his father. He died in 1676, making his widow, Susannah, executrix of his will. His son Jonathan married a sister of John Hopkins, an early settler of Mattatuck.

Lieut. Olmstead of Hartford was a son of James Olmstead, (who died in 1640,) and married a daughter of Joseph Loomis of Windsor. He was a Pequot soldier and apparently a wild youth. In 1640, for his moral delinquencies, he was "adjudged" by "the P<sup>r</sup>ticular Court" "to pay twenty pownd fyne to the country and to stand vpon the Pillery at Hartford the next lecture day, during the time of the lecture. He is to be sett on, a lytle before the beginning and to stay thereon a litle after the end." He was a deputy in 1672, and in active service, as a lieutenant, in King Philip's war. He died in 1684, and was the father of several sons and daughters.

Ens. Samuel Steele was the son of John Steele, an early settler of Hartford and a prominent man. He was born in 1626, and, together with his father, removed to Farmington at an early date, and became one of the original settlers of that town. He married Mary Boosy and had many children; Mary, Rachel, Sarah, Samuel, John, Benoni, James, Hannah, Ebenezer. In May, 1669, he was a deputy to the General Court in Hartford; and in 1674, was approved as lieutenant of the Farmington "Traine Band." Late in life, he removed to Wethersfield, and died in 1685. He appears to have been a respectable but not a distinguished man. As a member of the committee, he was one of the most active, and was connected by marriage with some of the leading planters of Mattatuck. His sister Mary married Serg. William Judd, and his sister Sarah, Lient. Thomas Judd; while his brother John married a sister of the Judds. He is the only one of the committee who has left his name in the territory he assisted to plant, and connected it indissolubly with its physical features. Steel's Brook and the tracts of land upon its borders, Steel's Meadow and Steel's Plain, will preserve the memory of Samuel Steele.

Ensign John Wadsworth of Farmington, was a son of William Wadsworth of Hartford, and brother, I believe, of the famous Captain Joseph Wadsworth, of charter-oak memory. He was an assistant from 1679 to his death in 1689. Some of his descendants have been distinguished.

The business of this committee was "to regulate and order," in the language of the record, the affairs of the plantation; to make rules for the planters and prescribe the conditions of settlement; to select a site for the town; to lay out the house lots and to dispose of them and of the other lands, so far as expedient, by grant; to direct concerning highways and fences; to consult with the people, and to watch over their best interests. They were expected to see to it that education, virtue and religion were properly cared for in the infancy of the settlement, and to act with *authority*, when the emergency and the common weal required it. They were selected as the temporary guardians and the fathers of the plantation, with all the power usually exercised by the town authorities. In fact, they were to found a town; to organize it, and to supply it with locomotive force, until it got legs of its own. This done, their duties were ended, and their trust could be resigned.

The assembly's committee, (called on the town records the Grand Committee,) thus constituted, in pursuance of their duties, drew up the following ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION AND AGREEMENT, which the proposed settlers signed:—

Articles agreed vpon and concluded by us whos names are vnder written the Comity for settling a plantation att mattatucke as followeth that

1 Euery on[e] that is excepted for an inhabitant at matatucke shall have eight acres for a hous lott

2 We agre that the distribution of medow shall be proportioned to each person Acording to estats [propriety] noe person exceding a hundred pound alotment except too or thre alotments which we the Comite shall lay out acording to our best discretion

3 Also wee agree that all taxes and Ratts that shall be leuyed for defraying publick charges shall be payed proportion ably acording to their medow alotments and this article to stand in full forc and vertue fivue yers next folowing the datt hereof and after the end and expiration of fivue yers all Ratts for defraying publike charges shall be leuyed and raised upon persons and estats acording to the law or custom of the coutry

4 We determin that every parson that tacks up alotments att mattatucke within

four yer after the datt hereof shall build agood substan shall Dwelling house [at least eighteen feet in length and sixteen feet wide and]\* nine foot between joynts with a good chimly in the forsaid place.

5 Itt is agred in case any parson shall faile of building as aforesaid: a dweling house upon his lott as is inloyned within the 4th article within the terme of four yers after the date herof shall forfit all his alotments att mattatucke and lose all his right and title therein buildings only Excepted to be dis posed to such: other meet parsons for im proue ment as shall be excepted by the Comity according to the conditions of these Articles

6 And itt is also agreed that euey one to whom alotments are granted shall parsonly tack up his resedenc as an inhabitant att mattatuck in his own house within the term of four yeres after the date hereof and upon failer or defalte shall forfitt his lands and alotments att mattatuck to be imroued as aforesaid by the comite

7 Itt is further concluded that Every parson that shall be posed of lands att the said mattatock shall inhabit and dwell ther in his own House for the time and term of four yers after he hath built according to the Tenu<sup>r</sup> and true meaning of the fourth Article and untill the said foure yers be ended no parson shall haue pouer to mack any alynation or sale of the afor said lands of what he or they are posed of

8 Finally itt is determined that all those parsons to whom alotments Are granted (by vs the comity) shall be ingaged to the forgoing Articles by a subscription of their names or marcks

And for a full confirmation of the forgoing articles wee the comitie haue this thir tyeth of may in the yere one thousand six hundred seuenty and four: subscribed our names

We whos names are under writen doe Igag a faithful submission to and performance of the forgoing articles as wittness our hands this sixt of June in the yer 1674	}	John Talcott Robert webster Nicholas olmsted Samuel steel John wadsworth
---	---	--

John Langhton	100	Thomas Hankox	100
John Audres	100	William Judd	100
Thomas Juddl Jur	100	John warner Jun	90
Edmun Scoot	100	Thomas Richarson	50
John wilton	080	william Higason	70
Abraham Andrus	080	John Carington	060
Isaac Brunson	090	Obadiah Richards	080
John Stanly Jur	100	Thomas Newell [for] son	100
Samuell hicok	085	Sargt John Stanly for son	95
Richard Seamor	100	Daniel Warner	60
Abraham Brounson	080	John warner sen	100
Isaac brounson ingageth for him		John Judd	100
John Porter	080	Joseph Hecoks	060

\* The clause in brackets is presumed to have been inadvertently left out in the record. I have supplied the omission from other copies.

Joh bronson Ju <sup>r</sup>	080	Thomas Jud seno <sup>r</sup> for his	} 080
Thomas Gridly	080	son Sam <sup>11</sup>	
Danill Porter for son	090	Sam <sup>11</sup> Gridly 90,	th newell*

Soon after the signing of the articles of settlement, a new and more thorough exploration of the country was made, with a view of finding out its capabilities and deciding on a place for the center of the town. In the meantime, however, the committee took the precaution to extinguish any title to the land which was in the native or Indian proprietors. "Per order and in the name and behalf of the Genaral Court of Connecticut in New England," they purchased of certain Indians, eleven in number, living in Farmington and belonging to the Tunxis tribe, (and took to themselves a deed of the same,) a certain tract of land at Mattatuck, lying on both sides of the Naugatuck River, ten miles in length from north to south, and six miles in breadth from east to west, butting east on Farmington bounds, south on Pegasset, (Derby,) west on Pegasset, Pomperaug, (Woodbury,) and Potatuck, (Southbury,) and north on the wilderness. The consideration was thirty-eight pounds in hand, and "divers good causes," and the deed bore date Aug. 21st, 1674. It may be found in the second volume of the Waterbury Land Records, page 224, and is signed (by marks) by Caraachaquo, James, Putteko, Atumtacko, Alwaash, Spinning Squaw, Nosaheagon, John Compound, Queramousk, Chere, Aupkt. The witnesses are Samuel Willis, Benjamin Fenn and Philip Lewis.

During the same season, a site was selected for the contemplated village. It was the elevated ground on the west side the river, which, from this circumstance, has ever since been known by the name of Old Town Plat, or Town Plot. It was airy and showy ground, overlooking the alluvial lands upon the river. Here, three quarters of a mile west of the

---

\* Thomas Newell, Jr., was afterwards substituted for Samuel Gridley, and the name is placed here in the original.

This document is taken from the second volume of the Waterbury Land Records, pages 221 and 222. It is in the hand of John Stanly, copied professedly from the original by direction of the proprietors, (in 1717,) after he removed from Waterbury, and certified by John Judd, then the town clerk. There are several copies of this paper to be found in the early volumes of the Town and Proprietor's Records, differing from one another in several (for the most part) unimportant particulars. I have selected that which was fullest and seemingly most complete and authentic.

present city, the roads were laid out, the one running north and south, sixteen rods wide.\* This was cut in the middle, by an east and west road, running down towards the river, south of Sled Hall Brook, eight rods wide. There was another cross-road at the south end, probably near the present highway over the hill from the south bridge. The home lots, eight acres in each, according to the articles of settlement, were ranged along the north and south street, thirty-two in number, sixteen on each side, the east and west road already referred to, dividing each "teer" in the middle, leaving eight lots on either hand.

So much was done in the summer and fall of 1674, towards the settlement of Mattatuck, but it does not appear that any dwellings were erected. For some cause, not fully understood, the progress of the enterprise was suspended at this point. Perhaps the country, on a closer examination, did not prove so attractive as it had been represented. In the following year, however, there were new and obvious reasons for not pushing forward the enterprise. A more serious and pressing business presented itself, demanding attention.

Early in the summer of 1675, the great Indian War of New England, commonly called King Philip's War, broke out. Connecticut, though not itself attacked, entered with spirit into the struggle. Her sons left their husbandry and followed Treat and Talcott to the scene of danger. All thoughts of new settlements were abandoned and many of those recently commenced were broken up. For the present, the policy of the colonies was to concentrate themselves that their defense might be less difficult. It was a fierce and bloody war, in which the parties aimed at extermination. It was more destructive to the lives, property and immediate prospects of the country, than any which has taken place since. The whole weight of it fell upon New England, then containing about forty thou-

---

\* Afterwards, on January 15, 1677, old style, when a new site had been selected and approved for the town, the committee passed a new order respecting this road, as follows :—"we order the highway of sixteen rods wide that is already layed out north and south through the old town platt to be butt two rods wide and grant that the proprietors of eck side the said highway to butt upon the new highway for enlargement of their lots proportionally."

sand people, (Connecticut perhaps ten thousand,) widely dispersed in small settlements, and destitute of almost everything but stout hearts and a trust in Heaven. It was brought to a successful termination, without any assistance from the mother country, or the neighboring colonies, in the latter part of 1676, by the death of King Philip, an able, and, in many respects, a wise chief.

Who among those who subsequently became the planters of Mattatuck were personally engaged in the war against King Philip and his confederates, I am unable to say. I find, however, the following:

A meeting of the Council in Hartford Dec. 5, 1676.

The Council granted John Brunson of Farmington the sume of five pounds, as a reparation for his wounds and damage rec<sup>d</sup>. thereby, and quarteridg and half pay to the first of this present moneth. [Col. Rec. II, p. 483.]

There were, at this time, three persons bearing the name of John Bronson living in Farmington, John, John the son of John, and John, Jr., the son of Richard. Probably the extract refers to John, the son of John, who went to Waterbury, and the reward was for injuries received in the war just closed. His father, though an old Pequot soldier, was now doubtless too old for active service.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### THE SETTLEMENT BEGUN: TOWN CENTER.

In the spring of 1677, the tranquillity of the colony being secured, the Farmington people began once more to think of making a settlement at Mattatuck. They were, however, dissatisfied with the place selected for a village site. Though attractive from its sightliness and probable healthfulness, a closer examination brought to light disadvantages and objec-

tions of a decisive character. The many broad acres which it allowed for each man's home lot were hardly a recompense for its rocky surface and moderate productiveness. It was of difficult access from the east. It could be reached from the river lands (from which, in an important degree, subsistence was expected to be drawn) only by a long and steep ascent. Besides, a settlement upon the west side of the river would be liable, from the frequent floods which covered the flats, to have its communication with Farmington cut off. For the present, Farmington alone would connect the people with the civilization of the day, whence, for a time, must be obtained many of the necessities and all the comforts of life. There lived their friends, and there they would look for refuge, or succor, in case of a hostile attack from the Indians. There, too, for a time, they must resort for the regular ministrations and ordinances of the Gospel.

In pursuance of a plan entertained by those most interested of changing the town center, a meeting of the proprietors was held and a committee appointed "to view and consider whether it will not be for the benefit," &c. This is the first meeting of the ancient proprietors of Waterbury, of which we have any account. I infer, from the date, that it was held in Farmington, though the place is not mentioned. The vote passed at this meeting is recorded, and the record seems to be original. It is the oldest, by several years, of the Waterbury Records. The recorder is, apparently, the "John Standly, Jr.," who subscribed the articles of settlement, though his name does not appear—the same person who subsequently, for many years, is known as the clerk of the proprietors and the town. The vote is written in a business-like hand, somewhat brisker than that which characterized the clerk's performances at a later day. The record book is an old, dingy manuscript, of foolscap size, which I dug out of a mass of forgotten rubbish, found in a private family. The sheets are sewed through and through, in the middle, by a cord of unnecessary strength, and the whole is covered by coarse, brown paper turned over at the edge, with a broad margin and made fast with a thread. Many leaves are gone at the beginning and end, and those



which are left, are rent and broken and exceedingly brittle when handled. Fifty four pages only remain. This is the first original Proprietor's Book, now in existence. Much of its contents has been copied, by successive clerks, into more recent books. The same has been done with the other earliest records, and the originals afterwards scattered and lost. Care has been taken by transcribing to preserve the evidences of property, particularly land titles; but other matters have been regarded as of little account.

The following is the vote referred to in the preceding paragraph:—

At a meeting held by the proprietors of mattatucke may the twenty first, 1677, upon furdur Consideration of some difeculty that doth atende them seting the towne where It is now laid out they made chois of deacon Judd, John Langhton sen<sup>r</sup> John andrus sean<sup>r</sup> goodman Rote and John Judd and danell porter as a comite to vew & Consider whether It will not be more for the benefit of the propriators In General: to set the towne on this east side of the River contenting themselves with les hom lots prouided: those formerly laide out be secured to them: prouided also they thinke & conclude It so to be to aduis with the grande Comite and in conjunction with them they jine with liberty so so doe we the propriators agre to act Acordingly not withstanding what Is alreedy done.

As the result of these movements, favored by the reasonableness of the thing itself, the Court's committee changed the town center to the place where it now is, the planters "contenting themselves with les home lots." The latter seemed disposed to settle as near as possible to the lands from which they expected to draw their chief sustenance. In consequence of this anxiety, they jeopardized health to some extent. They erected their dwellings, in many instances, upon ground which was wholly unfit for building purposes. Just at the center of the village, the land was low and wet, and in some instances, marshy, and covered with standing water. Even within the writers's memory, the road was made solid by logs, laid in "corduroy" fashion, and cows that got off the traveled path sunk deep and helplessly in the yielding mire. As the consequence of its low situation, the ancient town was often enveloped in fogs, as the young city now is. A part of the sickness and mortality among the early planters, may, perhaps, be attributed to damp dwellings and an unhealthy locality. Against

the evils of these, they could provide but a slight defense, on account of their straitened circumstances.

Our fathers, looking to agriculture for support, did not select the most eligible part of the Naugatuck Valley for a settlement. Indeed they could hardly have fared worse, within the limits of their future township. Had they gone up or down the river, and planted themselves in what is now Plymouth, or Naugatuck, they would have found better land, and have been in the former case no farther removed from their friends in Farmington. It is true, they would not have had, perhaps, as liberal a supply of meadow lands, ready cleared and prepared for tillage; but these proved, in the end, an unsafe dependence. Had they crossed the river and established themselves in present Watertown, they would have found a good soil of superior agricultural capacity, for this part of the State. Middlebury, too, that part of it embraced within the limits of the ancient town, though rough, has much strong land. But there was an objection to a locality so far west, with the Naugatuck\* flowing between the settlers and the parent town, which has already been alluded to.

On the tenth day of September, 1677, the committee, being the grantees named in the deed from the Indians conveying the lands of Mattatuck, made over all their title and interest in the same to the proprietors of Mattatuck. By this act, however, they did not part with any of their authority in the management of the settlement. This is the assignment, signed by John Talcott, only:—

The aboue written deed of sale we the said John talcot Nicholas olmsted and Samuel Steel do this tenth of September in the year 1677 assign and mack ouer all our Right and tittle therein and thereunto vnto Thomas Judd John Stanly Samuell hickoks and Abraham brunson inhabitants of mattatuck to themselus heirs and assigns for euer and to the rest of the inhabitants belonging to the said mattatuck for them selves and their heirs and assigns for ever as witness our hands the said inhabitants having paid the purches to our order the purchasers

Lieut Webster being dead before our Assign

Signed and delivered by us      John Talcott

---

\* Naugatuck—in the Indian language, *Naukotunk*, *one large tree*—is said to have been the original name of Humphreysville, (Seymour;) so called from a large tree which formerly stood near Rock Rimmon at Seymour. (Barber's Con. Hist. Col.)

Soon after this assignment, or in October next following, the committee in the exercise of their appropriate functions, "ordered" that the inhabitants of the new plantation "should settle near together for benefit of Christian duties and defense against enemies." They also modified at a little later date, some of the conditions of settlement, in consequence of the unexpected delay which had taken place in the movement of the emigrants. I quote, the date being Jan. 15th, 1677, (1678, new style):\*

We doe also allow the proprietors of mattatuck one yere for settling them selues on [in] the aforesaid mattatuck more than was first granted: not withstanding any thing to the contrary and all publick charges to be borne one yer longer or more than is concluded in the third article datted may 30<sup>th</sup> 1677


From various circumstances, it would seem that the first settlers came to this place some time in the summer of 1677, but at what precise date, I have been unable to ascertain. At any rate they were here on the tenth of September, as appears by the assignment of the Indian deed to certain persons, "inhabitants of Mattatuck." They came without their families, and erected some rude huts, for temporary shelter, on the banks of the river, near Sled Hall, so called. Having put in their winter crops, and made some preparations for the ensuing spring, most of them probably returned to Farmington, as the cold weather came on. In the spring following, some of the proprietors removed their families to their new-found homes, and went to work. And serious work they had to do. But they were inured to it. Their hands were hardened by toil, and their hearts made

---

\* The old year began March 25th. Between 1685 and 1690, the subject was first agitated of making a change, and commencing the year Jan. 1st. During this interval, some used old style and others new style. After 1690, the custom obtained, when giving a date from Jan. 1st to March 25th, of adding the new year to the old, in the form of a double date. Thus Feb. 5, 1710, old style, (which would be Feb. 5, 1711, new style,) was written Feb. 5, 17<sup>10</sup>/<sub>11</sub>. The custom, however, was not entirely uniform. Some began the year on the 1st of March, and on (and after) that day employed the new style. Our clerks were very careless, following no certain rule. Mr. Southmayd sometimes uses the double date, sometimes old style and sometimes new style. More usually, he employs new style for dates occurring any time in March. On the 14th day of March, 1752, it was enacted by Parliament that the year should commence on the 1st day of January. By the same act, eleven days were struck out of the month, and the third was called the fourteenth, to correct an error arising from the "procession of the equinoxes." In this work, when referring to specific dates, I shall observe the custom of the eras concerning which I write, making at the time such explanation as may be necessary.


1917


THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
LIBRARY  
540 EAST 57TH STREET  
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637




# Village of MATTATUCK.

*Those whose names are in parentheses were  
not original proprietors.  
The roads which are marked by dotted lines  
were not original.*







brave by successful encounter with difficulty and danger. They were neither drones nor cowards. They were tough men, and had come into a tough country—a country which, for easy tillage, was in striking contrast with the plains of Farmington. Though prepared for unceasing toil and much sacrifice, they probably did not expect the prolonged hardship, the great discouragements, and fearful calamities which kept the population of the colony stationary for more than thirty years.

In the course of the summer of 1678, a few houses were erected on the newly selected site for the village. They were constructed of logs, after the fashion of the new settlements of the present day, with the naked ground, or in some cases, if the soil was wet, or the occupants were persons of taste and substance, with split logs, for a floor. They were “good and substantial dwellings,” doubtless, (“mansion houses,” they were sometimes called,) “at least eighteen feet in length and sixteen feet wide, and nine foot between joyns with a good chimney” of stone and clay mortar, according to the requirements of the subscribed articles; but they were not what, at this day, would be called *fashionable*. They might have been picturesque, provided the spectator stood far enough off. We shall be obliged to guess how they were furnished; but I risk nothing in saying that they contained no tapestry carpeting or lace curtains. They in fact were designed for shelter, not ornament. According to tradition, there were, at a later period, forty of these rude log-houses, standing at one time, in the town center.

The village streets were laid out, in the commencement, very nearly, in most cases, where they still are—three running east and west, something more than half a mile long, and three shorter ones running north and south, the four outside streets forming an irregular oblong square, the east being more than twice as broad as the west end. The west street on the map of Waterbury, published in 1852, is called Willow street; the east, Mill street and Cherry street; the north, Grove street, and the south, Grand street and Union street; while the central streets are named, one West and East Main, and the other Bank, North Main and Cook streets. No new roads of much



importance have been laid out until about the commencement of the present century. That part of Cook street, however, which lies between Main and Grove streets, previously to 1703, ran farther west than at present. It must have wound round between the hills west of Lyman W. Coe's house, coming into Grove street, probably a few rods west of the present junction, where the Brunt Hill road (Cook above Grove) commences. It passed west far enough to leave a house lot of four acres, owned by Benjamin Warner, between the road and the brow of the hill just east of the Little Brook, near the house owned by Andrew Bryan. In the conveyances of this four acre lot after it went out of the possession of Warner, it is described as in two pieces, the larger one butting east, and the smaller west, on the highway. The town action, relating to this new road up the Brook is seen in the following extract from the town record :

January: 25<sup>th</sup>: 1702-3 y<sup>e</sup> town with benimin worner exchanged y<sup>t</sup> highway on y<sup>e</sup> west s<sup>d</sup> worners hous lot next beniamin barns to let s<sup>d</sup> worner haue y<sup>t</sup> hiway for a three rods highway throu his lot on y<sup>e</sup> hill sid on y<sup>e</sup> east s<sup>d</sup> his lot next y<sup>e</sup> litle brook and s<sup>d</sup> worner is to extend southword in y<sup>e</sup> frunt of his lot to y<sup>e</sup> sixt porst of beniamin barnses fenc y<sup>t</sup> is now set and to extend northward in y<sup>e</sup> deuident loyn next barns as fur as s<sup>d</sup> barnses lot gos and to run to his own north east conr not to pergedis [&c.]

Probably when the town was planned and the highways staked out, there was no road contemplated in the place of that which runs diagonally from Mr. Coe's, past Charles D. Kingsbury's to the east end of Grove street; but subsequently, and before long, its convenience became apparent. It is mentioned in connection with the grant of George Scott's (afterwards Benjamin Warner's) house lot, in December, 1687, and referred to "as the highway that runs over the Little Brook." After this road was made, the thought of a new and better road north, up the brook, doubtless suggested itself.

The road which now runs from Bank, across South Main, and up Union, to the top of the hill, being a continuation of Grand, seems not to have existed in the early history of the town. This appears from the descriptions of the home lots on the easterly side of Bank street, which were bounded west,

but not north or south, on highway. South Main street, so called, was laid out and made as a country road, not till after 1800; but there was, from an early date, a passage, called the Pine Hill road, from the south end of Bank street, near where Meadow street commences, running southeasterly in the general direction of Meadow street,\* within the common fence, to the Mad River crossing, near the present bridge, and so on to Judd's Meadow, (Naugatuck.) A branch from this passage, communicating with what is now Union street, and the corn mill, (Scovill Manufacturing Co's Rolling Mill,) extended northeasterly, bounding in the rear, or on the southeast, some of the Bank street home lots above mentioned.

I have been unable to find (as already suggested) any reference at an early date, to what is now Union street, from Bank to Elm. I have not identified it as bounding any of the home lots, or any grants of land. And yet, it was probably included in the original plan of the village. A road, or path, such as I have referred to in the preceding paragraph, connecting the corn mill with the Pine Hill road running down the river, was required for the convenience of the people. I obtain no certain knowledge of it, however, till March 13th, 1730, when a highway was laid out, (which has been closed within the last thirty years,) beginning near the top of the hill, a little west of Elm street, "a little below Hopkins' Plain bars, from that highway that runs by the common fence, to that that goes to Judd's Meadow," at a stake on the brow of the hill, in the corner of Thomas Porter's lot, running across said lot southwardly fourteen rods, then seven rods, "at the bottom of the hill within Deacon Clark's fence, where it empties into said highway that goes to Judd's Meadow, two rods wide." It came out near Charles Bronson's house. It was to be a "pent road," that is, to be closed at its upper end with a gate or bars. Its object appears to have been to shorten the distance to the mill, for the southern and southwestern inhabitants.

Probably the survey above referred to is, for the most part,

---

\* The passage referred to, at the time the turnpike was made, (1801,) came into the latter near the house of John M. Stocking, (on the map.)

only a resurvey of an old road—the same which has been alluded to as extending in the rear of the Bank street home lots, bounding them on the east. Union street, within the present century, came into South Main from the east, farther north than now, at a point nearly opposite the continuation of Grand street.

Mill street, below the old mill, which thirty years ago ran close to the river, down to the place occupied by the Hotchkiss & Merriman Manufacturing Co's Factory, did not exist at an early period. The lot between the mill-dam and the river crossing, bounded easterly on the river, in 1713. Abraham Andrus' house lot next the river, below the crossing, bounded on the river in 1687 and 1704.

The following extract relates to that part of Mill street which runs from the old corn mill to East Main street, by George W. Welton's house:—

Water bury March y<sup>e</sup> 9<sup>th</sup> 1720 we whose name are under writen ware formerly apointed accomety with leftenante Judd by the town of Waterbury to lay out highways to the mill in persuante thare too we laid out a high way from the Rode that goes to farmingtown opposite against the south easte corner of the hous lot that is now thomas hikcox so to the mill foure rods wide at that ende next be fore mentioned rode and something wider towards the mill buting east upon doctor porters land and west upon the land that stephen hopkins hous now stands on

BENJAMIN BARNES

mark

Comety

STEPHEN 2 UBSON Sen.

his

From another and earlier record, it would seem that the above was a re-survey of an old highway, or else that the committee previously appointed to lay it out neglected to do it. A copy of the record is given below. The old road referred to, which was to be changed, bore off more to the east than the present one.

December 8 1712 de [deacon] thomas Judd abraham andrus s<sup>r</sup> Stuen upson was chosen a commity to run a hi way north from the mill between John hopkins and doc danll porter in order to chang it for land on west sid the mill plan of s<sup>d</sup> hopkins and mak return to the town

“The mill path,” so called in the early records, now Cole street, which runs obliquely from East Main by Mrs. Zenas Cook's house (on the map) to the mill, was not apparently an

original street, though it existed from an early period. I find it first alluded to in 1694, in connection with John Richards' house and house lot.

I believe there is no early mention made of that part of Cherry street which runs north and south, except incidentally. In December, 1724, the town granted John Bronson liberty to run the lines by his house in a certain manner; but he was "to leave a high way six rods wide against his house." His house (then the only one upon the street) stood just north of Solomon B. Miner's, (on the map.) Cherry street, at that point, was once much wider than now.

The upper end of Cherry street, that portion of it which runs westerly across the Great Brook and terminates at North Main, was laid out by Daniel Southmayd, Dec. 1st, 1746, though doubtless it existed as a passage long before. It is described as "a highway at the upper end of Lt. John Bronson's saw mill lot, beginning at the highway that goes by said Bronson's new barn, the first corner being at James Nichols' southeast corner, which is the first corner of the highway, running west twenty one rods to said Nichols' southwest corner, which is the northwest corner of said highway, bounded north on said Nichols' land, three rods wide, the bounds being on the north side."

Grove street was surveyed or re-surveyed, in two parts, Dec. 21, 1752. The east part began at Deacon Thomas Bronson's clay pit pasture, (corner of North Main and Grove streets,) and ran west thirty-two rods to the southwest corner of Isaac Nichols' Little Brook pasture, terminating at the road that "goes north from Obadiah Worner's barn to Robert Johnsons house," (Cook street continued.) It was four rods wide. The west part began at the highway last mentioned "at the South East corner of William Adams lot," and ran west one hundred and sixteen rods "to the highway that goes by Serg. Thomas Barnes house," (Willow street.) It was three rods wide.

This highway doubtless existed from the beginning of the settlement. The original home-lots on West Main street were bounded on it on the north.

Church street was laid out May 5th, 1806. It ran south forty rods and was two rods wide.

The following action of the grand committee related to East Main street.—(Joseph Gaylord lived on the north side of the street, on the corner of North Main.)

Farmington November 27 1679: A meeting of the comitte for mattatuck It is determined that high way layed out by Lt. Samuell Steele att the east end of the town plat att mattatuck running eastward out of said town plat being thre rod wid shall always be and remain for publick and common vse which is between Joseph Gaylords lott and a hous lott reserved for such inhabitants as shall herafter be entertained

I have given above all which I have been able to gather, concerning the old highways comprehended in the original plan of the town center. There is nothing on record regarding the most ancient roads as they were first laid out. Whatever we know is obtained from the re-surveys, incidental remarks and the very imperfect memoranda, and often erroneous descriptions of the home lots, and the early land grants, which "butted" on highways.

In Feb. 1702-3, it was ordered by the town "that the highways layd out be recorded:" but this order appears to have been wholly neglected till 1716.

The home-lots of the first settlers of Mattatuck were upon the central streets, most of them on that running east and west, a few on the one running north and south. The lots on the outside streets, and those that were situated most distant from the center, were taken up at later dates, as there was occasion for them. They were staked out by the committee, and those first disposed of, distributed by lot, in the way the old town plot lots were designed to be, without reference to amount of proprietorship. They varied in size according to the desirableness of the locality, and "the make of the ground," natural disadvantages being compensated by additional acres. A majority of them contained two acres, but some had four, one five, and others only one and a half acres. Some eligible lots were reserved, and many outside ones, not so desirable, were left for future settlers. These were disposed of by grant—by the committee, at first, and subsequently by the proprietors.

Around the "Green," (Centre Square,) on all sides and so

west as far as the house of the late Bennet Bronson, the houses were numerous, the land having been all taken up and built upon, except a tract near the present Episcopal Church. The lots on the south side of the road, except one at the east end, and those on the north side, except four at the east end, extended through to the back streets. Previously to about 1700, there were no dwellings east of Dr. Jesse Porter's, north of C. D. Kingsbury's, south of a house on Bank street, marked on the map, "Timothy Ball," and west of the late B. Bronson's. On the plan of the old town center, I have entered the names of the first settlers. When the block is omitted, it is to be understood that no house is expressly mentioned, (in some cases from inadvertence, probably,) as existing on the lot.

There are no land records of Waterbury, attempting description, that bear date earlier than 1687, immediately after the incorporation of the town. The lands granted by the Assembly's committee were not recorded at the time; and those which were afterwards distributed by the proprietors, in public meetings, are not defined, except in the most general terms. For instance, in 1684, the proprietors granted to Daniel Porter "four acers in y<sup>e</sup> wigwam swamp as near y<sup>e</sup> loer end as may be so as to haue the breath [breadth] of y<sup>e</sup> swamp." But in the year named, (1687,) something more was attempted. A record was made of each man's lots, and particularly of his house lot. This was made both in Hartford (on the colony records) and in Waterbury. The description is of the briefest sort, and in the most general terms. Boundaries are given, and the estimated number of acres; and whether the title was obtained by purchase, or special grant. If a deed had been taken, the date of the signing and acknowledgment is given, with the name of the commissioner, or justice. These recorded and very brief accounts, are afterwards referred to as evidence of title. On these chiefly, I have been obliged to rely in my attempts to locate the early planters of Waterbury. They are often so indefinite, so lacking in detail, so erroneous indeed, that it is a matter of the utmost difficulty to make anything out of them. Distances are very rarely given, and points of compass, never, except in the most general way.

East is sometimes inadvertently used for west, and north for south, and *vice versa*. The settlers often bought and sold, and exchanged houses and lots, and this circumstance has increased the difficulty of ascertaining the earliest dwelling places of individuals.

---

### CHAPTER III.

#### DELINQUENT SUBSCRIBERS.

OF the thirty original subscribers to the articles of settlement, thirteen never became permanent proprietors of Waterbury. Their names follow :

JOHN WARNER, Sen.,  
DANIEL WARNER,

JOHN ANDRUSS,  
ABRAHAM BRONSON,  
THOMAS GRIDLEY,  
JOHN PORTER,  
RICHARD SEYMOUR.

WILLIAM HIGASON,  
SAMUEL GRIDLEY,  
JOHN LANKTON,  
JOHN JUDD,  
SAMUEL JUDD,  
WILLIAM JUDD.

John Warner, Sen., and Daniel Warner, father and son, whose names are in the first group, both intended to join the planters of Mattatuck, but died when about to remove, in 1679, in Farmington. The place of the father seems to have been filled by his son, Thomas Warner ; while the death of the son gave rise to the following action of the committee, which conferred his rights upon his widow.

Farmington, November 26, 1679,

Where as Daniel Worner with his Family were upon the Remove to Mattatuck, And on that Juncture of time the Divine providence of God hath Removed the s<sup>d</sup> Daniell out of the Land of the Land of\* the Living. Out of compassion to his Relict & children left behind him, we do Grant the s<sup>d</sup> Relict shall hold her Allotments Firm and Good to her self and children not with standing any thing Contained In any Former Article to the Contrary, only advising her Self and Relatives that a Dwelling house be Erected there with all possible Speed, and that Shee Inhabit there or some sufficient person to manage he[r] Lands & accommodations upon the place.

{ By us  
 John Talcott  
 John Wadsworth  
 Nicholas Olmstead  
 Samuel Steel

A true Record of the Original

Attest John Southmayd, Clerk.

It appeared early that there were several of the original signers of the articles who had changed their minds, and had no longer any intention of becoming permanent settlers of Mattatuck. They made a declaration to this effect, and the committee permitted other applicants to take their places. There were five of these persons who abandoned the enterprise at the outset, or in the first season, 1677, before any houses were erected. No more than one of these is heard of as having been with the first planters of this town. Their names are in the second group.

John Andruss. Benjamin Jones was accepted as a proprietor, in his stead. The name will again be mentioned in connection with his son, Abraham, an early settler. He was one of the committee of the proprietors, appointed May twenty-first, 1677, to take into consideration the expediency of removing the town site.

Abraham Bronson was a younger brother of John and Isaac Bronson, original signers and settlers. He was one of the assignees named in the assignment of the first Indian deed to certain persons, "inhabitants of Mattatuck." This was Sept. 10, 1777; so that he would seem to have been one of the first

---

\* So in the Record.



company of planters. But he sickened of the enterprise, and his place was filled Jan. 15, 1677-8, by John Scovill.

Thomas Gridley, of Farmington, was a son of Thomas Gridley of Hartford and Farmington, and brother of Samuel, another signer. His name is among those of the "eighty-four Proprietors of Farmington," in 1673. He was born 1650, and died in 1742. The vacancy made by his failure was supplied by Joseph Gaylord, Jan. 15th, 1677-8.

John Porter, of Farmington, was probably a son of Robert, a subsequent settler and proprietor. David Carpenter was accepted for him, Jan. 15th, 1677-8. The family will again be mentioned.

Richard Seymour, of Farmington, was a son of Richard Seymour, of Hartford, Farmington and Norwalk. He was the leader of the settlement which was made at the Great Swamp, (afterwards Kensington,) to which place he removed in 1685. He was killed by the falling of a tree in 1710. His wife died in 1712. His sister Mercy married John Steel, the father of Ensign Samuel Steel, one of the State's Committee; and his sister Mary married, in 1644, Thomas Gridley, another signer. Benjamin Barnes was accepted in his place, Jan. 15th, 1677, (1678, new style.)

The six persons in the third group all had meadow allotments and divisions of the common fence assigned them, at different times, from 1678 to 1681;\* and from this circumstance it is rendered probable that they were, for a time at least, residents at Mattatuck, with a prospect of securing their proprietary rights and becoming permanent settlers.

William Higason. His name is on the list of proprietors of Farmington, 1672. He was born in 1648, and had several children—Sarah, Margaret, Elizabeth, Mary. The last, married Clark Carrington, a son of John, an original proprietor of Waterbury. Edmund Scott, Jr., was accepted for him and took his allotments, about 1680.

Samuel Gridley, a "smith" and "trader," was a son of

---

\* The four first divisions of fence, of which a record has been preserved, were made between these dates.

Thomas, and elder brother of Thomas above mentioned. He was born in 1647, and died 1712, having had eleven children. Thomas Newell, Sen. was made a proprietor in his place, probably before 1680.

John Lankton, or Langdon, was a deacon of the church in Farmington. He was one of the committee raised in May, 1677, to inquire into the propriety of removing the town site. He was a son-in-law of Thomas Gridley, had several children, and died in 1689. His rights as proprietor of Mattatuck were declared forfeited, "Feb. 5<sup>th</sup>, 1680," and were afterwards conferred on John Hopkins, the miller.

John Judd and Samuel Judd, were sons of Dea. Thomas Judd, of Farmington, to be hereafter mentioned. They neglected to comply with the articles of settlement, and, after a long indulgence on the part of the committee, their allotments were "condemned," Feb. 6<sup>th</sup>, 1682. (1682-3.) The committee accepted of Abraham Andruss, 2d, or Jr., in the place of John Judd; and at a later period, 1687, Samuel's right was bestowed on his brother Philip.

William Judd was an elder brother of John and Samuel, above mentioned—a man of substance, of much influence and greatly esteemed. He was the most distinguished of the Judds, and promised to be the leading man among the planters of Mattatuck. He is usually called Sergeant William Judd, he having been confirmed sergeant of the Farmington train band by the County Court of Hartford, Dec. 4<sup>th</sup>, 1679. He was one of a committee to apportion the fence among the proprietors, appointed Jan. 15<sup>th</sup>, 1677-8, and was selected for a similar service, March 11<sup>th</sup>, 1678-9. At the same date, he was chosen, in company with Lieut. Steele and John Stanley, to lay out "the three acre lots" to the settlers, and was allowed the privilege of having his own lot laid out adjoining his house lot. From the nature of the duties assigned him, and the way he is spoken of, I conclude that he was an inhabitant of Mattatuck at the dates mentioned, with the intention of remaining; but some how the time allowed for building, &c., ran out, and on complaint, he along with other delinquents, was declared, under date of "Feb. 5<sup>th</sup>, 1680," to have forfeited all his rights. Here is the action of the committee:

In consideration of some of those persons that haue had alotments granted Att mattatuck we haue heard the alygations layed in against them and doe determin that deacon John langton william Judd and dauid carpenter haue forfeited all their rights and titles to those alotments granted to them att mattatuck not hauing attended [to] those articles to which thay haue subscribed.

Afterwards, however, William Judd's name again appears as a subscriber to the articles, he obligating himself to erect a dwelling, and to settle in the place, with his family, within one year after subscription. May 18th, 1680, he was at the head of a committee, on the part of Mattatuck, to settle bounds, with Derby, and a little later, June 9th, 1680, to settle bounds with Woodbury. A second time, however, he was a defaulter, and at length, his lands and rights of land were given, by the proprietors, to his son Thomas. His name disappears from the record after 1681. His house lot appears to have been on Willow street, a little north of the dwelling of the late Bennet Bronson.

Of those who signed the articles *after* a settlement had been commenced, five got faint hearted, or for some other reason, failed to secure their propriety rights. They are named below. All had meadow allotments and divisions of fence except the first.

Thomas newell s<sup>ca</sup>  
 Joseph Andruss  
 David Carpenter  
 Benjamin Judd  
 John Root

Thomas Newell, Sen., was an original settler of Farmington, and the father of John and Thomas Newell, proprietors. He was one of the petitioners to the General Court, in 1673, for liberty to plant a colony in Mattatuck; but there is no evidence that he took any steps in the way of forwarding the enterprize after subscribing the articles. The "Thomas Newell" whose name appears about 1679 as having fence assigned him to build, appears to have been his son, who took his place and became a proprietor.

Joseph Andruss, I suppose to have been the fourth son of John Andruss of Farmington, another signer, and younger brother of Abraham Andruss, a proprietor. I know nothing

of him except that he had a meadow allotment, and a division of fence assigned him in 1680.

David Carpenter. There were two persons by this name in Farmington, father and son. The above is presumed to have been the son. He was born in 1647, and married Hannah, a daughter of Richard Bronson of Farmington. He was accepted as a proprietor, Jan. 15th, 1677-8, in the place of John Porter, but his right was not declared forfeited till Feb. 5, 1680-1. He removed to New London.

Benjamin Judd probably subscribed the articles and joined the planters of Mattatuck, within the first year of the settlement. He was a brother of William, John and Samuel, and a son of Dea. Thomas Judd, of Farmington. Jan. 15th, 1677-8, he was appointed "to call out the proprietors in their turns to mend the highways." Feb. 6th, 1680-1, he was selected by the committee to lay out land which was granted to the mill. At the same date he was allowed an addition to his propriety so as to "mack it in valen of one hundred pounds," and land was granted him as follows:

Also we doe grant Benjamin Judd shall haue added to the north end of his House Lott some land to build one always provided that the highway that runeth through the Towne in towne in that place shall be and remain four rods and a half wide to be layd out to him by the forsaid persons.

At a later period, he signed a petition addressed to the committee, "in reference to herding of cattell," which was answered April 5th, 1682-3. Before the date of this answer, however, (Feb. 6th, 1682-3,) his allotments were all "condemned" for not building according to articles, &c. But a year afterwards, Jan. 10th, 1683, he was allowed the "priviledg of reseasing" (entering again into the possession of) his allotments, on the conditions prescribed by the "act of Feb. 6th, 1682," which required a residence of "full four yers in a stedy way and manor," with his family. After this he is heard of no more in Mattatuck.

John Root was the son of the John "Roote senr.," who subscribed and was accepted "in behalf of one of his sons," Jan. 15, 1677-8. The father, called "goodman Rote," was one of the committee, in 1677, to take into consideration the expe-

diency of changing the village site. As to the son, his name is among those who had a division of fence in 1680, but he is spoken of no more. He removed to Westfield, (Mass.,) and died in 1687.

There were then eighteen persons (including the two who died) who signed the articles—thirteen in 1674, and five in 1677 and subsequently—who failed to make good their proprietary rights.

The following passage shows the way in which vacancies happening among the proprietors were filled by the committee :

Att a meeting of the Comity for mattatuck January 15, 1677 Itt was agreed and concluded: that we doe accept of John Roote senor subscribing to the articles for Settling of mattatuck in the behalf of one of his sons and we accept of John Scouall on the Acc<sup>t</sup> of Abraham Bronson and benjamin barnes on account of Richard Seymour and of John Stanly Junior Joseph Gaylor on the account of Thomas Gridley [they] subscribing to submit to the articles aforsaid dated may 30<sup>th</sup> 1674 and in soo doing are excepted as inhabitants of the place dauid Carpenter subscribing in behalf of John Porter is excepted upon the same terms

Below will be found what purports to have been copied from "the back side of the leaf where the original articles were filed." The new proprietors, of course, were required to take upon themselves the obligations of the old. The names of some of them are here met with.

We whose names are here under written do ingage to stand by and fullfill the Articals within written according to the tru intent and meaning in all Respects as witness our hands

Thomas newil Senor on the account of Sam Gridly

Benjamin Barnes

Thomas newill Ser

John Scoval

his T mark

John Stanly Junor for Joseph gaylor

Benjamin Joans on the account of John Andrus

Edmund Scott Junor his  
mark for william higason

Benjamin Joans

Abraham Andruss  
in rome of John Judd }

William Judd has his allotment  
granted to him by the comitee  
according to their act febr 5 1680

William Judd

Steven upson subscribes on the account of a new lott this 29 of December 1679.

The mark of Steven } upson

## CHAPTER IV.

## SUBSCRIBERS WHO FINALLY SECURED THEIR RIGHTS.

THE number of persons who signed the articles subsequently to 1674, and who ultimately became proprietors, is nineteen, making with the seventeen on the list of 1674 who made good their rights, thirty-six. I give below a complete catalogue of their names, throwing them into several groups, placing the groups in the order in which the individuals are known (or are supposed) to have subscribed the articles and complied with the conditions they imposed. Those of the two first groups signed in 1674; those of the third in 1677-8; those of the fourth about 1679; those of the fifth between 1682 and 1705. The persons who have a star prefixed to their names had not made good their claims as proprietors, in Feb. 1682-3.

Thomas Judd,	£100	*Thomas Warner,	£100
Edmund Scott,	100	Widow Warner,	60
John Welton,	80	*Thomas Newell,	90
Abraham Andruss,	80	Edmund Scott, Jr.,	70
Isaac Bronson,	90	Stephen Upson,	50
John Stanley,	100	Benjamin Jones,	100
Samuel Hikcox,	85	*Abraham Andruss, 2d,	100
Joseph Hikcox,	60		
John Bronson,	80	John Hopkins,	100
John Warner,	90	Thomas Judd, Jr.,	100
John Newell,	100	[Robert Porter,	100]
		Samuel Scott,	50
*Thomas Hancox,	100	Richard Porter,	50
*Thomas Richason,	50	Thomas Judd (smith),	100
*John Carrington,	60	Philip Judd,	80
*Obadiah Richards,	80	John Richards,	80
*Timothy Stanley,	95	Jeremiah Peck,	150
*Daniel Porter,	90	John Southmayd,	150
			<hr/>
Benjamin Barnes,	100		£3,130
*Joseph Gaylord,	80		
*John Scovill,	80		

The name of Timothy Stanley, in the above catalogue, occupies the place of "Sergt. John Stanley for son," in the original subscription list, he appearing to take possession of the allotment thus subscribed for by his father. In the same way, Daniel Porter (the son) and John Newell (the son) stand in the places of "Daniel Porter for son," and of "Thomas Newell for son." Thomas Judd, John Stanley, John Bronson, and John Warner, all signers of 1674, have, in each case, *Jr.* attached to their names in the original list, they having fathers bearing the same name. After they became inhabitants of Mattatuck the *Jr.* was omitted, and at length, when their sons had grown up, they were called *Sen.*, in each instance, except that of Stanley. Robert Porter's name is omitted (for what reason I know not) from all the lists of proprietors made out after 1688. But as he is on that list, owned a house and lived, and finally died, in Waterbury, in 1689, he would seem to have complied with the conditions of a proprietor. Besides, after his death, his son Thomas sold his lands, and in 1700, his £100 propriety, to John Richards, proving his rights had not been forfeited. We might suppose that Richards name, which appears not till after the death of Porter, was intended to occupy the place of the latter, were it not for the fact that the proprieties of the two are different, that of Richards being but £80.

The following passage relates to the acceptance of Thomas Judd, Jr., as a proprietor :

Hartford Jan 10<sup>th</sup> 1683 [1683-4] Thomas Judd Jun<sup>r</sup> is accepted as an inhabitant att Mattatuck his father thomas Judd having signified his desires of the same he the sayd Thomas Judd Junor subscribing to the act and order of the comity feb the 6 1682 \* \* \* \* \* itt being determined by us the committee in case any grant or any grants be made by the inhabitants of mattatuck to thomas Judd Junor in refarence too posesion of Any parsols or tracts of land it is hereby made void: and of none effect not with standing anything to the contrary

Samuel Scott was made a proprietor soon after, receiving probably a part of a grant to Thomas Judd, Jr., "made void" by the preceding act of the committee.

Matatuck Decembe y<sup>e</sup> 30 1684 y<sup>e</sup> town granted to Samuel Scott half y<sup>e</sup> allotment formerly granted to thomas Judd junr with y<sup>t</sup> exception of four acres to be









Engraved by H. W. Smith.

*Samuel Hopkins*



taken out of y<sup>e</sup> a lotment [for a?] great lot—and a deuition of meadow with y<sup>e</sup> Rest of y<sup>e</sup> propriators in y<sup>e</sup> next deuition of meadow land according to a fifty poward a lot[ment] with y<sup>e</sup> hous lot an y<sup>e</sup> south sd of stephen ubson with thes prouisals y<sup>t</sup> he build a hous according to articles within four yeirs and liue here after his hous be build and pay y<sup>e</sup> purchas of a fifty pound lot

Samuel Scott's name disappears from the list of proprietors after 1688, that of Jonathan Scott occupying its place, the latter having bought, April 28th, 1691, the house and all the lands divided and undivided, of his brother, in Waterbury.

It seems there was some doubt about the proprietary rights of Stephen Upson, Richard Porter and Jonathan Scott. This doubt was finally the origin of a declaratory act in 1702-3, which seems to have settled the question :

At a meeting of y<sup>e</sup> propriators in waterbury february 22<sup>th</sup> 1702 y<sup>e</sup> propriators declare y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> propriators for y<sup>e</sup> first purchasing of y<sup>e</sup> place and such as stand possessed of alotments according to y<sup>e</sup> gran comitys act with stephen ubson Richard porter and jonathan scott whos alotments ware excepted of y<sup>e</sup> commity as a fifty powards a lot ment apeic shall be acknowledged propriatory inhabitants and to act in giuing a way lands in s<sup>d</sup> propriatory ship and for y<sup>e</sup> futur no more to act in y<sup>e</sup> propriators meeting then one for a singell alotment

Several of the signers had the amount of propriety for which they at first subscribed (given above) increased, on application, by the committee. Here are extracts from the record relating to Isaac Bronson's and Samuel Hickox's rights. (Benjamin Judd, it will be remembered, forfeited his claim.)

Upon further considaration we haue hereby granted benjamin Judd and Isaac brownson shall haue so much uplands aded to their allotments as shall mack their medow alotments in valew of one hundred pounds and that addition to be aded to their respectiue eight acre lotts already granted feb. 6 1680

Att a town meeting in mattatock decem 29<sup>th</sup> 1682: there was granted to sam<sup>ll</sup> hickox an adition to his alotment so much land as shall make up his lot to be a hundred pound alotment and this addition to be aded to his eyght acer deuition y<sup>e</sup> com<sup>te</sup> [committee] granting y<sup>e</sup> same

The rights of Daniel Porter and Timothy Stanley seem also to have been augmented, each, £5; but I am unable to say when. Doubtless it was done by grant of the committee. The whole increase, in this way, was £35.

It will be recollected that, in the articles of settlement, the committee reserved to themselves the right "to lay out two or three allotments at their best discretion." This they exercised by setting apart, in the beginning, three proprieties of £150 each, for the common benefit—"for public and pious uses,"—particularly for the maintenance of religion, and the promotion of education. These were called "great lots," ("greate lotes," on the record.) Two of them were given to Mr. Peck and Mr. Southmayd as they were settled successively in the ministry.

A declaratory act was passed in 1715, relative to Jeremiah Peck's right, as follows:

The Proprietors did conclude that Mr. Jeremiah Peck our former Minister in his life time was Invested with one hundred & fifty Pound propriety.

The sum of all the subscriptions of the thirty-six persons in the above list, was £3,130. There were additions made after subscription to the rights of certain individuals, as already stated, in all of £35, which sum added to the other, makes a total of £3,165. Of this amount there was subscribed in 1674, by thirty persons, and afterwards represented by them, or by those who were accepted in equal numbers, in their places, the sum of - - - - - £2,580

There was added to this "a new lot" for Stephen

Upson, Dec. 29, 1679, the sum of	- - - -	50
For Isaac Bronson's addition,	- - - -	10
For Samuel Hickox's addition,	- - - -	15
For Daniel Porter's addition,	- - - -	5
For Timothy Stanley's addition,	- - - -	5
For Samuel Scott's "half an allotment,"	- - - -	50
For Richard Porter the other half, probably, of the same,		50
For Thomas Judd, Jr., probably a new allotment,	-	100
For Mr. Peck and Mr. Southmayd, £150 each,	-	300

---

£3,165

As a general rule, a propriety once subscribed for, and secured by a compliance with the articles, went in the name of the original signer. If a person sold out a part, or the whole

of his right, or if he died and his interest was distributed among his heirs, the propriety was kept together on the record and stood in the name of the first owner. If a man had a claim, derived from others, he must show that he obtained his title by regular conveyance from the original owner. Rights in the undivided lands were transferred like other real estate by deeds, warrantee, or quit claim. A man, for instance, sold a £5 or £10 right or propriety, and the deed was recorded, the record being evidence of title.

There are a few instances, however, in which the name was changed on a change of ownership. When Thomas Judd, Sen., died in 1702-3, his £100 right went into the possession of his son John, and John Judd's name, ever after, is entered in the place of his father's. Benjamin Jones died in 1689, and Capt. Thomas Judd, in 1715, purchased his right. From that date, Thomas Judd appears twice in the successive lists of proprietors, once as "Thomas Judd," and again as "Thomas Judd Jones," while Benjamin Jones is heard of no more. Again, the original Thomas Judd, Jr., conveyed, in 1721, to Samuel Hall of Wallingford, his propriety. After that, the right goes in the name not of Samuel Hall Judd, (according to the rule in the preceding case,) nor of Samuel Hall, but of "Thomas Judd, Jr. Halls."

The above, three in number, are all the alterations of names which resulted from a change of ownership, (unless John Richards' name was substituted for Robert Porter in consequence of such a change.) And in adopting these, it will be observed, no uniform rule was followed.

The subscribers to the articles were, in the beginning, the joint owners of all the lands of the town, each having as many shares or "rights," so to speak, as he subscribed pounds. A person in the first instance, might subscribe for any sum, not exceeding a £100 allotment, according to article II, thus securing, within certain limits, such proportional interest as he pleased. This limitation was designed to prevent speculation, and to restrain individuals from obtaining too much land. The committee wished to secure actual settlers, and as far as consistent, equality of condition and possessions. The

sum of all the subscriptions, as they at first stood, was £2,580, or twenty-five hundred and eighty shares. Each person, then, who had a £100 propriety, had a title to one-twenty-sixth part (within a fraction) of all the undivided lands in the township. The admission of new proprietors, or additions to the rights or shares of the old signers, of course diminished the proportion of each one whose propriety had remained unaltered. By augmenting the number of proprietors one-fifth, or rather by increasing the number of shares nearly one-third, a pound right came to have a greatly reduced land value. The cost of the original purchases of the Indians was borne by shareholders, according to each man's interest. Expenses incurred for the common benefit, were defrayed by the same rule. Roads and fences to inclose the common field, were built by a tax on shares. Article III required that all public charges, in the first years of the settlement, should "be paid proportionably to meadow allotments," and "meadow allotments" were proportioned to propriety.

Each settler was to have, in the commencement, according to the articles, eight acres for a home lot. These eight acre lots, as has already been stated, were at first "located" on the old town plot; but as the town center was changed, there was at that time no occasion to do more, and they were not regularly laid out and surveyed, till 1730. As there were not lots enough for all, a few of the original subscribers, and all the most recent ones, had to take their lots somewhere else.\*

---

\* "Nov. 29, 1726. It was by vote agreed that if the Committee for the Old Town platt Lotts Cant find all the Old Town platt Lotts for all the Original Proprietors, those that are Wanting may have Liberty to take them up in the Undivided Lands." Pro. Book, p. 80.

The record of the laying out and distribution of these lots is particularly interesting, because it furnishes the first authentic list, as far as it goes, of the original proprietors of Waterbury. There are thirty names, it will be noticed, corresponding with the number who first signed the articles. If a signer had forfeited his right, his name is omitted, and that of a substitute, who had complied with the conditions, is inserted. There is one exception, however. David Carpenter's name is here, though he did not "fulfill." I don't know why it is found, and am unable to say who took his place. Fea, Judd's name is entered twice, once, I suppose, for Benjamin Jones, whose propriety he bought in 1715. Lieut. Timothy Stanley's name is also inserted twice, once doubtless for that of somebody whose right he had purchased. Of the two "great lots," one was for schools and the other for the minister. The latter went to Mr. Peck. These last lots swell the whole number to thirty-two.

"A list of the House Lotts on the Old Town Platt Set out by a Committee Lieut. Timothy Stan-

The new house lots were distributed in the same way, each proprietor being entitled to one, the choice being determined by lot. "A three acre lot for pasture," seems also to have been granted by the committee, in the beginning, to each settler. This appears not from direct evidence, but from allusions like the following, under date of March 11th, 1678-9.

And it is ordered that Lieut samuel Steele Willum Judd and John Stanly Jun<sup>r</sup> Lay out to the proprietors their thre acre lotts that are granted to them according to former agreement.

It appears that in addition to the above, each proprietor had eight acres (called his "eight acre lot") granted him by a vote of the committee, Feb. 6th, 1682-3:—

ly, Doctr Daniel Porter Senr & Deacon Thos Hickcox. We began on the West Teer, at the south End and found as follows:—

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. John Brounsons Lott</li> <li>2. Edmund Scotts, Lott</li> <li>3. Isaac Brounsons Lott</li> <li>4. Samuel Hickcox senr. Lott</li> <li>5. Doctr Porters —</li> <li>6. A Great Lott</li> <li>7. A Great Lott</li> <li>8. John Warner —</li> </ol> <p style="margin-left: 2em;">Then an Eight Road highway South of Warners Lott that Runs East and West as the Lotts lye,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Thomas Richardsons Lott</li> <li>10. Joseph Hickcox —</li> <li>11. Lieut. Timo Stanleys —</li> <li>12. John Newells —</li> <li>13. Benjmn Jones —</li> <li>14. Lieut. John Stanleys —</li> <li>15. Deacon Judds —</li> <li>16. John Hopkins —</li> </ol>	<p>Then we begun at the South End of the East Teer &amp; found</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td style="padding-right: 2em;">1. Deacon Judds</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Lott</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. David Carpenters</td> <td style="text-align: right;">—</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Abraham Andrus</td> <td style="text-align: right;">—</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Lieut. Judds</td> <td style="text-align: right;">—</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. Edmund Scotts Senr</td> <td style="text-align: right;">—</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6. Lieut. Timo Stanleys</td> <td style="text-align: right;">—</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7. Abraham Andrus, Cooper</td> <td style="text-align: right;">—</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8. Benjmn Barnes</td> <td style="text-align: right;">—</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9. Thomas Newell's</td> <td style="text-align: right;">—</td> </tr> </table> <p>Then Eight Rods highway to Run East &amp; West or as the Lotts lie</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. Obadiab Richards Lott</li> <li>11. Thomas Warners —</li> <li>12. John Scovills —</li> <li>13. John Carringtons —</li> <li>14. John Weltons —</li> <li>15. Daniel Warners —</li> <li>16. Thomas Juds —</li> </ol>	1. Deacon Judds	Lott	2. David Carpenters	—	3. Abraham Andrus	—	4. Lieut. Judds	—	5. Edmund Scotts Senr	—	6. Lieut. Timo Stanleys	—	7. Abraham Andrus, Cooper	—	8. Benjmn Barnes	—	9. Thomas Newell's	—
1. Deacon Judds	Lott																		
2. David Carpenters	—																		
3. Abraham Andrus	—																		
4. Lieut. Judds	—																		
5. Edmund Scotts Senr	—																		
6. Lieut. Timo Stanleys	—																		
7. Abraham Andrus, Cooper	—																		
8. Benjmn Barnes	—																		
9. Thomas Newell's	—																		

The several Lotts in the East Teer Butt west on highway.

The several Lotts in the West Teer Butt East on highway.

found by the Committee

DANIEL PORTER  
 THOMAS HICKCOX  
 TIMOTHY STANLEY."

The old, familiar names which we do not find in this catalogue, are those of Thomas Hancox, who signed in 1674, (but who afterwards forfeited his rights and was obliged to take his chance as a new subscriber,) and of Joseph Gaylord, who signed in 1677-8, and of several others who became proprietors at a later period—Stephen Upson, Richard Porter, Phillip Judd, Jonathan Scott, John Richards, John Southmayd and John Judd, the last, however, being represented in the list by Lieut. Judd. All these, I suppose, omitting the last, had to go to the undivided lands for their eight acre lots.



Itt is Granted that each propriator as addisonal to ther former grants shall each inhabitant haue eight acrs pr man layed out to them in such places within their towne bounds as the inhabitants shall agre to be layed out by persons chosen by the inhabitants of the place.

These several parcels of land, then—the town plot eight acre lots, the new home lots, the three acre lots for pasture, and the eight acre lots of 1682–3—were distributed, at the outset, without reference to propriety. With these exceptions, and also with the exception of certain special grants hereafter to be referred to, the lands of Waterbury were, from time to time, as there was need of them for improvement, distributed among the proprietors in the way of division. The land thus obtained was called an allotment, and the same term was applied to the proprietary right, or the right of allotment. These divisions were nothing more than dividends on shares, usually so many acres, or so many parts of an acre, on each pound propriety. There was occasionally, particularly in the early years of the settlement, a modification of the rule which commonly gave some advantage to the small stockholders, or proprietors. The divisions were repeated at intervals, till there was nothing more to divide, or till the entire township passed into the hands of individuals. The first one was made at the time the settlement was commenced, under the direction of the committee, when the meadows were distributed, or the “meadow allotments” taken up. The first made by authority of the proprietors themselves, was in 1688, and the last in 1801.

The proprietors, as has already been mentioned, disposed of their lands by division, except in the cases in which reasons were supposed to exist for special grants. That the division might be equitably made, it was the practice to draw lots for a choice of lands. He who drew number one, was to have the first choice, having liberty to select from any of the lands proposed to be distributed. He who drew number two, had the second choice, and so on. A person's chance was his lot, and the thing acquired (the land) was also his lot. After the order of choice had been determined, a certain day, distant enough to allow time for examining the lands and making a

selection, was specified, on which the laying out was to commence. Running on from this fixed time, each proprietor was to have a day determined by his lot drawn, (sometimes two were to have two days,) on which he might take up his lands and have them surveyed by the town measurers. If he neglected to do this, in the time allowed, he must wait till all the others had had their turns. In some instances, in order to equalize the chances, or compensate for good or ill luck, the land to be drawn for was divided into two equal parcels, with a distinct lot for each, (two *draughts*, the record says.) The first was drawn in the way described. In the second lot, he who had the first chance in the first drawing, now had the last, and he who before had the last now had the first, the order of choice being reversed. Certain regulations and restrictions were established, at different times, designed to govern action in taking up the lands, and to secure the common weal, by preventing an abuse of privileges.

The following extracts indicate the steps that were taken preparatory to the proprietors' first land division of 1688 :

Att a town meeting in mattatuck decem 30 (1684) the town determined that there should be adiuition of all y<sup>e</sup> undeuided meadow to each propriator according to his meadow allotment former grants execepted

Dec 31 1684 y<sup>e</sup> town mad choys of serg Judd sam<sup>ll</sup> hikcox and John standly a commity to uew and prepare al y<sup>e</sup> undeuided meadow for allotment \* \* \* it was determined y<sup>t</sup> each man should haue y<sup>e</sup> charg of laying out hys lot

Geneuary: 3<sup>d</sup> 1686 y<sup>e</sup> town declare y<sup>e</sup> worck of y<sup>e</sup> commity chosn decm 30<sup>d</sup> (1694) [1684] namely srg judd sr standly & sam<sup>ll</sup> hickox was to uew and prepare all y<sup>e</sup> undeuided meadow up y<sup>e</sup> great Riuer and up Steels brook and hancox brook and all y<sup>e</sup> branches up y<sup>e</sup> Riuer.

I have been unable to ascertain how much land there was distributed in this division. At any rate, there was not enough to be found in the places indicated up the river and up Hancox's and Steel's Brook, to give a full proportion to all the proprietors, so that several had to take a part of their allotments somewhere else.

This division bears date April 17th, 1688. I transcribe the record which gives a list of the proprietors who were concerned in this land distribution. It is the earliest formal list now

extant, made out after the town was incorporated, and under circumstances which give it authority. It is interesting and important. The amount of propriety is not stated.

Timothy Standly	Robard porter
Stephen ubson	thomas Judd jun <sup>r</sup>
Samuell Scott	Richard porter
daniel porter	Mr fraysr
thomas warner	smith judd
John brunson	obadiah richards
isaac brunson	daniell warner
John welton	John standly
edman scott juner	John wornor
Tho nuell	john nuell
jn hopkins	john scouell
ben barns	john carrinton
ben joanes	thomas hancox
Thomas Richason	philip judd
Joseph gaylard	abraham andrus senior
Sam <sup>l</sup> hikcox	Ensign Judd
edman Scott senior	abraham andruss junr

Here are thirty-four names, two less than the full number, at a subsequent period. Who Mr. Frayser was, I know not. His name is not found, in any other instance, upon the record. It may, temporarily, have been substituted for that of Joseph Hickox, who had removed and recently died. Possibly Frayser was Hickox's executor or administrator. We miss in this catalogue, Joseph Hickox and John Richards. Doubtless Richards had not yet become a proprietor. I have already stated that he purchased Robert Porter's right, and that we ought to suppose that he afterwards stood in his place, were it not for a discrepancy in the amount of their proprieties.

If we deduct two from this list, and add two, and then again add Mr. Peck and Mr. Southmayd, afterwards made proprietors, we complete the catalogue, having thirty-six in number.

The next land division, so far as can be gathered from the records, was in 1691-2. The following passage is all I can find relating to it. It is taken from the old, unbound Propri-

etors' Book, page 20th, and it is in the hand of John Stanley:—

Att a meeting of the propriators in Watterbury: march the 15 169 $\frac{1}{2}$  there was granted: to ech propriator: inhabetant a deuition of outlands of ten acres to a hundred pound alotment and fue acres to a fifty pounce alotmente and so proportionable acording to mens alotments granted by the comity for the plas that is to say to thos that hould the poseson of the medow alotments by their own righte: ech man to tacke itt up by suckseson after the lots are drawn the first too men to haue two days liberty to tack his land: and bringe in his report to ensign Judd who is to lay it out two them: and so to haue on day to two men.

Besides the method by division, the lands were disposed of by grant. I have already referred to the home lots, the three acre lots and the eight acre lots, bestowed by the committee in the beginning. These grants were continued for the purpose of securing some common good, (as in the case of the grants to the mill and for the use of the ministry;) or with the design of correcting inequalities and furthering the ends of impartial justice.

One would suppose that our fathers need not have complained for want of land, considering their possessions. Some of them, however, considered themselves "straitened" as individuals, and applied to the committee for relief. Relief was vouchsafed, as, for instance:

And wharas steuen upson macks complaint that he is much straitened in his presant posesion of lands we grant ane adition acording to what the town se caus [&c] to be layd out by Tho Judd John Stanly and the present townsmen\* febey 5 1680

And wharas Daniell Porter [and] Thomas richason mack complaint that they are in want of Land to improue we grant liberty to the towne to add to what they haue acording to their good discrestion and what shall be allowed by the towne shall be layd out [to] them by Benjamin Judd and John stanly and also to lay out what belongs to the mille and miler febey 5 1680

Joh Stanley, it seems, was unfortunate in his allotments, and prayed for more land in the way of compensation. The committee consented and advised the grant.

---

\* Selectmen.

Upon the petition [petition of] sergent Jo stanly that he may be acomadated with four or five acers of medow land up the river allthoug itt be four or five miles off from the towne in considaration of the meannes of his Alotments we the comity doe aduis the inhabitants to a compliyance tharunto: The forgoinge conclusion signed feb 7th 1682

John Talcott  
John wadsworth  
Nicho Olmsted

After the committee had withdrawn from an active participation in the affairs of the plantation, the proprietors continued to make special grants of land whenever occasion called for them. At first, these grants were somewhat sparingly made, but they gradually became common, till at length the lands were given away with a profuse liberality. Often the object was to encourage some undertaking, or business, or trade, calculated to be beneficial to the people; such as the erection of a saw mill, or fulling mill, or tan yard. When there was no purpose but to distribute the land as fast as it could be improved, among those to whom it belonged, there was an endeavor to preserve a sort of equality—to regard the different and just claims of the recipiants. Land, however, was abundant and not sufficiently valuable or in demand, to make generosity a difficult virtue. A main design was to encourage the settlement of the town, and extend the borders of agriculture. A wilderness was to be subdued, and workers were wanted. If a man proposed to take up a tract of land and cultivate it, he was considered as offering a fair equivalent for it. All were benefited by his labor. If a person followed some trade, considered as of first importance in the new plantation, as that of a blacksmith or clothier, he was regarded with special favor, and a grant to him was allowed to be a good investment. If an individual, not an inhabitant, who would make a good citizen, could be induced by a few acres for pasture, or a tract of boggy meadow, to settle in the town, the proprietors thought they made a profitable bargain.

Jan. 21st, 1689–90, there were grants of land to many of the proprietors, seven acres to each, the lots to be improved as “hogfields” or hog enclosures. Into these the swine ap-

pear to have been turned, in the summer season, to root the ground, to pick up the nuts and thus obtain their living. These "fields" seem to have been east of the town, on and near Farmington road, in the neighborhood of the long wigwam, Hog Pound, or Beaver Pond Brook, and Turkey Hill. I quote a passage from the record:

At the same meeting the proprietors granted to samuell hickox s<sup>r</sup> seauen a cers of land on the hill on the west side of hoog pound broke on the same condition richard porter had his jan 21 1689

One would naturally suppose that this use of land for keeping swine was the origin of the name Hog Pound, by which the district was known till a very recent period. But it will be observed that some of the tracts are located on Hog Pound Brook, showing that the name was in existence at an earlier period. Most likely, however, the lands had been employed, in some instances, for a similar purpose, previous to the date of the grants named. The district is now known by the more decorous name of East Farms.

At first it was not usual for the proprietors to attach any conditions to the grants of land, except they were "not to prejudice highways and former grants." At length, however, individuals who had resided long enough in the town to secure their estates, began to show a disposition to leave. Joseph Hickox removed in 1685, Thomes Hancox in 1687, and many others soon after. The course was then, to a considerable extent, changed. Those who were not proprietors, but the sons of those who were, no longer received unconditional grants. Sometimes they were to build a portion of the common fence as a consideration. Usually they were required to reside in town, not off and on, but "in a steady way," four years, often five, and occasionally even six years. Sometimes, particularly if they received house-lots, they were "to build a tenantable house according to articles."

Sometimes the proprietors themselves were subjected to conditions. For instance, Jan. 3d, 1686-7. Abraham Andruss, Sen., had five acres of land given him on Little Brook, which were to be forfeited if he went away in four years.

Isaac Bronson and John Welton had grants in 1694-5, which were to hold good only on condition they remained in the town four years. Similar restrictions were imposed in other cases. There was a distrust even of the fathers of the settlement. Many were gone away, and others were preparing to follow. These, taken in connection with other things to be noticed hereafter, occasioned, very naturally, the greatest discouragement.

The frequent refusal of those who had signed the articles to comply with the conditions which they prescribed, and the laggard movements and long delays of those who intended ultimate compliance, were the cause of much dissatisfaction and early complaint on the part of the planters, and of stringent action by the committee. I quote:—

Att a metting of the comite for mattatuck: on the 26 of nouember 1679: whereas we haue receiued information by some of the inhabitants belonging to that place that [some] of the propriators to whom alotments ware granted haue hitherto neglected the settlement of them selues and families there to the great discouragment and weakening of the hands of those: that are Alredy upon the place with their famelys

We haue thought meet to determine and resoluue that all such propriators as shall not be personally with their famelies inhabiting att mattatuck by the last of may next: enseuing and ther to abide shall forfitt all their title property and interest in any alotments granted to them att mattatuck to be disposed by the comity to such other as they shall aproue off

Also we doe further determine that all such inhabitants as shall not erect a mation hous by the last of may come twelue month Acording to a former article to that purpose shall forfit all their right and title in lands att mattatucke aforsaid.

Soon after, an order was passed designed to secure prompt action and faithfulness to engagements on the part of new subscribers.

Further itt is agred by vs that in case any doe apere desiring alotments ther [they] shall subscribe to original articles and ingag also to erect a dwelling hous acording to dementions [required by] said articles within one year after subscription and settle with his or their famelies vpon the place within that time oth. erwis forfit all their grant of land and right therein: to be disposed to such others as the comity shall Judg meet feb 5 1680

Still there were hesitation and procrastination on the part of many proprietors. Some neglected to build, others to reside

in the place, and others to bring their families. The complaints became louder and more frequent. The committee, for a long time reluctant to act, were finally obliged to take decisive measures. They passed the act known as the "Act of Feb. 6th, 1682." It declared the allotments of several delinquent proprietors, Benjamin Judd, Samuel Judd and Thomas Hancox, "to be condemned as forfeited," unconditionally. The same sentence was passed upon the allotments of Timothy Stanley, Joseph Gaylord, John Carrington, Abraham Andruss, cooper, Thomas Newell, Daniel Porter, Thomas Warner, Thomas Richason, Obadiah Richards and John Scovill; but upon condition of "their submission and reformation with their cohabitation upon the place one complete yere as a dision all [additional] to the four yers Injoined" by the articles, their rights were to be restored. It also required new subscribers to reside in the place "the full term of four yers in a stedy way and manor with their famelies," and all persons accepted as proprietors, after its date, were to sign the act. Thomas Hancox signed it as a new subscriber. A few others, afterwards admitted, did the same.

We whose [names] are under writen doe subscribe to a faithfull submission and obseruation of the act of the comity one the other side of this leafe february 6 1682:

subscribed this 4 of June 83	Thomas hancox
genuary 10: 83	Thomas Judd Junr
May 26 84	Robert porter
June 13 87	philip Judd

Timothy Stanley and the nine others whose names are mentioned in the same connection, "submitted and reformed," and thus regained possession of their land.

The act of removal to a new settlement in the time of which I am writing was a solemn thing. It was undertaken only after certain formalities and much prayer. The Bible was consulted, and the aid of the church sought. There was much and earnest endeavor to ascertain the indications of Providence. Then, as now, however, it was generally found, at last, that the finger of Providence pointed in the same di-



rection as the inclinations of those who sought guidance. By this remark, however, I do not mean to impugn the motives or question the sincerity of our forefathers, or the good men of our day.

The extract given below, is from the Farmington church record. It is an answer to an application for advice. The paper is very shrewdly written, and contains much wordly wisdom, to say nothing of its strong religious sentiment. We can see why the church was so reluctant to part with William Judd, though the very man the new settlement stood in need of. The record bears no date, but there are indications that the time was as early as the spring of 1677-8.

The Church having considered the desires of their brethren William, Thomas, John and Benjamin Judd, as also John Standly, Jun. touching their removal from us to Mattatuck, agreed as followeth :

1 In general, that considering the diverse difficulty and inconueniency which attend the plan toward which they are looking, and how hazardable it may be, for ought that appeareth, that the house and ordinances of Christ may not, for a long time at least, be settled among them—

The Church doth advise the brethren, to be wary of engaging far until some comfortable hopes appears of being suited for the inward man, in the great things fore mentioned.

2. Particularly to our brother William Judd, that it having pleased God to deal so bountifully with him—that not many of the brethren with us have so large accommodations as himself, they see not his call to remove, on the account of straitness for outward subsistance, & therefore counsel him, if it may be with satisfaction to his spirit, to continue his abode with us, hoping God [will] bless him in so doing.

3. To the rest, though we know [not how] much they will be bettered as to land, all things considered, by there removal, especially John and Benjamin Judd, and therefore cannot much encourage, yet if the bent of their Spirits be strong for going, and the advice fore given, touching the worship of God be taken, we shall not trouble, but say the will of the Lord be done.

Of the above mentioned persons, only two, Thomas Judd and John Stanley, Jr., lived up to the articles and became proprietors; though the others, particularly William and Benjamin Judd, found “the bent of their spirits to be strong for going,” and apparently tried hard to like the enterprise, but finally gave it up, finding perhaps that they had misread the teachings of duty.

## CHAPTER V.

## THE COMMON FENCE AND COMMON FIELD.

ONE of the first things to be attended to in the new settlement, was the building of fences for the protection of the crops and the meadow lands. The committee gave this subject their early attention. I quote from their acts under date Jan. 15, 1677, (1677-8):—

We order the comon fenc one the este sid the riuer for securing the medows shall be made sutfiently by the last of may acording to the number of acrs of medow land ecth propriator is seized of and we desire and apoint willum Judd, Thomas Judd and John Stanly to proportion the said fenc and lay out ecth person his just dues and being soe layed out: ecth person that shall neglect macking his just proportion shall be finable acording to the law of this colony.

There was another order made regarding the “common fence,” bearing date March 11th, 1678-9. By this, a new and additional division, it would seem, was to be erected, and the proprietors were required to make their respective proportions by the first of May, then ensuing.

Wharas there is a mile of fence tharabouts yet to be erected: for securing thos lands that are under improuement from spoill of catle and swine wee doe aduise and order that willum Judd Thomas Judd and John Stanly Jun shall proportion and stacke out to ecth propriator his proportion with all sped conueni[ent]

We further order that ecth propriator doe erect a sufisent fence vpon thoss respective places apointed [to him] for defenc of that land that no damage to either corne or gras by cattle or swine [be done] which fence shall be done betwixt this and the first of May next:

Late in the spring of the next year, or May 22d, 1680, there was an order issued, signed by John Talcott and John Wadsworth, for the building of three hundred and fifty rods of additional fence “forthwith;” and each proprietor who neglected his work till the first of June was to pay sixpence per rod, and for longer delay, sixpence per week. Further action upon the same subject was taken the succeeding year. Un-


der date of Feb. 8, 1680, (1680-1,) the committee directed a portion of fence to be constructed by the first of April.

The meadow lands up and down the river, on which the early settlers mainly depended for tillage and fodder, were regarded as particularly valuable. They were distributed in the beginning, but the lots lay in common; that is, they were not separated by division fences. Fences were expensive and could not be afforded; besides, on the low grounds they were liable to be swept away by the frequent floods. For the protection of the meadows (as may be gathered from the preceding extracts and remarks) a "common fence" was erected running along on the high ground, east of the river and west of the village, and extending a distance north and south. It was called "common," because it was for the equal benefit of all and was built and maintained by all. At this period, as no inhabitants dwelt upon the west side of the river, and no cattle were kept there, this single line of fence was deemed sufficient for the protection of the meadows. It was erected, in the first instance, and supported afterwards, by the proprietors in proportion to the land each had to be inclosed—a given number of rods and feet to each acre. A man's particular portion of fence was determined by lot. Beginning at the Mill River (Mad River) and running north, each man's position in the line was decided by the number drawn, number one standing first, number two second, and so on. This being done, each person's portion of the work was measured and "staked out."

In the first Proprietors' Book, so called, in the beginning of the volume, is the following entry :

The first diuision [of fence] begins at the made riuer and soe runs northwards: till itt butts on the banke of the riuer: against stells [Steels'] meadow as itt falls by lott:—

Then follow the names of the proprietors, beginning with Thomas Richason, in the order apparently in which the numbers were drawn, with the length of fence, in "rods," "fete" and "inches," assigned to each, the amount of fence being, in every instance, proportioned to proprietorship. There are







ENGRAVED BY SAMUEL CHAMBERS

*Mark Leavenworth*



twenty-six names in this list, including three "grate lots," the latter having thirty-three rods and fifteen feet each—the proportion for £150 propriety. The entire length of this division of fence appears to have been two hundred and eighty-four rods, nine feet and ten inches, or seven-eighths of a mile. It was doubtless that portion which was first built, (in the spring of 1677–8,) it being more immediately necessary than other portions.

This catalogue of names, on the record, is followed by a second division of fence, beginning at the north end of the last division and running northward. Then come thirty names, including the three great lots, and a line of fence amounting to two hundred and fifty-eight rods, one foot and three inches, or over three quarters of a mile. It was probably erected in the spring of 1678–9. The third division began at the Mill River and ran south three hundred and four rods, twelve feet and nine inches, or nearly one mile, and was parceled out to twenty-seven proprietors, inclusive of the great lots, and seems to have been built in the spring of 1679–80. The fourth division continued the line south two hundred and seven rods, twelve feet, seven inches, or over three-eighths of a mile, and was distributed among thirty-seven proprietors, counting the great lots. It appears to have been made in the spring of 1680–81.

The four divisions of common fence spoken of, (erected in the early parts of the four first years after the settlement,) two north and two south of the Mad River, in their whole length, measured a little over three and a quarter miles, the two northern divisions making somewhat more than half of the whole. A fifth division is spoken of in 1686–7. At any rate, additions were made to the fence from time to time, either way, as circumstances required. At an early period (before 1700) it seems to have reached Long Meadow Falls, about two and a half miles below the village, on the south; and on the north, to have extended as far as Mount Taylor, four miles from the center. Before 1685–6, it had crossed Hancox Brook, as appears from the record which follows:



Mattatock march y<sup>e</sup> last 1685-6 y<sup>e</sup> town by uoat detmrined y<sup>t</sup> thos men y<sup>e</sup> haue fenc ouer hancox brook and northward from y<sup>e</sup> town be brought ouer to y<sup>e</sup> east s<sup>d</sup> y<sup>e</sup> brook and set in y<sup>e</sup> rang on as good ground as they now stand for fencing y<sup>t</sup> is on y<sup>e</sup> rang y<sup>t</sup> is determined funder to fenc for y<sup>e</sup> securing of y<sup>e</sup> meadows.

This removal of fence seems to have been in pursuance of a plan for protecting the lands farther up the brook, and so crossing perhaps at a higher point. The lands to be thus secured were about to be divided among the proprietors, and brought under cultivation. It seemed to be the design to include within the common fence all the lands which were most valuable for meadow and tillage. A lot at "Pine Hole," so late as 1733, is described in a deed as within the "common field," and as bounded east on the common fence.

Near the village the common fence ran as follows: Beginning at Mill River a little above the manufactory of the Hotchkiss and Merriman Manufacturing Company, at a point (where "it was agreed," March 31st, 1709, "by a mager nott to cal the fens cros the mad riuier in the comon line seauen rod") at the southeast corner of Abraham Andruss, Sen's house lot of three and a half acres, it ran northwesterly along the brow of the hill between said Andruss' land and the Mill Plain fifteen acre lot, (sometimes called Hopkins' Plain,) till it reached Union street, at "Union square." Thence it continued along the south side of Union street and the north side of the Plain above mentioned to the hill just west of Elm street, where there were bars and an entrance to the common field. Thence I can find no early traces of it till we come to the south meadow gate at the southwest corner of Bank and Grand streets. Probably, at the bars in Union street, it continued westerly, in the line of that street, to the point named in Bank street, thus including within the common field the house lots of Stephen Upson, Samuel Scott and Richard Porter. Here it ran, at so late a period as 1790.\*

---

\* This appears from a deed, dated Feb. 10th, of that year, from Thomas Porter to his son Phineas Porter, conveying, for £78 15s. lawful money, a tract of land in the "common field," estimated at seventeen acres, lying between Union street and the old roads running, one southwesterly from the Plain bars, the other southeasterly from Bank street. The boundary line is described in the deed as follows: "Beginning about two rods east of David Pritchard's

From the corner of Bank street the fence extended west in the south line of Grand street and in front of Stephen Upson's and John Welton's land and the burying yard to the Little Pasture (parsonage lot) and Willow street. Thence it passed up Willow street, on the westerly side, (leaving Benjamin Jones' and Dea. Judd's houses on the left) to West Main street and the "common gate." Thence it continued past John Scovill's in the west line of Willow street, up the hill and into the woods above. Afterwards, it appears to have borne off more to the west till it reached the river's bank, opposite Steel's meadow, seven-eighths of a mile from the starting place at Mad River. A little farther on, it left the Naugatuck and extended in a more easterly direction, so as to include the better lands east and south of Hancock's Brook.

In the above description, I have considered the home lots of Benjamin Jones, Dea. Judd and John Scovill as lying within the common field. This was undoubtedly the fact, although I do not find the circumstance alluded to in any conveyance, or by any direct or incidental remark.

The fence spoken of above was removed from time to time, farther westward, till it came to inclose the meadows, properly so called, only. A portion of it, in the form of an old, broken stone-wall, may still be seen, standing where it was placed, after this process of removal was begun, up Willow street, north of the village, a little west of the road.

East of the Mad River the common fence ran south and southwesterly, keeping on the west side of the mill lot of eight acres, and below occupying the high ground at some distance from the river.

Soon after 1700, when people began to settle on the west side of the river, more frequent complaints were made of damage done to the common fields by cattle. In 1701, the town resolved that all horses, cattle or swine found running at large

---

dwelling house, [on the southwest corner of Bank and Grand.] extending eastward to the highway that goeth into the common field at the mill plain bars, then southward by the highway till it comes to the highway that goeth to Salem, then by said highway to the first corner, butting all sides on highway." At the date of this deed, and afterwards, the land on the borders of the Great Brook, lying within this tract, and for a considerable distance above, was an alder swamp.

west of the river might be impounded. The following vote has relation to this subject:—

April 6, 1702, y<sup>e</sup> proprietors by uoate agree that who soeuer shall haue liberty to liue on y<sup>e</sup> west s<sup>d</sup> y<sup>e</sup> fence or great riuer within our bounds shall submit to y<sup>e</sup> order of y<sup>e</sup> proprietors as if they liued y<sup>e</sup> east s<sup>d</sup> y<sup>e</sup> common fenc as to our agreement of fencing or [our] meadows y<sup>t</sup> by reson of them we be not under nesity of fencing on y<sup>e</sup> west s<sup>d</sup> our meadows but y<sup>t</sup> theyr creators be pound fesent in any of our meadows, and they oblidged to keep theyr creators out of our feild, as if they were fenced round and he y<sup>t</sup> gos to liue on y<sup>e</sup> west sid to subscrib this act in testimony of his submitting to it and he y<sup>t</sup> refuses to submit to this order not to be alowed to liue on y<sup>e</sup> west s<sup>d</sup>

It became more apparent, however, from year to year, that it would be necessary to construct a fence on the west side of the river, running down to and crossing it at each end, so as completely to encircle the common field. Some, however, so late as 1704, were in favor of extending the line on the east side south as far as Beacon Hill Brook, the southern boundary of the town, and of being content, for the present, with the additional security which that extension would afford. I copy the vote of the proprietors to show how this subject was disposed of:—

[Voted] to fenc from y<sup>e</sup> east end of y<sup>e</sup> mountain against mount taylor on y<sup>e</sup> west s<sup>d</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Riuer and so to y<sup>e</sup> falls in y<sup>e</sup> Riuer at y<sup>e</sup> lor end of y<sup>e</sup> long meadow and to make y<sup>e</sup> fenc good and substanchall aganst al orderly horses and cattell and sufficient aganst too yeir olds and y<sup>e</sup> fenc to be uewed by the fenc-uewers. deak Tho judd Left Timothy Stanly Jo<sup>e</sup> hopkins sen<sup>r</sup> benjamin borns sen<sup>r</sup> & Tho. judd ju<sup>r</sup> was Chosen a com<sup>ty</sup> to modell y<sup>e</sup> land\* in s<sup>d</sup> feild and proportion y<sup>e</sup> fenc of s<sup>d</sup> feild to each man acording to his propriaty & lay out to each man his part— y<sup>e</sup> lands on which y<sup>e</sup> fenc is to be laid is all y<sup>t</sup> is fit for plowing or moing in s<sup>d</sup> feild hauing Respect to y<sup>e</sup> fenc already layd out each man to keep his fenc alreay layd out to him and there being much land spoyled with y<sup>e</sup> flood y<sup>e</sup> oners of such land to be considred and abated in this diuition y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> whol Rang of fenc of s<sup>d</sup> feild may be equally proportioned to each proprietor accordring to his benift of lands in s<sup>d</sup> feild as near as they can desemb<sup>r</sup> 12 1704

Y<sup>e</sup> proprietors agreed to leaue a mile at y<sup>e</sup> north end of y<sup>e</sup> loyn wher they began to measure on y<sup>e</sup> west sid wher they intend to set y<sup>e</sup> fenc to be dun by y<sup>e</sup> proprietors in a general way to be layd on y<sup>e</sup> land yet undeuided as it shall be taken up march y<sup>e</sup> 5<sup>th</sup> 170<sup>4</sup>

---

\* "To modell ye land"—to appraise the land, or rather to determine its relative value or quality, in order that an apportionment of fence on this basis might be made among the owners. I infer this to be the meaning of the phrase, from the connections in which it is used in the record.

This last part of the fence was to be done by the proprietors in their collective capacity until the undivided lands spoken of were taken up, when it was to be distributed among the owners of such lands according to usage.

But the vote which I have given, dated December 12th, 1704, and which determined the principle on which the new fence was to be divided among the proprietors, gave much dissatisfaction. At a subsequent meeting, April 10th, 1705, a modification of the principle was sought and obtained. It was then determined—

Y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> whole Rang of fenc quit round sd feild shall be equally diuided on y<sup>e</sup> acer alike of all sorts of land With in s<sup>d</sup> feild booth of plowing moing upland and paustor y<sup>t</sup> is already layd out or giuen to any man and each man to maintain his fenc so layd out to him but the fenc already layd on y<sup>e</sup> east s<sup>d</sup> [side] to remain and belong to them y<sup>t</sup> it belongs to not to remoue them but to be counted as part of their diuition as fare as it will go y<sup>e</sup> former act by this made uoid in exempting pastor lands considering waste land & modalizing

This uoat was full but four or 5 acted aganst it and doctor porter one of them did protest aganst it.

But there was delay in making the fence, and much murmuring at the injustice of the last vote. By that vote, it will be noticed, each man's proportion of fence was to depend, as it did in the beginning, by order of the grand committee, on the number of acres he owned in the common field, without reference to the value of the land; so that a person having twenty acres of valuable "moing" land had to build no more fence than he who had twenty acres of upland or "paustor," or who had a large proportion of waste lands barely worth fencing. But the argument was not all on one side. It would cost as much to fence the poor as the good land. An acre of the second or third quality increased the size of the field to be inclosed as much as an acre of the first quality. If a man's lands had been damaged by floods it might be claimed that it was *his* misfortune and not his neighbors'; unless, indeed, the neighbors *chose* to share it with him. There was then some show of right in a per acre distribution of the fence. But those who claimed this at last yielded the point. Our fathers were friends of peace, and bore each other's burdens.

In order "for to attain a peicable proceeding" the proprietors again agreed "to model y<sup>e</sup> land," "proportioning y<sup>e</sup> fenc to each propriator according to his benifit," "abating for paustor lands, waste lands and lands spoyled with the flood." In fact, the vote that was passed on the 12th of Dec., 1704, was, with some slight alterations of orthography, &c., again adopted. This was on the 17th day of Dec. 1706. A new committee—Thomas Judd, Jr., John Hopkins, Sen., and Dea. Judd—was appointed "to model y<sup>e</sup> land in sd feild & deuid y<sup>e</sup> fenc," while "Stephen ubson sen, John welton sen<sup>r</sup> and abraham andruss" were chosen "a com<sup>-</sup>ty to model y<sup>e</sup> lands" of the first named committee.

But this west fence was long in getting itself built. The truth is, it was a great work for the people, considered as an addition to their other necessary labor, in their then weakened condition. But our fathers were men of pluck. Votes were taken and committees appointed, the land measured and "modeled," and the work apportioned "according to interest and benefit;" and at last a sort of board of relief was selected "to Regulate mistackes if any be and if any are over charged to haue it taken off and they y<sup>t</sup> want to haue it [;] but if any haue not enough fenc and it be not in y<sup>e</sup> loyn [line] staked out to take it by sucesion at y<sup>e</sup> northend, y<sup>e</sup> south ward to be first so sucesiuely [April 12, 1708.]" The fence upon the west side, like that upon the east, was designed to inclose all the lands most valuable for culture which could be conveniently done. It ran along upon the high ground, in many places at a distance from the river, and the remains of it are still met with at certain points, in the form of a broken wall of stone.

The whole quantity of divided lands included in the common field, soon after the west side fence was built, when the entire common fence was apportioned, seems to have been six hundred and eighty-one acres. How much land there was undivided, or which had not yet been taken up, may be gathered from the circumstance that one mile of fence at the upper end, on the west side, was left, by the act of March, 1704-5, "to be done in a general way," and to be afterwards distributed to

those who should come into possession of the inclosed undivided lands. One mile of fence may therefore be considered as the just proportion of the prospective owners—as the proportion which the undivided bore to the divided lands. As there were twelve miles of fence in the whole, six miles on each side the river, and as eleven miles represented six hundred and eighty-one acres, one mile should represent sixty-two acres. These sums added together, give seven hundred and forty-three acres as the entire contents of the common field, at the time indicated.

To show who were the owners of the divided lands in the common field, how they were distributed and how the fence was apportioned, at the period of which I am speaking, I give an extract :

An accountt of the number of the acurs of land ech man has to fens for in the generall feild as it was mesured by us: in march 1709

		Thomas Judd Steun ubson John scoull	
Abraham Andruss	27	Jeremiah Peck	30
Wid. Andruss	14	Doct. Porter	26
Benjamin Barnes	21	Richard Porter	10
Serg. Bronson	17	Thomas Porter	5
Isaac Bronson		Obadiah Richards	10
John Bronson	9	John Richards	18
Wid. Bronson	8	Thomas Richason	13
Mr. Bull	4	John Richason	7
John Carrington	5	John Scovill	21
Joseph Gaylord	4	Edmund Scott	19
Benjamin Hickox		George Scott	16
William Hickox	21	Jonathan Scott	7
Thomas Hickox	19	David Scott	11
Ebenezer Hickox	½	Mr. Southmayd	21
John Hopkins	22	Lt. Timothy Stanley	38
Wid. Jones	11	Samuel Stanley	29
John Judd	25	School Land	7
Philip Judd	15	Stephen Upson	24
Thomas Judd Jr.	23	Thomas Warner	6
Dea. Judd	47	Daniel Warner	2
Benjamin Judd		John Warner	1
Mill Land	19	John Welton	18
Thomas Newell	1	Stephen Welton	11
Parsonage	18	Thomas Welton	1

The common fence was variously constructed according to the nature of the ground and the convenience of materials. It was made of rails laid in the form of the "worm fence," or of logs and poles, with the help of stakes. If stones were more abundant than anything else, these were laid into a wall. I find the hedge fence spoken of, its strength being increased by stakes. In some instances, a ditch was dug, and its effect augmented by rails or a hedge upon the embankment.

The following order relates to the "sufficiency" of the common fence.

March: 20: 1691: an ordor What shall be counted soficien fenc for our meadows

Rayl fenc to be: 4: foots high not exseeding: 6: inches between y<sup>e</sup> Rayls: too foots from y<sup>e</sup> ground upward—heg fenc: four foots and a half high: 5 stakes to each Rod and well Rought—ston fenc, three foots and nin inches in height—log or pool fenc four foots in height and well Rought—dich, too foots wid and Rayls or heg four foots in height from y<sup>e</sup> bottom of y<sup>e</sup> ditch to y<sup>e</sup> top of y<sup>e</sup> fenc and well Rought—

And if there be any aduantage by resin of the land or plac where y<sup>e</sup> fenc is it is to be left to y<sup>e</sup> judgement of y<sup>e</sup> fencuewers what shall be soficant—

By order of y<sup>e</sup> tounsmen abraham andrus John hopkins—april: y<sup>e</sup>: 6: 1692: this order to stand for y<sup>e</sup> fenc uewers to go by till y<sup>e</sup> town see caus to alter it

THOMAS JUDD

In the spring season, when vegetation began to start, it became the duty of each proprietor to put in good repair his portion of the common fence. The proprietors each year, in meeting, fixed upon the day beyond which the work should not be neglected. The day chosen was usually between the tenth and fifteenth of March.

Immediately after the expiration of the time for these repairs, the fence viewers, who were annually appointed by the town, were required to make a careful examination of the fence, to decide whether it was conformable to law, and an adequate protection for the lands inclosed. If they found it insufficient in any place, they gave notice to him to whom it belonged, requiring him to make it good in five days, according to the statute. In case this notice was neglected, it became the duty of the fence viewers to make the necessary repairs, and to charge the delinquent double the cost of the work, to be collected by warrant. If they were not able to make the

repairs, or "hire sufficient help to do the same, so that the common field may be timely secured," they were authorized by law

To make complaint to the next Assistant, or Justice of the Peace; and it shall be in the power of such Assistant or Justice of the peace, to issue out his warrant to the Constable of said Town, in which such common field is situate, or to the fence viewers, to impress men and teams sufficient to repair such defective fence, who shall be paid by such fence viewers for their labor, as they can agree, or as shall be determined by such Assistant or Justice of the Peace. [Acts and Laws, printed 1715.]

Early in the spring, annually, there was a vote passed by the proprietors "to burn about the common fence." I give an example:

March 6th 1709-10 The proprietors agreed by voat that the beating the Drum through the town ouer night shall be warning that the fence on the west side is to be burnt about the next day and on the east side the day following.

In obedience to this summons, all the owners of the common fence sallied forth, each, I suppose, to look after his own. Wherever the fence was made of combustibile material, they set fire to the dry leaves, grass and other rubbish in its immediate neighborhood, preventing, by great watchfulness, its spreading to the woods, or destroying the fence. This being done, the woods and fields were burnt over without concern for the purpose of improving the pasturage. In this way, too, the damage which might have resulted from accidental fires, not infrequent, was prevented.

Sometimes the firing of the woods was forbidden for a season, in order that the young trees might attain some growth. For instance, December 13th, 1713, "it was voted that the east woods should not be fired for seven years," and "if any person shall fire the above woods, he shall pay 20s."

Early in the history of the town, there were two gates on the east side the river, frequently referred to, opening a passage through the fence from the village to the common field. One of these was in Bank street, near Grand, and was called the south gate. It was not removed till recently—some twenty years ago. The other was near the west corners of



Willow and West Main streets, and was known by the name of the west or common gate. This, it seems, was removed, at the date mentioned below, to a point farther west, some ten or twelve rods probably, and the common fence extended on either side down to it. The record, it will be noticed, does not convey a very clear idea.

Genuary 25. 170 $\frac{3}{4}$  y<sup>e</sup> town ordered y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> west gate and fenc belonging to y<sup>e</sup> town should be removed belo deac judds barn to be directed by y<sup>e</sup> towns men in seting of it down and john scouell to set y<sup>t</sup> part of his common [fence] y<sup>t</sup> frunts y<sup>t</sup> highway clos in y<sup>e</sup> highway where y<sup>e</sup> gate is to be set deac judd and john scouill hauing consented to haue theyr fenc next s<sup>d</sup> highway from y<sup>e</sup> common fenc down to s<sup>d</sup> gate to be accounted common fenc and proceeded in y<sup>t</sup> respect by y<sup>e</sup> fencuewers as such.

On the west side of the river there were no gates, but four sets of bars. The "west bars" were on the Woodbury road west of the present covered bridge. The "south bars" were on the way to Town Plot by the present R. R. depot, crossing the river near the new bridge. The "Long Meadow bars" were on the road to Judd's Meadow, below the "riding place" at the lower end of Mad Meadow. "Isaac's Meadow bars" were on the road which ran up Manhan Meadow, crossing the river near the present fording place, and so on west through Steel's Meadow and over Steel's Brook towards Elon Clark's.

For many years after the settlement of the town, there were no private fences except those which inclosed the home lots. Individuals relied on the common fence to protect their crops. Lands lying without this fence were for a time undivided. They were used by all for wood, timber, stone, pasturage, &c., and were called the "commons." The cattle, in the pasturing season, were kept in herds which were watched by a herdsman. I find an "order" of the committee relating to this subject :

Wharas we receiued a paper signed by sarg<sup>t</sup> Thomas Judd Isaac bronson and benjamin Judd in referanc to herding of cattell we doe order and apoint for the futur that the inhabitants att a towne meeting the maigor of the inhabitants so meete shall haue full pouer to resoluue and determin the way and method for herding and to statt what shall be charged for keeping of cows and what shall be leuiud one dry cattle

april 5 1682.

The sheep of the town were put under the care of a shep-

herd, and thus kept from mischief. I discover, however, no action on this subject earlier than 1708.

Att sheep meeting in waterbuey march=29=1708 deac Judd John scouell and John Richason was chosen sheep mastors for this yir to order y<sup>e</sup> prudensials of y<sup>e</sup> sheep and to hire a sheepord and see him pay<sup>d</sup> as y<sup>e</sup> law directs by y<sup>e</sup> owners of y<sup>e</sup> sheep

The meadows and the lands near the river were convenient, required little clearing or expensive preparation, and were easily worked. On these and their home lots, the people relied for their crops. In consequence of the value of the lands which it embraced, the common field was an important interest. The proprietors gave much of their time to its concerns. They framed such regulations as were for the good of all. A major vote governed; not a major vote of the proprietors, but of pounds of propriety. The Colonial Assembly granted general powers, and prescribed the mode of exercising them.

After the fence had been "done up" in the spring, and the fence viewers had attended to their duty, seeing that every thing was fast, the haywards were sent out to impound such cattle, horses, sheep and swine as were found within the common field. The owners of the imprisoned beasts were obliged to pay the poundage; but if it appeared that the fence was more at fault than the beasts, those who had thus paid their money could oblige the delinquent fence owners to bear the loss.

Here are regulations concerning the common gates or bars, the "baighting" of cattle, &c. :

Dec. 12th, 1704, "the propriators by uoate agreed y<sup>t</sup> he y<sup>t</sup> lefs [leaves] opin y<sup>e</sup> com<sup>-</sup>on gates or bers [bars] in y<sup>e</sup> com<sup>-</sup>on feild should pay al y<sup>e</sup> damag y<sup>t</sup> is dun thereby and y<sup>t</sup> no man shal stak horses\* in y<sup>e</sup> moing land in said feild or baight cattell after y<sup>e</sup> first of aprill till com<sup>-</sup>ing time† except they are at work by y<sup>m</sup> [them] and the fenc of s<sup>d</sup> feild to be kept up al y<sup>e</sup> yeir and hogs pound fesiart al y<sup>e</sup> yeir

---

\* A horse was *staked* by making him fast to a stake driven into the ground, by means of a rope or cord several yards in length. He could thus be safely left to feed around for the distance which the rope would permit him to go. When the grass was cropped short in one place, the stake was removed to another.

† Commoning time was the time fixed upon in the fall, after the crops had been removed, when all the owners in the common field turned in their cattle and horses for pasture.

Jan 7<sup>th</sup> 1706-7. The propriators agree y<sup>t</sup> when s<sup>d</sup> feild shall be opened to turn in cattell it shall be but one moneth and then y<sup>e</sup> cattle kept out and pounded as in y<sup>e</sup> sum<sup>er</sup> and y<sup>t</sup> men shall turn into s<sup>d</sup> feild according to their intrist in it and no man to baight or stake in s<sup>d</sup> field at no time but on his own land and takeing care of them and all y. brake this order to haue their cattle pounded or delt with as trespasors.

Four years afterward, (or March 5th, 1710-11, "it was grd [agreed] on by note" that *moneth*, (a common orthography of the day,) in the above record, "is intended for munth and with that amendation the act so stand yearly til the propriators se cas [cause] to alter it."

Verily, our fathers were getting critical! The former clerk had left town, and a wiser one had succeeded to his place. The orthography of Thomas Judd, the schoolmaster, is corrected by his cousin, Thomas Judd, the smith!

Y<sup>e</sup> propriators [Dec 12th, 1704] granted liberty to any y<sup>t</sup> see caus to inclos in prticular [to inclose his own land] for wheat or other corn

This right was secured by statute. Any man might fence in his own land and thus improve it exclusively; but he must inclose it at his own expense. If a man adjoining him chose to do the same thing, the division fence must be built by both in just proportion.

Desemb. the 8 1707 it was uoated that nither hors nor cattel shold be baited or staked within the feild from the fiftenth of april until the medows are clear funder it was uoted that each propriator shold put in cretures according to ther propotion of fence.

In the fall season after the grass had been cut and the crops removed from the common field, it was the custom to turn in the "cattle, horses and sheep" for pasture. It was the practice to name the day on which the fields should be "cleared," and when the people might turn in their cattle, &c. This was late in September or early in October. "Commoning time" was looked forward to with great interest. At the appointed time, early in the morning, or immediately after sundown, the whole town was astir. All the four footed beasts that lived by grazing were brought out, driven in long procession to the meadow gates, and "turned in" to

crop the fresh herbage. There they remained luxuriating and gathering fatness till the late autumnal frosts. The writer's recollections, extending back forty years, furnishes him with some refreshing scenes connected with the opening of the common field. Boys who used to drive the cows a mile to pasture, hailed the time with lively feelings.

There was a law of the Colony, at an early date, requiring every town and plantation "to make and maintain a sufficient pound or pounds for the impounding and restraining of all such swine, horses, cattle and other creatures, as shall be found damage feasant, and swine found unringed or unyoked." But the first record of the "setting up" of a pound in Waterbury is the following:

Genuary: 25<sup>h</sup>: 1702-3 y<sup>e</sup> town voted y<sup>e</sup> there should be a pound set up in y<sup>e</sup> South highway sum where neare y<sup>e</sup> south gate y<sup>e</sup> spot where to be set out by y<sup>e</sup> townsmen

The next year a pound was ordered near the west or common gate, and Deacon Thomas Judd, who lived hard by, was appointed pound keeper.

Decembr y<sup>e</sup> 12—1704 y<sup>e</sup> propriators gaue juds meadow men leaue to set up a pound for ym selues on their own charg for impounding their own cattel and such as are left out in y<sup>e</sup> field when men are at worck with them there

In 1735, the inhabitants of Northbury (now Plymouth) were authorized by the town to erect a pound at their own expense; and in Dec. 1749, Northbury and Westbury (Watertown) had each "liberty to build a pound at town charge." In February, 1753, Andrew Bronson, who lived on the southwest corner of West Main and Willow streets, obtained the consent of the town to remove the pound near his house, "farther westward in the lane," he being at the expense.

There must have been pounds, or yards, for the confinement of cattle, &c., before the early dates above mentioned, as the law required. Haywards were appointed by the town in 1681. The pounds ordered to be set up in 1702-3 and 1704, were probably designed to take the place of one or more of more ancient date, which had gone to decay.

## CHAPTER VI.

## INDIAN PURCHASES: INCORPORATION OF THE TOWN: SEQUESTER LANDS.

ON the 29th day of April, 1684, certain Farmington Indians, (nine in number, including two squaws,) "in consideration of nine pounds already received, or good security for that purpose," granted to Serg. Thomas Judd and John Stanley, in the name and behalf of the proprietors of the township of Mattatuck, an addition to the land which they formerly sold to Major Talcott, Mr. Wadsworth, &c., and lying north of it. It extended north from the rock called Mount Taylor and an east and west line, to a tree marked by Captain Stanley and John Norton, Senr., being eight miles. The grant butted east on Farmington bounds, south on the former grant, (upon that which was formerly the Spinning Squaw's land,) west by a north and south line, which if extended south would run "four score rods from the easternmost part of Quasepaug Pond," north on the wilderness, an east and west line.

This deed purports to have been given by "Patuckquo in the name and behalf and by order of Atumtockquo, Wawowas, Taphow, Judas, Mantow, Momantow's squaw, Mercy, Seques (squaw,) and Quatowquechuck (Taphow's son.)"

In the same year, on the second day of December, John Acompound, Hackatowsock and his squaw, Mantow, Waruncompound, Atumtocko, Spinning Squaw, Patuckeo (squaw,) Sebockett, the same persons, for the most part, who are the grantors named in the deed of 1674, for "nine pounds in hand received or security sufficiently given," conveyed to the same party "one parcel of land at Mattatuck situated on each side of Mattatuck River, to extend from the said river three miles towards Woodbury," butting north on the rock called Mount Taylor, and a line running east and west from that point, east

on Farmington bounds, the line running from the rock called the "Ordinary" south to Beacon Hill Brook, or Milford, or New Haven bounds, south on Beacon Hill Brook and Paugasset, west on Pootatuck and Pomperaug.

The tract of land here conveyed, it will be noticed, is the same, with a little more definite limits, as that granted in the deed of 1674. It was common in those times for the native proprietors to make claims to the lands which they had once sold, on the ground that they had been inadequately paid, or that they did not understand the import of their acts.

Feb. 28th, 1684, (1685, new style,) Conquapatana (sagamore,) Awawas, Curan, Cocapadous, Tataracum, Kecasahum, Wenuntacum, Cocoeson, Wechamunck and Weruncaske (Cocoesen's sister,) Arumpiske (Curan's squaw,) Notamunck (Curan's sister,) twelve in number, of the Paugasset or Milford tribe of Indians, as I suppose, deeded to Thomas Judd and John Stanley, "per order and in the name and behalf of the proprietors of Mattatuck," "for divers causes and considerations thereunto moving and for the sum of six pound in hand," twenty parcels of land, "nine parcels on the east side of Naugatuck River southward from Mattatuck town, which comprises all the land below, betwixt Beacon Hill Brook and the hither end of Judd's meadows, called by the name of Sqontk, and from Naugatuck River eastward to Wallingford and New Haven bounds, with all the low lands upon the brook formentioned; and eleven parcels on the west side of the first parcel," having certain relations not easy to understand, to Cedar Swamp, the middle of Toamtick Pond, Quasepaug Pond, and Woodbury bounds; at the north part, butting east on "Naugatuck or Mattatuck River," and at the south part, east on the lands first mentioned. These twenty parcels of land seem to have been contiguous tracts, each having a distinct Indian name given in the deed, and lying in the southern and southwestern parts of the township. They are included, it will be observed, in the first and third purchases from the Farmington Indians; but were also claimed, it appears, by the Derby Indians. Without inquiring very particularly into the justice of the claim, it was thought expedient to extinguish it by purchase.

On the 28th day of June, 1711, Cockapatane, Sagamore of "Saugosset" and Tom Indian, his son, for twenty five shillings deeded to the proprietors of Waterbury "a small piece of land" north of Derby bounds, west of Naugatuck River and south of Toantick Brook.

Thus the limits of ancient Waterbury, as described by the several deeds from the Indians, extended from north to south eighteen miles, and from east to west, nine miles towards the northern line and six miles towards the south.

The territory in question was all honestly purchased, most of it twice, and some of it three times. And it was bought not with baubles, but with hard cash. However it may have been in other cases, *our* ancestors did not get possession of their lands by robbery, or finesse. They were neither "fillibusters" nor cheats. What they had of this world's goods, which was but little, they paid for. Doubtless, those who conveyed their lands did not obtain possession by a method equally just. But it has been claimed that the Indian owners or occupants of the soil did not know the significance of a deed by which they parted with their titles, and could not comprehend the consequences of their acts.\* But they did know what a sale meant. They did know in our case, (as there are the best reasons to believe,) as they signed the deeds with "marks uncouth," that they were selling their lands, and thus giving up the right of possession. And as for consequences, even the white purchasers had but the dimmest notions. Were they to wake up from their long sleep, and see what our eyes behold in the year 1857, their astonishment would be unmeasured. Nor was the price paid so entirely disproportionate to the thing bought. Sixty-three pounds—the amount of all the purchase money—was to the first planters of Waterbury, a large sum. It probably represented as much wealth as the lands would have sold for at this day, had the country generally remained in the undisturbed possession of the savages.

Civilization, industry, skill and thrift have made the Nauga-

---

\* Judge Church's Litchfield Centennial Address, p. 26.

Wilderness

Poland

Village

Wooster Swamp

Branch

Northbury

Scotts Mountain

Westbury

Farmington

Woodbury

Steele's Brook

McLellan Brook

Hanson Brook

Spindle Hill

Bucks Hill

Farmingbury

Burnt Hill

Long Hill

Grand Brook

McLellan Brook

Sawyer's Brook

Breaker's Neck

Town Plot

Hop Brook

Turkey Brook

Onassapung Pond

Smug Brook

Wallingford

Newfound Brook

Falling Mill Brook

Judds Meadow

Long Meadow Brook

Toantick Pond

Twelve Mile stake

Beacon Brook

Three sisters

Derby

Milford

New Haven

THE OLD TOWNSHIP OF WATERBURY.





THE STATE OF TEXAS,  
COUNTY OF [illegible]

atuck valley what it is. The wealth which exists here to day has been created by their agency. The soil has been subdued and improved, its incumbrances removed and its capacities developed. Fences, bridges, roads, railways, mill-dams, mills, factories, store houses and dwellings have been built. Quarries have been opened, swamps drained, stones removed and trees felled. Farms have been stocked with horses, horned cattle, sheep and swine. Superior grasses have been introduced and orchards planted. The Indians did none of these things—transferred none. They conveyed the naked soil, (much of it literally naked,) without any improvements, and totally unfitted in its then natural state for the abode of civilized men. They sold that of which they had a superfluity, and which they were incapable of putting to profitable use. It was the smallest fraction of a continent running to waste, awaiting a purchaser and the application of capital. The value which population and cultivation, labor, skilled and unskilled, invention, science, capital and commerce have given, should be kept distinct from natural and inherent value. The former our fathers did not purchase, and did not obtain, and for which it did not behoove them to pay. The latter they bought, and like honest men, paid for it. They thought they gave a fair equivalent—more indeed, perhaps, than they would have been willing to give, had it not been for their ignorance of better lands, at cheaper rates, farther west, and in other localities. If they took advantage of the ignorance of the natives, they lost more, it may be plausibly said, by their own lack of information. At any rate, for many long years they apparently considered their bargain a hard one; and most likely, had it not been for their improvements, would have abandoned the settlement. Many did so, glad to escape at any necessary sacrifice.

The wild Indian is not the precise being he is represented in many works of romance. He has been painted as possessed of certain manly traits, and the truth of the likeness, illustrated by certain examples. But his general character is quite the reverse. He is given to lying, cheating, thieving. He is lazy, thriftless, faithless, bloodthirsty. He lives like a robber and a vagabond. His cunning and his courage are like

those that belong to certain beasts of prey. The only restraints he knows are those imposed by indolence and fear. Brought into contact with a civilized people, he learns all their vices, but not one of their virtues. He becomes a drunkard—an outcast. Every persistent attempt to civilize and Christianize him has resulted in the annihilation of the race. He is essentially, as is now generally admitted, untamable, as much so as certain wild animals. Attempts to improve him, do violence to his nature, and in a few generations sweep him out of existence. His character is essentially defective. He appears to lack the moral sentiments necessary to a higher life. These the appliances of civilization are inadequate to supply. I admit there is a difference in different tribes, and that various degrees of partial improvement, among certain Indian races, have sometimes resulted from the efforts of philanthropists. Nevertheless, that the general fact is as stated, is undeniable.

The Indian titles to the lands proposed to be included in the township being secured, the inhabitants of Mattatuck were prepared for a town patent, or act of incorporation. They presented a petition to the General Court at the May session of 1685, praying for “a Patent for the confirmation of their lands unto the present proprietors.” They chose Serg. Thomas Judd and Serg. John Stanley “Patentees to take out a Patten for the township.” Other names, however—those of Robert Porter, Edmund Scott, Isaac Bronson and John Welton—are inserted in the instrument itself.

Probably the application was made at this particular time on account of the critical condition of the Colony. James II had ascended the throne of England and nothing good was expected from his reign. There was some delay, however, in obtaining the patent. In the mean time, three successive writs of *quo warranto*\* were served on the Governor and Company of the Colony, and it became evident that the Charter was doomed. The inhabitants of Connecticut were of course greatly alarmed. The people of the different towns and settlements were in haste to get their land titles and town franchises secured by a patent from the local government, in anticipation

---

\* A warrant requiring the party summoned to appear in court and show by what authority the powers of government were exercised.

of its dissolution. Thus they hoped to save themselves from the extortionate demands of royal governors. The General Court had authorized the governor and secretary of the Colony, in May, 1685, "to give patents and deeds to the proprietors of every township of all lands and rights," &c. All the towns then existing availed themselves of the privilege, and the new plantation seized the opportunity to gain a similar grant.

Mattatuck was invested with town privileges, in the usual way, May, 1686. Here is the form :—

This Court Grants that Mattatuck shall be and belong to the county of Hartford and the name of the plantation shall for the future be Waterbury. [May 13, 1686.]

The new town took the name of Waterbury on account of its numerous rivers, rivulets, ponds, swamps, "boggy meadows" and wet lands. *Bury* is another way of spelling borough or burg, and signifies a dwelling place. It is a pity the beautiful old Indian name of Mattatuck was not retained. But our Puritan ancestors regarded these native words as heathenish, and were in haste to discard and forget them. Latterly, they have been in some cases revived and applied to the new towns, to corporations and various local institutions and objects. Our friends down the river showed their good sense when they called their new town Naugatuck, (another beautiful name,) where the second settlement in the valley was made.

Sir Edmund Andros, of charter memory, arrived in Boston, Dec. 1686. Waterbury's patent was issued soon after, bearing date Feb. 8th, 1686-7.

Whereas the Generall Court of Connecticut haue formerly Granted unto the inhabitants of Waterbury all those lands within these abutments viz upon New Haven in part & Milford in part & Derby in part on the south & upon Woodbury in part & upon the comons in part on the west & upon Comon land on the North: & east in part upon farmington Bounds & in part upon the comons & from the South to the north line extends Thirteen Miles in length & from farmington Bounds to Woodbury about nine Miles breadth at the North & some what less at the South end the sayd lands hauing been by purchass or otherwise lawfully obtained of the native proprietors, And whereas the proprietors Inhabitants of Waterbury in the colony of Connecticut in Newengland haue made application to the Governor & company of the sayd colony of Connecticut assembled in Court the fourteenth of may one Thousand Six Hundred & Eighty sue that they may haue a patent for the confirmation of the afoarsayd lands as it is Butted & Bounded

aforsayd unto the present proprietors of the sayd Township of Waterbury which they haue for some years past enjoyed without Interruption Now for more full confirmation of the premises & aforsayd Tract of land as it is butted and Bounde aforsayd unto the present proprietors of the Township of Waterbury Know yee that the sayd Gov<sup>r</sup> & company assembled in Generall Court according to the commission granted to them by our late Sovereign Lord King Charles the Second of the blessed Memory in his letters patent bearing date the Three & Twentyeth day of April in the fourteenth year of his Sayd Ma<sup>ties</sup> Reigne haue given and Granted & by these presents doe giue grant ratify & confirm unto Thomas Judd John Standly Robert Porter Edmund Scott Isaac Brunson John Wilton & the rest of the proprietors Inhabitants of the Towne of Waterbury & their heirs & assigns forever & to each of them in such proportion as they haue already agreed upon for the diuision of the Same all that a foarsayd Tract of land as it is butted and Bounded together with all the woods uplands arable lande meadows pastures ponds waters Riuers fishings foulings mines Mineralls Quarries & precious Stones upon and within the sayd Tract of lands with all other profits and comodities thereunto belonging or in any wise appertaining & we doe also Grant unto the afore named Thomas Judd John Standly Robert Porter Edmund Scott Isaac Brunson John Wilton, & the rest of the p<sup>re</sup>sent proprietors Inhabitants of Waterbury there heirs and assigns foreuer, that the foresayd Tracts of land shall be foreuer hereafter decmed reputed & be an Intire Township of it Selfe to haue & to hold the sayd Tract of lands & premises with all & Singular their appurtenances together with the priuiledges, Immunities & franchises herein given & granted to the sayd Thomas Judd John Stanly Robert Porter Edmund Scott Isaac Brunson John Wilton & others the present proprietors Inhabitants of Waterbury their heirs assigns & to the only proper use and behoofe of the sayd Thomas Judd John Standly Robert Porter Edmund Scott Isaac Brunson John Wilton & the other proprietors Inhabitants of Waterbury their heirs & assignes forever according to the Tennore of his Ma<sup>ties</sup> Manor of East Greenwich in the County Kent in the Kingdom of England in fee & common soccage & not in capitee nor Knight seruice they yeilding & paying therefore to our Souerigne Lord the King his heirs & successors onely the fifth part of all the oare of Gold & Silver which from time to time & at all times hereafter shall be there gotten had or obtained in Lue of all rents services dutys & demands whatsoever according to the charter in witness whereof we have here unto affixed the seal of the Colony this eighth of february in the Third year of the reign of s<sup>d</sup> Soueraigne lord James the Second by the grace of God of England Scotland france & Ireland King defender of the faythe of o<sup>r</sup> Lord 1686:

Pr order of the Generall Court of Connecticut

JOHN ALLYN Secret'y

At the May session of the General Court, in 1703, the Waterbury patent, as well as the patents of the other towns in the Colony, was confirmed in the following act :

Whereas the Court did authorize May 14, 1685, the Governor & Secretary of the Colony to give Patents or deeds to the proprietors of every township [&c.] of all lands & rights [&c.] & did ratify all sequestrations, and donations, [&c.] it is hereby enacted that the several above mentioned lands with all the rights [&c.]

contained in the above mentioned Patents shall be & remain full & clear estate to the Proprietors of the respective towns mentioned [&c.] & the lands sequestered & given to public and pious uses shall remain forever for the same, [&c.]

At the October session of 1720, the proprietors of Waterbury petitioned that a new "deed of release and quit claim of and in the lands within the town may be granted and be signed and sealed by the Honorable the Governor and the Secretary." The petition was granted and a patent furnished in a more approved and ample form.

One reason for this new deed appears to have been the neglect to enter the names of all the proprietors, the grantees, in the former deed. Other reasons were probably found in the irregular practices and informal proceedings of the proprietors in disposing of their lands, hereafter to be noticed. The original patent, in the hand writing of Mr. Southmayd, (except the date and signatures,) is in the writer's possession :

To all people to whom these presents shall come, the Governor and Company of the English Colony of Connecticut, in New England in America, send, Greeting, &c. — Know Ye, that whereas all the lands contained within these abutments, Viz. beginning at a certain chestnut tree marked and stones about it, which is Waterbury's south west corner and Woodbury's south east corner, thence running northward thirteen miles to a small white oak tree marked with divers letters, and a heap of stones about it, which tree is Waterbury's north west corner and Woodbury's north east corner, thence running east eight miles till it strikes Farmington bounds, thence running south to the south west corner of Farmington bounds, thence east till it comes upon Wallingford bounds, and from thence a straight line to a certain chestnut tree, known by the name of the three sisters, which tree is Waterbury's south east corner, & Wallingford's south west corner, New Haven's north west corner, and Milford's north east corner, thence westerly a mile and six score rods to Milford's north west corner, thence south to Beacon Brook, thence westward as the brook runs, to a great rock marked on the west side of Naugatuck River, thence a straight line to the twelve mile stake, thence west to forementioned tree which is Waterbury's south west corner and Woodbury's south east corner, and is about five miles and a half in breadth at the south end of the bounds, butting west on Woodbury, north in part on Litchfield and in part on country land, to the east in part upon Farmington and in part upon Wallingford, to the south in part upon Milford and in part upon Derby.—Were purchased and lawfully obtained of the Indian native proprietors, and have been possessed and improved, for the space of more than forty years, by the persons whose names are hereafter mentioned, being present inhabitants and proprietors of Waterbury, in the County of Hartford and Colony of Connecticut aforesaid.

And Whereas King Charles the second, our late sovereign lord of England, &c., by letters patent, under the great seal of England, by writ of privy seal, bearing date the twenty eight day of April, in the fourteenth year of his reign, did give

and grant and confirm unto us the said Governor and Company all the lands within the Colony aforesaid, in which those lands are included, and the said Governor and Company did in the year one thousand six hundred and eighty five, May the fourteenth, grant letters patent for the land above s<sup>d</sup> to Thomas Judd, Esq., John Stanley, Edmund Scott Isaac Bronson, and John Welton, and others the then inhabitants of Waterbury, whose names should have been then enrolled but were not,—For this and other reasons and good causes, the said Thomas Judd, Esq., and other the inhabitants, proprietors of Waterbury, now moving to us the Governor and Company in general court assembled, for the more sure making and firm establishing of the rights to us given of the lands aforesaid unto them according to the several descents, devises, grants, divisions, agreements, to them fallen, given, made, concluded, purchased, or purchases by them made or procured, according to, or as are, to be found in their town records, from time to time, as they come to the said Thomas Judd, and all other the inhabitants, proprietors of Waterbury, whose names are hereafter declared, and whereby their several rights, proprieties and properties and proportions are distinguished whether holden by them in fee simple or fee tail, or considered for life, or lives, or years, in severalty, or as tenants, joint-tenants, or as partners—

*Now Know Ye* that we the said Governor and Company in General Court assembled, by virtue of the letters patent, to us given by our sovereign lord King Charles the second, of happy, blessed memory, have granted, remised, released and quitted claim, and by these presents, do fully and absolutely for us and our successors, give, grant, remise, release, and altogether for us and our successors, quit claim, ratify, approve and confirm in the quiet and peaceable and firm seizin and possession of the said Thomas Judd, Esq., John Stanley, Edmund Scott, Isaac Bronson, John Welton, Capt. Thomas Judd, Esq., John Southmayd, Timothy Stanley, John Hopkins, Abraham Andruss, Sen., John Richards, Edmund Scott, the heirs of Abraham Andruss, Jr., the heirs of John Newell, the heirs of John Carrington, the heirs of Daniel Warner, John Scovill, Sen., Thomas Judd, the heirs of Joseph Gaylord, the heirs of John Bronson, Daniel Porter, Sen., the heirs of Philip Judd, Thomas Newell, Jeremiah Peck, Jonathan Scott, Sen., Richard Porter, Stephen Upson, Sen., the School, the Parsonage, Samuel Stanley, Isaac Bronson, William Hickox, Thomas Hickox, Samuel Scott, Ephraim Warner, Thomas Upson, Thomas Andruss, John Bronson, Thomas Richards, Sen., John Barnes, Benjamin Warner, Thomas Bronson, Ebenezer Bronson, Samuel Porter, Obadiah Scott, the heirs of Thomas Welton, George Welton, the heirs of Stephen Welton, Ebenezer Hickox, Jr., Stephen Upson, Jr., the heirs of John Richards, Jr., Thomas Barnes, Samuel Warner, Sen., John Scovill, Jr., Ebenezer Richason, Thomas Clark, George Scott, Jr., David Scott, Sen., Jonathan Scott, Jr., John Welton, Jr., the heirs of John Richason, Stephen Hopkins, Joseph Lewis, William Judd, Daniel Porter, Jr., the heirs of John Judd, Timothy Hopkins, George Scott, Sen., Joshua Peck, Richard Welton, Benjamin Warner, Sen., Daniel Shelton, Joseph Prime, Josiah Platt, James Fenn, Moses Blachly, [Blakeslee,] John Prout, Thomas Furney, [Turney,] Joseph Moss, Israel Moss, Richard Bronson, the heirs of Samuel Howard, Elizabeth Wilson, Joseph Birdsey, the heirs of Thomas Richason, John Read, James Brown, the heirs of Serg. Jamuel Hickox, Hezekiah Rew, Ebenezer Hickox, Sen., Samuel Mix, Silvanus Baldwin, James Blachly, [Blakeslee,] Samuel Barnes, James Poisson, Samuel Warner, the heirs of Obadiah Richards, the heirs of Obadiah

Scovill, John Stanley, the whole right, title and claim which we have in or unto all the above said tract of land, bounded as abovesaid, with all the buildings, fences, orchards, trees, wood, timber, underwood, stones, precious stones, quarries, mines, minerals, lands, uplands, pastures, marshes, arable lands, meadows, swamps, rivers, brooks, creeks, ponds, springs, waterings, islands, upon or within the above said tract of land, and with the rights, members, appurtenances, hereditaments, and the reversion and reversions, remainder and remainders, royalties, privileges, whatsoever, of into, within and out of the premises, and any and every part and parcel of the same, to them and every of them, their heirs and assigns forever, according to their and each of their several parts, portions, proportions, shares, rights and interests, in, of and unto the lands above described, to be distinguished according to their several descents, devises, grants, divisions, agreements, and purchases, as of record appeareth, and by records of said town of Waterbury may be seen, (reference thereunto being had,) in this instrument— To HAVE AND TO HOLD, to them the said Thomas Judd, Esq., John Stanley, Edmund Scott, Isaac Bronson, John Welton, Capt. Thomas Judd, John Southmayd, Timothy Stanley, John Hopkins and all others, the inhabitants, proprietors of Waterbury, whose names have been above declared, and to their and each of their heirs, according to each one's several proportions aforesaid, to their proper use, benefit and behalf for ever.

And whereas, there is in the actual seizin and possession of the said Thomas Judd, John Stanley and others, the inhabitants and proprietors of Waterbury, sundry lands within the limits above described, called and known by the name of sequestered lands, sequestered by vote of the town of Waterbury and reserved for the town's use, intended to be improved and used by the inhabitants of said town as commonage, for the common and general feeding of cattle, for firewood, timber, stone, and any and all other the profits and conveniences thereof, without any regard to the distinction of shares, rights, proportions of interests, or property in the said lands—therefore upon motion made to us by the said present proprietors of Waterbury—We the Governor and Company of the English Colony of Connecticut, in New England, in America, in General Court assembled, do for ourselves and our successors, fully, freely and absolutely, remise, release, quit claim, ratify, approve and confirm, in the quiet and peaceable and firm seizen and possession of the said Thomas Judd, John Stanley, Isaac Bronson, John Welton, Capt. Thomas Judd, John Southmayd, Timothy Stanley, John Hopkins, and all other the present proprietors, inhabitants of Waterbury, as have been before named—the whole right, title and claim that we have had, or have in or unto the said sequestered lands above described, limited and bounded, as the records of the town of Waterbury will more fully show, (reference thereunto being had,) *To have and to hold*, to them the said Thomas Judd, John Stanley and others the proprietors above named, their heirs, successors and assigns, in equal proportion, as town commons, to be ever improved, used and occupied by them, the parties above named, their successors and assigns, in the way and manner above set forth, (which was the design and intent of the first sequestration,) without any distinction and particular limitation of the yearly and constant profits arising therefrom to the several proprietors among themselves, and never to be impropriated, granted, divided, or taken up in severalty, until three quarters of the proprietors, inhabitants of Waterbury, shall agree thereunto.

The whole of what is in this instrument above released, quit claimed and confirmed, *To hold* of his Majesty, his heirs and successors, according to the tenor of



his Majesty's Manor of East Greenwich, in the County of Kent, in that part of the Kingdom of Great Britian formerly called England, in free and common socage, rendering, yielding and paying therefor to our sovereign lord the King, his heirs and successors, for ever, only the fifth part of all the oar of gold and silver which, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, shall be gotten and obtained, in lieu of all services, duties and demands whatsoever, according to the charter of us the said Governor and Company granted, without any manner of claim, challenge, or demand whatsoever, to be had or made by us, or our successors, in any manner of wise—

In witness whereof, we have caused the seal of the said Colony to be hereunto affixed, this twenty eighth day of October anno Domo. one thousand, seven hundred and twenty, in the 7<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of our sovereign lord George of Great Britain, France and Ireland, King.

G. SALTONSTALL Gov<sup>r</sup>.

HEZ. WYLLYS. Secretary.

It is manifestly the intention of the above deed to enumerate, as grantees, either individually or as the heirs of certain persons, all those who, at the time, were owners of land, (or who had titles of land,) divided and undivided, in the town of Waterbury. Viewed in this light, the catalogue is full of interest. The five patentees of 1686 are mentioned in the beginning. Three of them were deceased. With the exception of these and of those persons whose "heirs" are referred to, the individuals named were living at the time. Several of them (most of those bearing unfamiliar names) were non-resident landholders. The following persons were not (and never had been) residents of the town :

Silvanus Baldwin of Milford, Joseph Birdsey, James Blachly of New Haven, afterwards of Litchfield and Waterbury, Moses Blachly of New Haven, afterwards of Waterbury, Richard Bronson of Woodbury, James Brown of New Haven, afterwards of Waterbury, James Fenn of Milford, Samuel Howard (heirs,) Samuel Mix of New Haven, Israel Moss of Derby, Joseph Moss of Derby, Josiah Platt of Milford, James Poisson, Joseph Prime of Milford, (Capt.) John Prout of New Haven, John Reed of "Lonetown," Fairfield County, Hezekiah Rew of Milford, Daniel Shelton of Stratford and Ripton, Thomas Turney of New Haven, Elizabeth Wilson of Hartford, (who held a mortgage on land of John Welton, Jr.)

The patents, it will be observed, make Waterbury thirteen miles in length. As for breadth, that of 1686 describes it as nine miles at the northern part, and somewhat less at the south; while that of 1720 speaks of it as eight miles broad at the north, and five and a half at the south end. These descriptions very essentially curtail the limits of the town, as they

are set forth by the Indian deeds. Probably it was the intention of the grantors, in thus describing the boundaries of the town, to avoid the possibility of encroaching on adjoining grants. It bordered on neighboring towns the limits of which had not yet been certainly determined. In truth, nobody knew, at the early dates of which I am speaking, how much territory there was that lay north of the Derby line and between the Farmington and Wallingford bounds on the east and the Woodbury bounds on the west. As the limits of Waterbury were finally settled, the town extended from north to south, on a meridian line, seventeen miles, and from east to west, at its broadest part, nine miles. Towards the southern extremity its sides approached, so that on the Derby and Milford border it was but about five and a quarter miles across. Its average length may have been sixteen miles, and its average breadth, eight and one third miles. It could not have contained less than one hundred and thirty-three square miles, or eighty-five thousand acres. These, divided *equally* among the thirty-six original proprietors, would have given twenty-three hundred and seventy acres of land to each—a pretty fair landed estate.

The limits of the old town, as above defined, comprehend the present towns of Waterbury, Watertown and Plymouth, half of Wolcott, a small part of Oxford, the greater portion of Middlebury, more than a third of Prospect, and nearly the whole of Naugatuck. This tract of territory, which a committee of the colonial government estimated as sufficient to maintain thirty families, now contains a population of (say) fourteen thousand souls.

In consequence of the lack of fixed landmarks, in the original deeds and patents of the township, Waterbury was involved in frequent, protracted and expensive controversies, (which were sometimes carried to the Assembly or the courts,) with the bordering towns. Throughout its entire boundaries, in fact, there seem to have been but three points which were fixed, and assented to from an early period. These were the "three sisters," (the southeast corner,) the mouth of Beacon Hill Brook, and a point "four score rods from the eastermost part of Quassepaug Pond," on the Woodbury road. The length of

but a single line, (and that a short one,) was given, till after the patent of 1720. This line ran "westerly" (that is, in some direction, towards the west) one mile and six score rods. It began at the "three sisters," a point which had been settled as the Waterbury southeast corner before 1720.

The following extracts from the colonial and town records show (in part) what was done, from time to time, in way of settling the boundaries between Waterbury and other towns:

May y<sup>e</sup>: 18: 1680: this presents may srtefy y<sup>e</sup> gen<sup>l</sup> Court or whom it may concern y<sup>e</sup> we y<sup>e</sup> agents of derby being desired and appointed by y<sup>e</sup> inhabitants of our town y<sup>e</sup> 30<sup>d</sup> of aprill (1680) hauing full pour to conclude a loyn place or places of bounds: depending betwixt mattatock and derby and make a final issue of y<sup>e</sup> matter before it coms to y<sup>e</sup> generall court and we y<sup>e</sup> agents of mattatock William iudd Thomas Judd and iohn standly iur: being appointed by our committy to gain a compliyanse with our freinds ioseph haukins and able gun according to y<sup>e</sup> tenor of y<sup>e</sup> premises so fare as it concerns these two plantations we do agree y<sup>e</sup> so y<sup>e</sup> generall court may giue their sanction upon it, do by theis presents determine betwein us as follows, y<sup>e</sup> y<sup>e</sup> south bounds of mattatock do begin at a stack at derbe twelue miles end and from y<sup>e</sup> stack to extend a west loyn where derby and mattatock shall meet Woodbury bounds and from y<sup>e</sup> stake afores<sup>d</sup> at the end of derbe twelue miles to go with a straight loyn to a ston marcked with: m: on y<sup>e</sup> north sid and: d: on y<sup>e</sup> south sid lying on y<sup>e</sup> west s<sup>d</sup> nagatock or mattatock riuier and from y<sup>e</sup> ston to y<sup>e</sup> mouth of becon hill brook where it falls into nagatock or mattatock riuier and y<sup>e</sup> brook to be y<sup>e</sup> deuident loyn east ward between mattatock and derby and this agreement is a finall issue or a full settell ment of y<sup>e</sup> s<sup>d</sup> bounds of mattatock and derby which is to all intents and purposes binding to them their heirs assigns and sucesors as witness our hands y<sup>e</sup> day and date aboue mentioned.

derby agents  
Joseph haukins  
Able gun:

Mattatock agents  
William iudd  
Thomas iudd  
John standly iur

To all whom it may concern be it known y<sup>e</sup> we herevnto subscribing as agents in y<sup>e</sup> behalf of y<sup>e</sup> Plantations of woodbury and mattatock by y<sup>e</sup> motion of honourable freinds and weighty arguments as hereunto inducing haue had a meeting upon y<sup>e</sup> 29<sup>th</sup> of iune 1680: in order to y<sup>e</sup> setling of boundarys betwein y<sup>e</sup> s<sup>d</sup> two plantations and do fully and unanimously agree and consent as foloweth uiz that there be a loyn run du east from ye westermost part of y<sup>e</sup> bounds agreed and concluded between mattatock and derby to mattatock riuier and so y<sup>e</sup> loyne to be run from y<sup>e</sup> s<sup>d</sup> riuier too miles and twelue scor rods due west and then a loyn from y<sup>e</sup> eastermost part of y<sup>e</sup> great pond commonly called or known by y<sup>e</sup> name of quassapaug from such a part of y<sup>e</sup> pond as by us already agreed on four score rods due east and then a straight loyn from y<sup>e</sup> four score rod to y<sup>e</sup> a fore sd west corner betwein derby and mattatock and from y<sup>e</sup> afore sd coner or four scor rod due east from y<sup>e</sup> forsd pond y<sup>e</sup> bounds is agreed and concluded to run due north

to ye extent northward of each plantations bounds and y. this our mutall agree- ment and firm settellment of y\* deuident bounds betwein our plantations as aforesd is signified by our subscribing hereunto this twenty ninth day of iune in y\* yeir of our lord sixteen hundred and eyghty.

Thomas Judd	John Minor
Isriell Curtis	William Judd
John Standly iur	Joseph Judson

May 1681. This Court haue granted that the bounds for the plantation of mat- tatak shall runn eight miles north from the town plott, as their stated bounds and doe confirme and rattify the boundaryes agreed upon by Mattatuck and Wood- bury plantations and the boundaries agred upon between Mattatuck and Derby inhabitants, which more at large is sett down in their subscribed papers by the hands of the committees appoynted by each plantation and Mattatock bounds on the east shall be upon Farmington bounds.\*

Aprill—3<sup>h</sup>—1703. Wee agree as followeth for boundrys betwein derby and Waterbury to run west ward from y\* marked ston or y\* west sd y\* riuer to a stone or rock on y\* straight mountain with stones layd on it and to run a straight loyn to y\* twelue mile stake and then run west from s<sup>d</sup> stake by marked trees and sta- tions Y a red oak with stones layd at y\* botom 7 ly a white oake 3 ly a red oake at y\* noreast s<sup>d</sup> of to antick pond 7 ly a white oake on a long redg of rocks south west from toantick pond

for Waterbury	for derby
Timothy Stanly	Ebenezer Johnson
John hopkins	henery Woster
obadiah Richards	Edward Rigs

We hereunto subscribing agents for Woodbury and Waterbury met together March 26th, 1744, and began at the known boundary east of Quassepaug pond and ran a line north two degrees west a straight line up to a stake with a heap of stones about it the north east corner of Woodbury bounds, and the north west corner of Waterbury bounds, and haue erected monuments in about eighty rods distance on s<sup>d</sup> line, which monuments are described by marking trees near to them with 44

Ephraim Minor	} Agents for Woodbury	Samuel Hickox	} Agents for Waterbury
Thomas Knowls		William Judd	
Timothy Hinman			

April the 23<sup>d</sup>, 1765. We whose names are hereunto subscribed, being by the towns of Milford and Waterbury appointed to settle the north and west lines be- tween the towns of Milford and Waterbury, with the assistance of two county surveyors for the County of New Haven—we began at the three sisters New Haven north west corner, Milford north east corner, Waterbury south east [corner] with Milford and from said corner we ran a due west line one mile and six score rods and made monuments once in eighty rods and at the end of said line we made a heap of stones by a white oak staddle, then southward forty eight rods to Derby north east corner, the south side of Beacon Hill River, which lines we do agree

\* Copied from Cothren's Woodbury, Vol. I, p. 58.

and establish to be the lines between the towns of Milford and Waterbury. Signed in Waterbury, upon the above date, by us

John Lewis	} Waterbury Committee	David Baldwin	} Milford Committee
Stephen Upson, Jr.		Nath <sup>l</sup> Farrand	
George Nichols		Phineas Peck	

March 27, 1768, the selectmen of Derby and Waterbury met at the twelve mile stake, and measured easterly to Beacon Hill Brook and westerly across Toantick Pond to the Woodbury line, giving distances and points of compass.

It was customary with the old towns, in obedience to the statutes provided in such cases, to appoint a committee of two or more persons, annually, whose duty it was, in concert with adjoining towns, "to perambulate the bounds," in the month of March or April, and "to renew the monuments," or boundmarks, which were usually heaps of stones at the corners, and once in eighty rods in the lines. It was usual also to mark the trees and sometimes the stones, as guides to those who might follow. The penalty for neglect to perambulate was five pounds. During the controversy with Farmington, about the dividing line, Waterbury passed a vote that it would not perambulate with her, but preferred to pay the fine. This was in April, 1748.

Previous to February, 1680-81, all legitimate authority in the affairs of the settlement centered in, and emanated from, the grand committee. At this time, however, they relieved themselves of some of their responsibilities, and conferred certain powers and privileges, relating to local administration, upon the people themselves.

A meeting of the comity for mattatuck febey 5 1680 att farmington itt was then determined by vs that thos towne ofesers that are chosen by the in habitants of sd mattatuck shall execut their respectiue ofeses and that for the futur the inhabitants of the place being orderly called and conuened by their maj<sup>r</sup> voat shall haue liberty to chus their Tounsmen Constables suruayors fence viewers and haywards or any other siuel ofesers from time to time without any further order from the Comity.

In 1682, the committee farther determined that the inhabitants should have power to make regulations concerning the impounding of cattle.

After these dates, the committee, having got the infant town upon its legs, as they conceived, gradually withdrew from the

management of its affairs. They now "advised," in cases in which they formerly "ordered." They continued, however, to make proprietors, to regulate the conditions of proprietorship, to determine questions of forfeiture, and to make special grants of land for the common good, &c. The acts of the proprietors relating to these matters had no force until approved by them. Their powers did not terminate, nor were their duties entirely at an end, till the incorporation of the town. In October, 1685, their number had been reduced by death to two, a minority of the original committee. The General Court authorized the survivors to continue their functions, as follows :

Oct. 1685. This Court appoint Major Talcott and Mr. Wadsworth to continue their powers as Committee for Mattatuck, notwithstanding the death of some of their number.

The last official act of the committee which I have met with on our records is one relating to "the way of raising rates for defraying of the public charges," dated Dec. 26, 1685. It is an "order," signed only by Major Talcott, though it runs in the name of "we." There is, however, a "request and desire," signed by the "friend and servant [of the proprietors] John Wadsworth," dated Sept. 9, 1687, which asks that an oversight in laying out land may be corrected.

At an early period, the proprietors, noticing that their lands, which were most valuable and conveniently situated, were gradually passing into the hands of individuals and beyond the control of the people at large, determined to provide against the possible evils which might result. They reserved certain large tracts for future occasions and the common good.

Gen: 3<sup>d</sup> 86 y<sup>e</sup> Town by uoate granted y<sup>e</sup> all y<sup>e</sup> bogey meadows east from y<sup>e</sup> town fence too miles north and southward from y<sup>e</sup> town shall be sequestered for common lands and too miles east from y<sup>e</sup> afore sd fence.

Another vote appears afterwards to have been passed, on the same day, which sequestered *all* the lands in the limits mentioned, making them common lands.

Gen: 3: 86 y<sup>e</sup> town detrimined y<sup>e</sup> all y<sup>e</sup> land on y<sup>e</sup> east sid y<sup>e</sup> fence Round to y<sup>e</sup> Mill Riuer so to y<sup>e</sup> east mountain we say to dauids brook and to y<sup>e</sup> east mountain all y<sup>e</sup> land in y<sup>e</sup> compas to be and belong as common land

Several years afterwards, still another vote was passed, designed apparently to extend and explain the preceding.

Genuary y<sup>o</sup> 8<sup>th</sup>—170 $\frac{7}{8}$  y<sup>o</sup> proprietors sequestered for y<sup>o</sup> use of y<sup>o</sup> town too miles from y<sup>o</sup> going down of y<sup>o</sup> hill beyond Thomas hikcox\* hous east and then from it too miles north and too miles south and then to run at each end west to y<sup>o</sup> common fence.

These votes gave origin to the terms sequester and sequestered lands, on our records. The territory described lay east of the village, being two miles broad from east to west and four long. It was not regularly surveyed till April, 1716, when Lieut. Timothy Stanley and William Hickox were appointed to lay it out. It was set aside, irrevocably, for public uses, its benefits to be enjoyed by the inhabitants in common, without any reference to proprietary ownership. In the divisions and grants that were made, from time to time, no one had a right to locate his lands within its boundaries. It furnished pasturage, fire-wood, timber, stone, &c., for all, as they stood in need. In several instances, when the public interest was likely to be promoted, grants of it were made to individuals on conditions.

In process of time, it was found that lands layed out, on the supposed sequester line, overlapped and encroached upon the sequestered territory, thus giving origin to conflicting claims. To settle the difficulty, the proprietors voted, in 1763, that all lands laid out near the reputed line of sequester, should remain good.

The sequester lands were kept sacred for many years, or were granted in small parcels for a common good. At length, however, they acquired value, and it was not so easy to keep the hands off them. Eight acres were distributed to each proprietor in 1715. In 1733, a vote was passed to have a regular division; but at a subsequent meeting, it was thought "likely to be very prejudicial to the town" and "very impracticable;" so the former vote was reconsidered. In January, 1738-9, however, it was again concluded by the proprietors, to have a division of the sequestered land. One quarter of an acre on each pound propriety was distributed. This operation was repeated in 1759 and afterwards, till the reserved lands were exhausted. I have not succeeded in finding the evidence that these acts of the proprietors were in conformity to the

---

\* Thomas Hickox's house stood on East Main street, near the house of the late Dr. Joseph Porter.

Assembly's confirming act of 1703, and to the town patent of 1720. By the confirming act "the lands sequestered and given to public and pious uses [were to] remain forever for the same;" while the patent declared that the sequestered lands, so called, should "never be impropriated, granted, divided, or taken up in severalty, until three quarters of the proprietors shall agree thereunto." In the recorded votes ordering the divisions which have been referred to, nothing is said about "three quarters of the proprietors" being in the major vote.

Other tracts of land were sequestered at different times, to prevent a too rapid appropriation by individuals. There was a large tract in the northwest quarter, next the Woodbury line, at a place which became known as "the Village," and afterwards as "Garnsey Town," which was thus reserved, (I know not when.) It embraced some of the more valuable lands of the town. It was finally divided among the proprietors, the first division being in Nov. 1722.

March 13th, 1733, a tract of land in the northwest quarter, "one mile and a half each way from the centre," was sequestered for the town's use. The tract embraced the present village of Watertown. Soon, however, the restriction was taken off this territory.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

### MILLS.

In all new settlements, mills for grinding grain and sawing logs are considered as things of the first necessity. They are a part of the labor-saving machinery which civilization invented at an early period. They perform the work of many men, and do it more perfectly than it can be done by hand.



Food and shelter are the first things to be provided for in a new country, and these mills are almost essential in the preparation of the materials. Corn can be pounded in a mortar, or crushed between stones; but it is a severe task, and none but a primitive people will long submit to it. Dwellings can be made mainly of logs prepared by an axe, with the assistance of clay and straw for the roof; but boards and other "sawed stuff" are almost essential for floors, doors, &c. Our fathers, when they first came to this place, must needs go to Farmington for all their mill-work. They must travel a distance of twenty miles through a pathless wilderness, or waste their labor in imperfect attempts to supply their wants at home. The only way to escape from this alternative was to provide mills of their own.

The State's committee, at an early period, took this matter into consideration, and under date of Nov. 27th, 1679, advised as follows:

We doe advise the inhabitants to build a sufficient corn mill for the use of the towne and keepe the same in good reparation for the same for the worck and servis of grinding corne and for incoragment we grant such persons shall haue thirty [acres] of land layd out and shall be and remain to them and their heirs and Assigns for euer he or they maintaining the said grist mille as aforesaid for ever.


Soon after, Stephen Hopkins of Hartford, erected a mill on Mill River (so called from this use of it) "for grinding corne." It stood where the Scovill Manufacturing Company's rolling mill now is, where a grain mill has ever since remained until within the last twenty-five years or so. The mill being built, the committee awarded to Hopkins the grant which he had become entitled to, and added to it a house lot of two acres, a three acre lot and a £100 allotment. I quote from the record, under date of Feb. 5th, 1680, (1681, N. S.)

It is further concluded that steuen Hopkins who hath builte a mile att that plantation [mattatuck] shall haue that thirty acrs apointed and intailed in a former order to such as shall erect a mille theare and so much more land aded to the sayd thirty acrs as may aduance the same to be in value of one hundred pound alotment

There is also a house lott containing in estimation to acrs granted steuen Hopkins as conuenantly as may be to suit the mile and the for said Thomas Judd and John Stanly and the present townsmen to lay itt out to him and also a thre acre lott: acording as the other inhabitants haue granted to be layed out by these same persons for him







*J. M. L. Scovill*



Aferwards, (Aug. 8, 1682,) the town, in order to carry out the intentions of the committee in relation to the "hundred pound allotment,"

Granted to Stephen Hopkins that alotment which was Decon Langton's with the prouision that one half of the said alotment shall be intailed to the mill as the thirty acres is, in case the committy grant the same, causing the said Hopkins to subscribe as other inhabytants haue don: prouid [ed] also this grant fre us from all former iniagments respecting the millars Lott

This action of the proprietors was ratified by the committee, February 6th, 1682, (1683 N. S. ;) but John Hopkins, "the present miller," who was the son of Stephen, was named as the grantee. This is the record :

In referance to what lands are granted by the inhabitants of mattatuck to John Hopkins the present miller we do well aprove of and in case they shall see cause to ease the intaile of any part the £100 Alotment we shall not object: against it

The result of all this action was, John Hopkins, "his heirs and assigns," became entitled to the original grant of thirty acres, the sole condition being that "he or they maintain a grist mill for ever." He also became the owner, by grant, of Dea. Lankton's propriety and allotments, without conditions, except that a two acre lot and a three acre lot were entailed to the mill in like manner "as the thirty acres are." To remove all doubt and misapprehension in relation to the tenure by which the Lankton allotments were held, a vote was passed, after the town was incorporated, of which the following is a copy :

Att a town meeting at waterbury december: 30<sup>th</sup>: 1687: y<sup>e</sup> town granted John hopkins y<sup>e</sup> alotment now in his possesion which was formerly deac langtons freely and absolutely to him and his heirs foreuer exsepting y<sup>e</sup> allotment in Isaacs meadow containing three acers and y<sup>e</sup> too acer alotment in hancox meadow, which still abids intayld to y<sup>e</sup> mill as appears by y<sup>e</sup> town act febeur 13: 1682: we say theis too lots are intayld to y<sup>e</sup> mill as y<sup>e</sup> 30 acers was intayld by y<sup>e</sup> comity. [Pro. Book. Vol. I, p. 13.]

Several years later, a misunderstanding or difficulty appears to have arisen between the miller and the town, possibly in consequence of the dam being carried away by the floods, and a claim made upon the town to rebuild it. The result was a compromise and an agreement signed by Hopkins on the town book, "in y<sup>e</sup> presents of y<sup>e</sup> town."

Att a town meeting in waterbury genuary 30<sup>d</sup> 1699 or 700 y<sup>e</sup> town by uoat ingaged to make and maintain y<sup>e</sup> mill dam from y<sup>e</sup> east s<sup>d</sup> of y<sup>e</sup> cornmill to y<sup>e</sup> hill on y<sup>e</sup> east sid y<sup>e</sup> Riuer for teen yeirs on theis conditions y<sup>e</sup> y<sup>e</sup> miler make and keep y<sup>e</sup> corn mill in good Repayer to do y<sup>e</sup> towns worck in grinding for them fifteen yeirs and maintain y<sup>e</sup> dam from y<sup>e</sup> east sid y<sup>e</sup> mill to y<sup>e</sup> hill on y<sup>e</sup> west sid of y<sup>e</sup> mill extriordinarys exsepted.

Boath on ye towns part and millers in y<sup>e</sup> presents of y<sup>e</sup> town I acsept theyr act and they doing what they promis I ingage to do min in makeing and maintaining the mill as witness my hand  
John Hopkins

But the causes of misunderstanding were not yet all removed. In less than three years a new compromise became necessary, and John Hopkins signed another agreement on the town book "in presents of the town." This relates to the mill-place.

Att a town meeting sept: 14: 1702: where as there has bin sum dificulty a bout y<sup>e</sup> mill place for a finall issue on y<sup>e</sup> same y<sup>e</sup> town and miller agree y<sup>e</sup> y<sup>e</sup> property of y<sup>e</sup> mill place be and remain to him and his heirs foreuer as y<sup>e</sup> mill land is he maintayning a mill to do ye towns worck for euer but if ye miller fayl to maintayn a mill to do y<sup>e</sup> towns work in grinding theyr corn well corn being sutable to grind then y<sup>e</sup> property of y<sup>e</sup> mill place to return to y<sup>e</sup> town and priuiledges of it only they are to giue y<sup>e</sup> miller a resonable price for what is his own on y<sup>e</sup> mill place and if y<sup>e</sup> town and miller cannot agree to be prised by indefrent men in tes. timony of my compliyance with y<sup>e</sup> town i have in presents of y<sup>e</sup> town set to my hand  
John Hopkins

The matter of the mill place being settled, as a part of the compromise, probably, the following vote was passed :

Att the same meting the town agree by uoat to tak of [off] the remainder of in-tail ment layd one John hopkins meadow lot [s<sup>r</sup>] a [and] gife him lefe to re[cord] it to him self as his one [own]. [Town Book, p. 103.]

The word "lot," in the preceding vote, must, I think, have been intended for lots. If so, it is fair to conclude that the pieces referred to are the meadow tracts, one of three acres in Isaac's Meadow and one of two acres in Handcox's Meadow, which were a part of Dea. Lankton's allotments. This view is strengthened, if not proved to be the correct one, by the fact that soon afterwards, under date of April 8, 1703, the two lots in question were recorded, as though without any conditions, among the lands belonging to John Hopkins. [L. R. Vol. I, p, 17.] The mill lands, proper, are recorded by themselves.

Genuary: 25th: 170<sup>3</sup> y<sup>e</sup> town gaue y<sup>e</sup> miller leaue to remoue y<sup>e</sup> 8 acers of y<sup>e</sup> mill lot from y<sup>e</sup> pin hool and take it where it suts ouer y<sup>e</sup> mill riuer

For aught that appears, after this, for a considerable time, matters went on harmoniously between the miller and the town, the one "grinding corn," and the other bringing "corn suitable to grind," each party thus contributing to the best good of the other. In process of time, however, John Hopkins died and was gathered to his fathers, having been town miller for fifty years. His executors and sons, Stephen and Timothy Hopkins, January 17th, 1732-3, in consideration of £350, conveyed to Jonathan Baldwin, Jr., of Milford, all their right and title in the grist mill and mill place, with the thirty acres thereto belonging, lying in several pieces, viz, fifteen acres on the mill plain, eight acres on the Mad River by the common fence, two acres over against the mill, one acre on this side the river by the mill, two acres in Isaac's Meadow on the east side the brook, and two acres towards the upper end of Hancox Meadow.\*

For many years, there is nothing to show how "Jonathan Baldwin, Jr." acquitted himself as the new miller; but at a town meeting held Dec. 10th, 1753, it was voted to raise a committee "to search into the circumstances of the mill Land and see what Tittle Mr. Baldwin has to said Land," &c. At another meeting, held Feb. 4, 1754, the following action was taken :

After some considerable Discourse about the old corn mill that was Mr. Hopkins the Question was put to the Town wheither they were Easie with Mr. Jonathan Baldwins tending of the mill It appearing to them that the most of the customers had not their Corn Ground Well—Voted that they were uneasie and at the same meeting made Choise of Capt Sam<sup>l</sup>. Hickcox Lieut John Scovill Liut Tho<sup>r</sup> porter a Committe to treat with Mr. Jonathan Baldwin and his son Jonathan and Learn what agreement they can come to.

Quite recently, since the grist mill was discontinued, and the site and water privilege devoted to other uses, questions arose, on the part of certain persons, as to the conditions attached to the old mill grants, and the effect which a neglect of these would have on the titles of the present owners. Some came to the conclusion, after searching the records, that the mill grants had been forfeited and that the lands reverted back to the grantors, the original proprietors of the town, their heirs and assigns. This conclusion, if established, would put

---

\* Land Records, Vol. IV, p. 18.



into the possession of the latter a large amount of property within the present city limits, including mills, factories, water privileges and dwellings, and dispossessing a large population of their estate. As the inquiry proceeded, it became a matter of interest to know what the mill grants were and what lands were included, and subjected to the conditions.

The "mill lands," so called, were the following:

1. *The "thirty acres."* These were granted by the committee of the General Court, in 1679, on condition that the mill be maintained forever, as we have seen. It does not appear that this land was "located" by the committee. Doubtless, the proprietors and the miller were left to settle among themselves the location, and thus accommodate their mutual convenience. Nor is there anything to show that the land was taken up, or at any rate, surveyed, immediately; indeed the contrary appears in regard to a part of it; for on the eighteenth of March, 1701-2, Stephen Upton and Benjamin Barnes with the town measurer were appointed a committee "to lay out the mill lot at the mill, and what highways are needful for the mill." The mill lot here alluded to is, probably, the one referred to in the following extracts:

March y<sup>o</sup>—25—1704 y<sup>o</sup> town granted y<sup>o</sup> too acers of y<sup>o</sup> mill land to be layd out to gether betweyn y<sup>o</sup> highway y<sup>t</sup> leads to y<sup>o</sup> mill and y<sup>o</sup> highway y<sup>t</sup> is next to abraham andruss sn<sup>t</sup> lot if it be there to be had not pregedising y<sup>o</sup> highway but takeing y<sup>t</sup> highway betweyn where yong abraham set up a hous and y<sup>o</sup> riuier

Oct. 26. 1713, the town by uot agre the too acers of mill land laid out by Leftenant Timothy Standly buting on the mill riuier est and so to run west betwen the hig way that gose from the town to the mil and the highway that gose from the town to the mad riuier a long by the est sid of Abraham Andrus hous lot it buting also west on a high way that gose from the corner of Thomas warners to said Andruss is accepted and determined to be and remain part of the thirty acurs of land intaile by the grand comity. [Town Book, p. 117.]

The piece of land above is recorded, Dec. 14th, 1713, among the mill lands, by John Hopkins, then clerk, as "two acres on Mad River, below the mill dam, south on highway, that goes to said river, north on highway that goes from the town to the mill, west on highway." It seems to have been the land immediately below the old mill extending down the river to the present bridge and to the road which leads to it, reaching west to Union square and north to the "mill path,"

or the road coming from the town, (Cole street.) In the sale, however, to Jonathan Baldwin, in 1732-3, this piece is called one acre. Perhaps a part of it had been exchanged for other land.

The "Mill Plain" lot is recorded by John Hopkins, in 1713, and described as "within the common fence southward from part of Abraham Andruss, his house lot," butted north on common fence, west on Dr. Porter, John Richards, Timothy Stanley and common land, south on highway, east on Abraham Andruss and the "brow of the hill."

This tract of land lay down the river from the mill, below the bridge and south of Union street. Abraham Andruss' lot of three and a half acres lay between it and the river and the road going to the river. It extended south as far as Liberty street,\* or some other east and west road, and west to the lands of the individuals named. It appears to have embraced the entire plain at the north end.

The "eight acre lot" before alluded to as removed, by consent, from Pine Hole, was situated on the east side the Mad River, opposite Mill Plain, lying between the New Haven road, (as it was then called,—Balwin street, on the map,) the common fence and the river. It appears, however, not to have extended as far west as the river, but to have been four rods from it at the nearest point, on the lower side, where it met the common fence. It is described on the same page of the record as the other pieces as lying "over Mill River southward from the town, butted west on common fence, southerly on common land, easterly and westerly on highway."

Another piece still, of two acres, lay on the east side of the river, north of the crossing, "over against the mill."

These four pieces, containing in all twenty-seven acres, are recorded by John Hopkins, for the first time, apparently, in 1713, and are described as the mill lands, belonging to the thirty acres. The remaining two acres are not recorded. But

---

\* Liberty street is recorded as having been laid out, Sep. 28d, 1808, through Col. Wm. Leavenworth's land, called the Mill Plain, to the grist mill at the place of the Hotchkiss & Merriman Manufacturing Co., two and a half rods wide and thirty-two rods in length. There is no mention of a previous road. At that time, the high level ground, down as far as the bridge on the present New Haven road, was called Mill Plain, though the mill land could not have extended so far south or west.

in the conveyance to Jonathan Baldwin, two other pieces are enumerated, each of two acres, one in Isaac's Meadow, (at Isaac's Meadow bars,) and the other in Hancox's Meadow, while the two acre piece "below the mill dam" is called one acre, making in all thirty acres quit claimed to Baldwin.

The two pieces of land in Isaac's Meadow and in Hancox's Meadow, I suppose to be the same as those which came from Dea. Lankton's propriety, and which were at first "entailed to the mill," and then (Sep. 1702) the "entailment taken off" by the town. And yet, previous to Baldwin's purchase, the lot in Isaac's Meadow ("easterly on the brook [Steel's] westerly on the hill") had been called three acres, instead of two, as mentioned in the deed to Baldwin. Nor do I know why the two tracts in question should be named as a part of the thirty acres. The act of 1687 would seem to imply that they were distinct from, and additional to, the latter.

2. *The mill place.* There is no record to show who were the grantors of the mill site and mill privilege; but as the title, or rather the right to grant, was in the committee at the time the mill was erected, it is fair to conclude that they were the grantors. Nor does it appear what conditions, if any, were originally attached to the grant. The action of the town, however, in 1702, taken in connection with the agreement signed by Hopkins, proves that there were conditions. This agreement between the parties, it will be remembered, put the mill place on the same (or similar) footing as the other mill lands. The mill place was "to remain to the miller and his heirs forever, he maintaining a mill to do the town's work forever; but if the miller fail to maintain a mill, the mill place to return to the town and privileges of it, only they are to give y<sup>e</sup> miller a reasonable price for what is his own on the mill place." It is not clear that the town or proprietors had any right, either inherent or conferred by the town patent, to change, or consent to a change, of the conditions of an original grant of the committee; but perhaps no change was designed, but only a declaration of what was the original intention. It will be noticed that the kind of mill to be maintained, whether a corn mill, a saw mill, or a rolling mill is not mentioned. "Town meeting" and "town" are employed, according to the custom

of the time, for proprietors' meeting and proprietors of the town ; but these mistakes, in common with others of the same sort, were corrected by the statute of 1723.

There is no sufficient evidence to show that the conditions of any of the mill grants, even those attached to the mill place itself, required that the mill should be maintained where it was first erected. For aught that appears, Hopkins, his heirs and assigns, would not have forfeited the grants, had he or they suffered the old mill to go to decay, and erected a new one somewhere else, up or down the river, or in any other place not inconveniently remote, running it by such power as was at hand—water, wind, steam or horse power. If any one of those who subsequently held a part of the entailed property, however small, had chosen to do this, the old mill being neglected, that act, it appears to me, would have fulfilled the conditions and kept alive all the grants.

The question has been asked—and it seemed at one time to be a question of some importance—to whom would the mill lands revert in case of a forfeiture ? Undoubtedly, to the State, unless the State has in some way parted with its rights. The title to all the territory of the colony of Connecticut, at the time of the grants, was in the "Governor and Company," derived by "letters patent" from the king of England. The committee for the settlement of Mattatuck represented the Governor and Company—the colonial government—and acted by their authority. Grants, conditions and reservations made by them, who were mere agents, were as if made by the principal—the government. All the benefits of forfeiture, therefore, would accrue to the Colony or State.

But was there no change wrought in the rights of the government by the town patents, or acts of incorporation ? That of 1686 may be equivocal in its phraseology ; but that of 1720 seems to me clear and explicit. The latter instrument declares that "we the Governor and Company" "have granted remised, released and quit claimed" to the inhabitants, proprietors of Waterbury, "all the abovesaid tract of land," (having described the boundaries,) "with all the buildings, fences, woods, stones," &c., "with the rights, members, appurtenances, hereditaments and the reversion and reversions, remainder and re-

mainders, to them their heirs and assigns forever, according to their several grants, proportions, shares, rights and interests in of and unto the lands above described, to be distinguished according to their several descents, devises, grants, divisions, agreements and purchases, as of record appeareth, and by the records of said town of Waterbury may be seen," &c., &c.

Thus, it seems to me that the State has divested itself of all its rights, reversionary and other, in the lands of ancient Waterbury, and has made over its whole title, of whatever kind, to the proprietors. All original grants, therefore, incumbered with conditions which have been disregarded, till a forfeiture has been wrought, would seem to be the property of the proprietors. This is the apparent condition of the mill lands. Before the "mill place and privileges" however, can go into new hands, their present owners must be paid a "reasonable price for what is their own on the place," according to the agreement of 1702, and if the parties cannot "agree [the property is] to be appraised by indifferent men."

Such are the views of the writer, but as he is no lawyer and no expert in such matters, he may labor under some fundamental error.

I have said that questions arose as to the effect which a discontinuance of the mill must have on the old mill grants. Several meetings were held in 1849 and 1850, and committees appointed, at different times, to investigate the subject. April 2d, 1850, Edmund E. Davis, Isaiah Dunbar, David Chatfield and Josiah Culver were chosen "a committee to examine into the right the proprietors have to Scovill's mill seat which was formerly granted to Stephen Hopkins." These meetings, however, and some subsequent ones, seem to have been informal; when some of those opposed to the farther agitation of the subject thought it worth while to move. A special meeting, purporting to be legally warned, was held Jan. 4th, 1851, when it was voted "to bargain, sell and convey all the right, title and interest that the proprietors of the ancient town of Waterbury have to any of the undivided lands holden or possessed by individuals given or granted on condition," &c. Samuel H. Nettleton, Silas Hoadley and Josiah Hine were chosen a committee "to release and convey," &c.

At an adjourned meeting held the 25th day of January, 1851, the committee appointed at the last meeting made a report, the result of their investigations. They recapitulate some of the facts which have already been mentioned concerning the old mill grants, at the same time overlooking others of material importance. They then go on to say :

And we further find that from that date said lands have been regularly conveyed from one person to another down to the present occupants, some by deeds of quit claim and some by deeds of warranty, without any reservations in the same and warranting against all claims whatsoever and free from all conditions, and that in some of the deeds of the mill lands as then called, the mill and privilege are named as a separate part of the property and distinct from the same.

And we further find that from the long lapse of time and the course of conveyances of said property and the impossibility of now determining the precise location of the said lands—we recommend that the subject is not deserving of further attention, and for the purpose of quieting all further agitation on the subject—we recommend the appointment of a committee of two, in lieu of the one appointed at the last meeting, to release to any of the present owners of said property or [of] any other property, any rights that the ancient proprietors may have to lands heretofore granted upon condition as aforesaid—

We also find that the grant of said lands was from the State [Colony] of Connecticut instead of the ancient proprietors, and if there is any reversionary interest as to said lands, the title is in the State of Connecticut instead of the ancient proprietors of Waterbury.

This report was accepted by a vote of twenty-one to ten. In the affirmative were Daniel Upson, Thomas Welton, William H. Scovill, James M. L. Scovill, E. F. Merrill, Aaron Benedict, John Thomson, John S. Kingsbury, Garry Merrill, S. W. Hall, William Hickox, John Buckingham, S. M. Buckingham, Edward S. Clark, Charles D. Kingsbury, Miles Newton, Willard Spencer, Eldad Bradley, Anson Bronson, P. W. Carter, Sherman Hickox.

In the negative were Isaiah Dunbar, George N. Pritchard, Horace Foot, David Chatfield, Thomas B. Davis, Alonzo Allen, David C. Adams, Enos Chatfield, Josiah Culver, David M. Pritchard.

In pursuance of the recommendation of the report, a committee, consisting of Willard Spencer and John P. Elton, were appointed "for, and in the name and behalf of the proprietors of the common and undivided lands of the ancient town of Waterbury, to release and convey by proper deeds of conveyance to the present owner or owners of any lands known as

the mill lands and all others heretofore given or granted on conditions by a committee appointed by the State [Colony] of Connecticut, or by any subsequent committee or committees of the ancient town [or proprietors?] of Waterbury all the rights, titles and interests that the said proprietors may or ought to have thereto, also to release and discharge said lands from said conditions."

This is the important vote. The record says it passed, but the number of voters or votes, (or the names of those who voted,) is not given. It does not appear whether all the persons whose names appear in the first vote, and who may have been in the last, were proprietors. It does not appear that the votes were counted according to each man's propriety, or interest in the common lands, as the old statute directed, and as was the ancient custom. Nor does it appear that those deriving their rights from bachelor proprietors, who (by the express terms of the grant which made them such, were denied a voice in "giving away lands") were excluded from the vote. But the question on the acceptance of the report was not a material one.

It is clear that the proprietors have no power to "release and discharge lands" from conditions that were imposed by the Colony or its committee; though they may undoubtedly "release and convey," or quit claim, lands to which they have acquired a title in consequence of a forfeiture of, or a non compliance with, the conditions imposed by said Colony or committee.

The minority of course were not pleased with the course which had been pursued at this meeting, and particularly with the powers given to the "deeding committee." They questioned the rights of certain persons who had been permitted to act and vote, and disputed the legality of the whole proceeding, &c.

Grist mills in a new settlement are soon followed by *saw mills*. I am unable to say when or where the first saw mill in Waterbury was erected. There was one existing in 1686, for the "path that leads to the saw mill" is spoken of Jan. 3d, 1686, (1686-7.) I suspect, but I do not certainly know, that the mill thus referred to stood where the Waterbury Knitting

Company now carry on business, where one was in being at the time the factory was erected, and where the writer, in early life, sawed logs. I find as early as 1704, that a lot, at this point, of four acres, owned by Jeremiah and Joshua Peck, and fronting on Cherry street, (now so called,) was bounded west on a "passage," which I suppose to have been the same as that which still exists, coming down from the north, along which logs were drawn to the mill. This lot was called in 1746, "Lieut. Bronson's saw mill lot." Whether this mill was referred to in the following grant, April 6th, 1702, I am unable with certainty to say.

Stephen Upson had a grant of land between Bronson's path that goes to his boggie meadow and the path that goes over the meadow to the saw mill.

A meadow called "Bronson's Meadow, in 1724, was on the east side of the brook, in the neighborhood of the supposed saw mill.

There was a saw mill on Mad River, near the Farmington road, which is referred to March 28, 1695, which I suppose not to be the same as that alluded to in 1686, or in 1702.

After grist mills and saw mills have been provided for a new township, *fulling mills* are thought of for the purpose of fulling and dressing cloth for wearing apparel. Cloth is more easily transported to distant mills than grain or logs; still, as the farmers of new countries expect to pay for what they buy by the products of their farms, which are, for the most part, too heavy for convenient transport, it is very desirable to have mills for this as well as for other machine-work, near at hand. The people of Waterbury gave this matter their early consideration.

[Jan 20, 1692.] There was sequestered the great brook from edmun scots lot down to samuell hickox jr lot for to build a fulling mill.

It was thus sequestered, or set apart, that it might not be taken up by those in search of desirable places where they might "locate" their grants or divisions, thus becoming individual property. The design was to reserve it to be given, or disposed of, to some person who would erect and maintain a fulling mill. Whether the portion of the brook thus set apart was above or below the Knitting Company's factory, I cannot



say. I am not aware that a fulling mill existed upon this stream early, though there may have been one. The earliest mention of such a mill on Great Brook which I have met with is in April, 1737, when Nathan Prindle sold to Nathaniel Arnold a fulling mill, which stood on the Buck's Hill road near the site of the old Clock Factory of the late Mark Leavenworth, (Waterbury Knitting Co., on the map.) The mill then standing must have been built between 1728 and 1732.

The first fulling mill known to have been built in Waterbury, was on Fulling Mill Brook, at Judd's Meadow, now Naugatuck. I suppose this mill, then about to be built, is referred to in the following passage, and that Daniel Warner's Brook is the same as that which was afterwards called Fulling Mill Brook, the mill giving its name to the stream.

March 6<sup>th</sup>, 1709-10, the proprietors granted to Samuel Hickox the Liberty of that Stream called Daniel Warner's Brook from the East side of the going over the s<sup>d</sup> Brook. Any place for Conveniency of Daming So Long as he Shall maintain A fulling mill and Conveniency of Land to pass and dry Cloth.

Samuel Hickox, 2d, died June 3d, 1713, and after his death, one of his sons is spoken of as having had land laid out "where his father built a fulling mill." Samuel Hickox, then, had a mill, which was erected before 1713, and probably after 1709, on the brook where he lived, called Fulling Mill Brook. Dr. Trumbull, in his History of Connecticut, remarks that there was but one clothier in the Colony, in 1713. In reference to this statement, Mr. Cothren, in his History of Ancient Woodbury, (Vol. I, p. 73,) remarks, that "if the assertion is true, which he has no reason to doubt, Woodbury was the location of the first clothier," Abraham Fulford having established himself there and built a fulling mill previous to that time. Dr. Trumbull, who quotes as his authority, "Answers to questions from the Lords of Trade and Plantations, 1710," was doubtless mistaken. In all probability, there were many clothiers and fulling mills in the Colony at the period named.

## CHAPTER VIII.

## ROADS, BRIDGES, &amp;c.

ALL new settlements suffer much inconvenience and privation for want of roads. To make good, or even passable roads, requires much time, labor and expense—sacrifices that new settlers can ill afford. And yet, civilization cannot go on—cannot even be preserved—without them. Of course, men will first build those roads which are most needed—which best serve to connect them with the world which they have left—with its people, its institutions, its machinery and its markets.

The first planters of Mattatuck found it convenient and necessary to keep a constant communication with Farmington. The Farmington road was the first that was opened. It was doubtless, for a time, a mere horse path, and was in a very imperfect state for many years. In its general course, it ran nearly east from the village, along just north of Spectacle Pond, (at the junction of the new plank road and the old Cheshire road.) It crossed Beaver Pond (Hog Pound) Brook a little distance from its mouth, passed north of Beaver Pond through East Farms, occupying a position near the present road. At the east end it came out just at the boundary line between Farmington and Wallingford, (now Wolcott and Cheshire.) There is no early survey of it on record. Our whole knowledge respecting it is gathered from land surveys, votes, &c., in which it is incidentally mentioned. Though a vote was passed in 1702, ordering that all surveys of highways should be recorded, this was not done till 1716 and afterwards.

In May, 1731, an “upper road to Farmington” was in existence, in the northeast corner of the town, at a place called Poland. Lands at Ash Swamp were situated on this road. It was probably a continuation of the Bucks Hill road.

There is a record of a survey of a highway "from Farmington bounds to the town," bearing date Feb. 9th, 1754, which seems to be the old road which has been described, though this fact is not alluded to. It "began at Farmington southwest corner," and terminated in the village at Ebenezer Bronson's and John Scovill's corners, butting, as it passed through the town, "on each side on y<sup>e</sup> ends of each man's home lot as it is now fenced, the boundaries of said highway being set at y<sup>e</sup> corner of each man's lot." Distances are mentioned in this survey, and the general direction, but not the points of the compass.

In 1686, New Haven and Mattatuck were ordered by the General Court to make a road between the two places as speedily as the work could be conveniently done. It was soon after alluded to on the town record as "our road that leads to New Haven," and land was laid out on it, at Judd's Meadow, in Jan. 1690-1. It was the second road connecting Waterbury with the other settlements. Its commencement was at Mill River. It ran in the direction of Baldwin street, continuing along upon the high ground on the east side of Naugatuck River, and some distance from it, passing a little east of the old burying yard at Judd's Meadow. It was used as the road to Judd's Meadow till 1721, (when a highway on the west side of the river was built,) and as the road to New Haven till the present turnpike was constructed, about 1802.

In June, 1716, there was a survey of the "country road" to New Haven by Serg. Stephen Upson and Abram Andruss, which is recorded. It began "at the paith that goeth over the river a letel westward of the mill," "at the mouth of the mill treanch," and ended at the New Haven bounds. The road ran apparently where the old one did. The survey of the New Haven road is the first which is recorded. Distances and points of compass are not mentioned, and little can now be learned from it.

The third road running out of Waterbury, chronologically speaking, was the Woodbury road. It is mentioned incidentally as early as 1687, though it could not have been much used at that time. After the breaking out of the French and Indian wars, which followed the English Revolution, this be-

came a more important and more frequently traveled road. It connected Woodbury with Hartford and the river towns. It was made use of, it is believed, to communicate with Albany and the military posts lying north of that place. The Waterbury people, in their petition to the General Court for assistance in building their new meeting house in 1691, while enumerating their burdens, speak of the trouble and expense of "the soldiers passing to and fro and their often entertainments." After Mr. Peck was disabled by illness, the inhabitants of Waterbury went by this road to Woodbury to obtain baptism for their children. It passed up the West Side hill nearly where the present road runs across Breakneck Hill, north of the pond, in Middlebury.

In June, 1720, Isaac Bronson, Timothy Standly and Thomas Judd laid out a "rode towards Woodbury," commencing at "the weste bars," being twenty rods wide for a distance up the hill, running by Isaac Bronson's farm (at Breakneck) and ending "at the going down of Wolfpit Hill to the Bridg Brook at Woodbury bounds." At what points this road deviated from the old one, I am unable to say. "The old path" is referred to in only one instance.

In Dec. 1766, there was a resurvey of the Woodbury road, commencing at Obadiah Scovill's (now Mrs. Bennet Bronson's) corner, (being four rods and eleven feet from Andrew Bronson's corner opposite,) and running one hundred and seventy-six rods to the bridge, the highway being three rods wide. On the other side of the river, the road was eleven rods wide, and on the hill, twenty rods wide. The old river crossing was some ten rods below the present bridge.

The road to Bucks Hill was next in order. Feb 25th, 1702-3, "Sergt. Bronson and Ens. Stanley were appointed a committee to lay out a highway from y<sup>e</sup> highway at y<sup>e</sup> town to Bucks Hill and a passage from Bucks Hill to y<sup>e</sup> common fenc at Hancox Meadow and one to Ash Swamp." Another committee, consisting of Doct. Warner and Richard Wilton, were chosen to lay out a road to Bucks Hill, in 1715. But there is no record of a survey at either of these times; but in 1724, Ephraim Warner and John Bronson "laid out a highway to Bucks Hill, beginning at the Claypits, [west corner of North Main and

Grove,] six rods wide where the path now is," and running to Edmund Scott's pasture, then twenty rods wide to Obadiah Scott's house, thence in the path to the east end of Bucks Hill to Richard Welton's house, thence northward in a path to Hancox Brook Meadow.

The following town vote relates to the continuation of Willow street, up the hill north of Mrs. Bennet Bronson's dwelling. It is the earliest formal record concerning a highway outside of the original town plot.

Oct. 26. 1713, at atown meting the town determin that the highway to run northward by the common fens from John scouils on the est sid of the fens shal be the sam breth [breadth] as tis a gainst said scouils lot till it coms to the extent of said scouils land estward from the fens.

A highway towards Westbury through the common field was laid out by Nathaniel Arnold and Thomas Barnes, in Nov. 1729. It began "at the road on the hill against Manhan Meadow," (where the house marked Timothy Church stands,) and "continued twenty foot wide as the path now goes" to the upper end of Manhan Meadow.\* It then crossed the river and bore westward and northward across Steel's Meadow to Steel's Plain east of J. G. Bronson's house. This road was subsequently changed at its commencement near the village, so as to begin at "the country road that goeth to Woodbury before we come to Manhan Meadow Hill," crossing the plain and a small brook, and continuing on the hill side, near where the present road runs. At the other end, or Steel's Plain, it was continued west and north, at the foot of the hill up Steel's Brook and on the west side, and so on to Scott mill, Wooster Swamp and the village, in the northern and northwestern part of Westbury.


That part of the present Watertown road which is next to the covered bridge was not laid out till November, 1753. It began three rods from the top of the river bank, and ran

---

\* In Eliot's Indian Bible, Munhan, Manhan, Munnahan Mannahan, &c., are the Indian words for an island. Manhattan, the Indian name of New York Island, is doubtless the same word in another dialect. There are indications, (or used to be,) that Manhan Meadow was once an island, and that a part of the river, at no very distant period, ran down upon the east side next the hill in the course of the canal of the Water Power Co., and so continuing through the old Long Cove and along the line of the Naugatuck railroad till it met the Great Brook. This was low ground, and throughout its extent there was, in the writer's memory, a chain of miniature lakes or ponds.







Henry Inman, Pinx<sup>t</sup>

Charles Burt, Sc.

*Isaac Bronson*





“northward forty four rods to a heap of stones three rods from the bank on the west side of Bronson’s Island.” It then ran a little more eastward nine rods to an apple tree three rods from the river bank ; then northward one hundred and thirteen rods to a rock three rods from the top of the river bank, bounding east on said bank ; then a little west of north twenty rods ; then “northward,” in all, one hundred and ninety-four rods, terminating at a heap of stones “between Joseph Bronson’s and Obadiah Richards” at “the passage that comes from Tompkins to Isaac’s Meadow.”

From the description of this road, it would seem that the river above the bridge (or a branch of it) at the date mentioned, ran down across the meadow three rods from the highway. The road was designed to give the Westbury people and those living north up the river, access to the lower bridge.

In Dec. 1721, there was a highway laid out to Judd’s Meadow,\* on the west side of the river. It began at Long Meadow bars and passed down the river a distance, then over the hill and across Hop Brook, and ended at Joseph Lewis’ home lot.

To reach this road, people went in at the south meadow gate, followed the course of the present turnpike to the lower end of Mad Meadow, and crossed the Naugatuck River at the “Long Meadow riding place,” at the foot of Benedict and Burnham Manufacturing Co’s race way.

The river road to Plymouth (now called) did not exist at an early period. There was one, however, laid out on the west side December, 1735, from Steel’s Plain northward to Buck’s Meadow Mountain, for the accommodation of the inhabitants living in that direction. On the east side of the Naugatuck, there was the pent road to the upper end of Manhan Meadow. From this point, it was extended (at a very early date, doubtless) to Hancox Meadow, for the accommodation of the farmers. There was a passage above for those living upon the river, north ; for in 1738, it was stated by the people of North-

---

\* March 26th, 1699. “Abraham Andrus, Sen., John Warner, Sen., and John Hopkins were chosen a committee to lay out a passage to Judd’s Meadow.”

Where it was proposed that this passage should be, or whether the committee did anything on the subject, does not appear.

bury, in their petition to the Assembly for "winter privileges," that to get to meeting at the center, they were obliged to cross the river nine times, and to pass through ten gates and sets of bars.\* In October, 1745, a regular highway was laid out from the mouth of Spruce Brook, south, on the river bank, twelve rods wide, to Hancox Meadow. In December, 1772, a committee was appointed "to go and view a proposed pent road the east side of the river through Hancox Meadow to Northbury and make report."

The present turnpike road from Plymouth to Salem (Naugatuck) bridge, there to unite with the Strait's turnpike connecting New Haven with Litchfield by Watertown, was finished in 1702. It was an open highway and a great undertaking.

I suppose that the first bridge over the Naugatuck River was built on the Woodbury road, in 1736, probably a little below where the present bridge stands, in accordance with a town vote passed in 1735. In Dec. 1736, there was a tax laid "of three pence on the pound to pay the charges of the bridge and other town charges." These are the first notices of a bridge to be found on record. In a petition to the General Court for "winter privileges," in October, 1732, the Westbury people mentioned as one of the reasons why their prayer should be granted, that they were separated from the meeting house by "a great river which is called Waterbury River, which for great part of the winter and spring is not passable." It is fair therefore to conclude that no bridge was in existence in 1732, and that the notices which have been referred to in 1735 and 1736, relate to the first bridge.

In the spring of 1740-41, the bridge was carried away or much damaged by a flood. A vote was passed to "repair" it, and Lieut. Thomas Bronson and others were appointed a committee "to look after and save what timber can be found." In the fall, however, the bridge had been again swept away, and a committee was chosen to rebuild it, and to

---

\* A letter before me from Mr. Noah M. Bronson of Medina, Ohio, dated July, 1855, when the writer was eighty-eight years of age, states that in passing down the river from Jerico to Waterbury village, with a team, after the Revolution, one was obliged to cross the stream six times, and remove from twenty-five to thirty sets of bars.

“take advice in what form or manner” to construct it. They were to have “a discretionary power whether to hire it done by the grate or otherwise.” In order to defray a part of the expenses, it was decided, in February, 1743-4, to ask the General Assembly to make “the bridge built over the Naugatuck River in the country road to Woodbury a toll bridge.”

In February, 1748-9, it was necessary again to rebuild the bridge on the Woodbury road, “the timber and plank of the old bridge” to be used. £80 were appropriated for this purpose. In 1758, a bridge was built by Isaac Bronson and George Nichols. Five pounds were voted them the next year. In September, 1761, they petitioned the town for thirty pounds, saying the whole cost of the bridge had been about sixty-five pounds lawful money,\* and that it was hard for them to bear the whole charge. It had not been made a public bridge at this time.

In December, 1745, Capt. Samuel Hickox requested the town to assist him to erect a bridge over the river at the upper end of Hancox Meadow, (where he had a mill.) “They allowed him to call out Waterbury men and Bucks’ Hill men and those of the old society, excluding Judd’s Meadow men, that are obliged to work in the highway, one day, provided he allow a pent road through his fields and maintain gates and furnish a good cart bridge.”

In January, 1748-9, twenty-two pounds were granted to Capt. Hickox towards “a good cart bridge at his mill,” a flood having swept away the old one. Abraham Hickox and John Hickox, (sons of Capt. Samuel,) received from the town, March, 1764, “three pounds as a donation,” for the cart bridge which they had built over the “Great River,” at the same place, the other having apparently shared the fate of the first. Twelve pounds, in provision, were appropriated, in February, 1767, for still another bridge at Hancox Meadow.

A cart bridge in Northbury was about being built in 1747, and £22 money, old tenor, were voted Dec. 8th, of that year, to be paid when the bridge was completed. It was situated,

---

\* The reader will understand that £1 old Connecticut currency was the equivalent of \$3.88 1-3 U. S. currency.

according to the record, "where the highway is laid to the river, east from Mr. John How's house." Five pounds were granted in February, 1759, to the society of Northbury for their encouragement in constructing a cart bridge over the river at that place. Probably the old bridge had been destroyed by a freshet, and the balance of the cost of replacing it was borne by individuals.

In 1761, eleven petitioners applied to the General Court for relief, saying that they had built a bridge over the river near the center of Northbury, at an expense of £70, and that the town refused to pay for it. The town was ordered to pay £30 and keep the bridge in repair.

In January, 1748-9, a grant of twenty-two pounds money, old tenor, was made, for the first time, apparently, for constructing a bridge over the Mad River, a little below Mr. Jonathan Baldwin's mill, on the road to Judd's Meadow.

On the report of a committee, March 5th, 1753, the town "voted that Judd's Meadow men should draw one hundred pounds money, old tenor, out of the town treasury towards the building a bridge over the river at the mouth of Toantick [Long Meadow] Brook," provided "that there shall be no farther demands on the town for building or repairing a bridge in that place." In February, 1759, however, the town gave Capt. Thomas Porter five pounds for building a bridge "in that place;" and in September, 1761, twenty pounds for the same or another bridge.

Five petitioners, in 1767, applied to the General Assembly, and asked that the town might be ordered to pay for and keep in repair a bridge which they had erected over the Naugatuck at Judd's Meadow, at an expense of £50. The town paid twenty-five pounds for a cart bridge; and four years afterwards, or in December, 1771, accepted the bridge as a town bridge. Before the close of the winter, it was again carried away by a flood, as was the Northbury bridge.

December, 1757, the town voted to pay Mr. Joseph Bronson five pounds "towards y<sup>e</sup> building a cart bridge over y<sup>e</sup> river near the upper end of Manhan Meadow, provided he shall complete such bridge by y<sup>e</sup> first of December next." There are still remaining slight traces of the eastern abutment

of a bridge a few rods above the river crossing to Steel's Meadow. Joseph Bronson lived where the Alms House now stands. The bridge was a private one, and probably did not remain long.

At the same time, (Dec. '57,) five pounds were voted to Capt. Thomas Porter for a good horse bridge which he proposed to build over the river at Beaver Meadow.

It will be seen from the preceding notices that the work of constructing and repairing the bridges over the Naugatuck was exceedingly burdensome. The freshets in those days are believed to have been more frequent and destructive than now. The bridges, too, were less substantially built, and the people undertook to maintain too many of them.

It may surprise the present generation to know that the thought was once entertained of improving the Naugatuck River, and then using it for the purposes of navigation. December 21st, 1761, Abraham Hickox and Stephen Upson, Jr., petitioned the town that men might be permitted to "work at clearing the river," and have their work allowed as highway work, "it having been conjectured that the river from Waterbury to Derby might be made navigable for battooting." There seems to have been no action on the petition.

---

## CHAPTER IX.

### INDIAN WARS: THE GREAT FLOOD: THE GREAT SICKNESS.

FROM 1689, when William and Mary ascended the throne of England, to the peace of Utrecht, in 1713, with the exception of about four years from 1697 to 1702, England and France were constantly at war. The English colonies were of course involved. During all this time, the Indians of Can-

ada, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and the eastern and northern parts of Maine, were under the influence and control of the French. Marauding parties of Indians, or French and Indians, made frèquent hostile expeditions to the infant settlements of New England, destroying the crops, driving off the cattle, firing dwellings, and massacring the inhabitants, or carrying them into captivity. The colonies, particularly the weaker ones, were kept in a state of perpetual alarm. During this whole period, Waterbury was a frontier town and much exposed from the small number of its people, the want of fortified places and its distance from effectual succor. It was not till 1720 that Litchfield was settled on the north, affording protection in that direction. With Woodbury and Derby on the west and south, our fathers had little intercourse for many years.

By an act of the colonial government, the people of Waterbury, during much of the time of which I have been speaking, were required to keep two men employed as scouts "to discover the designs of the enemy, and to give intelligence should they make their appearance." They performed this duty in rotation. Elevated places which overlooked the village and the meadows where the men labored during the day were selected, where the sentinels were placed. Newel's Hill, east of Willard Spencer's, was one of these places, and the high ground back of the house occupied by the late Daniel Hayden (*David* Hayden on the map) was another. The records show the preparations which were made from time to time for defense:—

April 9<sup>th</sup>, 1700. The town voted [in consequence of apprehended trouble from the Indians] to fortify Ens. Stanley's house and if it should prou trouble-some times and y<sup>e</sup> town see they have need, two more should they be able.

Att y<sup>e</sup> same meeting y<sup>e</sup> town agreed by uoate for y<sup>e</sup> building y<sup>e</sup> fort about ensign Standly's hous that the town go about it forthwith, al men and boys and teams y<sup>e</sup> are able to worck and to begin to morrow, and he y<sup>e</sup> shall neglect to go on with the worck till it be dun shall forthwith pay to the aduantage of y<sup>e</sup> worck 2s 6d for a man and 6s for a team a day.

Aprill: 15<sup>th</sup>, 1703 y<sup>e</sup> town desired y<sup>e</sup> towns men to prouid a town stock of aminition according to law as soon as they can conueniently and if need be to caus a rate to be mad for to purchis s<sup>d</sup> stock.

[At the next meeting in Oct.] the town mad choys of Left Timothy Standly for to keep y<sup>e</sup> town stock of ammonition: for y<sup>e</sup> town. [Each town was required by

statute to keep "a barrel of good powder, two hundred weight of bullets, and three hundred flints, for every sixty listed souldiers, and after that proportion." Left. Stanley commanded the train band; of course it was meet that he should have the charge of the "military stores."]

March y<sup>e</sup>—25—1704— y<sup>e</sup> town agreed to fortifi Mr. Southmaid's hous, and deak judd Left Stanly and tho judd iur was appointed to stake out each man his proportion according to their gran leauy.

In May, 1704, the General Court designated Waterbury as one of the frontier towns. They ordered that ten men should "be put in garrison" in each of the towns of Danbury, Woodbury, Waterbury and Simsbury.

Feb 31 1706-7 the town agreed to buld the foert that is at left standlis strong. at the same meeting the act was past to build a nue foart at the east end of the town at the place wher they shall agre dek thomas judd was chosing comiti to asist the townsmen laying the s<sup>d</sup> foarts out and to state euri [every] man[<sup>s</sup>] pre posun [proportion] according to his leui.

An alarm was spread through the country early in 1707, in consequence of intelligence that the French and Indians of Canada were planning a descent upon the colonies. It was reported, too, that the Indians of Woodbury and New Milford—the Pootatucks and Wiantennucks—had formed an alliance with the enemy. A council of war was convened in Hartford in February, and it was resolved that the frontier towns upon the west, which were most exposed—Simsbury, Waterbury, Woodbury, and Danbury—should be fortified with all possible despatch. As Waterbury had sustained great losses from the floods, it was resolved that the Governor and Council, as an encouragement to the work, would recommend to the Assembly an abatement of the country rates (colony taxes) of the town.\*

The people of Waterbury bestirred themselves in due time. The work of "cutting bushes" was laid aside. A statute, in those days, required the selectmen of every town to warn every male person from fourteen years old to seventy (with certain exceptions) to work one day in each year "in cutting down and clearing the underwood in any highways, commons, or other places agreed on by the town," the object being to improve the pasture, &c. It was this work doubtless that was

---

\* Trumbull's History of Connecticut, I, 285.



to give way to the pressure of impending war. I copy from the record :—

June y<sup>e</sup> 23—1707 y<sup>e</sup> town by uoate considering our troubles and feere of an enemie do agree to lay a sid cutting busshis which was warned for this day till after micalmast, and this day forthwith to go abouth finshing and repaying y<sup>e</sup> forts, and to finish them by wensday next at night [;] and he or they y<sup>t</sup> shall neglect to do their part of s<sup>d</sup> foorts according to y<sup>e</sup> intent of this act and direction of y<sup>e</sup> com<sup>ty</sup> shall be proseeded against by distress as y<sup>e</sup> law directs in rates [;] y<sup>e</sup> price of y<sup>e</sup> worck to be stated by y<sup>e</sup> com<sup>ty</sup>—att the same meeting Leiu<sup>Tim</sup> Stanly serj. Isaac brunson and stephen ubson sen<sup>r</sup> was chosen a com<sup>ty</sup> with y<sup>e</sup> townsmen for y<sup>e</sup> above s<sup>d</sup> worck.

At the October Session, in 1707, the General Court made liberal grants of money to the frontier towns for their promptness and zeal in fortifying themselves. Waterbury received £15, to be divided among its people according to the amount of labor performed.

At the October (?) Session of the Assembly, in 1708, it was enacted, that two forts should be erected in Waterbury, and that garrisons should be maintained at the public charge at Simsbury and Waterbury, two in each place. Thus the government assumed the responsibility and the expense of defending the people of Waterbury. The latter, however, still supported one of the forts at their own cost :—

Novem<sup>r</sup> 15<sup>th</sup> 1708 y<sup>e</sup> town agree to have three forts in y<sup>e</sup> Town one built at y<sup>e</sup> west end of y<sup>e</sup> Town on the cuntry account one at Leiu Stanlys on y<sup>e</sup> cuntry account one at John hopkins hous on y<sup>e</sup> Town account—[Dec. 13, 1708] the fort to be built at the west end of the town shall be built about Mr. Southmayds hous.

These fortifications, so called, were distributed in such a way as to be of convenient access to the scattered population. They were constructed of logs or sticks of timber placed firmly in the ground, perpendicularly and close together, with a door properly secured for passing in and out. The houses to be fortified were thus surrounded by a high and strong wooden wall. Such a wall would afford very good security against Indian attacks. A small body of troops placed within one of the enclosures, well provided with guns and ammunition, and firing through crevices, could resist and beat off a large body of hostile savages. To these fortified houses all the people resorted at night, returning again in the morning to their houses and

the labors of the day. But, notwithstanding all that was done, the affairs of the settlement remained in a critical state.

In the spring of 1709, the New England colonies, at the instance of the royal government, fitted out an expedition against Canada, which was to meet an English force at Boston and sail for Quebec. Of the three hundred and fifty men which Connecticut provided, Waterbury furnished four. The English fleet never arrived and the enterprise was a failure. One quarter or more of the troops, says Dr. Trumbull, died. Connecticut lost ninety men.

In 1710, a party of Indians, or French and Indians, made a visit to Simsbury and Waterbury. In the south part of what is now Plymouth, they killed a man named Holt. (He may have been a transient person, or a hunter from another town.) The place is called Mount Holt, from the circumstance of the massacre. It is a spur of Mount Toby. About the same time, some Indians came down from Canada, on their customary errand, and ascended a hill, or mountain, on the west side of the river, opposite Mount Taylor, to reconnoitre. They saw Jonathan Scott seated under a large oak tree, in Hancock's Meadow, eating his dinner, with his two sons, aged fourteen and eleven, at a little distance. The Indians approached stealthily, keeping in a line with the tree and Mr. Scott. In this way they reached him unperceived and made him prisoner. The boys took to their heels; but the father, in order to save his own life, which he was given to understand would be taken if he refused, recalled his sons. Thus the three were captured. The Indians then retraced their steps rapidly with their prizes, having taken the precaution to cut off Scott's right thumb, in order to cripple him if he should make resistance.

The wife of Jonathan Scott was Hannah Hawks, the daughter of John Hawks of Deerfield. Her mother was killed in the Indian attack on that town on the terrible twenty-ninth of February, 1704. Her only sister, Elizabeth, was taken prisoner and put to death on her way to Canada. Her only brother John and his wife and three children, were also slain. Poor John Hawks was thus bereft of all his family except Hannah of Waterbury. What must have been the anguish of

both when this new bereavement became known! Hawks spent his latter days with his daughter in Waterbury.

The following vote explains itself:

[July 26<sup>th</sup> 1710] the town by vote gaue jonathan Scott his town rat for 1709 for getting out of town wiliam stanerds wife [a transient person whom the selectmen had warned out of town,] and in consideration of his present surcumstances he being in captivity.

The General Court, also, in 1711, abated the colony tax of Hannah Scott, "in consequence of her husband being in captivity in Canada."

After the peace, Jonathan Scott, with his eldest son, Jonathan, returned to Waterbury. The younger son, John, became accustomed to savage life, preferred it, and never returned. This preference, under similar circumstances, is not a solitary instance. White people who have been a long time with the Indians, particularly if their acquaintance began in childhood, very generally become attached to them and their mode of living. It is far easier to make a savage out of, than into, a civilized man.\*

At the May session of 1721, Scott applied to the General Assembly for pecuniary assistance on account of the expenses of his captivity and his attempts to release his son. He was allowed ten pounds. In October, 1725, he again petitioned; this time for aid to get his son out of bondage, and obtained a grant of £5.

The capture of Scott and his sons, of course, produced great excitement among the inhabitants of Waterbury. The alarm was greater from their not knowing the extent of the danger, or the time an impending storm might break over them. Their utmost vigilance might fail to give them the needed warning. It was in this state of uncertainty that the following vote was taken :

July 26, 1710 the town by uote mad chose of Mr. john Soth mad de Thomas Judd lft timothy standly sr John hopkins a comity to draw up in writing the surcumstances of the town in this tim of ware and reposit to the general cort to be holden in New haven on agst 4 1710 by their duboty to be by them presented to said cort

The General Court made provision for the safety of the town, as appears from the colony records :

---

\* See Hutchinson's History of Massachusetts, II, p. 128, note.

In consideration of the remoteness of the town of Waterbury from the County town and the committee of war appointed there, by reason whereof they cannot have so speedy relief up on the sudden approach of the enemy as is requisite— This Assembly do constitute and appoint John Alling, Esq., Major Samuel Ells, Jeremiah Osborn, Esq., and Capt John munson or any three of them, to be a committee of war with full power up on the application of the inhabitants of said town of Waterbury, and in case of danger on the approach of the enemy, to raise and send men thither from New Haven County for their relief by scouting or lying in garrison there, as occasion may require.

The next year, in consequence of the continued threatening aspect of affairs, the town appointed a committee as follows :

At a town meeting in waterbury April 9<sup>th</sup> 1711 the town by uote mad chos of Mr. John Southmad lft Timothy Standly Thomas Judd: John Hopkins sr Isac brunson sr steuen upson gorg scott as a commity to writ to the commity of safety at new haven and to Represent our cas to said commity consarning our present fears of the common enymy to take their aduice and counsel in said afar

It is difficult to picture to ourselves the condition of our forefathers at the time of which I have been speaking. They numbered only from thirty to thirty-three families throughout the whole period, there being one family less in 1713, according to my estimate, than in 1685. The whole population, doubtless, did not amount to more than two hundred souls. They were far removed from sympathizing friends, and were destitute of many of the comforts and all the luxuries of life. They toiled all day to wring a livelihood from an unwilling soil, and too frequently spent the night in watching. Their dwellings at this day would hardly be called tenantable. They all slept, during periods of supposed danger, in the fortified houses, as before stated. These were larger than the others, and were selected in part for that reason ; but the three, or the two, when but two existed, could not have properly accommodated so many. In the winter season, when all needed shelter, they must have been crowded to an inconvenient and unwholesome degree. Indian warfare is of a kind calculated to fill the breasts of a peaceful and exposed population with dreadful apprehensions and to chill the blood of the most courageous. The Indian prowls about by night and conceals himself by day and delights most to strike his victim unseen. The secrecy of his movements is only equalled by his fleetness. He

disdains the arts and also the virtues of civilized warfare. He falls upon the weak and unprotected, slaughters old men, women and children, waylays the traveler and tortures the captive. Cunning, treacherous, bloodthirsty, he dogs the footsteps of his enemy and waits his chance. He may be beaten back, but he returns to the attack and is subdued with difficulty. It is not so much his object to obtain victory as to destroy his adversary and lay waste his country. This is the foe with which the early settlers of Waterbury were threatened. It does not appear that they were actually assailed, except in the instances mentioned; but they were for long periods in a state of constant apprehension, expecting an attack and fearing surprise. The perplexing uncertainty and frequent alarms to which they were exposed, doubtless tried their fortitude, putting it to a severer test than the dangers of active and open war. In the latter, there are excitements and incentives which keep up the spirits. The idea of "glory" strengthens the arm and makes the heart courageous. But Indian warfare has few attractions. The laurels won in an Indian fight are not many. A wound received in some great *civilized* battle is deemed honorable, but there is little glory in being scalped.

After the peace of 1713, there was but little trouble or apprehension from the natives for several years. In 1720, however, hostilities were begun, on the part of the Indians, on the eastern frontier of New England, when Canso, an English settlement in Nova Scotia, was attacked and several of its inhabitants killed. This outrage and others which followed led to a declaration of war by Massachusetts, in 1722. Connecticut was invited to join in the contest, but declined. She, however, agreed to send a small force to protect the county of Hampshire from threatened attacks from the north and took vigorous measure to put her own frontier towns in a posture of defense. In the new town of Litchfield, a man (Capt. Jacob Griswold) was captured by a party of Indians and carried off, but he made his escape the first night. Soon after, (Aug. 1722,) one Joseph Harris was murdered near the place where Griswold was taken.\* In 1724, the Assembly gave Waterbury authority to employ six men "to guard y<sup>e</sup> men in

---

\* Morris's Statistical Account of Litchfield.

their outfields at the discretion of y<sup>e</sup> commission officers of sd. Town." The authority thus given was exercised for about one month.

Though danger was sometimes apprehended, the early colonists of this State did not suffer much from the resident tribes of Indians in the northwestern part of the Colony. The latter, few in number, were generally peaceful and friendly. They may sometimes have regarded the progress of the whites with jealousy and seriously contemplated hostilities; but, as a common thing, they courted their alliance and gave them kindly assistance in extremity. For a time, they regarded with satisfaction the growth among them of a new power which promised to protect them from their dreaded enemies and oppressors, the Mohawks of the west, to whom they paid tribute.

Still, our fathers were essentially a martial people. They loved and honored a military life. No race of men ever held in higher esteem individual bravery and strategic skill. The circumstances of their position influenced their opinions. The warlike virtues were to them a necessity. They were obliged to cultivate them for their own protection; and whatever such men seriously undertake they excel in. This continent never could have been settled and subdued by a timid or even by an unmilitary people. There was a demand for warriors and warriors of a superior order came forth. The early colonists attained the same excellence in the Indian fight that Cromwell's men did in the pitched battle. They soon became an overmatch for the most warlike of their enemies. They beat them in their own mode of carrying on a contest. They fought for their firesides and their existence. They prayed for aid to the God of Battles; but they did not despise carnal weapons, or neglect the lessons of worldly wisdom. They put their trust in Providence; but they also kept their powder dry.

Military titles were in high repute among the colonists. They were preferred to civil or ecclesiastical honors. A corporal was on the road to distinction. His office was occasionally, but not usually, attached to his name. A sergeant had attained distinction and his title was never omitted. An en-

sign or a lieutenant was lifted quite above the heads of his fellows. A captain was necessarily a man of great influence, whose opinion was taken in all the weighty concerns of a town. Few aspired to the exalted rank of a major. It was the reward of the most distinguished services. Major Talcott and Major Treat were rendered illustrious by their titles as well as their achievements.

The drum was a favorite instrument among our ancestors, and was put to many uses. It answered the purpose of a town bell. It called the people to meeting on Sundays. It summoned them to the fortified houses at night. It gave the signal for the town gatherings on public business. It told the people when to turn out "to burn about the common fence."

A law of the colony at the time of and after the settlement of Mattatuck, required that "all white male persons, from the age of sixteen to sixty years, except magistrates, justices of the peace, the secretary, church officers, allowed physicians, chyrurgeons, schoolmasters, representatives or deputies for the time being, one miller to each grist-mill, constant herdsmen and mariners, sheriffs, constables, constant ferrymen, lame persons, or otherwise disabled in body," should bear arms and be subject to military duty. Six days yearly were devoted to martial exercises, and a guard in every town, in no case of less than eight soldiers, was required to be maintained on the sabbath and other days of public worship. This guard, however, was dispensed with in 1714, there no longer being occasion for it.\* The law also provided, that every train band of sixty-four soldiers should have a captain, lieutenant, ensign and four sergeants—that a train band of thirty-two soldiers should have a lieutenant, ensign and two sergeants, and that a train band of twenty-four soldiers should "have but two sergeants," in all cases, exclusive of officers.

The Mattatuck settlers probably organized themselves into a military company so soon as their numbers warranted this measure. There is no record showing this, and they were not at that period exposed to the attacks of an enemy, but such was the custom of the times. As early as 1682, they had two

---

\* Field's Middlesex County.

sergeants in the persons of Thomas Judd, Sen. and John Stanley. (These individuals at that date were so denominated.) They must then have numbered, at least, twenty-four soldiers besides officers. In records bearing the dates of 1686, 1687, and 1688, Judd is, in a few instances, called ensign, but these are copied records, and a title which he afterwards bore, not found in the original, may have been applied to him negligently; for, it will be observed, he is repeatedly styled sergeant during the years mentioned.


After Andros' usurpation and the resumption of the government under the charter in 1689, the Waterbury train band was found to number, at least, thirty-two rank and file and became entitled to a higher grade of officers. It was then, Oct. 1689, that John Stanley was appointed and confirmed by the General Court as lieutenant, and Thomas Judd, (Sen.,) as ensign. At the same time, Samuel Hickox (Sen.) and (probably) Timothy Stanley were chosen sergeants. Isaac Bronson and John Welton were the corporals.

After Lieut. Stanley's removal from the town and Sergeant Hickox's death, both about 1694-5, Ensign Judd was made lieutenant; Sergeant Timothy Stanley, ensign; Corporal Isaac Bronson and (probably) Dea. Thomas Judd, sergeants. Lieut. Judd died in 1702-3, and Ensign Stanley succeeded him in command of the company, while Deacon Thomas Judd was made ensign. These continued to be the officers till 1715, when the soldiers of the company numbered, for the first time, sixty-four, and from this circumstance were allowed to have a captain. Lieut. Thomas Judd (the deacon) was promoted to this high position, and Ens. John Hopkins was appointed lieutenant. The next captains before 1732, were, successively, Dr. Ephraim Warner, William Hickox and William Judd. In 1732, the company was divided into two by authority of the Assembly. William Judd and Timothy Hopkins appear to have been the captains in that year.

But during the period to which the preceding remarks immediately refer, Waterbury suffered severely from other causes than war. In Feb., 1691, happened the Great Flood, so called. Owing to rains and the sudden melting of the snows, the river left its banks and covered the meadows, rising to a







AN OIL BY SAMUEL SAUNDERS

*Eli Terry*

height never known before or since. The water flowed along the low ground back of the house of Mrs. Giles Ives, and submerged a portion of the Green which is in front of the Episcopal Church. Great damage was done to the river lands and sore distress was the consequence. A large proportion had been recently plowed, while the surface had been loosened and softened by the rains and the coming out of the frost. As a consequence, the soil was wholly washed away in many places, while that which remained was covered with sand and stones. Thus the suffering inhabitants saw their labors come to naught. Their best lands were almost ruined and their hopes for the present blasted. This dreadful calamity was the cause of great discouragement. Many forsook the place in despair.

We have recently had examples of what the Naugatuck *can* do in freshet-time. On the 13th day of November, 1853, there came down the valley, on short notice, such a body of water as had not been seen by the oldest persons living. Those not acquainted with the ancient performances of our usually quiet and orderly river, were astonished and in some instances dismayed. Some of the manufacturing companies suffered greatly from the washing away of their race-way embankments. Bridges were carried off, and in Derby (Ansonia) some persons were drowned who happened to be crossing a foot-bridge at the time it gave way.

On the thirteenth of April, 1854, there was another great flood, the water rising in Waterbury within eighteen inches as high as in the previous November. At Derby, owing to a greater freshet in the Housatonic, the water was highest in April.

The most recent of the great floods, previous to the two last, occurred in 1801.

One reason, doubtless, why the floods of the Naugatuck do less damage now-a-days than formerly to the meadows upon its banks, is owing to the fact that the trees and bushes which once obstructed the current, forcing the water out of its natural course and throwing it into eddies, have been removed. It is when water is resisted by a barrier, or is fretted continually by obstacles, that it becomes such a terrific physical agent.





In October, 1712, a great sickness, mortal beyond example in the previous history of the town, broke out. It raged until September, 1713, carrying off, in eleven months, more than one tenth of the population. It was known afterwards, for a long time, as the Great Sickness. The well were not numerous enough to take care of the sick and bury the dead. Several families lost three of their number, and several others two. Of the twenty-one victims, (ten of them heads of families,) seven died between the sixth and twenty-first of March, 1712-13.

---

## CHAPTER X.

### BACHELOR PROPRIETORS.

By reason of the Indian wars, the great flood, the great sickness and other causes incident to a new and feeble settlement, in want of almost everything, to say nothing of a laborious and niggardly agriculture, Waterbury did not flourish for a long time after its settlement. The population was as great (if not greater) in 1685 or 1686, eight or nine years after the planters left their Farmington homes, as at any time during the first thirty-five years. It was at the period first named that the proprietors, who had secured their rights, began to remove from the town. Joseph Hickox led the way, setting a very bad example. He may have been deficient in "backbone." He was in Woodbury early in 1686. He died there the next year, his being the first death among the old proprietors. In 1687, Thomas Hancox sold his house and returned to Farmington. Soon after, Benjamin Jones removed to New Haven and died in 1689. Thomas Newell disappeared in 1690, going back to

Farmington. Samuel Scott followed him in the same year, or the year after. John Newell and John Stanley turned their footsteps in the same direction, the first in 1694, the last early in 1695. Stanley was a prominent and most influential man, but not, it seems, of the iron mould required for the valley of the Naugatuck. His defection was much regretted. John Scovill went off in 1696 and brought up in Haddam. John Warner stuck by till about 1703, when he too gave up and went back to Farmington. Joseph Gaylord's courage held out till 1707, when he followed his sons to Durham. Thomas Judd, Jr., town clerk and school master, whom the people delighted to honor, persevered in a course of well-doing till 1709, when, for some reason unknown to the writer, he removed to Hartford, (now West Hartford.) He was the last of the old proprietors of Waterbury who thought it their duty or for their interest to leave their brethren in the hour of darkness and peril. They numbered eleven in all. One only, Richard Porter, went away at a later period. All the others continued at their posts and laid their bones in the town they had founded.

During the period of gloom about which I have been writing, many of the proprietors who remained were removed by death. The first who died was Robert Porter, the second, Philip Judd, both in 1689. The next was John Carrington, in 1690. Edmund Scott, Sen., died in 1691; Abraham Andruss, (cooper,) in 1693; Samuel Hickox, a leading man, in 1694; John Bronson, in 1696; Jeremiah Peck, the first minister, in 1699; Obadiah Richards, late in 1702; Thomas Judd, Sen., second to none as a man of character, early in 1703; Thomas Rickason, in 1712. There were ten in all, which number, added to the eleven that removed, makes twenty-one of the original proprietors who had disappeared in 1713, leaving fifteen who were still living in Waterbury at that time.

It has been often remarked that sickness and mortality are greater in the first years of a settlement than at a later period. While the first generation is short-lived, the second or third is often distinguished by unusual longevity. These facts are illustrated in the history of Waterbury. Its early inhabitants,

in too many instances, died young, while its later population is somewhat remarkable for instances of old age.\*

Besides the losses referred to, there were many young men, sons of proprietors, who either died or removed from the town during the period in question. The mortality among them was very considerable. The families of the proprietors who died, in many cases, left the place. This was the fact with the entire families of Philip Judd, John Carrington and Abraham Andrus, 2d, and parts of the families of Samuel Hickox, John Bronson, Obadiah Richards and Thomas Richason. If a proprietor removed, he, as a general rule, took all his near kindred with him; or if any were left, they did not stay long. Thus the names of Hancox, Jones, Newell, Stanley, and Gaylord, became extinct, temporarily or permanently.

After several of the inhabitants had removed from the town, and the young men had manifested an inclination to follow the example on account of the gloomy prospects at home, the proprietors began to inquire what the emergency demanded. That their own sons should threaten to leave them in the midst of their trials, was the source of unaffected grief. Them, therefore, they thought to make contented by more liberal offers of certain pecuniary advantages. They resorted to the means that the fathers of the present age sometimes employ, when their children contract roving habits. That they might stick by their sires and thus manifest their attachment, they gave them an important portion of their estate. In a proprietors' meeting held in December, 1697, the proprietors granted to each young man certain lands and a propriety of £40 in the commons, all on certain conditions. For very good reasons, the new proprietors were not to have a voice in giving away lands. This limitation of power was designed to prevent them from helping themselves too liberally, as boys are wont to do, when they have free access to the paternal estate. I give below an exact copy of the record.

---

\* The oldest person that has died within the limits of ancient Waterbury was John Bronson, of Wolcott, who deceased in Nov., 1893, aged one hundred and two years and three months. The next oldest (who died in present Waterbury) was David Prichard, whose death took place Dec. 28, 1738, at the age of one hundred and one years and seven months. I have the names of sixty-two others who have died within the limits of the old township between the ages of 90 and 100.



Att a metting of y<sup>e</sup> propriators in waterbury december 20<sup>d</sup> 1697.

In order to y<sup>e</sup> getting such yong men y<sup>t</sup> desire to settell in y<sup>e</sup> town y<sup>e</sup> propriators grant to each one y<sup>t</sup> desires to settell for their incuragment or accomadation thirty acres of upland swam [p] and bogey meadow as alotment with a propriety in y<sup>e</sup> commons according to theyr alotment with a hous lot and four acres for a pastor to be layd out to them by y<sup>e</sup> town measurer giuing them four years to build a tenantable hous not less than sixteen foots square and he y<sup>t</sup> takes up a lot and is not in way of improuement and shall not build accordingly shall forfit his lot [;] and what land has been giuen to any yong man shall be accounted as part of his lot [;] this act not to pregedes former grants nor highways [;] this act to be in force for al such as liue a mongus as they shall com of age and desire this priuiledg and be accepted by y<sup>e</sup> propriators but y<sup>e</sup> priuiledg of acting in giuing away land we do not give them [;] this alotment to be deemed a forty pound alotment in all diuisions and so to have theyr propriety in y<sup>e</sup> commons and after 2 [altered from "4"] years each alotment to be deemed at too [altered from "4"] pounds Estate in y<sup>e</sup> bareing town charg: for 4 years, and after according as they improue according to law or y<sup>e</sup> apprisall of other lands in y<sup>e</sup> town and not to make sale of any but y<sup>t</sup> improued & subdued but if any dye here his heirs to posea his lands

At subsequent meetings, certain regulations were established, designed for the government of the new proprietors in the taking up of their lands, &c.

Att a meeting may 15: 1699 y<sup>e</sup> propriators granted y<sup>e</sup> yong men liberty to take up their thirty acers in three places and if any haue perticular grants of land to haue them counted in y<sup>e</sup> 30 acres and not to hinder theyr pitches\* and he y<sup>t</sup> has had 3 pitches to haue on [one] more.

Dec 23 1700 the propriators granted that thos yong men that build in y<sup>e</sup> town plat shall haue six acers for a pastor not takeing it where it would do for a hous lot and they y<sup>t</sup> go out furdur to build to haue four acers for a hous lot

The vote of December, 1697, laid the foundation of what were afterwards called bachelor rights or accommodations. In order the more effectually to secure its objects, and to constrain, if possible, those who took advantage of it to remain in the town, the proprietors, at a subsequent period, so altered its conditions as to require those claiming its benefits to reside with them five years after building a house. This is the supplementary act:

At y<sup>e</sup> same meeting [Feb. 22<sup>d</sup>. 1702-3] y<sup>e</sup> propriators took up y<sup>t</sup> obligation of y<sup>e</sup> yong men for subducing and clearing as in y<sup>t</sup> act december 20<sup>d</sup>: 1697: and thos y<sup>e</sup> haue now built according to sd act to in habit fue years from this day and

---

\* The word *pitch* in the record seems to be used in the sense of choice or lot. When a person selected his land and brought in an account of it to the measurer, he brought in his pitch. Each act of choice by which he selected a separate tract of land was a distinct pitch.

then their lands be their own, and others y' are now accepted on bachelors accomodations, and hereafter shall be excepted shall build according to said act and inhabit five years after they haue build and then their lands be their own.

This vote, so far as its action was retrospective—so far as it affected those “yong men” who had already been made proprietors under the act of December, 1697—was plainly illegal; and the attempt to enforce it was not persisted in.

The custom of giving away the lands of the town, instead of disposing of them by division, was established as the fixed policy of the proprietors. This policy, because, probably, of some objection made to it, was declared in a vote, as follows:

At a meeting of y<sup>e</sup> proprietors in Waterbury January 7th 1705-6 it being uoated whether y<sup>e</sup> proprietors would diuide theyr commons according to purchase or no y<sup>e</sup> uoat past in y<sup>e</sup> negitiue y' they would not deuide their commons but in y<sup>e</sup> second uoate y' they would gie away their land to perticular men as they see cause or as they iudg men haue need of it.

But notwithstanding these signal proofs of liberality and paternal regard, on the part of the proprietors, the youngsters, in too many cases, would not remain and claim their lands; or if they made a show of staying, they frequently left the settlement when they had resided in it long enough to make sure of their bachelor rights. This conduct was ungrateful, not to say provoking. Considering that the town had not, at this time, a single able bodied man to spare, one is tempted to call it cowardly. After several young persons had removed, under the circumstances named, the proprietors in meeting, January, 7th, 1705-6, voted, “to take the forfeiture of all the lands that was given to Jos. Gaylord, Jun., Joseph Hickox, Abraham Andruss, Jr. and Benjamin Warner that they cant hold by the records.” But the lands given to these persons proved to be beyond the reach of the givers, for their names were continued as proprietors.

The proprietors' profuse liberality in giving away their lands and their marked partiality for those who dwelt among them, caused no complaint and no remark, so long as the lands had little value—so long as it was difficult to induce men to take them and improve them. But circumstances changed. It was found, in process of time, that in some parts of the town, there were richer lands than those first taken up. After

the peace of 1713, the population began to increase. The prospects for "real estate" materially improved. Then it was that inquiries began to be made into the doings of proprietors. Self interest quickened the sense of right and justice. Those that had not participated in the grants made, saw distinctly the grievous wrong that had been done. Those persons that had removed from the town found that the proprietors that remained were rapidly stripping them of their estate, passing it over to others without consideration, for the sole purpose of obtaining permanent settlers. They complained as men would naturally do. They disputed the legality as well as the justice of the proceedings. They had originally, they claimed, an undivided right in all the lands of Waterbury which they had secured by purchase and deed, which right had been put beyond a doubt by the town patent. What they had fairly purchased they had honestly paid for. And there was no equitable or lawful mode, they contended, by which this common property could be disposed of, except by division among the proprietors according to ownership. A majority, they said, had no power to bind the minority, except in case of equal distribution. They furthermore complained that they had not been warned to those meetings of the proprietors which had made the extraordinary grants complained of. I copy from the records Dea. Stanley's communication protesting against the obnoxious grants. There is pith in it, when the crust is once penetrated and the meaning arrived at :

To the propriator inhabitance of Waterbury assembled april 12-1715 brethren and nabours I the subscriber haueing to grate dissatisfaction Observed the way of your giuing or granting away of land To bring in inhabitance according to an act made for that purpos upon record desembr, 20-1697 which hath a drect tendensy to uialate and destroy and conterary to right equity and justis or any well digested reson to inuaid the property of the first purchesars i suppose it to be a truth not to be gainsayed that Those that were the first purchesurs of the land within the township did thereby aquere a right according to the proportion of what payments they made by order of the Comity for the settling of the place and the articles they fullfilled and to be subdiuided as is at large comprised in the pattin [patent] to the then propriator inhabitancc and their heirs. I haue no where seen that the antient propriators did impower the mager part by uoat to giue the land at their plesure—the receiued prinsiple I perceau if I mestake not is that the majer parte of the propriators in comon may by uoat when aposed by the miner giue away from the miner when and as they pleas—that which is consequent upon it is that the majer may combien and giue it all to and amongst them

selves so that the miner shall haue nither land nor comonig [commoning] \* \* \*  
 \* \* \* for my own part to my best remembrance I haue neuer been warned  
 to any propriatory meeting or at the making s<sup>d</sup> act in 1697 besure I was not there  
 to my knowlidge—others haue not been warned as they haue told [me] but upon  
 the whole i take this opertunity to declare and protest aganst the propriators  
 proseding any father in giuing [or] granting any more in [accordance] with sd  
 act to any purticolure person or persons and also i do protest aganst all the grants  
 that haue been made according to sd act to make propriator inhabitation—I haue  
 here unto sett my hand as one of the patentese and one of the first propriators  
 and were posed of one hundred pound right of my own and by distribution of  
 john [newel's] estate all his right in the outlands fell to me—pray let there be no  
 strife between us [&c].

JOHN STANDLEY

witness

Jeremiah peck

Thomas Clark.

At the same meeting at which John Stanley's protest was presented, the proprietors, as if to fortify themselves in what they had done, and to make sure the grants, passed a vote which is recorded as follows :

It was inacted by voat that the land formerly giuen to the bachelors\* shall be ther one [own] exsepting thos that haue not fullfid the conditions nor like to fulfill them

We agree that all the grants of land formerly giuen by the town and propriators shall stand good

At the same time that this confirmatory act was passed, another, quite remarkable in some of its particulars, was voted. It appears to have been aimed at the bachelors. It attempted to break faith with them by cutting them off from future divisions of land; and must have been without any binding force. On account of its objectionable features, the act was repealed in the following December. At the same time, a division of land was agreed upon, in which each original proprietor having a £100 right was to have eighty acres and others in proportion, and each bachelor proprietor thirty acres. Eight acres of it might be taken up in the sequester-

---

\* The reader will understand that the bachelor proprietors were not all literal bachelors. They were men of different ages, married and unmarried, who applied for the privileges granted in the acts of 1697 and 1702-8 and were accepted by the proprietors. They were, however, all what may be called young men, though a few may have been over thirty. In a few instances, persons under twenty-one years of age were admitted as bachelor proprietors with the understanding that they were to have five years after they came of age to fulfill the conditions.

ed land. The lot appears to have been drawn Dec. 15th, 1715, and as a pacifying measure, apparently, "it was agreed that Dea. John Stanley\* should have the first lot for John Newel's lot," of which he was the owner. John Southmayd, as a compliment, was to have the second lot. There are, on the list of 1715, thirty-six original and fifty-two bachelor proprietors.

A proprietors meeting in Waterbury desmbr the 20 1716 and it was acted by voat that the yong proprietors shall be recorded in the 2 cond book of records with the prouissiall or conditions that the proprietors laid on the sd bachelldor elotments

Dotr Daniell porter and Edman Scott did protest against the act of the yong proprietors haung their lands Recorded in the book of records

Dr. Porter was somewhat in the way of protesting in proprietor's meeting. The difficulty in his case seems to have arisen from his having no sons yet old enough to be admitted as bachelor proprietors. He had therefore not been benefited but injured by the proceedings relating to them. He had afterwards, however, a son who was admitted.

On the seventh day of February, 1720-1, a committee was appointed "to sarch the records and finde out what bachelurs haue fulfilled articles and whoo haue not fulfilled articles and macke returns to the proprietors." A report was made to a meeting held the next day, as follows :

We being appointed a comety to macke sarch to finde out who ware admited upon bachelulers acomedations and who have fulfilled the coneditions to macke the land theire owne and who have not fulfilled the articles—february 8 1721

Those that haue fulfilled

William hikeox	Stephen wellton	nathaniel Richason	} these on a 40 poun propriaty when we deided
John Gaylard	Joseph hikeox	thomas Richards	
Joseph Gaylard	Robert Scott		
John worner ser	John Richason	gorg scott	
thomas Richason	thomas hikeox	dauid scott	
John Brunson ser	Richard welton	John welton	
Israel Richason	Benjamin worner		

\* Two of Dea. Stanley's sons, John Stanley, Jr. and Samuel Stanley, appear to have been admitted as bachelor proprietors this year, their names appearing in the division. John Stanley, Jr., lived in Farmington. I am unable to find that he ever lived in Waterbury after his fathers' removal in 1693. Samuel Stanley resided in Waterbury, but went away before 1715. So far as it appears, neither of them could have been admitted proprietors in accordance with the votes of 1697 and 1702-3, and neither could have complied with the conditions of those votes. I suspect the £40 propieties were given them by special vote and unconditionally, or on easy conditions, for the purpose of removing the father's discontentment.

Isaac Brunson	Ebenezer Richason	John barns
Eprim worner	benjamin Richards	thomas brunson
samuell Standndly	thomas Barns	Joseph lewes
Benjamin Barns jur	stephen hopkins	obediah richards
thomas welton	obediah scott	abraham andrus jur
Joseph Brunson	ebenezer brunson	
Stepen ubson jur	thomas clark	

Those admited that haue not fulfilled but in a likely way

John scouell	timothy standly ser	thomas andrus
Jonathan scott jur	timothy hopkins	benjamin worner jur
Jonn standly jur	gorg scott jur	samuell porter
william Judd	John hikcox	Ebenezer hikcox
daniell porter jur ,	samuell scott	John Richards jur
John Judd	thomas ubson	gorg welton

Those that haue not fulfilled as we Judg

william gaylord	stephen hikcox	daniel porter son of
John worner tailer	moses brunson	richard

Timothy standly	} comety
John Hopkins	
Thomas Judd	

At a meeting of the propriators of waterbury february 8 1721 they agre by uote to axsepte y<sup>e</sup> return of the comety and order it to be entered upon record

Thus, thirty-eight persons were reported as having "fulfilled" the articles, eighteen as "in a likely way to fulfil," and five as having "not fulfilled." The last, of course, had forfeited their rights. The eighteen who were "in a likely way," were yet, I conclude, on probation, their five years not having expired. They all finally secured their rights.

February 8th, 1720-1, there was a renewed attempt to make a considerable addition to the propriety rights of the old proprietors, and to increase their proportional interest in the undivided lands, thus counteracting, as far as might be, what had been done for the bachelors. A vote was passed augmenting the proprieties of the original proprietors; but they were to submit to the conditions of the acts of 1697 and 1702-3, as to building, &c.; and what their sons had received was to go towards the increase. But it was not satisfactory on account of the restrictions, and a year afterwards a modified vote was carried:

February 28<sup>th</sup>, 1721-2 It was agreed upon by vote that where as an Act In February 8<sup>th</sup>, 1721 [altered from 1720] was greivous to some of our proprietors

we now Further Agree that Every original proprietor or propriety Shall have two bachelord Lots upon an hundred pound propriety and proportionally upon Greater and lesser proprieties with what was Granted Last February notwithstanding what their sons have had which bachelord Lott Is Looked upon to be now 68 Acres And a forty pound propriety And the Obligation upon those Granted In February 8<sup>th</sup> 1721 [altered from 1720] and now Granted to be taken off And be free from Any Incumbrance of building and cohabiting. And the Grant to the Bachelords that were admitted upon a forty pound propriety that they Shall have as a Division of fifty five Acres to Every bachelord that has fullfilled Articles or In Away to fullfill articles as they are returned by A Committy Appointed for February and Recorded in the old proprietors Book. and for the future our Devisions shall be made upon Original proprietors with the addition made to their propriety and upon bachelord proprietors According to their propriety And It is the true Intent and meaning of the proprietors In this act and Shall be so taken and Explained that Every original propriety of one hundred pound shall have two bachelord proprieties and no more and so proportionably for Greater or Lesser proprieties and that all Devisions of all our Lands after this shall be made upon the present original proprietors and bachelord proprietors that are already made

Each original proprietor of £100 obtained by this act an immediate addition to his propriety of two bachelord accommodations, amounting to £80, carrying with them the divisions which had already been made to the bachelors. Others were favored, in like manner, according to their existing interests, the addition being always eighty per cent. of the original propriety. Thenceforth, the vote declared, lands should be disposed of by division and the divisions should be according to interest. Thus the system of unequal distribution and special grants, with its abuses, was put an end to.

By far the largest proportion of the bachelord proprietors were sons of the original proprietors. About nine were grandsons. The remainder, two only, Joseph Lewis and Thomas Clark, came from other towns. The last was the adopted son of Timothy Stanley. Nearly one quarter of them were made proprietors, in 1699 ; more than one third in 1715, and the remainder, with two or three exceptions, between these periods.

The proprietors agreed, Nov. 27th, 1722, that there should be reserved, "for the use of the proprietors," six propriety lots, or rights, of £40 each. They were reserved to meet such contingencies as might naturally be expected to arise. It was determined that they should have all the divisions which had already been made on the bachelord lots, except "the eight acres n sequester," and all the future divisions. On the 28th of

Nov. 1722, one of these lots was granted to Moses Bronson. It was the fifth propriety lot, so called, and had been formerly given to Bronson and forfeited. At the same time, the fourth propriety lot, (which had belonged to Daniel Porter, the son of Richard, and been forfeited by him,) was granted to John Warner, son of Ephraim, and William Scott. The other four lots, the first, second, third, and sixth, were ordered, Nov. 29th, 1726, to be sold, and the money reserved for building a new meeting house. They brought £262. These six lots were always entered, in the record, by their numbers. To the fourth and fifth were added the names of the grantees or owners—thus, “5th Propriety Lott, Moses Bronson,” &c.

There were some persons who were accepted as bachelor proprietors, who did not comply with the conditions and who therefore forfeited their rights. I give their names. William Gaylord, John Warner, “tailor,”\* Stephen Hickox, Daniel Porter, son of Richard, Zachariah Baldwin, Jr., of Milford,† Obadiah Scovill, Samuel Warner and Moses Bronson, (afterwards re-admitted.)

There were in the end, six forfeited propriety lots that remained in the hands of the proprietors. These were the six that were reserved, in 1622, “for the use of the proprietors.”

On the twenty-eighth day of November, 1722, a list was made out for the purpose of a land division, containing the names of the original and bachelor proprietors. It is the first complete list to be found on record. We find here thirty-six original and fifty-seven bachelor proprietors, the first having, unitedly, £3,165, and the last, £2,280, propriety. If we add to these the six propriety lots of £40 each, the school lot of £150 and the ministry lot of £150, granted in 1715, we

\* On the eleventh of March, 1745-6, Ebeneser Warner, 3d, and George Nichols petitioned the proprietors for the bachelor right of John Warner (tallor) which they claimed to have purchased. The petition was addressed “To the worshipfull Moderator and Gentlemen Proprietors.” The petitioners laid claim to all the lands laid out on Warner’s lot—the thirty-eight acres at the date of his acceptance (1701)—the thirty acres of 1715—the fifty-five acres of 1721-2—the forty acres of 1728—the forty acres of 1737—the thirty acres of 1788-9—“the sixteen acres and twenty rods in the village soon after; in the whole amounting to two hundred and forty-nine acres and twenty rods.” The meeting voted “not to do anything.”

† Baldwin was accepted in 1710, but in 1718, he sold all his right and title of lands in Waterbury with his *bachelor propriety* and all the improvements which he had made “with the building and other timber,” to George Scott, and returned to Milford.



have a total of £5,985. To this sum must be added the increase of the old proprietor and school allotments, amounting to eighty per cent. (The new ministry lot did not have the bachelor addition.) Add this increase (£2,652) to the former total, (£5,985,) and we have a grand total of £8,637. On this amount, all the divisions of land were made in 1722 and afterwards.

If we compare the list of original proprietors of 1722 with that of 1688, we shall observe several changes of names and a few additions. Capt. Thomas Judd, Wm. (meaning the son of William) stands in the place of Smith Judd, as he was at first called. Thomas Judd, Jones, is substituted for Benjamin Jones. John Judd occupies the place of Ensign Judd. Joseph Hickox, John Richards and Jonathan Scott stand in the places of Mr. Frayser, Robert Porter and Samuel Scott. Abraham Andruss, cooper, is written for Abraham Andruss, Jr., the elder Andruss now having a son who was a bachelor proprietor. Mr. Jeremiah Peck and John Southmayd are new names. "Timothy Stanley, original," is thus written to distinguish his original from his bachelor propriety. With these exceptions, the names are the same as in 1688.

Of the fifty-seven bachelor proprietors on the catalogue of 1722, the name of one, that of John Stanley, Jr.,\* is sometimes omitted. The whole number of proprietors, original and bachelor, counting Stanley, Jr., is ninety-three. Adding the six propriety lots, the school lot and the ministry lot of 1715, and we have one hundred and one proprieties entitled to land divisions.

I copy below the list of Nov., 1722, adding to the name of each proprietor the amount of his propriety before and after the bachelor addition.

---

\* "[March 11 1730-31] It was by vote Agreed and Concluded that they [the proprietors] Look upon John Standlies Jur Right to be Good to a Bachelor Lott and he ought to have a note for his Land to be laid out and he Engaged that the Proprietors might have the Eight acres In the Sequester to be Disposed by them as they See Cause."

In March, 1757, the proprietors again passed a vote in favor of John Stanley, Jr's right and directed his name to be added to the list of proprietors.

ORIGINAL PROPRIETORS.

	Propriety.	With the addition.		Propriety.	With the addition.
Abraham Andruss, Sen.,	£ 80	£144	Richard Porter,	50	90
Abraham Andruss, Cooper,	100	180	John Richards, Sen.,	80	144
Benjamin Barns, Sen.,	100	180	Obadiah Richards, Sen.,	80	144
Isaac Bronson, Sen.,	100	180	Thomas Richason,	50	90
John Bronson, Sen.,	80	144	Edmund Scott, Sen.,	100	180
John Carrington,	60	108	Edmund Scott, Jr.,	70	126
Joseph Gaylord, Sen.,	80	144	Jonathan Scott, Sen.,	50	90
Thomas Hancox,	100	180	Sohn Scovill, Sen.,	80	144
Joseph Hickox, Sen.,	60	108	John Southmayd,	150	270
Samuel Hickox, Sen.,	100	180	John Stanley, Sen.,	100	180
Lieut. John Hopkins,	100	180	Timothy Stanley, original,	100	180
John Judd, Sen.,	100	180	Stephen Upson, Sen.,	50	90
Philip Judd,	80	144	Daniel Warner,	60	180
Capt. Thomas Judd, Wm.,	100	180	John Warner, Sen.,	90	162
Thomas Judd, Jones,	100	180	Thomas Warner,	100	180
Thomas Judd, Jr.,	100	180	John Welton, Sen.,	80	144
John Newell,	100	180			
Thomas Newell,	90	162	A Great Lot for Schools,	150	270
Mr. Jeremiah Peck,	150	270	A Great Lott for the Ministry,	150	
Daniel Porter, Sen.,	95	171			

BACHELOR PROPRIETORS, each having £40 propriety :

Abraham Andruss, Jr.	William Hickox,
Thomas Andruss,	Timothy Hopkins,
Benjamin Barnes, Jr.,	Stephen Hopkins,
John Barnes,	John Judd, Jr.,
Thomas Barnes,	William Judd,*
Ebenezer Bronson,	Joseph Lewis,
Isaac Bronson, Jr.,	Daniel Porter, son of Daniel,
John Bronson, son of Isaac,	Samuel Porter,
Joseph Bronson,	Benjamin Richards,
Thomas Bronson,	John Richards, Jr.,
Thomas Clark,	Obadiah Richards, Jr.,
John Gaylord,	Thomas Richards, Sen.,
Joseph Gaylord, Jr.,	Ebenezer Richason,
Ebenezer Hickox,	Israel Richason,
John Hickox,	John Richason,
Joseph Hickox,	Nathaniel Richason,
Thomas Hickox,	Thomas Richason, Jr.,

\* William Judd, after 1722, is generally "William Judd, bach. lott," to distinguish him probably, from the original subscriber by that name who forfeited and who was his grandfather.

David Scott,	Samuel Warner, son of Thomas,
George Scott, Sen.,	George Welton,
George Scott, Jr.,	John Welton, Jr.,
Jonathan Scott, Jr.,	Richard Welton,
Obadiah Scott,	Stephen Welton,
Robert Scott,	Thomas Welton,
Samuel Scott,	
John Scovill, Jr.,	1 <sup>st</sup> Propriety Lot,
John Stanley, Jr.,	2 <sup>d</sup> Propriety Lot,
Samuel Stanley,	3 <sup>d</sup> Propriety Lot,
Lieut. Timothy Stanley, bachelor lot,	4 <sup>th</sup> Propriety Lot, } John Warner, } William Scott, }
Stephen Upson, Jr.,	
Thomas Upson,	5 <sup>th</sup> Propriety Lot, } Moses Bronson,† }
Benjamin Warner, Sen.,	
Benjamin Warner, Jr.,	6 Propriety Lot.
Ephraim Warner,	
John Warner, Sen.,* bachelor lot,	

In the early history of Waterbury, the town, for convenience, was divided in four sections. That part of it lying east of the Naugatuck River and north of the Farmington road was the northeast quarter. That part situated east of the river and south of said road was the south east quarter. Of the territory west of the river, that which lay north of the Woodbury road was the northwest quarter, and that south of said road was the southwest quarter. When deeds were given, the quarter in which the land lay was usually named. There was a land measurer for each quarter, whose duty it was to lay out the land within his territory. When a lot was drawn for a division, a certificate or "note" was given by the town clerk to each proprietor or claimant, directed to the town measurer, authorizing him to lay out on a certain propriety right and to the person to whom it was given, the agreed number of acres. These "notes" were written on small pieces of paper from three to four inches square, several of which are now in my possession; some of them dating as far back as 1723. When a piece of land was found which suited the holder, which was often not till the lapse of many years, he got it measured and indorsed upon the paper. There

\* John Warner, Sen. bachelor lot—The Sen. is intended to distinguish him from "John Warner, tailor," (son of Thomas,) who had been made a bachelor and forfeited. The bachelor lot characterizes the lot as distinct from the original propriety of his father, which is also written John Warner, Sen.

† This name is omitted in the subsequent lists.

must be many of these certificates, given for the later land divisions, still outstanding and still unsatisfied.

After 1722, the land divisions were frequent. In 1723, one acre on £1 was distributed, (or a "note" given for it;) in 1727, one acre; in 1730, forty acres, one rood, and ten rods on £100, in the "north west quarter;" in 1738-9, one quarter of one acre on £1; in 1747-8, one quarter of an acre; in 1751, one half an acre; in 1759, one half an acre on £1, and five acres "in sequester" on £100; in 1780, one quarter of an acre on £1, and two and a half acres on £100 "in sequester;" in 1792, one half an acre on £1, and two and a half acres on £100; in 1802, one quarter of an acre on £1. Up to 1745, there had been two hundred and forty-nine acres and twenty rods distributed on each bachelor propriety. In 1780, the number had been increased to four hundred and eleven acres and twenty rods. From this, an approximate estimate may be made of the quantity of land received, in the same time, by each original proprietor, or his representatives.

Before the incorporation of the town, the land grants made by the proprietors appear to have been ratified by the grand committee. Any want of formality on the part of the proprietors would, I suppose, have been corrected by this subsequent ratification. But after Mattatuck was made a town, things were changed. The forms of law must be observed, in order that the titles to lands obtained by grant or division should be valid. These lands were parceled out at public meetings. These meetings are called, in the records, sometimes town meetings, at other times proprietors' meetings, (as will be observed from the record-extracts which have been made from time to time.) All the inhabitants of the place took part in them. So long as all who were of a proper age to act were proprietors, as they were for a considerable time after the settlement was begun, the evil might not be serious of a town meeting, so called, undertaking to transact proprietors' business. But, after a time, the case was different. Individuals began to make their appearance who owned no right in the undivided lands. At first, these were the grown up sons of proprietors. They all met in town meetings and voted, not only on the questions which concerned the

the town alone, but on those which related to the proprietors alone. Such questions were determined by a major vote. No regard was had to the inequality of rights. He who owned £50 propriety had one vote, he who owned £100 had but one, and he who owned nothing had one. After the withdrawal of the committee, there was no power at hand to ratify proceedings and correct mistakes. How long these irregularities were continued, I am not quite sure; but there appears to have been no separate record of town meetings kept till December, 1698. And for many years afterwards, down certainly to 1713, these meetings occasionally granted lands, &c. At length, the error became manifest, and evil results were apprehended. Men perceived that they held their lands by an insecure tenure. The validity of claims based on town grants and town action was denied. The best interests of society—those interests connected with the security of landed property—were put in jeopardy. The people of Waterbury were not alone in their embarrassment. Other towns had unconsciously fallen into the same error. In some instances, proprietors attempted to correct the mistake by ratifying what the towns had done. It would not do, however, and the General Assembly was at length called on to interpose. At the May session, 1723, an act was passed validating “all grants, divisions, or dispositions of common lands made according to ancient custom in town meetings,” whether made before, or after, the towns were incorporated. It was, at the same time, enacted, “that no person whatsoever by becoming an inhabitant of a town, or by any other means against or without the consent of such proprietors, shall be taken or esteemed to have any estate, title, right, or interest” in the common or undivided lands of any towns. It was also enacted, that the proprietors, in their meetings, should “have full power, by their major votes, to be reconed according to their interest in the common land, to regulate, improve, manage, and divide such common land, in such manner and proportion as they shall see good.”

*[Faint, illegible handwritten text]*

*[Faint handwritten text]*

*[Faint handwritten text]*

*[Faint handwritten text]*

*[Faint handwritten text]*

*[Faint handwritten text]*

THESE NAMES ARE HERE WRITTEN  
DARTY FOR OUR OWN SATISFACTION  
AND FOR THE SATISFACTION OF SOME  
GAVE US TWO WITH MATHEMATICS  
FARMS TO EXPLANATION DOO JUDG IT  
OF THE SAME  
LEONARD NEWELL SOND  
JOHN MARLER SOND  
Richard SOND

(see

Jeremiah Be  
From Waterbury 91. May. 12. year 1800  
(see page 205)

Thomas Fild SOND (1686)

Samuel Kirk SOND (1686)

John Standly (1689)

Brianin Bavan

Timothy Standly

richard SOND (1689)

John Hopkins: Clark

ation  
others  
to  
spells

(age 4)

Thomas yd Justice

Thomas Jud Register (1700)

John Jud Clerk

John Richards

John Southmayd Clerk

John Warner:

R

n soen

John Scoull (24)

Gerania Peck (24)  
(1709/10)

William Jud Register

William Hickcock

Thomas Hickcock (1727)

Jas. Brantton (24)

Thomas Cunson (24)

Thomas Clarke

Timothy Hopkins (1727)





## CHAPTER XI.

## PERSONAL NOTICES OF THE FIRST SETTLERS OF WATERBURY.

OF the thirty-four proprietors of Waterbury, who became settlers before 1688, all, except four, were from Farmington. Abraham Andrus, Sen., was from Fairfield, Joseph Gaylord was originally from Windsor, John Hopkins from Hartford and Benjamin Jones from ———. They were all farmers. Some of them had trades—such as are in most demand in new settlements—to which they devoted a part of their time, particularly when the weather was unfavorable for farm work. There were among them a few men of substance; but generally they were in moderate circumstances. None was rich, none very poor. All labored with their hands. As to family and station, they were from the great “middle class”—that which lies at the foundation of society and which perpetuates the race.\* Several were honorably, or rather respectably, connected, but there were no patrician families. Not one of them bore a name which was particularly distinguished in the early history of the colonies, with the exception of Hopkins, the town miller; and he is not known to have been a relation of Gov. Hopkins. I have not succeeded very well in tracing their origin. Farther investigations will discover more facts, undoubtedly; but I have rarely been able to track them, in the ascending line, beyond Hartford, or the old towns of Connecticut. We may rest assured, however, that they had an anti-

---

\* Mr. Hollister, in his History of Connecticut, (Vol. I, Chapter XX,) has taken some pains to show that the early planters of the Colony were of good descent and belonged to the better classes of the English people. In a certain sense I admit this. But it should be remembered that no other classes leave a permanent posterity. The vile, the dissolute, the infirm, the thriftless, those of mean endowments, mental and bodily, die out by a natural law, leaving few immediate and no remote descendants. They perish from want, violence and internal rottenness. Their numbers are kept good only by accessions from without. Coming in contact with a stronger and better race, they are overrun and disappear. And it is well for humanity that it is so. Thus, by an invincible law of nature, “the better classes,”—not the “landed gentry” necessarily—but those of sound mental, moral and bodily constitution—become the true and only progenitors of a people. Thus, virtue conquers vice, and strength overcomes weakness.

quity, and a very hoary one too. I have not consulted books of heraldry, partly, if you please, because I expected to make no discoveries in that quarter. I do not suppose the ancestors of the Judds, the Hickoxes, the Bronsons and the Weltons ever "bore arms;" and if the fact were otherwise, it would not make an unworthy descendant respectable. It would not save him from the pillory, or the halter. Those who are ambitious for coats of arms, may find them in New York, on sale, cheaper than broadcloth.\*

At an early period, there was a law of the colony requiring marriages, births and deaths to be recorded by the town clerk, with penalties for neglect or delay. This law, however, seems to have been very imperfectly observed in Waterbury. During John Stanley's clerkship, no record of these things was kept, or at least, none has been preserved. The only item of the kind entered by him, is the birth of his son Timothy, in 1689. Thomas Judd, Jr., was made register in 1696, and in 1699, he appears to have commenced a record of marriages, births and deaths, and made it retrospective to some extent. If the male head of a family was then living in Waterbury, he, in some cases, gave an account of his children born in the town, with the date, and in a few instances of those born before he joined the settlement. Thus, in the case of Abraham Andruss, Sen's children, the record begins with the birth (place not mentioned) of the first child, in 1672; while in the instance of Isaac Bronson's children, it commences with the fourth child, being the first born in Waterbury, in 1680. It is impossible to discover from written evidence, the date of the first birth from European parents that occurred in the town; but the first registered birth was that of Rebecca, daughter of Thomas and Mary Richason, April 27, 1679. She m. John Warner, son of John, afterwards a deacon of the Westbury church. Richard, son of John and Mary Welton, registered by

---

\* Since the above was written, I have looked into Burke's *Encyclopedia of Heraldry*, (Lond., 1844.) I find there the following names, (to wit:) Andrews, Barnes, Branson, or Braunson, Carrington, Clark, Hancock, Hiccox, Hopkins, Jones, Judd, Lewis, Newell, Peck, Porter, Richards, Richardson, Scott, Southmead, Stanley, Upton, Walton, Warner.

Any one who is interested in this information and is out at the elbows can pursue the inquiry. It may be he will find something that will fit him—a "coat" on which are blazoned his forgotten, and with which he may cover his dishonored, "arms."

Mr. Southmayd, was born "sometime in March, 1680." If this date is intended for 1680, *new style*, as it probably is, Richard Welton may be regarded, till evidence to the contrary is shown, as the first male child born in the Naugatuck Valley, above Derby. Family tradition concurs with the indications of the record.

Marriages in olden times were celebrated by the governor, deputy governor, assistants, or commissioners. Clergymen rarely performed the ceremony before 1700. Baptisms took place a few days after birth; sometimes, when a magistrate or minister lived in the village, "immediately after," as the old record saith.

Until 1666, wills were probated and estates settled in the Court of Magistrates. At this date, the several counties, four in number, were established, and this business was given to the County courts. It was continued in these courts till the counties were divided into probate districts. Waterbury at first belonged to Hartford County, and its probate business was done in the County Court of Hartford till 1719. At this period the town was annexed to the district of Woodbury. It thus continued till 1779, when the Waterbury District was established. On the probate record of Hartford, Woodbury and Waterbury, I have been obliged to rely for many facts relating to the early settlers of Waterbury.

#### ABRAHAM ANDRUSS, SEN.

The name is usually spelled Andrews, though rarely or never on our record. He was the son of Thomas Andrews, who removed from Hartford to Bankside, in Fairfield, and who had four sons—John, Abraham, Jeremiah and Thomas—and six daughters. His will bore the date of 1662.

Abraham Andruss, Sen., was one of the thirty who signed the articles of 1674. He had an £80 propriety, and was among the earliest settlers of Mattatuck. His name is on all the lists of those who had early divisions of fence. He and Timothy Stanley were the first townsmen, or selectmen of the town, they being spoken of as holding this office in 1681. He subsequently occupied the same position in 1690, 1692, 1706, 1707, 1711, 1716. He was town surveyor in 1700 and afterwards;

a deputy to the General Court at the May session, in 1712; one of the signers of the agreement to pay Mr. Peck £60 per year, in 1689, and a frequent member of important committees appointed by the town and proprietors. On the whole, he was a man of considerable note among the first settlers of Waterbury.

Andruss had a "house lot" Nov., 1687, at the west end of the village, near where the late Dr. Buckley lived. It was bounded east on John Welton, west on "a great lot," (the corner lot.) Nothing is said of a house. The lot was conveyed, April 18th, 1696, to David Scott, and afterwards to Robert Scott, Thomas Judd, Jr. and John Southmayd. There is no house mentioned in any of the conveyances.

January 22<sup>d</sup> 1680 [?] the town granted to abraham andrus senor a peic of land buting on y<sup>e</sup> mill Riuer and on y<sup>e</sup> common fenc aganst s<sup>d</sup> andruses three acre lot provided it do not pregedis high wayes and he build a hous or set up a tan yard.\*

This lot was recorded in 1687, as four acres, and is described as butting north on the common, easterly on the river, southerly on the common, westerly on the top of the hill. "March 10, 1704," it was again recorded, and is mentioned as containing 3½ acres, with a dwelling house, "butting south on the common fence, north and west on the highway, east at the southeast corner coming to the river, and at the northeast corner falling four rods and a half from the mill river, so cattle may pass safely over the river." It was situated below the mill, immediately below the present bridge, on the west side of the river, bounding on the river at the lower corner, and falling four and a half rods from it, next the road which came from the village. From the fact that a tan-yard is mentioned in the original grant, it is probable that Andruss was a tanner.

In 1717-8, when it became necessary to provide for declining years, Andruss conveyed to his youngest son, Thomas, lands, &c., as follows—the deed is signed by a mark, and bears the date of January 4th, 1717):

---

\* But few of the land titles of the first proprietors of Waterbury, acquired in the first years of the settlement, can be traced to specific grants from the Colony's committee, or the proprietors, or to land divisions, or to any other valid source. This is particularly the fact with the house lots. Those of the present generation who hold the lands referred to must rely for the goodness of their titles on the validating acts of the Assembly.

For and in concediration of my son thomas andrus who now lives with me tacking the care of my self and my wife while we live unles my wife should be left by me and mary again and finding of us with a sutable and comfortable maintenance and tacking the whole care of us both while we live both in sixnes and in helth and for the loue and good will which I do bare towards my son thomas \* \* \* I giue him the whole of my teame and all the tackling there unto belonging both of Iron and wood and all tools that I have that is nesary to carry on husbandry work \* \* \* I give unto my son thomas all the lands I stand posest of within the bounds of Waterbury with the bulding fencing orcharding thare to belonging and the whole of my propriety in the undeuided land he to tacke posesion of the one half now and the other half at my deceas [&c.]

When the new meeting house was seated, in 1729, "Goodman Andruss and his wife" were placed in the seat next the pulpit, on the west side, opposite the minister, this high position being due to their age and worth. But the poor man died soon after, or before December of the same year, he being the last (who settled in Waterbury) of the original thirty subscribers. His inventory, taken in Dec., 1731, amounted to £36, 15s.

Abraham Andruss married Rebecca, a daughter of John Carrington, also an original proprietor. Their children were:—

1. Rebecca; born Dec. 16, 1672; married about 1696, William Hickox.
2. Mary; b. March 10, 1674-5; m. April, 1693, Daniel Warner, son of Daniel Warner of Farmington.
3. Hannah; b. Sep. 8, 1678; m. "Zopher Northrup."
4. Abraham; b. Oct. 14, 1680. He was admitted as a bachelor proprietor March 18, 1701; m. Nov. 5, 1702, Hannah, daughter of Thomas Stephens of Middletown, by whom he had a son born in Waterbury, Sep. 6, 1703. He had a house and half an acre and twelve rods of ground in Feb. 1702-3, butted on all sides on highway, and situated, apparently, west and in front of the old mill, between "Union Square" and the Scovill Manuf'g Co's rolling mill. He remained, however, only long enough to secure his propriety right. March 12, 1705-6, he sold his place to his father, and received in payment certain lands in Farmington, to which town he had already removed. He had five children born there between 1705 and 1712. Afterwards he turned up in Saybrook, where he was denominated "doctor." He was there in 1733.
5. Sarah; b. March 16, 1683-4; m. Joseph Lewis, and d. March 6, 1773.
6. Rachel; b. July 11, 1686; m. Samuel Orvice.
7. John; b. July 16, 1688. He m. Martha Warner and removed early to Farmington, where he had several children. He was there in 1710, 1715, 1723, and had returned to Waterbury in 1724, where his seventh and eighth children were born—the last in 1728. He lived in the southeast quarter, in 1730, near Judd's Meadow. In 1748-9 he was an inhabitant of Woodbury.
8. Thomas; b. "March 6, 1694." He became a bachelor proprietor in 1716, and married Mary, d. of John Turner of Hartford, Nov. 2, 1725, by whom he had

three daughters born in Waterbury, the last in 1734. In 1731, he exchanged with Stephen Kelsey his house and lands for a house and sixty-nine acres on the Woodbury road, near the Woodbury line. These last he sold, in 1735, to Thomas Mathews, Jr. of Wallingford, to which place he removed soon after.

ABRAHAM ANDRUSS, JR., OR COOPER.

He was called *junior* because he was younger than his namesake, the term in those days having no reference to family relationship. The term cooper designated his occupation. He was a son of John (and Mary) Andrews. The father was an early settler of Farmington, and one of the first (and non "fulfilling") signers of the articles for the settlement of Waterbury. He had seven sons, John, Abraham, Samuel, Daniel, Joseph, (who signed the articles, but never came to Waterbury,) Stephen, Benjamin, and three daughters, Mary, (the mother of Benjamin Barnes,) Hannah, (who married Obadiah Richards,) and Rachel. He died in 1681, (his wife in May, 1694,) leaving legacies to several of his grandchildren, including John and Abraham Andruss and John Richards.

Abraham Andruss, Jr., or cooper Andruss, (born Oct. 31, 1648, baptized, April 2d, 1654,) had a £100 propriety and subscribed the articles "in the room of John Judd." His name is first mentioned in the allotment of the fourth division of fence. He was one of those who were declared, Feb. 6th, 1682, to have forfeited their rights. On promise of "submission and reformation," however, he was again put in possession of his allotments. His name is on the list of proprietors in 1688, and on all subsequent lists. Nothing in particular is known of his standing. His house and a house lot of two acres were on the north corner of West Main and Bank streets, butting west on Daniel Porter and south on common land. He married Sarah, a daughter of Robert Porter. They both joined the church in Farmington, Jan. 3d, 1686. He died May 3d, 1693, leaving his widow pregnant. His inventory amounted to £177, 17s. 3d.; and the estate was distributed, March 20th, 1694-5, according to law—one third of the movables and the use of the real estate during life, to the widow, a double portion of the remainder to the oldest son, Abraham, and equal shares to the other children. The family all removed to Danbury, the widow having married James Benedict of

that place. In March, 1707, she relinquished her right to the real estate in Waterbury, and the homestead was taken by the eldest son, Abraham.

Andruss children, all mentioned in the settlement of the estate in 1707-8, were, as far as known :

1. Sarah; baptized in Farmington March 9th, 1683-4, and m. Thomas Raymond of Norwalk, where they were both living in 1723.
2. Abraham; baptized July 17, 1687,(?) in Farmington.
3. Mary; baptized in Farmington in 1689; m. James Benedict of Danbury.
4. Benjamin.
5. Robert.\*

Andruss propriety was owned by William Judd, in 1721, and, in June of the same year, was sold to Samuel Whittlesey of Wallingford, for £42.

#### BENJAMIN BARNES.

His father, Thomas Barnes, was an original proprietor and settler of Hartford and a soldier in the Pequot war of 1637. For his services in that war, he received, in 1671, from the colonial Assembly, a grant of land of fifty acres. When the settlement of Farmington was commenced, he became a proprietor and settled in that place. He was appointed a sergeant of the train-band in 1651, and became a member of the church in 1653. His wife was Mary, daughter of Thomas Andrews. He died in 1688. His children were:—

1. Benjamin; b. 1653.
2. Joseph; baptized 1655; m. July 8, 1684, Abigail Gibbs, and d. Jan. 23, 1740-1.
3. Sarah; m. John Scovill.
4. Thomas; m. June, 1690, Mary Jones, and became a deacon.
5. Ebenezer; m. April 8, 1690, Deborah Orvis or Orvice, and died 1756.

Benjamin Barnes was accepted as a proprietor of Waterbury, Jan. 15, 1677, (1677-8,) taking the place of Richard Seymour. He was an early settler, but probably was not of the first company. He had no allotment of fence in the first

---

\* Mary Benedict and Abraham, Robert and John Andruss, "heirs of Abraham Andruss, cooper," were all living in Danbury in 1754. (Wat. L. R., Vol. VIII, p. 514.) Whether this John Andruss was a son of cooper Andruss, or a grandson and represented Benjamin's interest, I am unable to say.



division; but his name is found in the other divisions. He signed the agreement with Mr. Peck, in 1689; was moderator of proprietors' meetings, in 1694-5; "grave digger" in 1699; townsman, school committee, lister, hayward, collector and grand juror, at different times; deputy to the General Court, in 1703. His house and home lot of two acres were on the corner of West and North Main streets, the lot being bounded, in 1687, easterly and south on highway, north on common and westerly on Samuel Hickox. The homestead and some outlands he conveyed, in 1714, to his son Thomas, in consideration of the said Thomas taking care of him while he lived and paying his just debts, "and taking the care of his father's wife, if he should haue one, with a comfortable mantainance, and the whole term of her being his widow." Afterwards, in 1728, the homestead, now two and a half acres, was conveyed to Joseph Smith, father and son uniting in the deed. When the new meeting house came to be seated, "Goodman Barnes," (still a widower, apparently,) along with other aged worthies, was voted into the first pew at the west end of the pulpit.

Benjamin Barnes was married to Sarah —. He joined the Farmington church March 22d, 1690-1. He died April 24, 1731, being the last of the original proprietors who became settlers as early as he. His wife died in the great sickness, Dec. 21st, 1712. Their children were:—

1. Benjamin; b. Sep. 1684 and d. in May, 1709. He was a bachelor proprietor, and his estate, being thirty eight acres and a £40 propriety, was distributed to his brothers and sisters.

2. John; b. Aug. 12, 1686, and was baptized in Farmington, (together with his brother, Benjamin,) Dec. 1, 1689. He became a bachelor proprietor at the age of 21; m. March 28, 1728, Mary, widow of Samuel Porter and d. of John Bronson, and died March 21, 1763. His widow died Jan. 27, 1774. He had five children, the four youngest of whom died in the great sickness of 1749. His occupation was that of a "husbandman." He lived at Judd's Meadow, west of the river.

3. A son; b. May 10, 1689; d. the same month.

4. Thomas; b. May 11, 1690; baptized in Farmington, June 8, 1690. He had a bachelor lot, and was at different times selectman, school committee, constable, &c. He was a shoemaker and is called, also, "cordwinder." In Feb. 1718-19, his father gave to him, in the language of the deed, "fifty acres of land belonging to me which was given to my father by the generall court for pequot war serus." After the sale of his father's homestead, he lived, for a time, on the south-west corner of Cook and Grove streets. This place he sold, in 1735, to Jonathan Garnsey, and in 1752, lived on the west side of Willow street, a little north of

Grove, in a house which is still standing. He was a sergeant in the train-band, and m. "Jan. 4, 1721," Susanna, the d. of Edward Scovill of Haddam. They had six children. He died Nov. 29, 1772. His will, dated Dec. 1768, mentions his wife, Susanna, a married daughter, Susanna Terrel, and one son, Daniel.

5. Ebenezer; b. "March 15, 1693," and d. "March 10, 1713."

6. Sarah; b. Aug. 15, 1695, and m. Thomas Day, Jr. They lived in Colchester in 1723, and then sold all their rights of land in Waterbury to Thomas Barnes.

7. Samuel; b. "March 16, 1697;" m. June 4, 1722, Mary, d. of John Johnson of Derby, and had nine children.

#### BRONSON.

The name is usually spelled Brownson on the Hartford and Brunson on the Farmington records. John Bronson, the father of the Waterbury Bronsons, was early in Hartford. He is believed, though not certainly known, to have been one of the company who came with Mr. Hooker, in 1636, of whose church he was a member. He was a soldier in the bloody Pequot battle of 1637. He is not named among the proprietors of Hartford in the land division of 1639; but is mentioned in the same year in the list of settlers, who, by the "towne's courtesie" had liberty "to fetch woode and keepe swine or cowes on the common." His house lot was in the "soldiers field," so called, in the north part of the old village of Hartford, on the "Neck Road," (supposed to have been given for service in the Pequot war,) where he lived in 1640. Hinman, in his "First Puritan Settlers," thinks that his father, then an aged man, owning no land, Richard by name, was with him. Nov. 9th, 1640, he (John Bronson) and Andrew Warner were fined five shillings "for putting their hogs over the Great River, and five shillings for every day they left them there."

After the purchase of Tunxis (Farmington) by the Hartford people, John Bronson, about 1641, removed to that place. His house lot was on a road running out of the village in an easterly direction and half a mile distant. (Richard Bronson, supposed to have been his brother, also an original proprietor and from Hartford, lived near by.) He was one of the seven pillars at the organization of the Farmington church, in 1652. He was a deputy to the General Court, in May, 1651, and at several subsequent sessions, and "the constable of Farming-

ton," who collected the rate for "y<sup>e</sup> Fort at Seabrook," in 1652. May 10th, 1670, "Cherry and will the indian with three of the milford indians were adjudged to pay to him for sider they stole from him twenty shillings." His name is on the list of freemen of Farmington in 1669. He died Nov. 28, 1680.—Estate £312. His children were:—

1. Jacob ; b. Jan. 1641, m. Mary — ; left posterity, and d. 1708. He lived in Farmington, in the society of Kensington.
2. John ; b. Jan. 1644.
3. Isaac ; b. Nov. 1645, baptized Dec. 7, 1645, in Hartford, by Mr. Hooker.
4. Mary ; m. an Ellis or Allis.
5. Abraham ; baptized Nov. 28, 1647. He signed the Mattatuck articles, but declined the responsibilities of a planter. He removed to Lyme, and m. Hannah, d. of Mathew Griswold, and d. at an advanced age, (Hinman says in 1647, which is probably a mistake,) leaving descendants.
6. Dorcas ; m. Stephen Hopkins of Hartford, father of John of Waterbury, and d. May 13, 1697.
7. Sarah ; m. Ebenezer Kilbourn of Wethersfield.

#### JOHN BRONSON.

He was one of the thirty original subscribers, in 1674. The name is written "John Bronson, Jr." The "Jr." on the Farmington records was usually applied to the son of Richard ; which fact has led to the conclusion that the settler in Mattatuck was the son of Richard, and not of John. I believe, however, but am not entirely confident, that John of Waterbury was the son of John of Farmington. I find this language used on the Farmington records, under date of March 28, 1695—"Land in Farmington belonging to John Brownson : son of John Brownson, at Watterbury." John, the son of the Waterbury John, lived in Farmington. But John, the son of Richard, appears also have had a son John.

John Bronson was an early settler of Mattatuck. He is not, however, named in the second division of fence, which fact indicates that he vacillated for a time. He lived on the north side of West Main street, where William R. Hitchcock now resides, having a lot of two acres ; bounded north and south on highway, east on Lieut. Judd, west on Thomas Richason. He m. Sarah Ventris and d. 1796. His widow d. Jan. 6, 1711—

12. The inventory of his estate, amounting to £141, 6s. 6d., with £22, 3s. debts, was taken Nov. 7, 1696. The estate was distributed by Isaac Bronson and Dea. Thomas Judd, according to an order of the Court. The widow was to have a double part and the children to share equally, leaving out the eldest son John:—

It appearing to this court y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> eldest soon has already received his full part by deed of gift from his father in his life time and by his own acknowledgment in court—it is to be understood y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> widow is to have one third part of y<sup>e</sup> reale estate during her naturall life and a double part of y<sup>e</sup> personal estate.

#### Children :

1. John; b. 1670; d. June 15, 1716. He removed to Farmington (the part which is now Southington) and had several children.

2. Sarah; b. 1672.

3. Dorothy; b. 1675; m. Stephen Kelsey of Wethersfield. They were both living in 1723, and deeded their right in their father Bronson's estate to their son Stephen Kelsey of Wethersfield, (afterwards of Waterbury.)

4. Ebenezer; b. 1677; m. Mary Munn, Aug. 13, 1702, and d. May 23, 1727, leaving daughters, Elizabeth Knowles, Bethiah, wife of Lemuel Wheeler, and others. He lived and died in Woodbury. (See Cothren's Woodbury.)

5. William; b. 1682; m. in 1707, Esther Barnes; and d. in 1761, having had several sons and daughters. He removed to Farmington at an early date. To him his father's homestead was distributed "as his whole portion," valued at £14, 16s 4d.

6. Moses; b. 1686; m. Jane Wait of Stratford, and d. Aug. 12, 1754. His widow and all his children, thirteen in number, are named on the Probate record as living at his decease. He was admitted as a bachelor proprietor Jan. 7, 1706–7, and again in Nov. 1722, having the "fifth propriety lot," so called, which was formerly his own. It seems that he left Waterbury and was absent several years. His friends having no intelligence from him supposed him dead, and the Court, in 1712, ordered his brother William to take all needful care of his estate. (Hinman's Puritans.) He was discovered, however, the next year, in Stratford, where he remained some time afterwards, having several children born there. I find no mention made of him, as an inhabitant of Waterbury, from Feb. 1709–10, till after Nov. 28, 1722, when his bachelor lot was granted him a second time. Thomas Sherwood of Stratford assisted him in obtaining this grant, for which assistance, and for his journey, Bronson conveyed to him, by a quit claim deed, "one half of the one hundred and twenty three acres" of land-divisions then to be taken up, on the said bachelor's right. Bronson returned to Waterbury about 1723. He lived up the river on the west side.

7. Grace; b. 1689.

## ISAAC BRONSON.

He was one of the original thirty subscribers, and is believed to have been one of the first company who came to Waterbury, having a meadow allotment in the beginning and being named in all the divisions of common fence. He appears to have complied promptly with all the conditions of the articles of settlement. He lived on North Main street, a little north of the house of Augustus Brown, having a lot of four acres, bounded, in 1687, westerly on highway, southerly on John Stanley, northerly on John Newell and easterly on common land. March 31, 1694, he purchased John Newell's house and lot of five acres next adjoining him on the north.

Isaac Bronson was one of the patentees named in the first town patent. He joined the Farmington church, May 15th, 1684, and was active in establishing a church in Waterbury. He was a petitioner with Mr. Peck to the General Court for liberty "to gather" a church, and was one of its seven pillars at its final organization, in 1691. When the train-band was re-organized, after the town was incorporated, in 1689, he was appointed corporal. About 1695, he became sergeant, and ever afterwards was known as Sergeant Bronson. He was deputy in May, 1697, and Oct. 1701, and townsman, school committee, town surveyor, &c., at different times. He seems to have been one of the most respected of the early settlers. When it became necessary to provide for his declining years, he deeded half his homestead, &c., to his youngest son Ebenezer, on condition as follows:—The instrument is dated June 23d, 1714, and is signed by a mark, in consequence, doubtless, of feeble health. The grantor wrote, in his better days, a fair hand, for the times. Specimens of his writing may be seen in the old proprietors' book, (pamphlet form,) he having sometimes acted as temporary clerk.

Know ye that i Isack brounson senr [&c.] in consideration of my son ebenezzer brounson hoo now liues with me finding of me and my wife mary brounson with a sutable and comfortable maintenance and taking the whole care of us both while we liue both in siknes and in helth I say for and in consideration here of I do giue and grant to my well be loueed ebinezzer brounson [&c.] the one half of my hom lot upon which my dwelling hous now stands which land is esteemed two acres and a half be

it more or less as it lies butted and bounded south on samuell standly east on John brounson west on highway north on the remainder of my homsted. Then my whole right in the lot he bought of John Warner—Item, half my team two young heffers and a young mare and One half of all my tackling and Impliments belonging to a team To haue and to hold [&c.]

Several years afterwards, or Dec. 2, 1718, Ebenezer relinquished his interest in his father's homestead, and his brother and brother-in-law, Thomas Bronson and Thomas Hickox, in consideration of five acres of land on the Farmington road, being the Tailor lot, so called, valued at £8, received of Ebenezer, assumed the care of their father and mother. On the same day, the father deeded to Ebenezer, "that he may be sutably rewarded and encouraged for what he has done for us," one acre of his home lot.

Isaac Bronson m. about 1669, Mary, daughter of John Root of Farmington, a non-fulfilling subscriber of the articles. He d. about 1719, and his widow soon after. An inventory of his estate was presented to court, Feb. 29, 1719–20, by "Mr. Isaac Bronson," his son, with an agreement among the heirs as to its settlement, they giving bonds for the support of the widow. The oldest son was to have £7 more than the other sons, and the latter £7 more than the daughters, eight in all. The amount distributed was £386. Thomas Clark and John Richards were appraisers of the estate.

#### Children :

1. Isaac ; b. 1670, and died June 13, 1751. As early as March, 1694–5, he (with others) had a grant of land out East, on the south side of the Farmington road, near Carrington Pond, (south of Timothy Porter's,) where he proposed to settle ; but the enterprise was given up. After his marriage, he purchased (April 24, 1704) of Ephraim Warner a house and lot on the northwest corner of Cook and Grove streets, where he perhaps lived for a time. He owned land at Breakneck Hill at an early date. In June, 1701, he purchased of Thomas Warner twelve acres on the south side of the Woodbury road. He went there to live before March, 1707, (N. S.,) and is considered as the first permanent settler of what is now Middlebury. According to a tradition of the family, his eldest son, Isaac, was the first child born (March 27, 1707) within the limits of that town. His house stood where Leonard Bronson now lives. He was a bachelor proprietor ; a deputy to the General Court in 1723 and 1733, and one of the most respectable and influential men of the town for many years.

2. John ; b. 1673, and died about the close of the year 1746. His inventory amounted to £1,184, 4s. 8d. He is supposed to have lived first at Breakneck. His father owned a house there as early as April 6, 1702, and it is probable that John

occupied it. The latter had a house of his own at Breakneck and twenty-two acres of land, Feb. 27th, 1705-6, which he bought, by exchange, of Joseph Gaylord, Sen. Afterwards, with his father's help, he built a house on the east end of his father's lot, on Cherry, near the junction of Walnut street. His father gave him the land, (on which the house had already been built, Jan. 29, 1707-8,) two acres, butting east on highway, (which at this point was six rods wide,) west on his father's land, north on Benjamin Barnes' and south on Thomas Hickox's land. In April, 1743, he bought the old Hopkins' place; but whether he lived on it, I am unable to say. He became a lieutenant of the militia and was, two or three times, selectman. He was licensed as a tavern-keeper by the New Haven County Court in 1730 and afterwards. It appears to have been his son John, who was also a lieutenant, who removed to Northbury about 1737, and afterwards to Amenia, N. Y.

3. Samuel; born about 1676. He was a cooper, and lived in Kensington.

4. Mary; b. Oct. 15, 1680; m. Dea. Thomas Hickox and died in 1756. She seems to have been a woman of great efficiency, and while a widow, managed her own business and property, dealing much in real estate.

5. Joseph; b. 1682, and d. May 10, 1707. His estate was distributed among his brothers and sisters in 1721, amounting to £24—a £40 propriety being estimated at £5 and sixty-eight acres of land, (being dividends on it,) at £19.

6. Thomas; b. Jan. 16, 1686, and d. May 6, 1777. He was the fifth deacon (appointed 1750) of the Waterbury first church, his son Thomas being the sixth. He had a house and four acres of land on the corner of Cook and Grove streets, which he sold to Joseph Smith of Derby, Dec. 30th, 1726, for £145; butted west on heirs of George Scott and Thomas Barnes, all other sides on highway. The land he bought in 1717 of his brother John for £8. After the death of his father, he bought of his brother Ebenezer, (in 1726,) the family homestead, which he afterwards occupied. He was a lieutenant, and is so called on his gravestone.

7. Ebenezer; b. Dec. 1688. He was baptized in Farmington, as were his older brothers and his sister Mary. He was a bachelor proprietor, and so were his brothers Isaac, John, Joseph and Thomas. He improved the old homestead for several years after the death of his father. In April, 1735, he bought of William Judd the place on the southwest corner of West Main and Willow streets, where he lived in 1744, and I suppose till his death, and where his son Andrew lived after him. In his will, he speaks of having already given his oldest son Andrew, "by way of acknowledgement of him as my eldest son, a yoke of steers, with £20 old tenor money, and some other small matters." He bequeathed to the first church in Waterbury, "forty shillings, lawful money, to lye in bank for the use and benefit of the church, the interest to be improved," so long as the church continue "in the present form and method," &c. He d. July 20, 1775. The amount of his inventory was £868, 11s. 4d. He is called in deeds, "yeoman."

8. Sarah; b. Nov. 15, 1691, and d. 1748.

9. Mercy; b. Sept. 28, 1694, and m. Richard Bronson of Woodbury.

## JOHN CARRINGTON.

He was an early settler of Farmington and one of the "eighty-four proprietors" of 1672. He signed the articles for the settlement of Mattatuck, in 1674, and appears to have joined the new plantation early; for he is named in all the divisions of fence. He, however, neglected full compliance with the conditions of the articles, and was declared to have forfeited his rights, Feb. 6, 1682, (1682-3.) But little is known of him. He died in the early part of 1690, leaving a widow who deceased before the inventory was rendered, (June 30, 1690.) His son John was administrator and the estate amounted to £120, 11s. John had £23, each of the other children £12. Benjamin Barnes and Thomas Judd, the smith, were appointed guardians of the three youngest children, with instructions to put them out, and not to be overruled by John, the administrator.

John Carrington's house lot of two acres was on West Main street, the south side, about where Leavenworth street now runs. It was bounded north and south on highway, east on Timothy Stanley, west on George Scott. It was sold, in 1710, by the heirs, to Timothy Stanley and George Scott, for £12.

## Children :

1. John; b. 1667, and d. 1692, in Waterbury. Benjamin Barnes and Thomas Judd, Jr. were administrators. The estate, amounting to £59, 17s. 2d, was distributed, his debts being first paid, to his brothers and sisters. He was a cooper.
2. Mary; b. 1672; m. Joshua Holcomb (?) of Simsbury. She was the wife of William Parsons of Farmington in 1721 and 1734-55.
3. Hannah; b. 1676; m. William Parsons of Farmington, according to Mr. W. S. Porter. Should not the name be Joshua Holcomb of Simsbury?
4. Clark; b. 1678; m. Sarah Higason, and lived in Farmington. He was there in 1721-2.
5. Elizabeth; b. 1682; m. John Hoskins of Windsor.
6. Ebenezer; b. 1687; removed to Hartford, and died in Waterbury, administration being taken out, (in 1711,) by his brother-in-law, William Parsons of Hartford. He left no family.

## THOMAS CLARK.

His grandfather, William Clark, came from England and settled in Dorchester, Mass., about 1637. Thence he removed to Northampton, in 1659, and d. in 1690. His son William,



the father of Thomas of Waterbury, after the birth of his children, removed to Lebanon, Conn.

Thomas Clark was born (in Northampton) April 14, 1690. His mother Sarah (Strong) was the sister of Timothy Stanley's wife. When a mere child, as tradition runs, his uncle Stanley visited his father's house in Lebanon and inquired, at first in a sportive way, which of his young nephews would go and live with him and be his boy, as he had none of his own. Thomas spoke up promptly and said that he would go. But as he was so young, it was finally arranged that his elder brother, Timothy, should accompany his uncle to Waterbury. But Timothy soon became home-sick and returned to Lebanon and Thomas was allowed to take his place, to become, afterwards, the adopted son and principal heir of Stanley. He was accepted as a £40 proprietor, Dec. 12, 1711. He became a "cloth-weaver," learning his trade of his uncle, with whom he continued to live after marriage, managing the farm, and taking care of the "old folks." In June, 1713, his father, by adoption, deeded to him a part of his property, and at his death gave him a large proportion of the remainder, by will. After the decease of Stanley, Clark occupied the old homestead. Here he wove "plain cloth at 1s-3d pr. yard,"\* "checkerd shirtin at 1s 3d per yard;" "drugged [drugget] at 12d. a yard;" striped flannel, &c., &c. He probably occupied himself at his loom during the winter season and in bad weather. He continued to cultivate his farm and exchanged its surplus products for the spare products of his neighbors' industry. He had a slave, named Mingo,† who, when not needed at home, worked for those who wanted him, for hire. When his sons became old enough—Timothy, Thomas, David—they occasionally labored at farm work, for others, frequently with the team, and their wages were charged to the debtors by their father. The girls, too—Mary, Sarah, Hannah, Hepzibah—though belonging to one of the "first families"

---

\* The book in which he kept his "accounts," commencing in 1727, is now in my possession, having been loaned me by his granddaughter, Mrs. Aurelia Clark.

† At Dea. Clark's death, Mingo was to be permitted to choose which of his master's sons he would live with. Being attached to his old home, he resided for a time with Thomas; but after the latter commenced keeping tavern, he did not like his occupation and went to live with Timothy, on Town Plot. He died, worth considerable property, in 1800.



Northampton; April 14, 1690

Dear Sister of Timothy Stan-

ton, I received your kind letter, and

was glad to hear from you, and

to hear that you were well.

I am well, and hope these few

lines will find you the same.

I have not much news to write

at present, but I am glad to hear

that you are all well, and that

you are all still in the same

place, and that you are all

still in the same health.

I am glad to hear that you are

all still in the same place,

and that you are all still in

the same health.

I am glad to hear that you are

all still in the same place,

and that you are all still in

the same health.

I am glad to hear that you are

all still in the same place,

and that you are all still in

the same health.

I am glad to hear that you are

all still in the same place,

and that you are all still in

the same health.



FACTURE BY JOHN BIRCHALL

ENGRAVED BY JAMES SMITH

*Secu M. Hopkins*

1800



of the town, and having more than the usual accomplishments of that time, frequently "went out to work" by the day, or the week, thus contributing to the support of a numerous family. Honest labor was in those days respectable, and none was too good to engage in it. In addition to his other business, Mr. Clark seems to have kept for sale some of the common goods which are found in a retail store, such as "shugger," molasses, salt, wine, "rumb," tobacco, nails. He appears to have bought his goods sometimes in Derby and sometimes in New Haven. He also occasionally took boarders, and has several charges against the Colony for "victeling" soldiers that were passing through the town. Being appointed a justice of the peace in 1736, (which office he held twenty-five out of the twenty-nine years of his remaining life,) he became somewhat acquainted with legal forms, and was often applied to to draw deeds, bonds, agreements and such simple writings as are most called for among a rural population.

No man in his day succeeded more completely in securing the good opinion and entire confidence of his fellow townsmen, than Thomas Clark. He occupied positions of trust and responsibility. He was a selectman in 1834, 1736 and 1737; a town deputy in Oct. 1727, 1728 and 1736; town treasurer from 1755 to 1760 and a justice of the peace, as has been mentioned. On Mr. Southmayd's death in 1755, he was chosen town and proprietor's clerk, and was continued in office till his decease. He wrote not an elegant, but a very legible hand. He was the third deacon of the church, being appointed in 1728 to succeed Dea. Hickox, who died in that year.

Thomas Clark's son Thomas succeeded his father in the occupancy of the homestead, and kept a tavern till his decease, Oct. 25, 1779. The house was the scene of some interesting events during the Revolutionary War. Capt. Lemuel Harrison's dwelling was built, for the most part, on the same foundations as the "old Clark house."

#### JOSEPH GAYLORD.

He was the son of Walter Gaylord and the grandson of Dea. William Gaylord of Windsor; the latter a leading man of that town. He was born May 13, 1649, and m. July 14,

1670, Sarah, d. of John Stanley of Farmington. Whether he removed from Windsor first to Farmington and then to Mattatuck, or directly from Windsor to Mattatuck, is uncertain. He was not one of the first subscribers of the articles; but was accepted Jan. 15, 1677, (1677-8.) He came to Mattatuck early, probably in the spring of 1678, and is named in the four divisions of fence. Still, he did not keep his engagements, and his right was declared forfeited, Feb. 1682-3. But he "submitted," and by better performance, regained and perfected his title to an £80 propriety. He is mentioned in all the lists of proprietors. He was collector of minister's rates in 1698, 1699 and 1700. In 1687, his lot of three acres was on the corner of East and North Main streets—south and west on highway, north on John Stanley and east on common. This place, with the house and barn, he sold, Feb. 2, 1703, (1703-4,) to Stephen Welton, son of John, reserving a quarter of an acre at the east end on which his son Joseph had erected a dwelling. After this, he built a house at Breakneck, (or at any rate he owned one there with twenty-two acres of land,) which he sold and deeded, Feb. 26, 1705-6, to John Bronson, "son of Isaac," as already stated. Whether he lived for a time at Breakneck, I have no means of ascertaining with certainty, though it is probable he did. Most likely he sold out as a preparation for removing from the town. Several members of his family had already gone to Durham, and he soon followed, there being no traces of him in Waterbury after the sale referred to. I find him in Durham in the early part of 1708, where he died before 1713.

Children :

1. Sarah; b. July 11, 1671; m. Thomas Judd, known as Thomas Judd, Jr.

2. Joseph; b. April 22, 1673; m. Feb. 8, 1699-1700, Mary, d. of Joseph Hickox, decd., of Woodbury, and had three children, Elizabeth, Joseph (died in infancy) and Thankful, all born in Waterbury. He was chosen fence viewer in 1698 and 1703, and admitted to bachelor privileges in 1699. He built a house on East Main street, on the east end of his father's lot. In April, 1702, the proprietors granted him and his brothers John and William, and Richard Porter, "eight acres apiece, at the place they talk of going to live at on the west side [the river], provided they go and live there with their families." To this place, presumed to be Breakneck, where his father built a house, he (and the others) did not go. Afterwards, probably in 1703 or 1704, he and his brother John erected houses on Buckshill and removed thither. They were, however, not contented; but soon

pulled up and went to Durham. Joseph had left as early as Jan. 7, 1705-6. The names of both and that of their father, and also of their brothers-in-law, Joseph and Stephen Hickox, are mentioned in the patent of Durham, in 1708. In Oct. 1708, for "eleven pounds in building and four pounds teen shillings to be dun in worck at s<sup>d</sup> durrum," Gaylord deeded to Richard Welton his house and lot of seven acres at Buckshill—"east on highway, west on said Gayland's land, south on John Gayland's house lot, north on John Warner's house lot."

Joseph Gayland, 2d, after having lived in Durham many years, removed to Wallingford. He and his brothers, John and Benjamin, and his sister, Joanna Royce, were in the latter place in 1722. "Joseph Gaylord, Jr.," was in Waterbury in 1730, apparently from Wallingford.

3. John; b. April 21, 1677; was one of the first nine bachelor proprietors, admitted March 26, 1799. He lived by the side of his brother Joseph on Buckshill, having a lot of six and three quarter acres, butting north on Joseph Gaylord, Jr's house lot, east and south on highway, west on common, which he bought of "John Warner of Buckshill." He removed with his elder brother to Durham, and finally to Wallingford, where he d. about 1753. His will was presented to the Probate Court in New Haven the first Monday in January, 1754, in which he names six sons and five daughters. His estate in Wallingford amounted to £1,995, and in Farmington to about £560.

Sarah, Joseph and John Gaylord, children of Joseph, Sen., were born in Windsor.

4. William. He was accepted as a £40 proprietor, March, 1701, but forfeited his right, removed to Woodbury and joined the church there, Jan. 13, 1706. He was among those taxed for the "North Purchase" in 1712, (Cothren, Vol I, p. 83.) Afterwards he removed to New Milford,\* where he d. about 1753. His will was approved Nov. 23, 1753, in which is mentioned his wife Mercy and six children. He was an ensign, and his first wife's name was Joanna, who joined the church in Woodbury, Dec. 7th, 1712. His son Nathan, of New Milford, m. Hannah, d. of John Bronson, son of Isaac.

5. Benjamin. He lived in Durham.

6. Elizabeth; b. 1680; m. (the same day as her brother Joseph) Joseph Hickox, son of Sergt. Samuel, deceased.

7. Mary; m. March 4, 1701-2, Stephen, son of John Welton, 1st, and d. July 18, 1709.

8. Abigail; b. in Waterbury, and bap. in Farmington, Nov. 7, 1686, and m. James Williams. They both lived in Hartford in March, 1722.

9. Joanna; m. Robert Royce. They were both of Wallingford, Nov. 1722.

10. Ruth; m. Stephen Hickox, and lived in Durham.

#### THOMAS HANCOX.

He was an early settler of Farmington and one of the eighty-four proprietors of 1672. He was one of the first thirty who signed the Mattatuck articles; but was dilatory in his movements, and is not mentioned in the first three divisions of

---

\* He is stated, erroneously, in the extracts from Mr. Griswold's sermon, in Barber's Con. Historical Collections, to have come from Windsor.



fence. He was among the delinquents whose allotments were condemned by the act of Feb. 1682-3; but he subscribed (June 4, 1683) to the new conditions imposed by that act, "reformed," and was restored to his rights, having a £100 propriety. I cannot find that he did anything to preserve his memory in Mattatuck; but he left his name to the brook and meadows at Waterville. His house and home lot of one and three quarter acres were on the north side of West Main street. The lot was bounded north and south on highway, east on Thomas Newell and west on Robert Porter. These Hancox sold, together with other lands and his propriety right, in Feb. 1687-8, to Lieut. Judd, and quit the town, shaking the dust from his feet, perhaps. He probably left about the time of the above sale. He was in Farmington Dec. 22d, 1688, in Hartford June, 1695, and in Farmington, (Kensington,) again, Jan. 1720-21.

Thomas Hancox m. March 17, 1684-5, Rachel Leonard of Springfield.

Children :

1. Thomas; b. March 13, 1685-6, and lived in Hartford and Boston.
2. John; b. Aug. 1, 1688, and lived in Springfield.
3. William; b. March 1, 1690-91, and d. 1721.
4. Rachel; b. Feb. 7, 1692-3, and d. 1737.
5. Daniel; b. Jan. 1, 1694-5, and m. June 4, 1724, Rachel Porter.
6. Mehitabel; b. Dec. 4, 1698, and m. Ebenezer Barnes.

#### HICKOX.

The planters of Waterbury bearing this name, Samuel and Joseph, are supposed to have been brothers, and sons of William Hickox of Farmington, one of the original proprietors and first settlers of that town. The latter died early. The names of Samuel and Joseph are on the list of the proprietors of Farmington, in 1672.

#### SAMUEL HICKOX.

He was one of the original thirty, and is believed to have been a member of the first company that came to our town. He was one of the assignees of the first Indian deed, and is named in all the fence divisions and proprietors' lists. So far as appears, he never once halted in the work he had undertaken. He lived where C. B. Merriman now resides, having a

home lot of two acres, bounded, in March, 1690–91, south on highway, north on "highland," west on Joseph Hickox's heirs, and east on Benjamin Barnes. He was called sergeant as early as 1686. When the train-band was organized, or re-organized, after the resumption of the colonial government under the charter, he was appointed sergeant and was ever afterwards known as Serg. Samuel Hickox. He held different offices by appointment of the grand committee and proprietors—was townsman in 1682, &c. He was one of the leading men of the settlement, and died at his post, at a critical time, when men of the right stamp could be poorly spared. His inventory was taken Feb. 28, 1694–5, amounting to £434.

Children :

1. Samuel ; b. 1669 ; m. April 16, 1690, Elizabeth, d. of John Plumb of Milford. He had a grant of land from the proprietors when he was but eighteen years old, "three acres at Pine swamp by the path that leads to the saw-mill." Jan. 20, 1692, he had two acres granted "on the side of chesnut hill near to his boggy meadow convenient for a yard," (for drying cloth ?) He lived on the corner of East Main and Cherry streets, where he had built a house before Sept. 1703. This place, bounded west on Stephen Welton and Samuel Stanley, north on John Bronson, south and east on highway, he conveyed, Jan. 26, 1705–6, to his brother Thomas, the latter having built him a barn and chimney and deeded to him sixteen acres of land at Judd's Meadow. The barn and chimney were probably at Judd's Meadow, where Samuel "had set his house" as early as Dec. 21, 1702, and where he was certainly living before December, 1705. He was probably the first settler of Naugatuck. He erected a fulling-mill on Fulling-Mill Brook (so called from the mill) about 1709, and his house was by the brook. Some of his lands "ran across the road that led to New Haven."

Samuel Hickox died in the great sickness, June 3, 1713, and his widow, Oct. 17, 1749. They had ten children, six of whom lived to be married. Ebenezer and John were bachelor proprietors. The first, after 1741, removed to Danbury and Norwalk, and the last, before July, 1720, to Durham.

2. Hannah ; b. 1671 ; m. John Judd of Waterbury.

3. William ; b. 1673 ; m. about 1696, Rebecca, d. of Abraham Andrus, (1st,) and d. Nov. 4, 1737. He was a bachelor proprietor and man of note—grand juror, school committee, surveyor, constable, townsman, (many times,) moderator of town meeting, captain in 1727, and deputy in 1728. He was always known by his military title. He lived where the church of the First Congregational Society now stands. The place he bought of Joseph Hickox (son of Joseph, decd.) of Woodbury, May 17, 1699. The lot, containing two acres, was bounded, March 12, 1704–5, north on common land, south on highway, east on a house lot of the heirs of Serg. Hickox, decd., west on a house lot of the heirs of Philip Judd, decd. The house lot which was Philip Judd's he afterwards purchased. Still later, he came into possession of three quarters of his father's homestead. In Sept. 1732, for £300, he deeded all to Samuel Camp, son of Edward, of Milford, seven

acres, with the house, barn, and mill-house, butted east on land of Joseph Smith, north on Samuel Scott, son of George, west on Dea. Clark, south on highway, reserving one quarter part of his father's lot belonging to the heirs of Thomas Hickox, decd., and reserving also "twenty foot square of land down the hill near the mill house as it is stoned out." This property, with the same reservations, Camp (who then improved it) conveyed, in 1736, for £185, to Dea. Thomas Judd.

Capt. William Hickox lost three sons in the great sickness of 1713. One son only, Capt. Samuel, survived him and had a family. His will bears date Jan. 4, 1732-3. Among his effects were Lewis, a negro man @ £140, and "fillis a negro woman" @ £100.

4. Thomas; b. 1675; m. Mary, daughter of Serg. Isaac Bronson, and d. June 28, 1728. His widow married Dea. Samuel Bull of Woodbury, and died a widow. March 28, 1694, he had a grant of land, four acres for a house lot, on the west side of Carrington Brook, on the south side of the highway to Farmington; but he does not appear to have built on it. He was made a bachelor proprietor in 1699; was grand juror, school committee, and townsman, at different times; represented the town in the Legislature two sessions, in 1722 and 1723, and was appointed a deacon in 1724, being the second who had held this office in the church. He is called "husbandman" in a deed. His residence was on the corner of East Main and Cherry streets, being the place he bought of his brother Samuel in 1705-6. He died in the prime of life, much regretted. His estate was valued at £1,251, and his homestead at £140.

5. Joseph; b. 1678, and m. Elizabeth Gaylord. He was accepted as a bachelor proprietor, March 26, 1699, and in the same month received a grant of land "on y<sup>e</sup> east side of y<sup>e</sup> little brook buting on gorg scott hom lot being a triangle peace between y<sup>e</sup> highways for a hous lot on condition y<sup>t</sup> he fence and improue it four yeirs not to pregedis y<sup>e</sup> high wayes nor hinder y<sup>e</sup> town coming to y<sup>e</sup> claypits." On this lot, which lay between North Main and Grove streets, east of Andrew Bryan's house, Hickox built a house, which he deeded, with three and a half acres of land, to John Judd, (1st.) Nov. 5, 1714; bounded east, west, north and south, on highway. He obtained the office of "chimney viewer" in 1701 and 1703, and begat two children, Joseph and Hannah, both of whom (and also a sister, Ruth) were living in 1725-6. Being satisfied with what he had done for Waterbury, and having made fast his propriety right, he quit the place, going to Durham with the Gaylords, where he died in 1725. He was a carpenter.

6. Mary; b. 1681; m. John Bronson, son of Isaac, and died "March 21, 1713."

7. Elizabeth; bap. Nov. 12, 1682; m. Dec. 1724, John Norton, (of Durham, previously of Saybrook?)

8. Stephen; bap. April 12, 1685, and m. Ruth Gaylord. He was admitted a bachelor proprietor, Jan. 7, 1705-6; but soon caught the run-away fever and followed his brother and father-in-law to Durham, thus losing his bachelor right. He was one of those whose feelings were hurt that the proprietors should give away their lands so liberally, he having a small interest after the decease of his father. His death took place before 1737-8. He had sons and daughters, Samuel, Stephen, Ruth Johnson and Sarah Spelman.

9. Benjamin; b. 1686. He was "of Stamford" in 1715, and had a suit in the Superior Court at Fairfield; about a negro boy, Dunboy, whom he claimed and had attached. He was living in Norwalk in May, 1735.

10. Mercy; bap. April 8, 1689.

11. Ebenezer; b. 1693. He chose, in 1707, his brother William his guardian. He was in Danbury in June, 1722.

#### JOSEPH HICKOX.

I suppose him to have been younger than his brother Samuel. He subscribed the articles in 1674, and had a \$60 allotment. He was early in Mattatuck, but was not there in "a steady way," I conclude; for though his name is in the first, second and fourth fence divisions, it is not in the third. He lived next west of his brother Samuel, between the latter and Philip Judd, having a lot of two acres. This lot, bounded north on common land, his son Joseph sold and conveyed, May 17, 1690, to his cousin William Hickox, as before stated.

Only the scantiest memorials remain of Joseph Hickox, first. He was the first proprietor that left the settlement, (and the first that died.) He removed to Woodbury, (Southbury,) in the early part of 1686; joined the church there May 2d, 1686, and died in 1687. His estate amounted to £107 in Waterbury and £100 in Woodbury.

#### JOHN HOPKINS.

His grandfather, John Hopkins, settled at Cambridge, Mass., in 1634; was made a freeman in 1635, and removed to Hartford, in 1636, where he became a juror, in 1643. It is not known what relation, if any, he bore to Stephen Hopkins, who came to Plymouth, Mass., in 1620, or to Edward Hopkins, who arrived at Boston in 1637, afterwards governor of Connecticut. He could not, however, have been a near relative of the last. His will was dated in 1648, and the inventory of his estate taken April 14, 1654. He left a widow Jane, who afterwards married Nathaniel Ward, and two children, Stephen and Bethiah. The last married Samuel Stocking of Middletown. *and 2<sup>nd</sup> Capt. James Threlk (no children)*

Stephen Hopkins, the father of John of Waterbury, made a freeman 1656, married Dorcas, daughter of John Bronson, 1st, of Farmington. He died about 1689, and his widow, May 10, 1697. His will bore date Sept. 28, 1680, and his inventory, (amounting to £591,) Nov. 6, 1689. His children named in his will, were:

1. John; 2. Stephen; b. 1665; m. Sarah, d. of Lieut. Thomas Judd and Hannah —. He had children, Thomas, Sarah and Rachel, and d. 1704. 3. Ebenezer; b. 1669, and m. Mary Butler, d. of Samuel of Wethersfield, Jan. 21, 1691. 4. Joseph; m. Hannah, d. of Paul Peck of Hartford, April 27, 1693. 5. Dorcas; m. Jonathan Webster, May 11, 1681. 6. Mary; m. Samuel Sedgwick.

John Hopkins, the son of Stephen of Hartford, came to Mattatuck to tend his father's mill. The mill was built apparently in 1680, and John probably took charge of it at that time. He did not however become a proprietor immediately. Perhaps he was not then of age. His name is not on either of the fence-division lists, so frequently referred to. The father had a house lot granted him, Feb. 5, 1680-81, which was probably intended for the son. The latter is first mentioned, Feb. 6, 1682, (1682-3,) when Dea. Lankton's forfeited allotments were confirmed to him by the committee. He was then called "the present miller."

John Hopkins was one of the most respected and influential of the early settlers of Waterbury. He ground the people's corn, "corn being suitable to grind," and was one of the youngest of the original proprietors. He subscribed to the £60 settlement of the first minister; was townsman in 1692, and several times afterwards; constable in 1702; grand juror for two years; deputy in 1704, and many times from 1708 to 1726; justice of the peace from 1725 to 1729, inclusive. He held the office of town clerk in 1713. He wrote his own signature in a fair hand; but his chirography was generally bad and his ink poor, making the records, as kept by him, difficult to decipher. He was also tavern keeper from 1712 to 1718, inclusive, and probably earlier, and "ordinary keeper" in 1714 and 1715. He obtained, too, military honors so much sought for in his day, being sergeant in 1714, ensign in 1715, and lieutenant in 1716. After the latter date, he was known as Left. Hopkins. When the new meeting house came to be seated in 1729, he was one of the revered dignitaries who were voted "into the first pew at the west end of the pulpit."

John Hopkins' house lot was situated on the corner of East Main and Bank streets. It contained two acres, and was

bounded, Dec. 26, 1691, north and west on highway, south on Thomas Warner, and east on common land. The house stood on Main street a little east of the lane put down on the map as Brook street.

John Hopkins was a large landholder. He gave away much land during his life time to his children, by deed; still, he left a considerable estate. He died Nov. 1632, his inventory amounting to £1,251, 15s. His wife's name was Hannah —, and their children were:

1. A daughter; b. Dec. 22d, 1684, and d. Jan. 4, 1684-5—the death being the first recorded in the town.

2. John; b. March 29, 1686; bap. in Hartford and died in Hartford, Dec. 5, 1709.

3. Consider; b. Nov. 10, 1687; m. Elizabeth Graham, "relict of George Graham of Hartford," and died in Hartford in 1726.

4. Stephen; b. Nov. 19, 1689, and died 1769. He received "bachelor accommodations," in 1712; was townsman in 1724 and afterwards; deputy many times after 1732; special agent to the General Court, in 1737 and 1738, &c. He was a prominent man in his day. His house was near the west corner of East Main and Mill streets. The lot his father bought of Richard Porter in May, 1711, described as "before Thomas Hickox's house, two acres, east, west and north on highway, south on common land." In Oct. 1713, the "town" granted to Stephen Hopkins one and a half acres, (laid out as two acres,) south of the above land, and adjoining to it. In June, 1718, the father deeded to the son his two acres, on which a house had been built, valuing both to him at £35. Afterwards, (Dec. 11, 1729,) the latter sold the house and lot of four acres, bounded north, south, east and west on highway, to Jonathan Garnsey, and Garnsey conveyed it, March 19, 1735, to Thomas Barnes.

Stephen Hopkins I suppose to have assisted his father in the care of the mill. After the death of the latter, Stephen and Timothy, executors of the will of the deceased, sold out the mill and mill lands, the deed bearing date Jan. 1732-3. About this time, probably, (certainly before Oct. 7, 1734,) Stephen removed to Judd's Meadow, locating himself on, or near, the New Haven road and Fulling Mill Brook.

5. Timothy; b. Nov. 16, 1691, and d. Feb. 5, 1748-9.\* He had a bachelor right granted him in 1715. He was a farmer; was called "yeoman" and "husbandman," in deeds, and had much to do with public business. He was on several occasions, constable, selectman, grand juror and moderator of town meeting. He was justice of the peace from 1734 to 1742 inclusive, and, for many years, a representative to the General Court. He obtained military distinction, and was made a captain in 1732. No man of the town seems to have had, in a greater degree, the confidence of the public.

---

\* On his tombstone, now standing, is this not unfamiliar verse:

When this you see,  
Then think on me.

Timothy Hopkins, after his marriage, lived with his father, the latter having conveyed to him, in June, 1719, by deed, one half of the house and homestead of two acres, valuing them to him at £40 advancement. After the decease of the father, the son became the owner of the whole; and in April, 1740, added to it the lot (with a house) adjoining on the south, two and three quarter acres, bought of John Punderson of New Haven, and which Punderson purchased of James Johnson, bounded west on highway, &c. The entire lot, then called four and a half acres, the son conveyed "with the buildings, fencings, orcharding," &c., April 4th, 1743, to Lieut. John Bronson, for £540 old tenor, bounded southerly on Stephen Upson, easterly on Jonathan Baldwin's home lot, &c.

After the sale of his homestead, Capt. Hopkins appears to have owned a house and other buildings beyond the limits of the village, out East, whither he, perhaps, removed.

6. Samuel; b. Dec. 27, 1693. He settled in West Springfield.
7. Mary; b. Jan. 27, 1696-7; m. Samuel Hickox.
8. Hannah; b. April 23, 1699, and m. Daniel Porter, 2d.
9. ———; b. at same date as the last, and d. an infant.
10. Dorcas; b. Feb. 12, 1705-6, and m. James Porter.

#### BENJAMIN JONES.

He was accepted in the place of John Andruss, and was not one of the first company of settlers. His name is first mentioned among those who had allotments in the fourth division of fence, about 1680-81. But little is known of him. His house and lot of two acres were on the west side of Willow street, south of William Brown's dwelling. The land was bounded, in 1687, southwest on "a great lot," northeast on Thomas Judd's land and highway, westwardly on Ensign Thomas Judd's land and eastwardly on highway. He removed to New Haven about 1689, where he bought of William Johnson of N. H., for £50, sixty-six and a half acres of land at a place on "West Side," (West Haven,) called Shepherd's Hill, "running to a highway next the sea." His propriety right of £100 was sold by his son Benjamin, in 1715, to Dea. Thomas Judd, for forty shillings, and was conveyed by the latter, in April, 1717, to his son William.

Whence Benjamin Jones came, and from whom he descended, I am not informed. He was married to Hannah Spencer, at Milford, May 2d, 1661, and had a son Benjamin born there, in June, 1662. (S. Judd.) He died in New Haven, Dec. 30, 1690, and his estate was settled in the County Court of N. H. His widow, Hannah, was administratrix, and guardian of the only child, Benjamin. This minor son was not, of course,

the one born in Milford, in 1662. The latter must have died, and another been born having the same name. Isaac Bronson and Thomas Judd, smith, took an inventory of the deceased man's estate in Waterbury.

Benjamin Jones, 2d, had born in New Haven, between 1706 and 1722, Benjamin, Hannah, Ruth, Vinson, Martha and Ebenezer.

#### JUDD.

Thomas Judd, ancestor of the Judds of New England, came from England in 1633 or 1634, and settled first in Cambridge, near Boston, where lands were granted him in 1634. He removed to Hartford in 1636 and to Farmington about 1644, where he lived till 1679, and buried his wife. He then went to Northampton and married a widow Mason, who was childless and had a good estate. There he died Nov. 9, 1688. He was the second deacon of the church of Farmington and a deputy from that town in 1657, and afterwards.

His children were :

1. William, and 2. Elizabeth. Both of them were born between 1633 and 1636, but it is uncertain which was the oldest. 3. Thomas; b. about 1738. 4. John; b. about 1740. He was a non-fulfilling subscriber. 5. Benjamin; b. about 1642—a non-fulfilling subscriber. 6. Mary; b. about 1644; m. June 1, 1662, Thomas Loomis of Windsor. 7. Ruth; b. 1646-7, m. John, son of John Steele. 8. Philip; b. 1649 and baptized Sept. 2, 1649. 9. Samuel; b. about 1653. His father subscribed the articles for him in 1674. He proposed joining the settlement in Mattatuck and had allotments of fence in the first and fourth divisions; but he failed at the critical time, and joined his father in Northampton, where he died in 1721.

William Judd, the eldest son of Dea. Thomas of Farmington and the father of Dea. Thomas of Waterbury, married Mary, daughter of John Steele, March 30, 1658, and died late in 1690, leaving an ample estate of £693. His inventory was presented to Court, Nov. 5, 1690.\* His widow, Mary, died

\* I cannot reconcile these dates, taken from Mr. Sylvester Judd's Genealogy of Thomas Judd, with an entry on the Farmington record, which, under date of March 20, 1690-91, refers to "Thomas Judd son of William, both residents of Waterbury." Perhaps I have made a mistake in copying.



Oct. 27, 1718, aged about eighty. The children's births are inferred from the baptisms, and the age given by the probate record. Their names were :

1. Mary ; b. 1658 ; m. Abel Janes of Northampton.
2. Thomas ; b. 1662, (baptized Oct. 13, 1662.)
3. John ; b. 1667, and d. in Farmington, 1710, leaving three children.
4. Rachel ; b. 1770 ; d. unmarried, 1703.
5. Samuel ; b. 1673 ; m. Ann Hart, in 1710 and Abigail Phelps of Westfield, in 1725. He lived in Farmington, had children and died 1728.
6. Daniel ; b. 1675 ; lived in Farmington ; m. in 1705, Mercy Mitchell of Woodbury ; d. April 29, 1748, having had eight children.
7. Elizabeth ; b. 1678 ; was living in 1718 unmarried.

All the sons of Dea. Judd of Farmington, six in number, signed the articles, first and last ; but only two became permanent settlers of Waterbury.

#### LIEUT. THOMAS JUDD.

Thomas Judd, the second son of Deacon Thomas of Farmington, was one of the original thirty. He subscribed as Thomas Judd, Jr. Afterwards, when his son Thomas became proprietor, he was known as Thomas Judd, Sen., and finally as Lieut. Thomas Judd. He was one of the first company of settlers, and discharged promptly all his obligations as a planter. He shirked no responsibility, and exposed himself to no censure or rebuke. He was one of the assignees to whom the first Indian deed was made over, in Sept. 1677, and was a grantee in the other and later Indian deeds. He is named in the first division of fence, and was one of the committee to lay it out, Jan. 1677-8. He had a like interest and a like agency in the other divisions. After his brother William abandoned the settlement, he was more than any other single person the leading man of the infant town. He was generally named by the grand committee as one of the persons who were to act in their absence, in certain emergencies. In the discharge of his duties as committee, John Stanley was usually associated with him. Judd's name was nearly always mentioned first, in part, perhaps, because he was older than Stanley.

Thomas Judd lived on the north side of West Main street, next east of John Bronson, his lot of two and one quarter

acres, extending through to the back street, bounded, in Nov. 1687, easterly on Daniel Warner, westerly on John Bronson, &c. After his death, his son Thomas took the old homestead.

Thomas Judd was one of the patentees in the first town patent. He was called sergeant in 1682 and afterwards, and occasionally ensign, (in copied records,) in 1686, 1687 and 1688. After Andros had abandoned the government, and the Waterbury train-band became entitled to a lieutenant, John Stanley received the commission of lieutenant, and Judd that of ensign. Why this precedence was given to Stanley, the junior in age, I am unable to say, unless he had some important advantage over his friend in military bearing. However, Judd was compensated. He was the first deputy to the General Court, (in May, 1689,) and was often reelected to the office. He was the first commissioner of the town, and was continued in office till a law was passed requiring at least three or four justices of the peace in each county. He was then, (in 1699, or earlier,) appointed the first justice of the peace—a great honor; and was annually reappointed till his death. In 1696, after Lieut. Stanley had removed to Farmington, he was promoted to a lieutenantcy, the highest military office allowed in the town, till 1716. No doubt he bore himself gallantly.

Lieut. Judd died Jan. 10, 1702-3, "in the sixty-fifth year of his age," at a time when his assistance and counsel were much needed. His sons John and Thomas were administrators, and the inventory of his estate, amounting to £407, bore date Jan. 30, 1702-3. His wife, Sarah, daughter of John Steel of Farmington, died May 22, 1695, in "the fifty-seventh year of her age." They were both members of Mr. Hooker's church in Farmington, in 1680.

#### Children:

1. Thomas; born probably in 1663.
2. John. He received a grant of land as early as 1689-90—four acres—to be his on condition that he remained four years in the town; but his name is rarely mentioned till after 1700. He was not a bachelor proprietor, it not being the practice to admit as such any person who had come into possession of another's right, by inheritance or otherwise; but in virtue of the right of his father which was distributed to him, he had an addition of two forty pound rights. He was

surveyor in 1703; grand juror in 1705; townsman in 1706; town collector in 1707; town treasurer in 1712, &c. In Dec. 1713, he was appointed town clerk, which office he held till his death. His chirography is atrociously bad—worse even than that of his immediate predecessors in office. His last record was a part of a deed from himself to John Welton, dated and acknowledged May 5th, 1717. The record was finished by his successor, William Judd. His decease took place in the latter part of 1717, (N. S.) The inventory of his estate, amounting to £305, was taken Jan. 3, 1717–18. Capt. Thomas Judd was guardian of the four youngest children, in 1720.

John Judd had a house and house lot of one acre and a half which he obtained by exchange, March 4, 1704, of John Warner, bounded east on Jonathan Scott's house lot, north, south and west on highway. This he exchanged, Nov. 5, 1714, with Joseph Hickox of Durham, said Hickox conveying to him a house and lot of three and a half acres, lying between Cook, Grove and North Main streets, butted north, south, east and west on highways, where I suppose Judd afterwards lived.

3. Sarah; m. Nov. 17, 1686, Stephen Hopkins, Jr., of Hartford. Her death is recorded in Waterbury as having taken place May 11, 1693, in the twenty-eighth year of her age. She left a son, Thomas, and two daughters.

#### PHILIP JUDD.

He was the sixth son of Dea. Thomas Judd, and m. Hannah, d. of Thomas Loomis of Windsor. Not much is known of him. He subscribed the articles June 13, 1687, (having already—in 1686—received some land grants,) being accepted in the place of his brother Samuel. He signed the agreement with Mr. Peck, in 1689, and died soon after. His death occurred before the expiration of the four years required by the articles of settlement, thus securing his right to his family. He was the first of the original proprietors who died in Waterbury. Ensign Thomas Judd and Thomas Judd, smith, administered on his estate. His inventory, taken Nov. 2, 1689, amounted to £237 in Waterbury, and £92 in Farmington. He was much in debt. The family removed from Waterbury, and the children all settled in Danbury.

Philip Judd's house lot of two acres ("y<sup>t</sup> fell to him by allotment") was on the north side of West Main street, next west of Joseph Hickox's home lot, and was bounded, March 27, 1708, west on Obadiah Richards, decd., east on William Hickox, north on common, south on highway, (no house mentioned at this date.) The lot was sold, Nov. 1711, by Benjamin Judd, son of Philip, to William Hickox, for £8, 10s., butted north on George Scott's land, and on the other sides as described above.

## Children :

1. Philip; baptized in Farmington, March 13, 1680-81. He settled in Danbury (Bethel Society,) and died between 1760 and 1765, leaving children.
2. Thomas; baptized May 27, 1683, and died young.
3. Hannah; baptized in F. Oct. 19, 1684, and married Thomas Hoyt of Danbury. They were both living in April, 1721.
4. William; baptized in F. July 3, 1687. He mar. Dec. 23, 1709, Mary, daughter of Thomas Gridly of Farmington, where he had two daughters, Eunice and Elizabeth, born in 1710 and 1712-13. He removed thence first to Waterbury, then to Danbury. He was in the former place in 1716 and in the latter in 1717 and 1720. He appears to have been the "William Judd, tailor," of the Waterbury records.
5. Benjamin; bap. in F. May 4, 1690. He was living in Danbury in 1711 and 1727. He became the owner of his father's £80 propriety and sold it to Timothy Hopkins.

## THOMAS JUDD, THE SON OF WILLIAM.

His name is first mentioned in the Waterbury records, Dec. 31, 1685, when he had a grant of land from the proprietors "on y<sup>e</sup> north sid of his hous lot to bute on John Scouels thre acre lot." This house lot was one of two acres on Willow Street, north of John Scovill's, which had been granted to his father and forfeited, and then bestowed on the son. It is recorded as a part of the estate of the latter, under date of December 26, 1691, which was granted by the committee. He is next mentioned, Jan. 3, 1686, (1686-7,) and again March 27, 1687, and again Sept. 29, 1687. His name is on the list of proprietors of 1688, and he was again grantee of the town Jan. 21, 1689, (1689-90,) and again Jan. 29, 1690, (1690-91.) At the latter date, he received twenty acres of upland and other lands, with the customary provision, that he build a house and comply with the conditions of the articles.\* March 20, 1690-91, he joined the church in Farmington, and is described as of Waterbury. Sept. 23, 1690, he was chosen brander of the town, he to keep a record of the horses branded. March 15, 1691, he had a division of upland, and Jan. 20, 1692, (1692-3,) a grant on Burnt Hill. May 17, 1694, the town appointed him to stake out a grant to John Richards.

---

\* The provision in this and other cases is not always sufficient evidence that the requirements of the articles as to building, &c., had not already been complied with. It seems often to have been inserted as a kind of form, and as a matter of safety should any dispute arise.

The above items, with the dates, I have given for the purpose of showing that Thomas Judd, the son of William, was a resident of Waterbury from the latter part of 1685 to May, 1694, in something like "a steady way." Why he was not a subscriber to Mr. Peck's £60 settlement in 1689-90, (as he ought to have been,) I am unable to say. That he was a proprietor during all this time there seems no sufficient reason to doubt. This would appear from his name being entered in the list of proprietors of 1688, and from a record of seven parcels of land made in Jan. 1688-9, and Dec. 26, 1691, which lands were "granted him by the committee." The last parcel, recorded under the last mentioned date, was "a hous lote of too acrs granted to his father as the aboue mentioned percles [the other six] were and after forfeitur to him." At the last named date, too, he had a house lot of three quarters of an acre, on which his dwelling house stood, on the south side of West Main street, corner of Willow, butted north and east on a highway, south on the heirs of Benjamin Jones.

Adopting the conclusion that Thomas Judd, the son of William, was made a proprietor before 1688, receiving his father's forfeited allotments, and that he had fulfilled the conditions of the articles and secured his right before the record of Dec. 26, 1691, I have been much perplexed with the following entry, made in the Proprietors' Book by Thomas Judd, Jr., and then copied by the same hand into the first volume of Land Records:—

Att a town meeting in mattatock february 25: 1695 the town granted to Thomas Judd soon of willyam judd y<sup>e</sup> a lot ment formerly granted to y<sup>e</sup> aboue s<sup>d</sup> willyam Judd prouided he com and inhabit four yers in a settled or steady way from y<sup>e</sup> first of may next ensuing with the six acers granted for pastor excepted.

However difficult to conceive it, I am persuaded there is a mistake in the date of this record. Were the considerations already offered insufficient to prove it, we might find in the record itself good ground for suspicion. Waterbury was never called Mattatuck after the town was incorporated in 1686, unless by mistake; and a mistake would not be likely to occur eight years after a change of name. Besides, there is no evidence that Judd had left town so that he could have



The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been appointed to the various positions in the Department of the Interior, under the administration of the President of the United States, from the year 1800 to the present time. The names are arranged in alphabetical order, and the dates of their appointments are given in parentheses. The names of the persons who have held the same position successively are given in the same order, and the dates of their appointments are given in parentheses. The names of the persons who have held the same position successively are given in the same order, and the dates of their appointments are given in parentheses.



ENGRAVED BY SAMUEL BARDEN PHILADELPHIA

Wm A Scoville





been properly invited, in 1695, "to *come* and inhabit four years," &c. I am persuaded, therefore, that the record quoted above should bear the date Feb. 25, 1685, (1685-6.)

In the extract below, Thomas Judd, son of William, is first called deacon :—

Att a town meeting in waterbury march: 27 1696 y<sup>e</sup> town gaue liberty to deac judd for y<sup>e</sup> enlarging of his shop to make use of six fouts of y<sup>e</sup> highway at y<sup>e</sup> east end of his shop so long as he improue it for y<sup>e</sup> end

According to his tombstone, he was the first deacon of the Waterbury church. He was thirty-three years old in 1695, (the date of his probable appointment,) and the fact that he was selected at that early period of life for so responsible a position, with no associate in office for twenty-nine years, is a high tribute to the general good qualities of his head and heart.

The merits of Dea. Judd seem to have been in a measure unknown until about the time he was made an officer in the church. After that, and particularly after the death of Lieut. Judd, no other man in the town received such substantial evidence of the people's confidence and regard. He was many times townsman, school committee, rate-maker, &c. In Oct. 1696, he was, for the first time, deputy to the General Court, being associated with Lieut. Judd. Afterwards he was often the associate, in the town's representation, of Lieut. Judd, Thomas Judd, Jr., or schoolmaster, Lieut. Timothy Stanley, Lieut. John Hopkins, Serg. Stephen Upson, and others, till 1733. After Lieut. Judd's decease he was made a justice of the peace, which office he held by annual appointment till 1729. During this time, he was the sole justice for Waterbury till 1725. He was one of the receivers appointed by the General Court, in 1703, of funds collected for the Saybrook school. When the office of town clerk was made vacant by the removal of Thomas Judd, Jr., the deacon was chosen (April 26, 1709) to fill the place. He filled it, in a very poor way, till Dec. 1712. Writing (to say nothing of spelling) was, with him, the gift (better say infiction) of nature.

Dea. Thomas Judd was also a military man, and a very gallant one too, it is safe to say. He was made an ensign after Lieut. Judd's decease, in 1702-3, and held the place under Lieut. Timothy Stanley till 1715. He was then promoted and

became the first captain of the Waterbury train-band, the number of soldiers having reached sixty-four, thus giving the town the right to a captain.

Thomas Judd, the smith, was so called on account of his trade. He branded horses and hammered iron, in a rough way, for the settlers. His "deal post" was a place for public advertisements. A record made by himself, 1709-10, says—"the decons deal porst is to be estemd a sine porst for sad town." He was usually called "smith," or the "son of William," till he became a deacon, and "deacon" till he was made a captain, and "captain" the remainder of his life. Occasionally, after the death of Lieut. Judd, and particularly in legal documents, he is termed "senior" or "smith," to distinguish him from his cousin of the same name.

Capt. Judd, April 1, 1717, in consideration of lands at Great Swamp, conveyed to his only son William, his house and all his lands in Waterbury, except the divisions on the £100 propriety he bought of Jones. After this, he appears to have lived with his son many years; but Oct. 19, 1736, he purchased for £185 of Samuel Camp the place which Camp bought of Capt. William Hickox, six acres, with certain reservations, where the house of C. B. Merriman now stands. Here Capt. Judd perhaps lived for a season; but in 1739, he sold out to Rev. Mark Leavenworth, for £250.

Thomas Judd was married, Feb. 9, 1687-8, to Sarah, daughter of Stephen Freeman, first of Milford, then of Newark, N. J. He died full of years and honors. Near the northwest corner of the old burying yard, a gravestone is standing on which may be read, with some difficulty, the following inscription:—

Here [lies]
the body of
<b>THOMAS JUDD, ESQ.</b>
the { Justice
first { Deacon &
{ Captain
in Waterbury,
who died Jan'y
y <sup>e</sup> 4th A. D. 1747
aged 79.

On the next stone close by, is another inscription with these words: "Sarah Judd, wife of Deac. Thomas Judd, dyed Sept. 8, 1738, in y<sup>e</sup> 69th year of her age."

There are two errors in Dea. Judd's inscription. He was not the first but the second justice, his uncle, Lieut. Judd, being the first; and he was several years older than is stated. He must have been about 85. The inventory of his estate amounted to £2,279, 10s. 10d., being nominally larger than that of any inhabitant of Waterbury who had died before him. The currency, however, at this period was much depreciated. The silver headed cane of Captain Judd is now in the possession of his descendant, Mr. Sylvester Judd of Northampton.

Children :

1. William; b. May 7, 1689; bap. in Farmington, April 5, 1691, and m. Jan. 21, 1712-13, Mary, d. of Stephen Root of Farmington, where he settled, at the Great Swamp, so called, (Kensington, now Berlin.) About 1715, he returned to Waterbury, was made a £40 proprietor, and received a special grant out of the common lands, "he to fence for it." His father deeded to him, in 1717, his house and homestead, on the corner of Willow street, now occupied by John S. Kingsbury, where they both lived for many years. In 1735, however, April 12th, the son, in the way of exchange, conveyed all "his lands and buildings in the stated line of the common fence," (the place where he lived being included,) to Ebenezer Bronson, and removed to Westbury, where he d. Jan. 29, 1772. His farm lay in the southwest corner of the society, its southern border forming the boundary line. His first wife d. Dec. 11, 1761, having had nine children. He then married Widow Hope Lee, who survived him. Estate £579, 10s.

William Judd, after his return from Farmington, soon became more or less of a public man, and repeatedly occupied posts of honor and responsibility. He was constable in 1718, 1719 and 1728; townsman in 1722, 1728 and afterwards; school committee in 1730; deputy in 1729, 1730, 1731, 1736 and 1739; moderator of town meeting, 1738-9 and 1753, &c. After the decease of John Judd, in 1717, he was chosen town clerk, and continued to discharge the duties of the office till Dec. 1721, when Mr. Southmayd was appointed. He was, so far as appears, a competent and acceptable clerk. His penmanship is a great improvement on that of his immediate predecessors. In 1730, he reached the goal of military ambition, and became a captain.

2. Martha; b. Sept. 11, 1692; m. 1714, Thomas Cowles of Farmington, and d. 1768.

3. Rachel; b. Nov. 13, 1694; m. Thomas Upson, son of Stephen, and d. July 19, 1750.

4. Sarah; b. April 23, 1697; d. Nov. 3, 1725 or 1726.

5. Hannah; b. July 2, 1699, and d. "March 12, 1718."

6. Mary; b. Jan 30, 1701; m. Timothy Hopkins.

7. Elizabeth; b. July 23, 1704; m. John Upson, son of Stephen.

8. Ruth ; b. May 9, 1707 ; m. April 26, 1727, James Smith of Farmington, and d. 1786.

9. Stephen ; b. Nov. 30, 1709, and d. June 25, 1715.

#### THOMAS JUDD, JR.

He was the son of Lieut. Thomas Judd, and was accepted by the committee as a proprietor, at the desire of his father, Jan. 10, 1683, (1683-4,) with £100 right. His name is rarely mentioned for several years, except as the grantee of certain lands. It is found, however, among the proprietors of 1688, and the subscribers to Mr. Peck's settlement, in 1689. He was John Stanley's successor as register or town clerk,\* being appointed June 4, 1696—a compliment to his penmanship, as well as his general respectability. He retained the office till his removal from the town. He was, I imagine, in his mature years, the literary oracle of the settlement. He wrote a very good, business-like hand, which, with some practice, is read with little difficulty. He was townsman in 1698, 1703 and 1704; town treasurer in 1699 and 1700, and constable in 1700.† After the death of his father, he represented the town in the General Assembly, first in Oct. 1704, and then in the three succeeding October sessions. In these instances, with one exception, his name is entered as Thomas Judd, Jr., to distinguish him from his colleague, Thomas Judd, the son of William, he being, I suppose, a little younger than his cousin.

I suppose—but cannot prove it—that Thomas Judd, Jr., was the schoolmaster of Waterbury—that he taught, or tried to teach, the juveniles of the village, intellectual archery. I suppose so from the fact that he calls himself schoolmaster, in certain deeds, very soon after his removal from Waterbury, where he had spent his whole previous adult life. But his teachings could have been but moderately successful. The urchin archers of his day were not all apt scholars, idea-shooting being a rather dull business, judging from their literary accomplishments when grown to manhood.

Thomas Judd, Jr., lived on West Main street, on the south

\* The town clerk was always proprietors' clerk until a comparatively recent period.

† The town officers were appointed in December for the ensuing year; and when I speak of the time that a person held an office, I generally refer to the date of his appointment.

side, his being the fourth lot east from the corner of Willow street. It contained two acres, and butted, Nov. 1687, north and south on highway, east on Edmund Scott, Jr's land, west on John Welton's land. He sold the place, April 1, 1701, to Robert Scott, and Scott sold it, with the same boundaries, Oct. 7, 1708, to his brother Edmund, "for a mare and colt and £5, 12s." After his father's decease, in 1702-3, he became the owner and occupant of the old homestead, recorded, in June, 1705, as containing five acres, east on Obadiah Richard's house lot, west on the heirs of John Bronson, deceased, &c. He appears to have been one of the most respectable men of the town; but after having battled with adversity for twenty-five years, he turned his back upon his friends and quit the settlement. He removed in the early part of 1709, (N. S.,) and settled first in Farmington, (where he lived in 1712,) and then in Hartford, (in the part called West Hartford,) residing near the boundary line.

The wife of Thomas Judd, Jr., was Sarah, daughter of Joseph Gaylord, Sen. They were married April 11, 1688, by Mr. Zachariah Walker, Sen., of Woodbury. He joined the church of Farmington, July 20, 1690, where he had two children, Thomas and Sarah, baptized Oct. 12, 1690. He died Aug. 24, 1724. His wife was dead in Feb. 1724-25.

Children :

1. Thomas ; b. March 28, 1690 and m. Hepzibah Williams.
2. Joseph ; } b. Feb. 2, 1693, { d. an infant.
3. Sarah ; } b. Feb. 2, 1693, { m. James Williams.
4. Elizabeth ; b. Oct. 18, 1695, and m. Joshua How.
5. Joanna ; b. Sept. 12, 1698 ; m. William Scott, and died Jan. 25, 1771.
6. Joseph ; b. April 21, 1701. In 1726, he bought a house and lands of Obadiah Scott in Waterbury, on Buckshill, where he settled.
7. Ebenezer ; b. March 3, 1702-3 ; lived in West Hartford, and d. 1734.
8. Mary ; b. April 2, 1706 ; m. Samuel Moss and was living with her husband in Wallingford, in 1737.
9. Rachel ; b. Oct. 4, 1708 ; unmarried in 1738.
10. Abigail ; b. 1712, and m. Joseph Hall.

#### JOSEPH LEWIS.

He and a brother John were sons of Joseph Lewis of Windsor and Simsbury, who died in 1706. He was the first man, an outsider and not an original proprietor, (if we except

Mr. Peck's sons,) that joined the settlement of Waterbury. At what precise time he came I have no means of knowing. His name is first mentioned on the Town Book, Dec. 23, 1700, at which date he was appointed one of the fence viewers. Had he been in the town much earlier than 1700, I think I should have discovered some traces of him. At what period he was made a bachelor proprietor is not clear. With the exception of Thomas Clark, he was the only one of this class of proprietors who was not either a son or grandson of an original proprietor. He settled at Judd's Meadow, on the west side of the river, where he owned, from an early date, much land, obtained by division and by purchase. The first reference made to his house was in Dec. 1714. He had doubtless then been several years in that part of the town. His sons took up their residences near him. To Joseph, he gave, in 1728, soon after marriage, a house and lands near the Straits Mountain, valuing them to him at £150. To John he gave, in 1736, under similar circumstances, sixty acres of land with a house, estimating them "at £120 portion."

Joseph Lewis was one of the respected and substantial men of the town. He was a cloth weaver by trade, and one of a committee to settle the bounds of Woodbury, as early as 1706. He was appointed to a similar duty in 1719, and again in 1730. He was town treasurer in 1711, and many years selectman. He was the town's deputy at the General Court for fifteen sessions between 1713 and 1741. In 1724, he was called sargeant, and early in 1738, was chosen the fourth deacon of the church, Dea. Judd being now advanced in life. In his will he gave to the church (in his own language) "twenty six pounds money due to me by Mr. Mark Leavenworth by note of hand, which I give to y<sup>e</sup> first church of Christ in Waterbury (now under the pastoral charge of y<sup>e</sup> sd Mr. Leavenworth) to be to y<sup>e</sup> use and benefit of sd church for ever." His estate was larger nominally than that of any deceased person of Waterbury which had previously been inventoried. It amounted to £5,628, 12s. 6d., when wheat sold at 35 shillings or so per bushel.

Joseph Lewis died in the fatal year of 1749, (Nov. 29.) His son Joseph, and his eldest son John's wife, died but a few

weeks before him. His widow Sarah (Andruss) died March 5, 1773. His son Samuel was a deacon of the Waterbury church, and afterwards the first deacon of the church in Salem, (Naugatuck.) Another son, Thomas, appears to have graduated at Yale College in 1741, being a classmate of Samuel Hopkins, Jonathan Judd and Daniel Southmayd, all from Waterbury, the four making a fifth part of the graduating class. He became a congregational minister.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

### PERSONAL NOTICES OF THE FIRST SETTLERS, CONTINUED.

#### NEWELL.

THOMAS NEWELL, (Sen.,) was one of the original settlers of Farmington, a member of the church, a freeman in 1669, and one of the eighty-four proprietors of 1672. He married Rebecca, a niece of John Olmsted, and died Sept. 13, 1689, leaving an estate of £700. His widow died Feb. 24, 1697-8.

#### Children :

1. Rebecca ; b. Jan. 1643, and m. Joseph or Josiah Woodford. 2. Mary ; b. March, 1645, and m. March 20, 1667, Thomas Bascomb of Northampton. 3. John ; b. Jan. 1647. 4. Thomas ; b. March, 1650. 5. Hester ; b. July, 1652, m. John Stanley of Waterbury. 6. Sarah ; bap. Feb. 18, 1655, and m. "Arter" Smith. 7. Hannah, or Martha ; bap. April 14, 1658, and m. Thomas North. 8. Samuel ; bap. Dec. 5, 1660 ; m. Dec. 20, 1683, Mary Hart. 9. Joseph ; bap. April 20, 1664, and d. 1689, unmarried.

Thomas Newell, Sen., was one of a preliminary committee who went to view Mattatuck, and one of the petitioners for "liberty of planting y<sup>e</sup> same," 1673. He afterwards signed



the articles, taking the place of Samuel Gridley, but declined to join the new settlement.

JOHN NEWELL.

He (or his father for him) seems to have been one of the original subscribers of 1674, the name being written "Thomas Newell, son, £100." He was one of the earliest settlers, being on all the fence-division lists. He had a house and house lot on North Main street, next to Isaac Bronson, recorded, July 11, 1692, as five acres of land, north on John Stanley and Benjamin Barnes, east on common land, south on Isaac Bronson, west on highway. Newell's hill, a part of his homestead, was named after him. If he did anything worthy to be remembered, history has taken no note of it. As early as Aug., 1694, he had removed to Farmington. He had conveyed, in the preceding March, his house and homestead, (then bounded north on Richard Porter and Benjamin Barnes,) to Isaac Bronson. He died in 1696, without a family, his brothers, Thomas and Samuel, being administrators.

THOMAS NEWELL, (Jr.)

He seems to have taken the right of £90 which his father subscribed for, and which was at first Thomas Gridley's. He did not, apparently, go to Waterbury as early as his brother. His name is not mentioned in the first fence-division, but it is in the three others. He was among those whose rights were declared forfeited in 1682-3, but he "submitted" and regained his propriety. His house was on the north side of West Main street, next east of Thomas Hancox. After Hancox left, he bought his lot (with the house) of Lieut. Judd, and added it to his own lot of one and three quarter acres, making in the whole three and a half acres. This is described Jan. 6, 1690, (1690-91,) as bounded east on John Bronson and west on John Warner, (*Thomas Porter*, son of Robert, is written over John Warner.)

Thomas Newell subscribed to Mr. Peck's settlement in 1689. Soon after, he followed the bad example set by Joseph Hickox, Thomas Hancox and Benjamin Jones, and left the town. He was in Farmington Nov. 6, 1690, where I hope he made himself useful. He sold his homestead, March 2d, 1692-3, to

Thomas Richason for £60. Afterwards, Isaac Bronson bought his right in the undivided lands.

He married Nov. 5, 1679, Elizabeth Wrothern, and died Oct. 25, 1723. His widow died Jan. 8, 1739-40. The births of the children, except Susanna, are recorded in Farmington.

Children :

1. Thomas ; b. Oct. 1, 1681. He had no family.
2. Simon ; b. April 1, and baptized June 1, 1683 ; m. Mehitable Bird and Mary Wallis.
3. Susanna ; bap. April 24, 1687, and d. Sept. 24, 1704.
4. Joseph ; b. Nov. 1, 1689. He lived in Southington.
5. Elizabeth ; b. Nov. 29, 1693. She m. Jonathan Lewis.
6. Sarah ; b. Jan. 1, 1698.
7. Esther ; b. Sept. 12, 1705.

#### REV. JEREMIAH PECK.

He was a son of Dea. William Peck, one of the company that made the first settlement in New Haven, in 1638, and one of those who signed the fundamental articles in 1639. Dea. Peck was chosen deacon in 1659, and was one of the trustees of the Grammar School for many years, and died, leaving a small property, in Lyme, Oct. 4, 1694, aged 93. In his will, dated March 9, 1688-9, he names as his, the following children :

1. Jeremiah. He was born in London or its neighborhood.
2. Joseph. He was baptized in New Haven, Jan. 17, 1641 ; settled in Saybrook and afterwards in Lyme.
3. John. He m. Nov. 3, 1664, Mary Moss, and had four children, born in New Haven. He removed to Wallingford.
4. Elizabeth. She m. Samuel Andrews, and appears to have had five children born in New Haven.

Of the Rev. Jeremiah Peck, the first minister of Waterbury, I shall give a more detailed account hereafter. His house and house lot, given him by the town, were on the north-east corner of West Main street, the lot being bounded, Feb., 1693-4, easterly on David and Robert Scott, east on Edmund Scott, north, south and west on highways.

Mr. Peck's will, (which is a gift-deed,) bearing date "Jan. 14, 1696," is a document of some interest. It is recorded in the first volume of the Waterbury Land Records, page 6. It enumerates the books which seem to have constituted his

library. They are sixteen in number, all of them of a religious character. His house and house lot he gave to his son Jeremiah. His other lands, divided and undivided, in Waterbury, and his husbandry implements, he gave to Jeremiah and Joshua, they to provide for him and his wife, "in sickness and health, both cloaths, food and fisick," during life.

The widow of Mr. Peck lived several years after his decease. I find her will recorded in the first volume of Land Records, bearing date Oct. 7th, 1706. It reads thus :

I Joanna Peck y<sup>e</sup> relict of Mr. Jeremiah Peck give [&c.] to my daughter anna y<sup>e</sup> bigest puter platter a winscort cubard and here choys of too more platters [&] y<sup>e</sup> great table; and to annas daughter y<sup>e</sup> draw box and a too yer old hefer—i giue to jeremiahs daughter y<sup>e</sup> brass pan only they are not now to com to y<sup>e</sup> possession of it till after my death [&c.]

The remainder of her estate she gave to Jeremiah and Joshua. She was still living in Waterbury, Jan. 23, 1711.

Children :

1. Samuel; b. Jan. 18, 1658-9, at Guilford and settled in Greenwich. He was a justice of the peace and a prominent man of that town, and d. April 28, 1746. He is said to have had twelve children.

2. Ruth; b. in New Haven, April 3, 1661; m. Jonathan Atwater, of New Haven, "merchant tailor," June 1, 1681, and had ten children.

3. Caleb. He proposed to settle in Waterbury with his father, and had a grant of a house lot and other lands, provided he did so; but he finally concluded to remain in Greenwich.

4. Anna; m. 1690, Thomas Stanley, son of Capt. John of Farmington.

5. Jeremiah. He was a freeholder in Greenwich in May, 1689, and came to Waterbury with his father. He had a house lot on Willow street, next to Benjamin Jones' home lot, and other lands, granted him on the usual conditions. Half of the school lot or propriety, it appears, was also given to him. In Aug. 1709, he purchased for £20 Israel Richason's house and home lot, on the corner of East Main and Cherry streets, but whether he ever lived in the house, I know not. He removed into the north part of the town a little before the Northbury society was organized.

Jeremiah Peck was collector of town rates in 1703; constable in 1713, 1717 and 1723, and a deputy to the General Court in May, 1720 and 1721. He was one of the two first deacons of the Northbury church, appointed 1739. His wife was Rachel, the d. of Obadiah Richards, to whom he was m. June 14, 1704. He d. 1752, having had nine children,—Johanna, Jeremiah, Rachel, Anna, Mary, Phebe, Ruth, Esther, Martha. All except Esther survived their father. The mother had previously died. Dea. Peck's inventory amounted to £3,702, 12s. 6d.

6. Joshua. He was the youngest son. Nothing was said about him at the

time his father settled in Waterbury, when his brothers were provided for; for the reason, it is presumed, that he was then a minor. "March 28, 1694-5," [a mistake probably for 1695,] he, for the first time, had a grant from the proprietors of four acres, for "a home lot where he can find it between this and the last of April next, he to build," &c.

Joshua Peck is rarely named and does not seem to have been of "much account," as the world goes. He may have been sickly or weakly. He conveyed to his brother Jeremiah, March 6, 1728-9, all his "right, title, interest or demands in lands or propriety in Waterbury whether divided or undivided," in consideration of which, he, the said Jeremiah, or his heirs, was, in the words of the record, "to take care of me and find and provide for me good and sufficient meat, drink, apparel, washing and lodging, and take care of me both in sickness and in health, so long as I live with him." He died Feb. 14, 1735-6, unmarried.

#### PORTER.

Daniel Porter, 1st, was early in the Colony. In March, 1644-5, he was fined, by the "Particular Court," forty shillings for an offense against the rights of property. He was licensed to practice physic and chirurgery, in 1654, by the General Court. In 1661-2, it was ordered that his yearly salary should be paid out of the public treasury, while his fee-table was established by law. Though not an original proprietor, he settled early in Farmington, and was required to attend upon the sick in Hartford, Windsor, Wethersfield, and occasionally in Middletown. In 1668, he was "freed from watching, wardeing and tryneinge," and in the next year had a special grant from the Court for his services.\* He was more particularly celebrated as a "bonesetter," and in 1671 his salary was increased thus :

For the incouragement of Daniel Porter in attending the seruice of the country in setting bones, &c., the Court doe hereby augment his sallery from six pounds a yeare to twelue pounds p<sup>r</sup> annum, and doe advise him to instruct some meet person in his arte.

Daniel Porter's name is not on the list of the freemen of Farmington in 1669, but is found among the proprietors of 1672. He died in 1690. His wife's name was Mary. Their children were: 1. Daniel; b. Feb. 2, 1652-3. 2. Mary; b. Feb. 5, 1654-5, and m. Eleazer Knowles of Woodbury. 3. Nehemiah; b. Oct. 24, 1656; m. Hannah Lum of Woodbury,

---

\* This was a grant of 100 acres which the grantee took up near the northwest corner of Wallingford. It, however, proved not to be colony land, as supposed, and the Assembly granted, in 1728, on petition, to the grandsons of Daniel Porter, (Daniel Porter, son of Daniel of Waterbury, and Hezekiah Porter of Woodbury, son of Richard of New Haven,) 100 acres west of Housatonic or Stratford River. [Towns and Lands.]

and d. 1722. 4. Richard; b. March 24, 1658. 5. Anne; b. 1660-61; not married. 6. John; b. Nov. 14, 1662; m. Rebecca Woodford and Martha North, and d. 1749. 7. Samuel; b. Oct. 24, 1665; m. Abigail Humphreys of Simsbury, and d. March 25, 1736. He was a doctor, and succeeded to his father's business in Farmington.

DANIEL PORTER, (Jr.)

He signed the articles, (or his father did for him—"Daniel Porter for son,") in 1674. He had an old town plot lot and a meadow allotment in the beginning of the settlement, and a proportion of fence in all the divisions. His name is never mentioned on the earliest records, except as grantee or proprietor. No reference whatever is made to his occupation till Feb. 22, 1696-7, when he is called, in a deed, "bonesetter." After this he is termed, in the record, Doctor Porter. He may not have taken up the business of his father till after the death of the latter. His knowledge appears to have been empirical, rather than scientific. There were but few educated surgeons or physicians in the country, at that day. Clergymen not infrequently practiced the healing art.

Dr. Porter had but little to do with the town business. He was town surveyor, however, in 1699 and 1719, and school committee in 1706. He had a house lot on the main street near the center of the village, where the Scovill House now stands, extending through to Grand street, containing about two acres. Adjoining lots are bounded on it, in 1687, but it is not then called a "house lot," according to the custom. It does not seem to have been recorded at all. Jan. 6, 1696, the town granted him a piece of land, &c., "provided he build a tenantable hous within thre yeirs." This language by no means proves that he had not already built a house, (or bought one,) as the articles required; nor indeed is it evidence that he did not own one at the time. Soon after he had taken a wife, his lot is called a house lot. It was bounded, in 1687, north and south on highway, west on Timothy Standley's house lot, east on Abraham Andruss, Jr's house lot. In March, 1707-8, he enlarged it by purchasing of Abraham Andruss, son of Abraham, decd., the place next his on the east, the considera-

tion being £20 cash. After Porter's death, his son Thomas bought of the other heirs the whole property, four and a half acres, "excepting twenty foot square on the east side, joining the highway, to build a small house upon," which his brother James reserved for himself.

Daniel Porter's death took place Jan. 18, 1726-7. His whole estate was appraised at about £1,265; his house and home lot at £190; his propriety right at £45; five cows at £20. His medical library consisted of "a bone set book, 2s." Much of his property he had given away to his children during his life-time. He left a widow, Deborah. She d. May 14, 1765.

#### Children :

1. Daniel; b. March 5, 1699; mar. Hannah, d. of John Hopkins, and d. Nov. 14, 1772. He was a bachelor proprietor and "bonesetter," and succeeded to his father's business and skill. July 5, 1725, his father conveyed to him, his eldest son, "that he may have conveniency of building and a house lot in the town, seven and a half acres at the east end of the town, north and east on highway, south on Mill River, west on bounds made by John Scovill, Sen., and Cap. Ephraim Warner," in 1770. This is the lot which lies between East Main street, Mill street, and the Mad River, on the northwest corner of which Porter built a house and lived.

2. James; b. April 20, 1700. He too was a doctor, settled at Hop Swamp, and d. March 20, 1785.

3. Thomas; b. April 1, 1702. He lived on the east side of Bank street, near the Baptist church, and late in life removed to Salem. He died in Jan. 1797. He was frequently selectman, and became a captain.

4. Deborah; b. March 6, 1703-4; m. James Baldwin.

5. Ebenezer; b. Dec. 24, 1708; m. Mary, d. of John Hull of New Haven.

6. Ann; b. April 28, 1712; m. Thomas Judd and James Nichols.

#### RICHARD PORTER.

He was not a proprietor of Waterbury sufficiently early to have one of the old town plot lots, or an allotment of either of the four first divisions of fence. He was accepted by the grand committee, probably in 1684, having one of the smallest rights, (£50.) I do not find his name mentioned till 1686. In May, 1688, he had liberty to record his lands, having then, I suppose, complied with the conditions of a subscriber and proprietor. He had two acres "for a house lot," within the south meadow gate on the corner near the present corner of Bank and Meadow street, bounded, Dec. 1691, west, south and east on highway, north on Jonathan Scott. After-

wards, March 18, 1694-5, he bought of the widow of Abraham Andruss, Jr., for £26, a house and lot of three acres next adjoining him on the north, "lying at y<sup>e</sup> south east corner of y<sup>e</sup> town," east and west on highway, north on Stephen Upson and south on said Porter.

Richard Porter seems to have been a quiet man, having but little to do with public business. He was, however, surveyor in 1703 and 1704, town collector in 1706, school committee in 1709 and selectman in 1713. In 1712, he was chosen "to dig the graves;" and a hard time he must have had, for the great sickness was in the town. Afterwards, he removed from the place, for what reason, it does not appear. He staid, however, through the dark days of the settlement. After Dec. 1716, when he was chosen hayward, his name does not appear in the Waterbury records as an inhabitant. In Nov. 1718, he was in New Haven in the part called West Haven. He d. in 1739-40. His will, dated Nov. 13, 1738, was approved Feb. 1739-40, his son Hezekiah being executor. In it he speaks of himself as "being weak of body by reason of age," alludes to his wife, to whom he gives his house, homestead and movables, and to the heirs of Daniel of Simsbury and Samuel of Waterbury, who had received their portions. His land and rights of land in Waterbury were to be divided equally among his other children, except John was to have "a double part he not being able to shift for himself so well as the others." Estate in New Haven £154; in Waterbury £199. Debts £28, 18s.

Richard Porter is called Doctor Porter on the probate record of New Haven, but never in Waterbury. Probably he took up the business of "doctoring" after his removal. His first wife, named Ruth, d. in Waterbury, Jan. 9, 1709-10.

#### Children :

1. Daniel; b. before his father came to Waterbury. He was admitted a bachelor proprietor Jan. 5, 1707-8, and remained in Waterbury several years afterwards; but he finally removed without having complied with the conditions of the grant and settled in Simsbury, where he had a family. (A son, Joshua, settled in Waterbury.) He was a doctor and d. before his father.

2. Joshua; b. Aug. 7, 1688, in Waterbury, and d. Nov. 19, 1709.

3. Mary; b. Jan. 14, 1690-91, and was living as Mary Northrop, at the time of her father's death.

4. Ruth ; b. Oct. 1692, and was living as Ruth Cosset at her father's decease.
5. Samuel ; b. March 30, 1695 ; m. Mary, d. of John Bronson, May 9, 1722. He was a bachelor proprietor, admitted in 1715. In Dec. 1722, his father deeded to him a part of his house lot in Waterbury, three acres, being the southeast part of the old homestead, southward and eastward on highway, northward on parsonage land, westward on the grantor's land. He d. 1727-8.
6. Hezekiah ; b. Jan. 29, 1696-7, and d. Aug. 1702.
7. John ; b. June 11, 1700 ; was living with Dea. Clark in 1730.
8. Timothy ; b. Dec. 21, 1701 ; m. Mary, d. of Jonathan Baldwin, of Waterbury, Dec. 18, 1735, and Hannah Winter, Aug. 27, 1767. He had a house in the southwest quarter in 1754. In 1732, he lived in Stratford.
9. Hezekiah ; b. July 27, 1704. He was living in Woodbury in 1728, and in Waterbury when his father died.
10. Joshua ; b. Nov. 5, 1718, his birth being recorded in New Haven.
11. Richard ; b. Aug. 22, 1722.
12. Lydia ; was living as Lydia Pardee of New Haven, at her father's decease.

## ROBERT PORTER.

He was a first settler but not an original proprietor of Farmington. It is not known what relation, if any, he was to Daniel and Thomas Porter, also of F. He joined the church Oct. 13, 1652, was one of the freemen of 1669, and of the eighty-four proprietors of 1672. He first subscribed the articles for the settlement of Mattatuck, as late as May 26, 1684. His name is on the list of proprietors of 1688, and it stands first among the subscribers to Mr. Peck's settlement. He had a house and house lot on the north side of West Main street, one acre and a half, bounded, Feb. 1687-8, "northerly and southerly on high-way, easterly on Thomas Hancox his land belonging to Ensign Judd, west on John Warner his land." This property his son Thomas sold, Jan. 1692-3, to Abraham Andruss, Jr.

Robert Porter m. 1644, Mary, d. of Thomas Scott of Hartford.

Children :

1. Mary ; b. Feb. 24, 1646, and m. Benjamin Andruss.
2. John ; b. Nov. 12, 1648, and d. before 1686.
3. Thomas ; b. Oct. 29, 1650 ; m. May, 1678, Abigail Cowles, and d. 1719. He was executor of his father's will, and the only surviving son and principal heir. He was a tailor by trade, lived in Farmington, and d. in 1719.
4. Robert ; b. Nov. 12, 1652, and d. 1689.
5. Elizabeth ; b. Jan. 11, 1653-4, and m. Thomas Andrews of Milford.
6. Joanna ; baptized Jan. 6, 1655-6.
7. Sarah ; b. Dec 20, 1657, and m. Abraham Andruss (cooper) of Waterbury, and James Benedict of Danbury.



8. Benjamin; b. March 18, 1659–60, and d. 1689, leaving his widow pregnant. She m. June, 1689, Edmund Scott, Jr.\*

9. Hannah, or Anne; b. April, 1664, and m. John Browne.

10. Hepzibah; b. March 4, 1666.

Robert Porter married (after 1675) for his second wife, Hannah, the widow of Stephen Freeman of Newark, (East Jersey,) and the mother of the wife of Thomas Judd, smith. He died in 1689. The inventory of his estate was taken Sept. 18, 1689,† and amounted to £179, 14s. in Waterbury, and £79, 6s. in Farmington. The children named are Thomas, Mary, Elizabeth, Sarah, Hannah.

#### OBADIAH RICHARDS.

Thomas Richards, the father of Obadiah of Waterbury, was early in Hartford. He was one of those who, in 1639, had the privilege of getting wood and keeping cows on the common. He soon died, however, and his lands went into the possession of his widow, who brought up the children. At her death, in 1671, the estate went to the children,—John, (born in 1631, and married Lydia Stocking,) Mary Peck, (of Milford,) Thomas, (married Mary, daughter of Dea. Parsons of Springfield, 1691,) and Obadiah. A son, Samuel, died before his mother.

Obadiah Richards was an early but not a first settler of Farmington. He was “presented for freeman” to the Court, May, 1669; was one of the proprietors of 1672; took an early interest in the Mattatuck enterprise; was one of the original thirty, &c. There is evidence that he joined the settlement early, in the fact that he had an old town plot lot and a

---

\* “A paper whith Edman Scote cased to be entred [on record]—the contents now follow—

¶ Know all men whom itt may concerne that I Robert Porter: of watterbury haue formerly giuen to my sonn: benjamin: thre parsells of land folowing which being now desesed [deceased] my desire is that if itt pleas god to giue him an heire: that the lands herafter: mentioned: may fall to it but as i desire the lord may requite the wife of my sonn desesed: so these are to declare that i doo sequester: the right to the: use of the lands following to the wife of my son aboue said desed during her naturall life: vis [viz: ]—[here are enumerated seven piece: of land, twenty four acres in all]—all which parsells of land as they ly my dafter [daughter] aboue said shall and may quatly pesably occupy poses and injoy [&c.,] my hand and seale this 19 feb 1689

Robert porter

† There are discrepencies as to dates which I am unable now to reconelle. His gift deed relating to his son Benjamin's widow bears date Feb. 19, 1689, which, in new style, should read Feb. 19, 1690; and yet, the said widow is stated on the record to have married Edmund Scott “sometime in June 1689.”







*James Brown*

*1850*



proportion of fence in all the divisions. But he had a tardy, slipshod way of doing things; and when the crisis came, it was found that he had not rendered a full compliance with the conditions of the articles, and his allotments were condemned in 1682-3. He mended his ways, however, and his rights were restored. As a grantee, I do not find his name earlier than 1685.

Obadiah Richards appears to have been one of the rank and file of the young town—an excellent man, it is safe to say. He had a house and home lot on the north side of West Main street, next west of Philip Judd's. The lot ("his by purchase as a planter") contained three acres, and was the first (going from east to west) which ran through to the back street. It was bounded, Jan. 1703-4, west on Thomas Judd's house lot, east on a house lot belonging to the heirs of Philip Judd, deceased.

Both Richards and his wife Hannah were members of Mr. Hooker's church of Farmington. After lingering for some time in poor health, he died Nov. 11, 1702. His inventory amounted to £138. (His widow died about May, 1725.) A year before his decease, he disposed of much of his estate by the following writing, which is recorded in Vol. I, Land Records, p. 102:

This wrighting made y<sup>e</sup> seuteenth of may one thousan seven hundred and one witnesseth y<sup>t</sup> I obadiah Richards sen<sup>r</sup> [&c.] for good and lawfull resins do giue, [&c.] unto my well beloued children as followeth first hauing a pece of upland situated in s<sup>d</sup> waterbury lying norwest from woster swamp by estimation fifteen acers butting on euery sd on com<sup>-</sup>on lands and I being by sickness layd by not able to labour and sd lands of no benefit without great chorg [charge] bestowed on it and for y<sup>e</sup> incuragment of my too soons John and Obediah to build on and breck up sd lands y<sup>t</sup> I and my wife haue som Releife by it do by this giue y<sup>e</sup> one half of sd land, to my soon John and y<sup>e</sup> other half to obadiah & to obadiah my part of sd buildings y<sup>t</sup> sd John and obadiah haue begun on these conditions not to com to full possession of it till after my death and after y<sup>t</sup> to alow my wife four bushills of grain by y<sup>e</sup> yeir such as y<sup>e</sup> land produces if they improue it and my soons john and obadiah to haue sd lands and buildings after my deceas as their own free estate [&c.] 2ly to my soons Thomas and ben<sup>-</sup>in Richards my three acer lot y<sup>t</sup> lyes northward from y<sup>e</sup> town within y<sup>e</sup> com<sup>-</sup>on fenc on y<sup>e</sup> same conditions y<sup>t</sup> john and obadiah has theirs [&c.] furdur I sd obadiah Richards sen<sup>r</sup> to my eldest soon John my a lot ment att bucks meadow [&c.] for euer to be accounted to him and his acknowledgment as my eldest soon and after in other distributions to be but equal with y<sup>e</sup> rest of my children—y<sup>e</sup> obligation of john and obadiah

to my wife if i dy before her is during her widowhood and thomas and benjamin is free from paying any obligation to my wife for y<sup>e</sup> lot i haue here giuen y<sup>m</sup> as witness my hand and sealle

Obadiah Richards Sen<sup>r</sup>

### Children :

1. John ; b. 1667.
2. Mary ; b. Jan., 1669, m. George Scott.
3. Hannah ; b. Nov. 1671, m. John Scovill, (2d.)
4. Esther ; b. June, 1673, m. Ephraim Warner.
5. Elizabeth ; b. July, 1675, m. John Richards, son of Thomas.
6. Sarah ; b. April, 1677, m. David Scott.
7. Obadiah ; b. Oct. 1, 1679. He was bap. in Farmington, March 14, 1679-80, at the same time with his sisters, Mary, Hannah, Esther, Elizabeth, Sarah. He was a £40 proprietor, admitted, Dec. 1700 ; one of the committee that settled the bounds with Derby in April, 1703, and a fence viewer the same year. Soon after, when his rights had been made sure, and thick gloom was settling over the planters of Waterbury, he made his escape, and was next heard of in Lyme. There he died about 1707. In 1720, his administrators, Jabez and Sarah Watrous, sold out his lands, rights, &c., in Waterbury, to Joseph Lathrop of Norwich for £30.
8. Rachel ; b. May 6, 1683, m. Jeremiah Peck, (2d.)
9. Thomas ; b. Aug. 9, 1685. He was made a bachelor proprietor in 1707-8 ; m. Hannah, d. of Stephen Upson, (1st,) and d. in 1726. Estate, £288.
10. Benjamin ; b. April 5, 1691. He was accepted as a bachelor proprietor as soon as he was of age, and d. June 2, 1714, without a family. His brother John was administrator, his estate going to his brothers and sisters.

### JOHN RICHARDS.

He was the eldest son of Obadiah, but appears not to have been an original proprietor. In 1700-1, Jan. 15, he purchased (of the executor) Robert Porter's £100 right, and the purchase was recorded in a formal way. And yet, he is always named on the division-lists as an £80 proprietor. He is first spoken of "Jan. 21, 1689," when he had a grant of land of four acres, on the usual conditions of building and "cohabiting four years." In December, 1690, he received twelve acres, "abought three quarters of a mile up y<sup>e</sup> spruce brook about moun taylor on y<sup>e</sup> east sd y<sup>e</sup> great riuer on y<sup>e</sup> same conditions," &c. In 1692, Aug. 17, he got married, and soon after had a house on the west side of the "mill path." May 7, 1694, the town granted him "liberty to let his house stand where now it is and to haue the land and to run to the rear of John Hopkins home lot he setting the fence on the north side the path that now leads to the corn mill and to relinquish that

part of his lot that runs the north side the path."\* The lot was afterwards ("March 28, 1694-5") granted in a more formal manner, butted south on Stephen Upson, west on John Hopkins and a great lot and on Thomas Warner, and north on the path leading to the corn mill. This land, called three acres, with the house, Richards sold in March, 1698-9, to Thomas Warner, taking in exchange Warner's house and lot on Bank street, near the present Baptist Church. Here he afterwards resided; but in 1727, Sept. 28, he sold out for £100, conveying the property (two and three quarter acres of land) to Jonathan Prindle.

John Richards seems to have maintained a respectable standing. He was several times collector of minister's rates, school committee, grand juror, &c. In 1700, 1701, 1712, 1713, 1720, he was selectman, and in May, 1723, a deputy to the General Court. He died early in 1735.—Estate £1,605, 10s. 10d. His will was dated June 7, 1733, and proved April 22d, 1735. Several children are named.

His wife was Mary, a daughter of John Welton, to whom he was married Aug. 17, 1692.

#### THOMAS RICHASON.

He was an early but not a first settler of Farmington, and was one of the eighty-four proprietors of 1672. In 1674, he subscribed the articles for settling Mattatuck, and was sufficiently early in his movements, as a planter, to secure an old town plot lot, and a portion of fence in each of the four divisions. Though a very good man, apparently, (I find him called Goodman† Richason at an early date,) he had not a "steady way," or was slow in meeting his engagements, and his rights were declared forfeited in 1682-3. But like others in a similar predicament, he bestired himself and regained possession. He had but a £50 right, and complained to the committee, in Feb. 1680-81, that he was in want of land to

---

\* From this vote, it would seem that the land, at the time the house was erected, was common land, and that afterwards a road was run through it to the mill, leaving a small portion on "the north [or northeasterly] side."

† This term was formerly applied to persons of humble but respectable mediocrity as to character and position.



improve. He had liberal grants at various times, and was a subscriber to Mr. Peck's settlement.

Thomas Richason owned a lot, in 1687, on the south side of the Green, west of Mr. Kendrick's; but whether he had a house there and lived in it, I am unable to say. In March, 1792-3, he bought of Thomas Newel for £60 three and a half acres on West Main street, near where Samuel J. Holmes now lives, where he afterwards appears to have resided. The lot had on it two houses, (one of which had been Thomas Hancock's,) and was bounded in 1708, "west on the Porters," east on John Bronson, north and south on highways.

Thomas Richason d. Nov. 14, 1712, and his wife, Mary, one week afterwards, Nov. 21, both victims of the great sickness. Three of their sons, John, Israel and Nathaniel, also d. of the pestilence before the close of the year.

#### Children :

1. Mary; b. Dec. 25, 1667.
2. Sarah; b. March 25, 1669.
3. John; b. April 15, 1672, d. Oct. 17, 1712. He m. Ruth, a daughter of John Wheeler, and Elizabeth, a daughter of Nathaniel Arnold, Senr. He was admitted to bachelor privileges, May 15, 1699, but he had previously had liberal grants of land. The first of these was March 28, 1694-5 — "four acres for a house lot on the north side the highway that leads to Farmington, the east side the highway that ranges by Serg. Stanley's lot into the woods north, he fulfilling the terms of original articles." This lot was on the east corner of East Main and Cherry streets, and on it Richarson, himself a carpenter, built a house. It was recorded to him Jan. 1708-4, and was described as lying northeast from the town, south and west on highway, and north and east on common land. This place he deeded at about the last named date to his brother Israel, receiving in exchange a house and lot of one acre next his father on the west side.
4. Thomas. He had a grant of land March, 1695; was accepted as a bach. proprietor, March 26, 1699; remained in Waterbury long enough to secure his right, and then removed to Wallingford. He was there in July, 1705. After his father's death, he returned to Waterbury, and was appointed fence viewer in 1713, "grave digger" in 1714, 1715 and 1716, and hayward in 1714, 1717 and 1718. In 1719, (March 30,) he sold his house and lot of six acres on the north side of West Main street, (north and south on highway, east on Richards' land, and west on Ebenezer Richason's house lot,) to Thomas Richards' and returned to Wallingford, where he was living in 1722, a farmer.
5. Israel. He had a grant of land as early as March 28, 1694, four acres for a house lot, on the north side the town, "if it be there to be had, he fulfilling the terms of the original articles." He became a bach. proprietor March 26, 1699. Before he had secured his right, he appears to have left the plantation. Dec. 21, 1702, the town granted him "liberty of two years before taking the forfeiture of

his land and that if he come again in two years to live in the town to have his land, but if he do not then to lose his land that is now forfeited." He returned, and was grave digger in 1707, and surveyor in 1708 and 1709. His name he signed by a mark in 1709. He lived at first on a lot of one acre next his father, which the latter gave him March, 1699-1700, bounded March, 1703-4, east on Thomas Richason's house lot, west on Jonathan Scott's house lot, north and south on highway. This he exchanged, in 1703, for his brother John's place. He d. of the great sickness, Dec. 18, 1712, a few weeks before his wife and his oldest child Mary.

6. Rebecca ; b. April 27, 1679, and m. John Warner, son of John. This is the first recorded birth in Waterbury.

7. Ruth ; b. May 10, 1681, became the second wife of Henry Castle of Woodbury. (Cothren.)

8. Johanna ; b. Sep. 1, 1683, m. Isaac Castle of Woodbury and Daniel Warner.

9. Nathaniel ; b. May 28, 1686. He was accepted as a bachelor, Jan 7, 1706-7. March 13, 1710-11, the proprietors gave him "four scor acurs of land on the north sid the road to Woodbury up the grat brok est from breck nek hill, one this condition that he tak it as his hole proprity as a bachelers acomydation and coinhabit ten years in the town in a seteled way and bild a tenitabel hous according to originell artycels in five yers and coinhabit 5 yers after bilding his hous." Lieut. Stanley, Edmund Scott and Jeremiah Peck protested against this act of the proprietors.

Nathaniel Richardson, d. Nov. 3, 1712, his death securing his lands and rights, which went to his brothers and sisters.

10. Ebenezer ; b. Feb. 4, 1689-90. He was made a bach. proprietor March 5, 1711-12, and m. Margaret, daughter of Thomas Warner. He was one of the earliest settlers at Wooster Swamp, living near "Wooster Brook." He d. June 30, 1772.

#### SCOTT.

Thomas Scott of Hartford, an original proprietor, but not a settler, of Farmington, had a son Edmund and two daughters, Mary, who m. Robert Porter, and Sarah, who m. John Stanley of Farmington.

#### EDMUND SCOTT, SEN.

He settled in Farmington, with children, at an early date, and m. the widow of Thomas Upson. His two youngest children, Robert and Joseph, were by her. He was one of the freemen of Farmington of 1669 and one of the proprietors of 1672. A subscriber of 1674, he was among the earliest that came to Mattatuck. His regular allotments of fence, &c., indicate that with him there was no vascillation of purpose, and that he discharged, seasonably, all his obligations. He is

mentioned as grantee as late as Jan. 21, 1689-90, and d. soon after, before June 2, 1690. At the last date, his will was proved, but his inventory, showing a small estate of \$17, 11s. 6d., was not presented to Court till April, 1691. His nine children are named on the probate record, several of whom remained in Waterbury.

Edmund Scott's house stood where Green Kendrick now lives. His lot contained two acres, and was bounded, Feb. 10, 1687-8, north on highway, south on common, east on John Carrington's land, west on Thomas Richason's land. His children were as follows, (not arranged probably in the exact order of age:)

1. Edmund; m. Sarah, widow of Benjamin Porter, June, 1689.
2. Samuel; b. 1660, m. Feb. 1686-7, Mary Orvice. (W. S. Porter.)
3. Elizabeth; m. ——— Davis.
4. Hannah; m. John Bronson, son of Richard of Farmington, Oct. 1664?
5. Jonathan; m. Hannah, d. of John Hawks of Deerfield, Nov. 1694.

6. George; m. Aug. 1691, Mary, d. of Obadiah Richards, and d. Sep. 26, 1724, leaving an estate to be distributed of £605, 12s. He was a bach. proprietor, being admitted, it appears, Jan. 5, 1707-8, after he had been many years a married man. He had a grant of a house lot of four acres, as early as Dec. 1687, described as "on the highway that runs over the Little Brook [North Main street] at the northeast corner of the town to butt easterly on the brow of the hill, [near Andrew Bryan's house,] and so to run westerly over the brook and to butt northerly on a highway, [Grove street,] provided he build a house and live four years in the town." On this lot Scott built a house, and in Nov. 1702, it was recorded as butting *west* on a highway. He sold the place, Aug. 6, 1703, to Benjamin Warner, and in March, 1707-8, owned a house and lot of eight acres and a half on the north side of Grove street, near C. C. Adams' residence.

George Scott was townsman for four years in 1698 and afterwards, surveyor in 1701, 1704 and 1717, and school committee in 1710 and 1711. He signed his name in 1702-3 by proxy. Obadiah Scott, his eldest son, had a bachelor lot, being accepted Dec. 13, 1713. He d. in 1735. George Scott, the second son, was also a bachelor, admitted in 1715. He d. without a family, in 1725, and his estate was distributed to his brothers and sisters. The third son, William Scott, had a half bachelor lot, granted in 1722, he and John Warner, son of Ephraim, dividing between them the "fourth propriety lot."

7. David; was accepted as a bachelor proprietor at the same time as his brother George. He had several grants of land, beginning as early as March 28, 1694, which were, of course, a part of his divisions on his £40 right. He was surveyor, school committee, and grand juror, at different times; and in 1710, townsman. He lived on the homestead of his father, and in 1710, enlarged his lot by purchase of John Carrington's heirs. After his death, his heirs, "March 8, 1734," sold the property for £100, to James Blakeslee, described as three acres with a house, near the meeting house, north and south on highway, east on Dea. Clark,

west on Edmund Scott. He was a "husbandman." He m. June 10, 1698, Sarah, daughter of Obadiah Richards, and d. in 1727, his will being proved Dec. 5, of that year.

8. Robert; was admitted as a £40 proprietor May 15, 1699. Land was granted him by the proprietors in Jan. 1692-3 and afterwards. He owned the house lot which had belonged to Thomas Judd, Jr., which he bought in 1701. This place he conveyed Oct. 1708, in consideration of a mare, a colt and a cow and £5, 12s., to his brother Edmund. After he had secured his bachelor right, he removed from the town, and was in Hartford in 1708, 1716 and 1725, a bachelor, apparently. His £40 right he sold to his brother Jonathan.

9. Joseph; he lived in Farmington. I know nothing of him, except what may be gathered from the following extract from the Farmington record. It bears date Dec. 19, 1692, and illustrates Puritan manners and government. I suppose he was a literal bachelor.

"The towne by vote gaue to Joseph Scott a Libertie to dwell a Lone prouided he do faithfully imroue his time and be haue him self peasably and honestly towards his neithours and their Creatures and constantly attend the publike worship of god, and that he do give an account how he spends his time unto the townesmen when it shall be demanded." [Town Book, Vol. I, p. 49.]

#### EDMUND SCOTT, JR.

He was a son of the preceding, and was accepted by the committee, in the place of William Higason. He probably came to Mattatuck with his father and was made a proprietor when he became of age. He had a proportion of fence in the second division, which would indicate that he had become a proprietor in 1678-9, and had a meadow allotment at that time. His father gave him, in Feb. 1682-3, the house which he had built, or assisted to build, on the lot which the committee had bestowed on him, (the son.) It stood on the south side of West Main street, near where John C. Booth lives. The lot contained two acres and was bounded, in June, 1691, north and south on highway, east on Mr. Peck's land, and west on Thomas Judd's land. He (Edmund, Jr.) conveyed it and the house, with the land which he had added to it, eight acres in the whole, in 1732, to his son Jonathan, the tract butting east on the heirs of David Scott, west on John Welton's house lot.

Edmund Scott, Jr., was townsman in 1701 and 1702, surveyor in 1710 and 1716, and grave digger in 1708, 1717, 1718, and 1720. He had a £70 right in the undivided lands. He d. at an advanced age, July 20, 1746, having outlived all the other settlers who became proprietors before 1780.—Estate £443. His wife d. Jan. 17, 1748-9.

## Children :

1. A son ; b. Oct., 1690, and d. Feb. 2d, 1690-1.
2. Sarah ; b. Jan. 29, 1691-2, m. Samuel Warner, son of Thomas.
3. Samuel ; b. Sept. 1694 ; became a bach. prop. in 1715 ; resided at Judd's Meadow and d. April 30, 1768.—Estate £294. His widow (Mary, daughter of John Richards) d. Sept. 5, 1776.
4. Elizabeth ; b. March 1, 1696-7 ; m. Samuel Warner, son of Daniel.
5. Hannah ; b. June, 1700, m. in 1744, Ebenezer Elwell.
6. Edmund ; b. May 10, 1703, m. Martha, d. of John Andruss, Aug. 12, 1730, and d. March 23, 1733.—Estate £229. He lived at Judd's Meadow.
7. John ; b. Sept. 21, 1707 ; m. Eunice, d. of Thomas Griffin of Simsbury, and d. March 14, 1756. (His widow was living in 1766.) He lived in the southwest quarter, at Judd's Meadow, near "Meshadock."
8. Jonathan ; b. Aug. 4, 1711, and d. 1741, giving his property to his wife.

## SAMUEL SCOTT.

He was admitted a proprietor, by act of the town, Dec. 30, 1684, receiving half an allotment of £100. He received, at the same time, a house lot on the east side of Bank street, all on condition that he should build a house according to the articles, and live in the town four years after building. These things he did. He was not in the town soon enough to have an early division of fence, or an old town plot eight acre lot ; but he was among those who participated in the land-division of 1688, after which time, his name disappears from the lists of proprietors. He did not remain long in the town after his propriety right had been secured. He probably left in 1689, or in 1689-90. He was not a subscriber to Mr. Peck's £60 settlement. April 28, 1691, he was "of Farmington," and at that date, sold and conveyed to his brother Jonathan all his lands, divided and undivided, in Waterbury, including his house and house lot of two acres, the latter bounded north on Stephen Upson's land, south on Richard Porter, west on highway, east on common. He died in Farmington June 30, 1745, aged 85, and his wife died Nov. 28, 1748, aged 85.

## JONATHAN SCOTT.

He was a son of Edmund, Sen., and is first mentioned on the records in Jan. 1689-90, when he received a grant of land on the west side of "Union Square," he to build a house and "inhabit" four years. It does not appear that he built upon this land. In Dec. 1690, he had ten acres granted him at Wooster Swamp. His name is not among the subscribers of

the agreement with Mr. Peck, he then probably being barely twenty-one years of age. He became a proprietor by purchase of his brother Samuel, April 28, 1691.

Jonathan Scott had but little to do with the public business. He was fence viewer in 1702, 1709 and again in 1717—nothing more. His name is rarely found on the records, and it is difficult to find his “whereabouts” from recorded evidence, conveyances, &c. At first, he may have lived in the house he bought of his brother, in 1691. Afterwards, before Jan., 1703-4, he resided on the north side, near the west end of West Main street, on a lot of one acre and three quarters, recorded April 27, 1717, and bounded north and south on highway, east and west on the heirs of John Richason, dec'd. He signed his name by proxy, as did several of his brothers. The story of his captivity by the Indians, in 1710, I have already related. He ultimately, or soon after 1720, removed to Wooster Swamp, in the north part of Watertown, near Scott's Mountain, where he built a saw mill, (spoken of in 1725, as belonging to him and his son Jonathan,) and lived with his sons. The tradition is that he was buried on Scott's Mountain, and his supposed grave is still pointed out. That part of the tradition, however, which relates to the circumstances and time of his death, as that he died by violence on his way to the north, at the hands of the Indians, after having had his tongue cut out, is without foundation in fact. He is believed to have been the earliest permanent settler of present Watertown. He d. May 15, 1745, and his wife, April 7, 1744.

Children :

1. A daughter ; b. and d. Aug. 1695.
2. Jonathan ; b. Sept. 29, 1696. After his return (in 1715) from captivity, he was made a £40 proprietor. In 1722, he was chosen pound keeper, and in 1723, surveyor, soon after which he appears to have removed to Wooster Swamp, at which place he had much land laid out on his own right and on that which was his uncle Robert's.
3. John ; b. June 5, 1699. He is said never to have returned from his captivity, in 1709.
4. Martha ; b. July 9, 1701 ; m. Joseph Hurlbut of Woodbury.
5. Gershom ; b. Sept. 6, 1703, and d. June 24, 1780. His father gave him a house and lands at Wooster Swamp in 1731.
6. Eleazer ; b. Dec. 31, 1705. His father gave him a house and three acres of land at Wooster Swamp in 1733.

7. Daniel ; b. Sept. 20, 1707. In 1735, his father gave him a part of his home-  
stead, three acres. He was a doctor.

#### JOHN SCOVILL.

He was an early settler of Farmington, and a proprietor of 1672. As a proprietor of Waterbury, he was accepted Jan. 15, 1677-8, as a substitute for Abraham Bronson. He probably did not join the settlement till late in 1678. His name is found in the second and fourth divisions of fence, and is on the list of those who had old town plot lots. He was one of those who tried the patience of the committee, till at last his rights were declared forfeited. He recovered his allotments by submitting, &c. He lived on a lot of two acres on the corner of West Main and Willow streets, where Mrs. Bennet Bronson now resides. But he found living in Waterbury a serious business, became discouraged, and went away. I know not the exact time. He was not a subscriber to Mr. Peck's settlement in 1689, but he may, notwithstanding, have been in town at the time. In 1696, he was "of Haddam," and July 18th of that year, he conveyed by deed "for divers valuable, good and lawful causes and considerations" to his "well beloved son John Scovill and his heirs for ever," all his estate in Waterbury—his lands and rights of land, divided and undivided, including his house and house lot of two acres, (butted south and east on highway, north and west on Dea. Judd's land,) together with nine other parcels of land. He, however, reserved an interest in the estate of the value of ten pounds, the income of which was to be paid to his wife during her natural life, "should it please God to take me away before her," &c.

There was a William Scovill, in Haddam, who settled there, according to Field, about 1686. There was also an Edward Scofell, or Scovill, who died there in 1703. I know nothing of their relationship to John of Waterbury.

John Scovill was m. March 20, 1666, to Sarah, d. of Thomas Barnes of Farmington, and died in Haddam in 1712.—Estate £176. But little is known of his children. Rev. W. S. Porter gives the names of four :

1. Mehitable ; m. Feb. 15, 1685, Caleb Hopkins.
2. Eleazer ; m. Abigail Langdon.
3. Samuel, (of Watertown, Mass. ;) m. Ruth Langdon.

4. John; m. Feb. 6, 1693-4, Hannah, d. of Obadiah Richards. He had his first grant of land in Waterbury, Jan. 21, 1689-90, on condition that he should build a house, &c., a condition from which he was afterwards, after his father's removal, released. When the grant was made, he had probably just reached the age of twenty-one years. It was customary to notice the young men at that age, in a similar way, for their encouragement. He lived where his father did. He was a man of considerable influence, and was engaged to some extent in the public business. He was school committee; collector of the town and minister's rates; grand juror; townsman in 1698, 1699, 1702, 1703; constable in 1707 and 1715; deputy to the Colonial Assembly in May, 1714, and "keeper of the pound key," in 1725, and afterwards. He had reputation as a military man, and rose to the rank of sergeant, as early as 1718. He d. Feb. 26, 1726-7, aged, probably, about 58. His wife d. "March 5, 1720."—Estate £1061, 15s. His house and house lot were appraised at £ 120. His son John, (born Jan. 12, 1694-5,) was accepted as a "bachelor," in 1715. The last was constable in 1729; pound keeper for many years; townsman often; a deputy, May, 1745, and a lieutenant. He too lived on the family homestead, (as did *his* son Obadiah,) and died April 28, 1759.

#### REV. JOHN SOUTHMAYD.

He was the great grandson of Sir William Southmayd of the county of Kent, England, to whom arms were granted in June, 1604. A son of the latter, named William, came to this country. His name is in the "quarterly files" of Salem, Mass., where this entry is found:

John Southmate sonne of Will Southmate by millissen his wife borne 26<sup>th</sup> of the 8<sup>th</sup> mo. 1645—william southmayd the elder sonne of william southmayd by millissen his wife born the 17<sup>th</sup>. of the 7<sup>th</sup>. mo. 1643.

william southmayd.

[Manuscript letter from Rev. Daniel S. Southmayd, Concord, Mass., Nov. 1829.]

Nothing more is known of William Southmayd, of Essex county, Mass., or of his son John named above. His "elder sonne" William, father of the Rev. John, removed to Middletown about 1660. In October, 1673, he married Esther, daughter of Giles Hamlin,\* and had the following children  
1. William; born July 24, 1674, and died an infant. 2. John b. August 23, 1676. 3. William; b. March 6, 1679, and died an infant. 4. Giles; b. Jan. 17, 1680-1; d. 1728, childless. 5. Esther; b. Oct. 28, 1682 and d. Dec. 29, 1682. Esther, the wife, d. Nov. 11, 1682 and Wm. Southmayd m. Margaret,

\* Mr. Hamlin was one of the early settlers of Middletown. He married Esther Crowe, a daughter of John Crowe of Hartford, and a granddaughter of Elder William Goodwin. Their children were, Esther, John, Mary, Giles, Mehitable, William. Mr. Hamlin was one of the prominent men of his times. He was commissioner, a member of the Council, and several times a deputy to the General Court. He died Sep. 1, 1689.



daughter of Col. John Allyn of Hartford, long secretary of the Colony. Their children were: 1. Allyn; b. Feb. 7, 1685; lived to an old age and d. at St. Johns, New Foundland. 2. Daniel; b. Sep. 1687; d. Nov. 23, 1703. 3. Margaret; b. Aug. 11, 1691. 4. Anna; b. Jan. 10, 1693. 5. Joseph; b. March 15, 1695, and d. 1772. 6. William; b. Jan. 9, 1698, and d. 1747. 7. Meliscent; b. Jan. 3, 1700; d. Dec. 12, 1717. From Joseph and William have descended the Southmayds of Middletown and Vermont. William Southmayd, the father, d. Dec. 4, 1702. He called himself a mariner. His inventory bears date Feb. 23, 1702-3, and amounted to £1,085, 17s. 6d. His wife d. a widow, March 16, 1732-3.

Rev. John Southmayd's home lot (previously called "a great lot") at first contained but two acres; but for his better accommodation, the town obtained for him, by exchange, in 1704, the lot next adjoining on the east, then owned by Thomas Judd, Jr. The house built for him was a frame house, and was fortified in the Indian wars.

Mr. Southmayd, in 1700, married Susanna Ward, a daughter of William and Phebe Ward. Their children were:

1. Esther; b. Sep 12, 1701; m. Capt. Daniel Starr, of Middletown. She had several children, and died a widow at an advanced age.

2. Susanna; b. Jan. 5, 1703-4; m. Sep. 25, 1734, Thomas Bronson, son of Thomas, and d. Aug 13, 1741.

3. Anne; b. Oct. 27, 1706; m. Joseph Bronson, son of John, June 1, 1732, and d. Aug. 12, 1749.

4. John; b. June 21, 1710; m. Miliscent, d. of Samuel Gaylard of Middletown, April 25, 1739. He d. Feb. 28, 1742-3, leaving two children, William and Samuel, both of whom left families. The widow m. Timothy Judd, son of William Judd.

5. Daniel; b. April 19, 1717; m. Hannah, d. of Samuel Brown, March 24, 1749; had three children, Anne, John and Daniel, (all of whom lived to be married,) and d. Jan. 12, 1754.

#### JOHN STANLEY.

The grandfather of the Waterbury Stanleys, John Stanley, is said to have died on his passage over from England, leaving a son John and a daughter Ruth, both of whom were married (the same day) Dec. 5, 1645, the latter to Isaac More. John, the son, was a nephew of Timothy Stanley of Cambridge and Hartford.

John Stanley, the father of our proprietors, was born in 1625; came to New England in 1634; settled in Farmington early; joined the church there, July 12, 1653; was a deputy to the General Court from F. four sessions, first in 1659; saw service in King Philip's war as lieutenant and captain, and was one of the leading men of Farmington.

John Stanley of F. m. Dec. 5, 1645, Sarah, d. of Thomas Scott, and June 26, 1661, Sarah, d. of John Fletcher of Milford. He d. Dec. 19, 1706, and his second wife and widow, May 15, 1713. His children were: 1. John; b. in Hartford, Nov. 3, 1647. 2. Thomas; b. in Farmington, Nov. 1, 1649; m., in 1690, Anne, d. of Rev. Jeremiah Peck, and d. May 23, 1718. 3. Sarah; b. Feb. 1651-2, and m. Joseph Gaylord. 4. Timothy; b. March 17, 1653-4. 5. Elizabeth; b. April 1, 1657, and d. young. 6. Abigail; b. July 25, 1669; m. Nov. 1687, John Hooker. 7. Elizabeth; b. Nov. 28, 1672; m. John Wadsworth, and d. Oct. 5, 1713. 8. Isaac; b. Sept. 22, 1660, and appears to have been an imbecile. By the will of his father, he could not dispose of the estate given him without the consent of his brothers, John Stanley and John Hooker.

#### JOHN STANLEY.

John Stanley, son of Capt. John of F., was one of the eighty-four proprietors of that town in 1672. He signed the petition to the General Court concerning Mattatuck, in 1673, and subscribed the articles of settlement in 1674, taking a £100 right. He was one of the assignees to whom the first Indian deed of lands in Mattatuck was made over, and a grantee, by name, in the subsequent deeds. He came very early to our town, but may not have been with the first company of settlers; for he had no allotment of fence in the first division made in the spring of 1677-8. In no other division is his name omitted. After having once put his hand to the plow, there is no appearance of his looking back; at any rate, till some broad furrows had been traced. He was, more than any other man, with the exception of Thomas Judd, Sen., the ruling spirit and father of the settlement. He was often se-

lected by the Assembly's committee to act in their absence. He laid out the lots of the proprietors, staked out and apporportioned the common fence, "located" highways, settled boundaries of adjoining towns, &c. Thomas Judd was usually his associate. He was the first recorder of the town and proprietors, appointed first by the committee and afterwards by the town. His first *recorded* appointment by the latter was Dec. 26, 1682, and he was annually reappointed till his removal to Farmington. So far as appears, he was the only person among the earliest proprietors of Mattatuck, who was fully qualified for the office. He wrote a legible and business-like hand.

John Stanley was a sergeant in the Waterbury train-band, in April, 1682, and afterwards, when no higher officer was permitted. In Oct. 1689, when a lieutenant was allowed, he was the first selected for that office. His appointment was confirmed by the Assembly, Oct. 1689. It was a distinguished honor, and no doubt he bore it worthily. After Waterbury began to send a representative to the General Court, Lieut. Stanley was the second whose name is recorded. He was a deputy in May, 1690, and in May, 1693. What persuaded him finally to quit the settlement, in a time of great affliction, I am not able to say. It is to be hoped he had better reasons than any that can be thought of at this distant day. His loss must have been seriously felt. He returned to Farmington early in 1695, or before April 9th of that year, where he was a deacon in 1711 and afterwards. He, however, retained most of his lands in Waterbury and his proprietary right, and was a frequent visitor to the town to look after his estate. His familiarity with the records of the town was the cause of his appointment, in 1705, to copy, for the purpose of preservation, such portions as were most important. He gave some attention to the duties of this appointment from time to time.

John Stanley lived near the old meeting-house and near the place where the Second Congregational Church now stands. His lot contained three and a half acres, and was bounded, Sept. 29, 1687, westwardly on highway, northwardly on Isaac Bronson's land, southwardly on Joseph Gaylord's land, and east on the common.

John Stanley m. in 1669, Esther, d. of Thomas Newell of Farmington, and d. May 16, 1729. His widow d. in 1740.

Children :

1. Esther ; b. in Farmington, Dec. 2, 1672, and d. 1676.
  2. John ; b. in F. April 9, 1675 ; m. Dec. 14, 1714, Mary Wright, and d. Sept. 8, 1748, leaving three children, John, Thomas and Mary. He lived in Kensington. Though accepted as a bachelor proprietor of Waterbury, in 1715, there is no trace of him as an inhabitant after his father's removal in 1695.
  3. Samuel ; b. 1677 ; m. July 15, 1702, Elizabeth, d. of Abraham Bronson of Lyme, and had six children born in Waterbury, the two last twins—Samuel, Abraham, John, Esther, Ebenezer and Anna, (b. "March 8, 1713;") two, Elizabeth and Asa, b. in 1715 and 1717 in Farmington and recorded in Waterbury ; and one or two others, Ruth and Josiah ? The father d. in 1747.
- Samuel Stanley was a carpenter and mill-wright ; townsman in 1704 and 1705 ; collector of town taxes in 1707 ; school committee in 1711 and 1712, &c. He lived on the old homestead of his father, in whom the title remained. The property was sold, July 9, 1714, to Ephraim Warner, for £45, the deed being signed by both father and son. Soon after the date of this deed, Samuel Stanley removed. He lived in Wallingford, Farmington and Durham. He was admitted a bachelor proprietor in 1715.
4. Nathaniel ; b. 1679 ; m. Sarah, d. of Samuel Smith of Farmington, where he lived and had nine children, and then removed (after 1739) to Goshen, and d. 1770.
  5. Thomas ; baptized May 25, 1684, at Farmington ; m. 1690, Anne, daughter of Rev. Jeremiah Peck. He had a son Thomas and a daughter Anne living in 1728.
  6. Sarah ; bap. July 4, 1686, at F.
  7. Timothy ; b. June 6, 1689 ;\* bap. in F. May 11, 1790 ; m. Dec. 15, 1718, Martha, d. of Samuel Smith of F. ; had seven children b. in F., four of whom died in infancy. He removed to Goshen after 1735 and before 1742, and d. 1761. He was a captain and the owner and emancipator of a slave.

#### TIMOTHY STANLEY.

He was in Mattatuck sufficiently early to have an old town plot lot, and an allotment in all the divisions of fence. In 1682-3, however, he was condemned for delinquency ; but he soon made amends, and regained what he had lost. He was one of the two first townsmen (appointed, probably, in 1680) whose names are recorded. He held the same office in 1702 and afterwards. He was school committee often ; moderator of proprietors' meeting in 1706 ; grand juror in 1713. In Oct. 1694, he was sent as deputy to the General Court, being the

---

\* This birth is recorded by the father in Waterbury, and it is the only one of the family that is so recorded.

third person that received that honor. He held the same office May, 1695, 1696 and 1699, May and Oct. 1708, 1709 and 1711, and Oct. 1718. For a short period, in 1704-5, after Lieut. Judd's death, he appears to have held the office of justice of the peace. In military rank he seems, in the first instance, to have ranked fourth. He was sergeant in 1695, ensign in 1696, and lieutenant and chief in command in 1703, which last office he held through a critical period till 1715.

Timothy Stanley called himself "cloath weur" in 1716-17.


His standing among his fellow townsmen may be gathered from the responsible positions he occupied. His house stood on the spot where Capt. Lemuel Harrison now lives. It was one of the fortified houses in the Indian war. His lot of two acres was bounded, in Nov. 1687, north and south on highway, west on John Carrington's land, east on Daniel Porter's land. In June, 1713, Stanley deeded to his wife's nephew, Thomas Clark, his adopted son, one half of his house and homestead and other lands, divided and undivided, Clark agreeing "to take care of s<sup>d</sup> Stanley and his wife and carion all the work of the family or families wn [when] there shall be need with y<sup>e</sup> help of s<sup>d</sup> Standley and the rest of y<sup>e</sup> family y<sup>e</sup> whole income of y<sup>e</sup> estate to be to y<sup>e</sup> use of both as they shall need," &c.

Timothy Stanley m. in 1676, Mary, d. of John Strong of Windsor, and d. childless, Nov. 12, 1723. His wife Mary d. Sep. 30, 1722. Thomas Clark was his executor and principal heir. The estate in Waterbury amounted to £703, and in Farmington to £108. The will mentions Thomas Clark and Sarah his wife, and their children; Timothy, Samuel, Nathaniel and John Stanley, sons of John, the brother of the testator; Joseph, John and Benjamin Gaylord; Ruth Hickox and Johannah Royce, children of Sarah Gaylord, the sister of the deceased.

Timothy Stanley and his wife were buried near the spot where the stone of Dea. Clark is now standing, in the old burying yard.







*Josiah Bronson*





## STEPHEN UPSON.

The father, Thomas Upson, was early in Hartford. He was one of those, not proprietors, enumerated in 1638, who had the privilege of getting wood and keeping cows on the common. In that year, he (with others) was "censured and fined for vnseasonable and immoderate drinking at the pinnace," 20s. He was an original proprietor and settler of Farmington, and m. in 1646, Elizabeth Fuller. He d. July 19, 1655, and a daughter named Elizabeth d. the next day. The widow m. Edmund Scott. The estate, which was small, was distributed in 1671, to the remaining children, Thomas, Stephen, Mary, Hannah, and to Edmund Scott in right of his wife.

Stephen Upson was not one of the first company of proprietors and settlers of Waterbury. He was accepted, (or rather signed the articles by a mark,) Dec. 29, 1679, not as the substitute of another, but as the record says, "on the account of a new lot." He had a £50 propriety and an allotment in the second and fourth divisions of fence; but he had not one of the old town plot lots, these being divided among the original thirty subscribers, or their substitutes and successors. In 1680-81, he was "straitened" for land, and the committee on petition granted relief. He does not appear to have faltered inexcusably in his duty as a subscriber of the articles. His name does not frequently appear on the earlier records, (before 1700,) except as the grantee of lands. He signed the £60 agreement with Mr. Peck and was one of a committee to settle bounds with Woodbury in April, 1702. He was surveyor, school committee, grand juror, often townsman, and three times deputy to the General Court—in May, 1710, Oct. 1712, and Oct. 1729. He became a sergeant in 1715, and in 1729, he had a seat with the veterans in the new meeting-house.

Stephen Upson, "carpenter," lived on the east side of Bank street, near where the house of E. E. Prichard now stands. His lot contained four acres and was bounded, Feb. 10, 1687-8, southerly on Samuel Scott's land, northerly on parsonage lot, west and east on highways. In Dec. 1697, he

exchanged with the town two acres at the east end of his lot for the two acres lying next him on the north called the parsonage lot.

Stephen Upson m. December 29, 1682, Mary d. of John Lee, Sen., of Farmington, and d. in 1735, aged 80, or over. His wife d. Feb. 15, 1715-16. His will was dated Nov. 8, 1713, and proved July 3, 1735. Estate, £520, 17s. He had, during his lifetime, given much of his property to his children.

Children :

1. Mary ; b. Nov. 5, 1683 ; m. Richard Welton, son of John.
2. Stephen ; b. Sep. 30, 1686 ; was accepted as a bachelor proprietor, Jan. 1705-6 ; m. Sarah, d. of Isaac Bronson and d. Sep. 10, 1777. His wife d. 1748. His house was, at first, on the southwest corner of Grand and Bank streets. The land on which he had already built, in 1718, described as three acres, "just by the south meadow gate and within the common fence," his father gave him at that date. June 28, 1733, he sold and conveyed this place, described now as five acres, with a house and barn, to James Prichard, and the same day received a deed from his father of the family homestead, four acres, bounded west on highway, north on John Punderson's land, east on Thomas Upson's and Thomas Porter's land, south on Thomas Porter.

Stephen Upson, Jr., represented the town in the Colonial Assembly, in Oct. 1743, at which time he bore the title of captain.

3. Elizabeth ; b. Feb. 14, 1689-90, and m. Thomas Bronson.
4. Thomas ; b. March 1, 1692-3 ; was accepted as a £40 proprietor in 1715 ; m. Rachel, d. of Dea. Thomas Judd, and d. in 1761. He lived on Cole street, near East Main, on the place owned first, by John Richards. His father bought it of Benjamin Warner, executor of Thomas Warner, and in 1718, gave it to the son, with the house. In the deed making this grant, the father "thinks it reasonable to consider" his sons "above" his daughters, in the distribution of his estate, and orders the gift "not to be recorded as part or portion in the distribution" of his estate among his children. In Feb. 1732-3, Thomas Upson sold out to Jonathan Baldwin for £150 money, the property being described as "three and a half acres of land with a house and barn," &c. He then removed to Farmington, afterwards Southington, and now the eastern part of Wolcott, (Southington Mountain.)
5. Hannah ; b. "abought March 16, 1695 ;" m. Thomas Richards and John Bronson, and was living a widow, in 1751.
6. Tabitha ; b. "March 11, 1698," and m. John Scovill, 2d.
7. John ; b. Dec. 13, 1702, and m. Elizabeth, d. of Thomas Judd. He appears to have resided, for several years, after 1732-3, in Farmington, though the births of his children, down to 1745, are recorded in Waterbury.
8. Thankful ; b. March 14, 1706-7, and m. James Blakeslee.

## WARNER.

John Warner, Sen. lived first in Hartford, then in Farmington. Of the latter town he was an original proprietor and settler. He was one of the Pequot soldiers, and for his services had a grant of land, in 1671, from the General Court, fifty acres, which Serg. Thomas Judd and Serg. John Stanley were appointed to lay out to his heirs in Oct. 1689. He was one of the petitioners who asked liberty "to make a small plantation at Mattatuck," (as were his sons John and Daniel,) and signed the articles of 1674, writing his name John Warner, Sen. He intended to join the new settlement but died before removal, in 1679. His will, dated in March of that year, names as his children, John, Daniel, Thomas, Sarah. The last was baptized March 15, 1656-7, and m. William Higason.

## JOHN WARNER, (JR.)

Both he and his father John are on the list of the freemen of F. in 1669, and on the list of proprietors of 1672. He subscribed the articles in 1674, and made an early movement to secure his right. His name is in all the fence-divisions.

John Warner, called *Sen.* on the Waterbury records, had recorded, Feb. 19, 1702-3, one acre and a half of land on which his dwelling-house then stood, east on Jonathan Scott's house lot, north, south and west on highway. There is some difficulty in ascertaining where this lot was situated. Though there is something not quite intelligible about the west boundary, I have ventured to place it on the north side of West Main street, near to Willow street. He owned land next west of Robert Porter in 1687-8. He sold the place, March 4, 1704-5, to John Judd, and Judd conveyed it, Nov. 5, 1715, to Joseph Hickox of Durham, and Hickox deeded it, the same day, to Elizabeth Richason, widow and administrator of John Richason, the boundaries being the same as when owned by Warner.

History has but little to say of John Warner, Sen., of Waterbury. He returned to Farmington soon after 1700. He called himself "of Farmington" in a deed, in April, 1703, and again in 1705-6; and yet in his will, dated Farmington,

Dec. 27, 1706, he speaks of himself as "of Waterbury." He died soon after the last date, his inventory being taken March, 1706-7. His personal estate was valued at £71, and his real estate was given by will, his house and homestead in Waterbury to his son John. John Warner and Samuel Bronson (son-in-law) were executors. His will (he signed by a mark, as did his brother Thomas) names five children. Thomas is not mentioned.

1. John; b. March 1, 1670; m. Sept. 28, 1698, Rebecca, d. of Thomas Richardson. He d. March 3, 1751, and his wife Aug 1, 1748. He was made a £40 proprietor, March 26, 1699, his right being entered in 1722 and afterwards as "John Warner, Sen., bach. lot." He had a grant of land of twenty-five acres in 1690, he to build, &c. As early as April 20, 1703, he seems to have been living on Buckshill. At that date he sold land adjoining him to Joseph Gaylord, Jr. He appears to have been the first settler on Buckshill. Here he remained several years, but at length removed to Stratford. He was in the latter place June, 1715, at which time he sold to Daniel Shelton of said Stratford thirty-three acres of land and a house on Buckshill. About 1723, he returned to Waterbury and settled in that part of the town afterwards called Westbury. Here he had previously much land laid out, and here he had a house in Dec. 1724, near Steel's Brook, and the road to Wooster Swamp. At this time and after his return from Stratford, he was sometimes called *Dr.* John Warner, as though he had been practicing medicine while absent. He continued in this occupation, and was the first physician in Westbury. When Westbury became a separate society he was made the first deacon of the church. He held no important town offices.

2. Ephraim; m. Esther, d. of Obadiah Richards, Aug. 16, 1692, and d. Aug. 1, 1753, in the eighty-fourth year of his age. This is the age given him by the record; but it would make him born about the same time as his brother John. I suppose they were not twins, and that Ephraim was the youngest; but there is no conclusive evidence of this. He had five children born in Waterbury, the last in Feb. 1702-3; and two born, I suppose, in Woodbury,\* Ebenezer and Ephraim. All outlived their father except Margaret and the first Ephraim. The estate was first settled by agreement among the heirs, and afterwards by order of probate, in 1762, there being probably some misunderstanding about the first settlement. It amounted, according to inventory, to but £14, 19s., much having been given away to the children during the lifetime of the deceased.

Ephraim Warner had his first grant of land, Jan. 21, 1689-90, on the northeast corner of Willow and Grove streets, (bounded south, west and north on highways and east on the three acre lot of Thomas Judd, Sen.,) on condition that he should erect a house and "coinhabit four years," according to the original articles. Here he seems to have built and resided till about Sept. 26, 1701, when he sold out to Stephen Welton. He next had a house and forty-two and a half acres

---

\* It is not certain they were not born in Waterbury because not recorded. It was common to make a record only at considerable intervals, and then record several together. If a person died, and particularly if he removed, one or more children born last were not sure to be recorded:

of land on Buckshill, which he exchanged, Feb. 21, 1703-4, with Benjamin Warner for a house and four acres of land, the land in two pieces, one situated on the east, the other on the west side of Cook street. The house was on the west side. Here he resided till he had secured his £40 right, which was granted "March 18, 1701," and then removed to Woodbury. In April, 1714, the following vote was passed in town meeting :

"The town to encourage Dr. Ephraim Warner to come and live with us grant him the use of the school land for three years (only one half the lot in Hancox's Meadow is exempted this year,) he to maintain the fence."

The town also voted him ten acres in the sequester, on the condition that he remained four years. It seems he had been practicing medicine in Woodbury, where his brother Ebenezer was engaged in the same calling, and the Waterbury people wanted his services. He may have served them as physician before his removal, but there is no sufficient evidence of this. He is never called Doctor on the record till Dec. 1706, and then it is not clear whether he was in Waterbury or Woodbury. After this date, his name is not mentioned till the town vote soliciting his return. He did return and became "physician" or "practitioner" (as he is called in deeds) of the town, Dr. Porter being surgeon, or more properly "bonesetter." He appears to have settled on Buckshill, as did several of his sons, to whom he gave houses and lands. In Aug. 1733, he conveyed to his "beloved son Ebenezer" half his dwelling-house, ("the north end,") and twenty acres of land on the east side the highway, opposite his (the father's) dwelling-house, and half the barn ; also, "the smith's shop and the tools for smith work," he to pay his brother Ephraim £20 in labor in twelve months. In April, 1738, he had removed down into the village, and occupied the northwest corner of Cook and Grove streets, which he had previously owned. At this date, for £120 which "he would bestow" on his son Ephraim "as his part or portion," he deeded to him the place, described as three acres and a half, with all the buildings and improvements, north and east on highways, south on Thomas Bronson, west on Samuel Scott, the grantor reserving the use of one half the property during his life and during the life of his wife. Afterwards, Jan. 1742-3, he quit-claimed to Ephraim, then of Farmington, the whole property.

Dr. Warner, after his return to Waterbury, became one of the "notabilities" of the town. His name is often met with on the record. He bought and sold real estate to a large extent, and was engaged in public business. He was townsman, school committee, town collector, deputy to the General Court in May, 1717, May, 1719, May and Oct. 1720, and May, 1722, and moderator of town meeting in 1730. As early as 1722, he was chosen captain of the train band, and was the second who was thus distinguished in the town.—Benjamin Warner, eldest son of Dr. Ephraim, (b. Sept. 30, 1698,) was accepted as a £40 proprietor, Dec. 23, 1715. He died in April, 1772. He lived on Buckshill, (where his father gave him a house and lands,) and was a physician. He was called "Doctor Ben," to distinguish him from his father.—John Warner, second son of Dr. Ephraim, was b. June 24, 1700. The proprietors granted him half a bachelor lot, which was the fourth propriety lot, Nov. 28, 1722, William Scott having the other half. In Dec. 1724, his father, with whom he then lived, gave him twenty acres of land and a house on Buckshill, valuing them to him "at £80 money." He afterwards removed to Northbury, and was the third deacon in the Northbury church, appointed in 1746. He d. Sept. 7, 1794.

3. Robert ; settled in Woodbury, and died in 1759.
4. Ebenezer. He settled in Woodbury, became a physician, and died in 1769. Col. Seth Warner of the Revolution was his grandson. (Cothren.)
5. Lydia ; bap. March 13, 1680-81, and m. Samuel Bronson. Her father in his will gave to her his "beds and bedding, furniture, and household stuff."
6. Thomas ; baptized May 6, 1683. He must have died before his father.

## (WID.) DANIEL WARNER.

It has already been stated that Daniel Warner, one of the original petitioners and first subscribers, died in Farmington, late in 1679 ; and that the committee bestowed his propriety of £60 and his allotments on the widow and her children, advising her to erect a dwelling-house "with all possible speed." She followed the advice, and is supposed to have lived on the north side of West Main street, next east of Thomas Judd, Sen., on a lot of two acres which, in April, 1693, stood in the name of her son, Daniel Warner, and which was sold by him, at that date, to the said Judd, butted north and south on highway, east on Obadiah Richards.

I know not who were the children of Daniel Warner of Farmington, except that one was

Daniel. He settled in Waterbury, and came into the possession of the family right in the undivided lands. His first recorded grant of land was in Jan. 1689-90, about the period probably of his majority. In exchange for the family homestead, he received of Judd, about the time of his marriage, three acres at Stanley's Timber, so called, on the north side of the Farmington road, half a mile or more from the meeting-house. Here he built a house and lived. The lot, with two acres which had been added to it, was recorded in June, 1703, as five acres, more or less, with a dwelling-house, east on Ensign Stanley, west on Abraham Andruss, decd., north and south on highways. In June, 1705, Warner conveyed his house and lot to John Warner, son of Thomas, receiving in exchange lands at Judd's Meadow. Soon afterwards, he removed into the south part of the town, settling on or near Fulling-Mill Brook, sometimes called Daniel Warner's Brook. There he is known to have had a house in Aug. 1708. He was once or twice fence viewer, but held no important public office. His first wife, Mary Andruss, died April 10, 1709. He d. Sept. 13, 1713, being the last victim of the great sickness of that and the previous year. His widow, Mary, who was a daughter of Thomas Richason, was living in 1730. His sons, Samuel, Ebenezer and Abraham, settled at Judd's Meadow.

## THOMAS WARNER.

He was probably younger than his brother John, Sen., of Waterbury and Daniel of Farmington. He was not a first subscriber, but probably took his deceased father's propriety

and allotments. He did not take effectual measures to secure his rights till after the forfeiture of Feb. 1682-3.

Thomas Warner was a subscriber to Mr. Peck's settlement. He held some unimportant town offices—was hayward, chimney viewer, surveyor. His house was on the eastern side of Bank street, where the Baptist Church now stands. The committee voted in Nov. 1679, that his "siller" [cellar] might stand "without molestation according to an agreement made with Left. Samuel Steel." His lot contained, March 21, 1698-9, two acres and three quarters, and was bounded north on John Hopkins' house lot, east (before the above date) on John Richards' house lot, "south on a lot which formerly belonged to the parsonage," west on highway. He conveyed the place, at the above date, to John Richards, and received in exchange a house and three acres of land on the southwest side of the "mill path," where he afterwards lived.

Thomas Warner m. Elizabeth —, and d. Nov. 24, 1714. His son Benjamin of New Haven, was administrator on his estate. The "heighrs" made an agreement with him, by which he was to take care of the widow, "providing for her a comfortable place to live in, and meat, drink, lodging, apparel, physic and necessaries suitable, as long as she lives." As a compensation, they quit-claimed to him, the said Benjamin, all their interest in the estate of the deceased.

#### Children :

1. Elizabeth ; m. Samuel Chatterton.
2. Benjamin. The first time his name is met with on the record is in 1698 ? He was accepted as the owner of a bachelor right about 1700. His father gave him a part of his home lot on the mill path, July 10, 1702. Soon after, when he could do it without jeoparding his £40 right, and when true men were most needed, he removed to New Haven. There he had a daughter, Desire, born Aug. 23, 1704, and afterwards, Benjamin and Joseph. He is called Sen. on the list of proprietors, to distinguish him from Benjamin, the son of Ephraim Warner, who is termed Jr.—(The *third* child born before 1680 I have been unable to find.)
4. John ; b. March 6, 1680-81, in Waterbury, as were the subsequent children. He was admitted as a £40 proprietor Dec. 23, 1701, and purchased, June, 1705, Daniel Warner's house and lot of five acres on the Farmington road. He was called tailor, that being his trade, to distinguish him from the other John Warners—John the son of John and John the son of Ephraim. Sept. 30, 1713, he deeded the land "with the fencing and building and fruit trees," which he bought of Daniel Warner, to Ebenezer Bronson for £11, and the same day left the town. The lot was afterwards called, after him, the "tailor lot." For some reason, he was



considered as having forfeited his bachelor lot. He appears to have returned to Waterbury at a later day, and to have been an inhabitant in 1734-5.

5. Mary; b. Dec. 9, 1682, and d. June 7, 1705.

6. Martha; b. April 1, 1684, and m. John Andruss, son of Abraham, Sen.

7. Thomas; b. Oct. 28, 1687, m. Abigail Barnes, and lived in Farmington.

8. Samuel; b. "March 16, 1690;" received a bachelor lot March 10, 1712, and was fence viewer and hayward in 1714. He lived at Judd's Meadow, and died about 1741.

9. Margaret; b. "March 16, 1693," and m. Ebenezer Richason, son of Thomas.

#### JOHN WELTON.

The family tradition is that he was originally from Saybrook. He was an early, but not a first settler of Farmington. He was one of the eighty-four proprietors of that town in 1672, and a signer of the articles in 1674. He had fence in all the allotments except the first, and was probably in Mattatuck as early as 1679. I do not learn that he was backward in complying with the conditions to which he had subscribed. Though not perhaps a leading man, he may have been a valuable one notwithstanding. At any rate, he did not run away when he found that difficulty and danger were to be encountered. He was one of the twenty-five that pledged themselves to pay Mr. Peck's salary. At one time (in 1691) he got upon the road of military distinction, but some how ended where he began, with the rank of corporal. He was select-man in 1708, and town constable for eight years between 1698 and 1714.

John Welton lived on the south side of West Main street, near where Mrs. Giles Ives' house stands. His house lot contained two acres, and was bounded, in 1687, east on Thomas Judd, Jr., west on Abraham Andruss, Sen.,\* north and south on highway. In his old age, by deed dated March 2, 1726, he conveyed to his eldest son John and to John's youngest son Oliver, (the latter to be "the proper heir," at the decease of his father,) his house and home lot, and his "three acer lot lying within the meadow fence," (next east of the old burying yard,) and another lot over the river, on condition that he the said John should take care of the father (then living with the son) and provide for him during his natural life.

---

\* A record, made in June, 1708, when there had been changes of ownership, bounds the lot east on Robert Scott, and west on Thomas Judd, Jr.

John Welton's wife's name was Mary. They had six children before they left Farmington; or at any rate, the first one born in Waterbury is called the seventh. He died June 18, 1726, and his wife, Mary, Oct. 18, 1716. His son George was administrator.—Estate £136, 14s.

Children:—(I am unable to find but five of the six born before the father came to Waterbury.)

1. Abigail; m. about 1691, Cornelius Bronson of Woodbury. She was living a widow in 1742.

2. Mary; m. Aug. 17, 1692, John Richards.

3. Elizabeth; m. Thomas Griffin, and d. about the time of her father.

4. John; m. "March 13, 1706," Sarah, d. of Ezekiel Buck, Jr. of Wethersfield, and d. April 3, 1738. His widow d. Sept. 5, 1751. He had a grant of a house lot from the proprietors as early as Jan. 1692-3, he to build and remain six years in the town. He had probably then just completed his twenty-first year. Afterwards, (in 1707-8,) he was made a £40 proprietor. He was a weaver by trade; surveyor in 1709; grave digger in 1726, 1727 and 1729, and wrote by proxy. He lived with his father, and probably improved the homestead after the death of the latter.

5. Stephen; m. March 4, 1701-2, Mary, d. of Joseph Gaylord, and Jan. 28, 1712-13, Joanna Wetmore of Simsbury. He died March 13, 1713. He was admitted a bachelor proprietor in due course, (March 26, 1699;) was chimney viewer in 1700, and collector of town and ministerial rates several times. His trade was that of a weaver. In Sept. 1701, he bought of Ephraim Warner a house and lot on the corner of Grove and Willow streets, (marked Francis H. Pratt.) Afterwards, he resided on the corner of East and North Main streets, in a house he bought Feb. 2, 1703-4, of his father Gaylord.

7. Richard; b. "March, 1680," (reputed the first male child of European parents born in Waterbury,) and d. in 1755. His wife was Mary, d. of Stephen Upson. He received bachelor accommodations in May, 1699; was (apparently) a builder by trade, a townsman in 1723, and a sergeant of militia. He first bought the house and a lot of three acres on the corner of Grove and Willow streets of his brother Stephen, for which he gave "a horse and a young steer and a parcel of timber," the date of the purchase being Aug. 1, 1703. He afterwards, in 1711, "in consideration of a two year old heffer" conveyed the land (nothing is said of a house) to John Scovill. Before this, or in 1708, he bought the house of Joseph Gaylord, Jr., on Buckshill, to which place he removed.

8. Hannah; b. April 1, 1683, and m. Thomas Squire, Jr. She was living in 1742.

9. Thomas; b. Feb. 4, 1684-5; m. March 9, 1714, Hannah, d. of Josiah Alford, and d. April 19, 1717. He had two sons, both of whom d. young, and his estate was distributed in 1730 to his brothers and sisters. He received a bachelor lot in 1705-6.

10. George; b. Feb. 3, 1686-7, m. Elizabeth —, and d. Jan. 7, 1773.—Estate £311, 5s. When he was sixteen years of age, his father bound him, for two years, to his brother Stephen to learn the weaver's trade. When the two years were com-

pleted, Stephen was to give him "a loom and all things or geers suitable for worck-  
ing one sort of plain worck." George was the fifth of his father's sons who re-  
ceived bachelor privileges, he being accepted Jan. 1705-6. When his right was  
secured, he removed to Stratford, where he was residing in 1715. He returned  
to Waterbury before Dec. 1721, and afterwards lived near Scott's Mountain,  
(northeastern part of Watertown.)

11. Else; b. Aug. 1690; m. — Griffin and lived in Simsbury in 1733.

---

## CHAPTER XIII.

### ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS: MR. PECK'S MINISTRY.

It is well understood that New England was settled by Congregationalists from Old England, who desired to get quit of a church establishment which they did not approve, and to set up religious worship and a church government which should accord with their peculiar views. By settling in this far distant country they hoped to escape the persecutions which non-conformity had brought upon them at home. They loved civil liberty, but chiefly as a means of securing freedom for themselves in the church. They sought to establish a government and a religion based on the Bible, and which should be administered, even in matters of detail, according to the Divine will.

The colonists of Connecticut took good care to provide for the interests of religion. They were not slow in granting material aid. The committee for the settlement of Mattatuck, in accordance with a provision in the original articles, reserved three proprietries of £150 each, for public and pious uses. These were the three "great lots" mentioned in the early records. It was designed the minister should have one of them, "the mayger part of the inhabitants" to determine which. His was a larger interest than was allowed to any other individual. It was larger because the minister was a

more dignified and important personage than any other. The propriety was entitled, from the first, to all the divisions and privileges of the other proprieties.

Besides the provision which has been mentioned, the committee, Nov. 27, 1679,

Determined that the hous lott of two acres lying att the east end of the town, abutting northwardly on thomas warners hous lott and a peec of meadow and swamp containing about fifteen Acrs by estimation lying upon Steels brooke abutting vpon the north on Edman [Edmund] Scoote Jun<sup>r</sup> on Thomas Judd Junor on the east and on a hill south and west—And a peice of land: containing by estimation thre acrs lying in the pasture land comanly so called: Shall be and remain for the occupation and improuement of the minister of the s<sup>d</sup> towne for euer without any alteration or disposall vce or improuement what soe euer.

The house lot in the preceding extract was on the east side of Bank street, a little south of the present Baptist Church. It was called the "parsonage," and was exchanged, without any right, by the town, Dec. 30, 1679, with Stephen Upson, (it was afterwards recorded as belonging to said Upson,) for a lot of two acres, lying further to the east and south, and in the rear of Upson's house lot. This rear lot was afterwards sequestered by special act of the town, as follows:

April: 10: 1699 y<sup>e</sup> town by uoat did sequester y<sup>e</sup> lot at y<sup>e</sup> east end of thomas worner Stephen ubson and richard porters hous lots to be and remain to y<sup>e</sup> pasnag.

The lot of "three acres in the pasture land," afterwards called "the little pasture," was the late "parsonage lot," lying between Willow street and the old "Long Cove," through which the Hartford and Fishkill Railroad was laid out.

The first settlers of Waterbury were, in a majority of instances, members of Mr. Samuel Hooker's church and society of Farmington. In removing, they deprived themselves, for the most part, of the ministrations of the Gospel. As they were a "go-to-meeting" people, they felt this to be a sore deprivation. They not only had no regular preaching, but they had nobody to officiate at the burial of their dead, or to perform the ceremony of baptism. For many years they had to go to Farmington, twenty miles, to get their children baptized. They doubtless had occasional preaching. As they had a minister's house already built at the time Mr. Peck was invited to settle, they probably had a minister

residing with them a part of the time. But they needed an ordained pastor of their own, and at the earliest moment, when their circumstances would allow it, they took steps to procure one. They gave a "call" to Mr. Jeremiah Peck of Greenwich, as follows:

Att a meeting of the proprietors of watterbury march the eighteen: 1689: [1690, N. S.] they did unanemussly: desir: m<sup>r</sup> Jerimy peecke sen<sup>r</sup> of grinage: to setle with them in the worcke of the ministry: Att the same meeting for the incouragement of m<sup>r</sup> peecke aboue said: the proprietors gaue him the houss built for the minester: with the hom lote: att his first entarans ther: with his famely:

Att the same meeting the aboue said proprietors of waterbury granted: m<sup>r</sup> Jeremy peek: of grinag: the other alotments: or seuerall deuisions: belonging to the minesters lote so called: prouided: he cohabit with them four yeres: : and if the prouidens of god: so dispos that he shod dye befor the four yers be out it shall fall to his heirs.

At the same meeting the proprietors Granted to Caleb and Jeremiah Peck the two House Lotts Laid out to the great Lotts one buting westerly on Abraham Andruss his home Lott the other on ben Jones his home Lott and one of the Great Lotts of Medow with the Seuerall Divisions of upland upon Condition they build Each of them A tenentable house that Is to Say a house upon Each home Lott and dwell with ym four years.

In order to provide for Mr. Peck's support, the proprietors entered into the following agreement. It bears no date, but is recorded in connection with the votes which gave the call, &c. It was probably signed at the same time, or soon after the votes were passed. There is evidence of this, (were any needed,) to be gathered from the names appended to it.

In Consideration of settling the reuarant: M<sup>r</sup> Jerimy peecke in the worcke of the menestry: amongst vs: in watterbury: we whos names: are vnder written: doe ingage: to pay to the aforesaid: m<sup>r</sup> Jerimy peecke according to our yerly grand leuy eeth: of us: our proportions of sixty: pounds by the yere: to be payed fifty: pounds in prouition pay: and ten pounds in wood and thus to doe yerly

Robert porter :	John brownson	John newill
Thomus Judd sen	Samuel hickox	Abraham andrews sen
John standly	Obadiah richards	Daniell warner :
John wilton sen	pilip Judd	beniamin barns
Edman scoote sen	Abram Andrews	Thomus richardson
Isaac brownson	Thomus Judd Ju	Timothy standly
Joseph gayler	Thomus warner :	John hopkins :
Daniel porter :	Edman scoot Ju	steuen vpson
	Thomus newell	

Mr. Peck accepted the invitation extended to him. He probably began to preach, regularly, for the Waterbury people,

as early as the summer of 1689, and removed into the town with his family, in the beginning of the following year. But his formal settlement was delayed for some time.

There was a law in existence, at this date, which declared "that no person, within this colony, shall in any wise imbody themselves into church estate, without consent of the general court, and approbation of neighboring elders." In obedience to this requirement, the following petition was drawn up and presented :

To the honored General Court our humble salutations presented : wishing all happiness may attend ye : we at least some of the Inhabitants of Waterbury being by the goodness of God, inclined and desirous to promoue [promote] the concerns of the Kingdom of Christ in this place by coming into church order : do find : which we well approue of: that it hath been ordered by the honoured General Court: that no persons within this Colony shall in any wise imbody: themselues into church estate without the consent of the General Court and approbation of the neighbour churches, wee humbly request ꝑe consent of the honoured General Court now assembling : that we may as God shall giue us Cause and assistance proceed to the gathering of a Congregationall Church in this place, and for the approbation of neighbour Churches we desire it and intend to seek it. So being unwilling too long to prevent your Honors from other emergent occasions, we in breuity subscribe ourselues in all duty your humble Seruants in the name and behalf of the rest of our Brethren.

From Waterbury. 91. May. 12.

JEREMIAH PECK  
ISAAC BROUNSOAN

The preceding document may be found in the first volume of Ecclesiastical Records, at Hartford. It is in Mr. Peck's hand writing, except the name of Isaac Bronson. It is written in a neat, almost elegant, hand. I have given, in another place, fac similes of the signatures with the date. The Court's action on the petition may be seen as follows :

May 1691. Mr. Peck and Isaac Brunson in the behalfe of the people of Waterbury petitioning this court [&c.] ——— This Court doe freely Grant them their request, and shall freely encourage them in their beginnings and desire the Lord to give them good success therein they proceeding according to call therein.

It was a practice among the early Congregationalists of Connecticut, when a church was to be "gathered," to select from among the brethren seven persons (males) who were termed the seven pillars. These chose their officers, including the pastor, who was usually one of their number. After the church was organized, other members were admitted by vote who

took part in the proceedings. The Waterbury church is understood to have been formed after this method with seven male members, who were the pillars;\* but Dr. Trumbull states, in his History of Connecticut, that the method in question was peculiar to the churches of New Haven, Milford and Guilford; "the churches in the other towns being gathered, by subscribing similar confessions of faith, and covenanting together in the same solemn manner, upon days of fasting and prayer. Neighboring Elders and churches were present on those occasions, assisted in the public solemnities, and gave their consent."

At what precise time the church of Waterbury was organized, I have been unable to ascertain. Dr. Trumbull says, "August 26th, 1669," and Mr. Farmer, in his Genealogical Register, gives this as the date of Mr. Peck's ordination. Probably Mr. Farmer copies from Trumbull. I once supposed that "1669" was a misprint for 1689, and that the last was the true time of Mr. Peck's settlement. Others have entertained a similar opinion. This, however, cannot be the proper explanation. Some of the Waterbury people were admitted members of the Farmington church as late as March, 1690-91, and their children were baptized there down to April, 1691. Indeed, Mr. Peck and "the brethren," as we have already seen, did not get permission of the General Court to "embody themselves" till the May Session, 1691. In all probability the installation, or ordination, took place soon after, possibly "August 26th," as in Trumbull. I say installation, or ordination, for it is not quite certain that Mr. Peck had been previously ordained, though he was then nearly seventy years of age. It has been supposed that he was an ordained minister while in Greenwich, and as strong circumstantial evidence that he was so, the recorded fact is adduced that he was complained of about the time of his removal to Waterbury, by some of the people, in a formal manner, because of his "refusing to baptize their children."† If he had no authority to baptize, nobody could have complained of him for refusing, &c. And

---

\* Manuscripts of Bennet Bronson.

† Manuscript letter of Darius Peck, Esq., Hudson, N. Y., from whom I have received interesting information concerning his ancestor. I am also largely indebted to Mr. Judd of Northampton.

yet, if he had authority, why did he not baptize the children of Waterbury, after he began to preach, and before his formal settlement? "No half-way covenant" question, it is believed, existed here, as there probably did in Greenwich. At any rate, the children were those of professors, and yet were carried to Farmington for baptism.

Again, it appears from the records of Greenwich that Mr. Peck performed the ceremony of marriage there as early as 1681; but the statute permitted no one to do this except magistrates, commissioners, justices of the peace and ordained ministers.

Who the seven male members were I am unable to say with certainty, except that Isaac Bronson was one of them. Mr. Peck himself may have been another. There can be but little doubt that John Stanley and Thomas Judd, Sen. were also of the number. The other church members were Obadiah Richards, Abraham Andruss, (cooper,) John Hopkins, (probably,) Joseph Gaylord, Thomas Judd, Jr., Benjamin Barnes, and Thomas Judd, son of William. All these, except Mr. Peck and John Hopkins, had belonged to Mr. Hooker's church of Farmington, the four last having been admitted within two years. There were no other known male members of churches.

Thomas Judd, the son of William Judd, or Thomas Judd the smith, was the first deacon of the Waterbury church. So says his tomb-stone, still standing, and there are not sufficient reasons for doubting it. Still, there are some circumstances which render it improbable that he was appointed at the organization of the church, in 1691. He did not become a church member till March 22d, of that year, he then being under twenty-nine years of age, as shown by the Farmington records. It is not probable that a man would have been chosen for deacon who had been a member of the church but a few months, especially if he was young in years as well as religious experience. There were persons then living who had been long members, who were older and better known than Judd, some of whom, we may suppose, would have been selected in preference, had a deacon been chosen as early as 1691. John Stanley, Thomas Judd, Sen., and Isaac Bronson, for aught that appears, were every way qualified for a respon-



... his  
... 1806. Had  
... certainly,  
... such an  
... was  
... with decency  
... Judd  
... 27th, 1806. This  
... for many  
... save in  
... more exalted  
... the eccle-

... Judd was  
... 1805, four  
... should  
... noble  
... were

... than  
... death. His  
... 1806.  
... 1806.



*Ambrose Ives*

*Rev. James M.*

sible place in the infant church. Why some one of them was not made a deacon at the outset, I am unable to say.

Thomas Judd, known as the son of William, or the smith, was thus called to distinguish him from his uncle, and his cousin of the same name. He is uniformly thus termed, whenever mentioned in the records, previous to 1696. Had he been deacon at an earlier date, he would most certainly, unless from carelessness, have been so denominated. Such an office, in those days, when titles were not so cheap as now, was no slight affair for a young man. It could not with decency have been forgotten or overlooked. For the first time, Judd is called deacon, on the town records, March 27th, 1696. This title was sufficiently distinctive, and afterwards, for many years, was applied to him with scarcely an exception, save in legal documents. At last, however, he won a more exalted honor. He became captain of the train-band, and the ecclesiastical was sunk in the military title.

It appears quite probable then that Dea. Thomas Judd was not appointed to his office in the church till about 1695, four years after Mr. Peck's settlement. Why the church should so long have neglected to make this appointment, I am unable to explain. Similar instances of delay, however, were occasional, and may have been common.

No sooner had Mr. Peck been settled in the ministry, than the want of a meeting house became painfully evident. The following is a petition, copied from the colonial records, presented to the General Court for assistance. I am not aware that the petitioners got any help :

[May it] please the honourable Generall Assembly to take into their serious consideration the Condition and Request of your humble and louing seruants the inhabitants of Waterbury as to our Condition the prouidence of God and that in seuerall ways hath brought us low by losses of the fruits of the earth, losses in our liuing stock : but especially by much sickness among us for the space of the last four years: we liue remotely \* \* \* our affaires cost us much Charge, pains and hardships, as to our Petition and that which we desirest is your encouraging and assisting of us we hope in the work : yet too heauy for us : viz the building of an house conuenient for us to assemble in for the worship of God such an house we doe more and more find very great need of [&c.] much we could mention by way of persuasion : but we are preuented of time and we hope that a few words to the wise will be sufficient, it may be considered that we haue been often at Charges in sending forth horsmen for the timely discouery of an approaching ene-





mie which hath been or might haue been some safeguard to our neighbours in other Townes, for this our Scouting we haue had publique recompense, we also haue had farr more trouble than some other Towns in the Colonie by the Souldiers passing to and fro and their often entertainments with us which hath occasioned much expense of our time [&c.] We also are anformed that we shall not be the first that haue publique assistance in the like work in this Colonie we hope right worthy Sirs that you that are the Patrons of this Christian Commonwealth; will be pleased to giue us further encouragement to build God's house—the encouragement which we doe particularly petition for is that our Publique rates may be giuen to us for the space of the four next ensuing years, we find in holy Writ that some whose spirit God hath Stirred up haue been famous in promoting such a work: as Daud and Solomon, we hope and trust we shall haue a placid return fro<sup>r</sup> our Worthies upo<sup>n</sup> whom our eyes are: So we remain your humble and needy Petitioners and Seruants—From Waterbury Anno Domini—91, October. 7.

In the name and on the behalf of the rest of our inhabitants,

John: Hopkins } Townsmen.  
Thomas Judd }

Under the greatest discouragements, the Waterbury people went on with their enterprize of building a meeting house; but they made slow progress. It was a serious work, and they were obliged to resort to various expedients.

May 17 1694 y<sup>e</sup> town by uoate agree to use or improue y<sup>e</sup> money y<sup>t</sup> now is or here after shall be due for wild horses y<sup>t</sup> are sould in y<sup>e</sup> town—we say to improue it for y<sup>e</sup> helping build y<sup>e</sup> meeting hous and to stand by y<sup>e</sup> officers y<sup>t</sup> sell them and hereafter to a low thos y<sup>t</sup> bring in such horses y<sup>e</sup> one half.

The wild horses referred to in the preceding extract were those that were found running wild without known owners, and which were occasionally caught and brought in.\*

I am unable to say when the new meeting house was finished, or so far finished that it could be occupied; but probably soon after the date of the town action concerning wild horses. It stood on the Green in front of the house marked on the map William H. Scovill, now owned by Dr. P. G. Rockwell, near the spot where the two next succeeding Congregational houses were placed. It was a small building without glass or gallery, suited to the humble circumstances of its projectors. It had doors upon the east, west and south sides, three in all.

Mr. Peck was an old man when he became the minister of

---

\* The law required that every horse two years old should be branded with the town mark by the town barnder. The brand for Waterbury was R. Thomas Judd, smith, was the first record- ed town brander.

Waterbury. In a few years, his health broke down, and he was unable to preach. He was not well enough to officiate in baptism as early as June, 1697. Afterwards a minister was hired; but Mr. Peck continued the pastor till his death, June 7th, 1699, at the age of 77. But few memorials remain of him during his residence in Waterbury. Appearances, however, indicate that he was a man of worth, and devoted to his people. If a minister's success is measured by the additions to his church, his was not great. There were but few accessions during his life, and for several years afterwards. It was a time of embarrassment and distress, as already related. The peaceful virtues of religion are not wont to prosper when the state is in jeopardy and men are suffering in their material interests. As a general rule, it is not the tendency, however much it should be, of war and worldly calamity, of sickness and bodily suffering, to improve the heart, or mend the life.

Jeremiah Peck, according to Mather's *Magnalia*, was graduated at Harvard College, but his name is not upon the general catalogue of 1854. He was in Guilford, either preaching or keeping school, in 1656, (before which time, no trace of him has yet been found,) and married, Nov. 12th of that year, Johannah, daughter of Mr. Robert Kitchell, a prominent citizen of Guilford, (afterwards of Newark, N. J.) His son Samuel was born there Jan. 18th, 1659. In Jan. 1660, he was invited to take charge of the Collegiate School at New Haven, his father being at the time one of the trustees and the business agent. The following is an extract from the colonial record of New Haven :

June 26 1660 It was agreed that Mr. Peck now at Guilford should be school-master and that it should begin in October next when his half year expires there he is to keep the school to teach the scholars Latin Greek and Hebrew and fit them for the College and for the salary he knows the allowance from the Colony is £40 a year.

This school is now called the Hopkins Grammar School, in consequence of the bequest of Gov. Hopkins. Besides the £40, Mr. Peck had the use of a house and some land. He probably began to teach in Oct. 1660, and continued until the middle of the next year. May 29th, 1661, the colonial record of New Haven says, "Mr. Peck the schoolmaster propounded

16 questions about the school which the Court answered and Mr. Peck seemed to be very well pleased."

In Sep. 1661, Mr. Peck was again in Guilford, and while there, in the fall of 1661, received an invitation to preach in Saybrook. He entered into an agreement with the Saybrook people, Sep. 25th, 1661, by which he was to have £100 settlement in lands in fee and £55 in a house and lot, the last to revert to the town, provided he removed within five years. He was also promised a salary of £60 per annum, two firkins of butter to go towards it, the rest to be paid in corn and flesh at current prices, his maintenance to be increased if necessary.

Some have supposed that Mr. Peck must have been ordained at Saybrook. The agreement he entered into, his £100 settlement and his building a house, look like arrangements for a permanent residence, and render the supposition plausible.

After a time, the Saybrook people became dissatisfied with their minister, and Mr. Peck addressed to them the following communication :

Anno Domini 63 feb. 2

Respected and loving friends the Inhabitants and planters of Seabroke I understand and that from divers [sources] that there is much Dissatisfaction with Reference to my selfe in respect of my proceeding in the Ministry at least to a settlement and that there are desires in many to provide themselves with a more able Help: I do freely leave myself to the providence of God and the Thots of his people: and so far as I am any wayes concerned herein I doe leave the Towne wholly to their own Liberty to provide for themselves as God shall direct: and with respect to laying aside the future Term of years expressed in the Covenant as also of laying me aside from an Employment of so great a concernment I do desire that these Things may be duly considered and dealt tenderly in that I may not be rendered useless in further service for God: altho I am unworthy to be improved so I am yours in what I may as God shall please to direct and enable.

JEREMIAH PECK.\*

The controversy with Mr. Peck was settled Jan. 30th, 1665, (1665-6,) the town confirming and "giving him full possession of his accomodation." He appears to have left soon after, the town purchasing the house which he had built, for his successor, Mr. Buckingham.

In 1664, Mr. Peck was concerned with others in the purchase of the Indians of a large tract of land between the Raritan and Passaic rivers in New Jersey, on a part of which the

---

\* Stiles' Itinerary, Vol. III, p. 122, Yale College Library.



city of Elizabethtown now stands. In the next year, 1665, the union of the Connecticut and New Haven colonies took place. Mr. Peck was one of those who perseveringly opposed the union. A party of dissatisfied persons, chiefly from Branford, Guilford and Milford, headed by Mr. Pearson, determined to remove. A committee was sent out to view lands on the Passaic, who made a purchase at Newark. A plantation covenant was entered into by the intended emigrants, which was "subscribed from time to time, until the removal, which happened June 24, 1667." The name of Rev. Jeremiah Peck, of Guilford, stands fourth on the list of subscribers.

Mr. Peck removed to Newark in 1666 or early in 1667. He does not appear to have officiated regularly as a minister at Newark, or anywhere in New Jersey. In 1672, he and others purchased of the Indians a tract of land, now the western part of the town of Greenwich, over the people of which town he was invited to settle as a minister. He declined the call, but in 1678, it was renewed, and he accepted. In the same year, he removed to Greenwich.

In consequence of Mr. Peck's poor health, the Waterbury people obtained, in 1698, the assistance of Rev. John Jones. He preached seven sabbaths, and for this service the town voted Nov. 14th, 1702, that he should have six pounds, to be raised by tax. From this delay of payment, we may infer that our ancestors, whatever other virtues they may have had, were not prompt in discharging debts.

After Mr. Jones left, Rev. John Reed preached, for a time. His performances pleased the people, and as Mr. Peck was not expected to recover, an invitation was given him to settle, as appears from the following town vote :

Feburary : 8: 1698-9 the town hauing by a comity giuen Mr. John Reed a Call to y<sup>e</sup> worck of y<sup>e</sup> ministrey amongst us acsept what they haue don in it and do now renew our call to him in order to y<sup>e</sup> worck of ye ministrey a mongst us

Att y<sup>e</sup> same meeting the town granted to y<sup>e</sup> ministrey a salary of 50P by y<sup>e</sup> yeir prouition pay and 10P in wood and y<sup>e</sup> use of y<sup>e</sup> pasnage lands y<sup>e</sup> town for y<sup>e</sup> incuragement of Mr iohn Reed if he acsept promis to giue him 20P ayeir for too yeirs to be payd in labor and lft Judd deac Judd Ens Standly and srg brunson was chosen to present our proposals to s<sup>d</sup> Mr. Reed and treat him consrning y<sup>e</sup> same

Att y<sup>e</sup> same meeting y<sup>e</sup> town granted to y<sup>e</sup> minister y<sup>e</sup> should settell and be an ordained officer in y<sup>e</sup> church after he has bin ordained too yeirs y<sup>e</sup> whole

of y<sup>e</sup> great lot with y<sup>e</sup> proprieti to be his own and to build him a hous 36 or 38 foots long and 19 foot wide [;] build two chimbleys from y<sup>e</sup> ground a chamber chimbley [;] make or dig and ston a sellar clabbord y<sup>e</sup> hous and shingel it [;] make one end of y<sup>e</sup> hous fit to lue in [;] which hous is to be y<sup>e</sup> ministers on y<sup>e</sup> same conditions y<sup>e</sup> land is

On the 15th of May, 1699, the town voted to give five acres of upland to the minister that should settle, and July 10th, following, renewed the call which had been given to Mr. Reed. At length, Mr. R. declined the invitation, thinking, probably, that he could "do more good" somewhere else. But the people persevered, Mr. Peck being now dead.

Att a town meeting august: 21: 1699 deac Thomas Judd was chosen a comitty to indeviour by himself and y<sup>e</sup> best counsell he can take to get one to help us in y<sup>e</sup> worck of y<sup>e</sup> ministry and to bring a man amongst us upon probation in order to settlment if he can

Sep: 12<sup>d</sup>: 1699 John hopkins was chosen a comity with ye Deac for geting a minister

In the mean time, the people went on with their enterprise of building a house for "y<sup>e</sup> minister y<sup>t</sup> should settell." The old one had been given to Mr. Peck, and a new clergyman would want suitable shelter. A committee, consisting of Deac. Judd, John Hopkins and Benjamin Barnes had already been appointed to superintend the work. The extracts below refer to this enterprise:

March 10d: 1699 [1698-9] y<sup>e</sup> town granted a Rate of 8<sup>d</sup> on y<sup>e</sup> pound for Carry- ing on y<sup>e</sup> work of y<sup>e</sup> ministers hous to be Raysd on y<sup>e</sup> present leauey accepted or proued at y<sup>e</sup> last october court in: 98: each man to do his proportion in worck and he y<sup>t</sup> fayls haueing his worck appoynted or called to worck by y<sup>e</sup> comitty shall pay in prouition pay or y<sup>t</sup> which is equeulent

Iun: 20d: 1699: the town mad choys deac thomas Judd to procure nayls for y<sup>e</sup> clabord and shingling y<sup>e</sup> ministers hous and y<sup>e</sup> town ingag to pay for them in money or y<sup>t</sup> which is equieulent where he byes them

Att y<sup>e</sup> same meeting deac Judd John Hopkins and benjamin barns was chosen a comity for y<sup>e</sup> carrying on y<sup>e</sup> worck of y<sup>e</sup> ministers hous to y<sup>e</sup> perfeting y<sup>e</sup> worck y<sup>e</sup> town has promised to do to it

October: 12d: 1698: y<sup>e</sup> town granted a Rate of a halfpenny on y<sup>e</sup> pound to be Rayed on y<sup>e</sup> new leuey which rate is to be payd in currant siluer money or y<sup>t</sup> which is equieulent bareing its own charg to y<sup>e</sup> merkit for to bye nayls and glass for y<sup>e</sup> ministers hous\*

---

\* I find at the beginning of the first book of town meetings what appear to be copies of subscription papers to furnish in part the means to pay for the work and materials for the minister's house. They bear no date, but they doubtless belong to the time of which I am writing, (1699.) John Brohson, Joseph Hickox, Samuel Hickox and John Scovill, subscribers, must have

At first it was proposed to place the new minister's house on the house lot which had belonged to John Carrington, deceased, now owned by Green Kendrick, and to exchange for it the lot in the rear of Stephen Upson's house lot. Afterwards,, however, it was decided to set it on the "great lot," so called, which is now the corner of West Main and Willow streets owned and occupied by Mrs. Ambrose Ives. The following vote, relating to this subject, was passed April 10th, 1699 :

[The town agreed to] take of [off] y<sup>e</sup> obligation y<sup>t</sup> was layed on y<sup>t</sup> hous lot at y<sup>e</sup> west end of y<sup>e</sup> town lying by Robard Scotts hous lot and giue y<sup>e</sup> sd lot to y<sup>e</sup> minister alotment and set y<sup>e</sup> minister on it.

I know not what the obligation was which is referred to in this vote, unless the lot spoken of had previously belonged to the school propriety.

been the sons of the original proprietors of the same name. Possibly the subscriptions for glass and nails may have been rendered unnecessary and void by the half penny tax. The names on it are not crossed, though those on the other are, (with the exception of Obadiah Richards and Israel Richason,) the cross indicating payment.

Wheat for ye mason to pay after harvest

Samil Standly half a bushill wheat  
 Serg brunson half a bushill  
 isriel richason one peck  
 deac judd one bushill  
 John scouell half a bushill  
 ben barnes half a bushill  
 Ensign Standly half a bushill  
 tho warner half a bushill  
 john welton half a bushill  
 sam. hikcox half a bushill  
 Joseph hikcox half a bushill

thomas hikcox half a bushill  
 isriel richason half a bushill  
 Joseph gaylord jur half a bushill  
 obadiah richards half a bushill  
 wm hikcox half a bushill  
 benjamin worner half a bushill  
 John welton half a bushill [altered to one bushell]  
 setphen ubson half a bushell [altered to one bushell]

Wheat for nayles and glass to finish ye ministers hous

John Richards one bushill  
 obadiah richards half a bus  
 ensign Standly half a bus  
 Left judd half a buse  
 serg brunson half a bushill

John brunson half a buss  
 John hopkins half a bush  
 jeremiah peck  
 John Scouell half a bushill

## CHAPTER XIV.

## ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS: MR. SOUTHMAYD'S MINISTRY.

THE committee chosen to procure a minister, after Mr. Reed left, were successful. They obtained Mr. John Southmayd of Middletown. As early as November 2d, 1699, he had satisfied the people of Waterbury that he was the man for them. He was not yet prepared for a settlement, but he continued to preach. He received several invitations before he yielded to the solicitations of the people. The progress of the negotiations is explained by the extracts below. The provision made for his support may also be seen:

Nouembr: 2d: 1699: y<sup>e</sup> town mad choyc of Left thomas Judd Ensign timo. Standly deac thomas Judd srg Isaac brunson John hopkins a commity to treat [with] mr. John southmeat furdur in order to y<sup>t</sup> worck of y<sup>e</sup> ministrey a mongst us and for his incuragement in order to his settellment amongst us in y<sup>e</sup> worck of y<sup>e</sup> ministrey to ofer him what y<sup>e</sup> town haue granted to y<sup>e</sup> ministrey

Att y<sup>e</sup> same meeting y<sup>e</sup> town granted to y<sup>e</sup> ministrey 40 pounds in labour with what is dun al ready for fencing and cleareing y<sup>e</sup> hous lot and other lands for y<sup>e</sup> aduantage of y<sup>e</sup> minister y<sup>t</sup> shal settell amongst us

December: 18d: 1699 y<sup>e</sup> Town granted to mr. John southmeat for his worck in y<sup>e</sup> ministrey amongst us for what we haue had and if he continue amongst us till y<sup>e</sup> first of march next a rate of too penc on y<sup>e</sup> pound according to our gran leuey and grain to pay to him wheat at 5s pr booshill Ry at 3s indian corn 2s 6d poorck 3d pr pound beeff at 2d  $\frac{1}{2}$  pr pound all to be good and merchantable

Iun: 24d: 1700 Wheras y<sup>e</sup> town hauing had sum taste of \_mr. southmeets ministrey declare themselves satisfied and are willing to accept him as theyr minister to despenc y<sup>e</sup> word of god amongst them and desire y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> church in due season should settell him in gosple order amongst them

Spt: 23: 1701 samll hikcox and willyam hikcox was chosen a commity for to gather y<sup>e</sup> 20P granted to y<sup>e</sup> ministrey in worck out of which by y<sup>e</sup> town order they are to macke a well for mr. southmaid and any Refusing to do his proportion when cal there to by this act ye town impour y<sup>e</sup> commity to distrain y<sup>e</sup> estate of such persons for y<sup>e</sup> payment of his just due they giueing men seasonable worning

Syt y<sup>e</sup>: 15:—1705 y<sup>e</sup> town granted mr. Southmaid his hous and lands and propriaty in lands to be his own when he is an ordained officer in y<sup>e</sup> church here onely on these conditions y<sup>t</sup> if he leafe y<sup>e</sup> town before y<sup>e</sup> too yeirs are out after

his ordination then to return to y<sup>e</sup> town again but if he dy here in y<sup>e</sup> time to be his heirs.

Octobr y<sup>e</sup> 7<sup>th</sup>: 1703 Serg Izaac brunson thomas Judd iun<sup>r</sup> and Edman Scott was chosen to provide what was needful for y<sup>e</sup> entertaining y<sup>e</sup> elders and mesengers for y<sup>e</sup> ordaining Mr Southmaid [ \* \* ] they [to] keep a fayr account of it and giue it to y<sup>e</sup> townsmen that it may be payd in y<sup>e</sup> town Ratt

Early in 1704, there was unmistakable evidence that Mr. Southmayd was about to yield to the importunities of his people and consent to be ordained. Five pounds had been granted him "in speci," in addition to the salary which had been offered him; but now it was ordered that the vote which gave the five pounds addition should "be canceled," (a vote was canceled by crossing it with a pen,) and, at Mr. Southmayd's suggestion, that ten pounds should be given him in labor, "to be payd according to men's gran leauy annually." Benjamin Barnes, Sen., and Stephen Upson, Sen., were added to the committee for "treating with mr. southmaid."

March: 19<sup>th</sup>—1704 y<sup>e</sup> town desired their commity chosen to treat mr. southmaid for a settlement amongst us in ghospale order to proceed to obtaine an ordination of mr. southmaid as soon as may be with conueniencie

Mr. Southmayd was at last settled over a church of twelve male members and the people of the town. Dr. Trumbull gives, as the date of his ordination, May 12th, 1705, which is presumed to be correct. Why the ceremony was delayed so long may be perhaps conjectured. The truth is, Waterbury, at that time, was not a very inviting field of labor. The people were few in number and poor. Some of their best men had died. Others had run away. They had not yet recovered from the effects of the great flood. They were upon the borders of civilization and in the midst of an Indian war. A gloom had settled over the prospects of the town. No wonder a young minister should hesitate and procrastinate. Besides, pastors, in those days, were "settled for life," or something approaching it. They were not permitted to indulge in roving habits, or to seek frequently other and "wider" (more conspicuous?) fields of labor. They did not consider themselves at liberty to leave their flocks except for weighty reasons.

Mr. Southmayd was settled on a salary of £50 in provision and £10 in labor, the same which was paid Mr. Peck and offered

to Mr. Reed, except the first ministers were to have wood instead of labor. This may seem but a small salary, in the eyes of the present generation; but the truth is, in consideration of the times and the circumstances, it was a large sum. Few people can boast of having made greater sacrifices for the support of a regular ministry than the early inhabitants of Waterbury. In the midst of their calamities, numbering only about thirty families, they settled Mr. Peck, gave him a house, provided for his support, erected a meeting-house and a second dwelling-house for his successor, made provision for Mr. Southmayd's maintenance, gave him £40 in labor to fence and clear his home lot, &c., and a £20 "ratt in worck," besides contributing many "extras" not easy to enumerate, all in the space of a few years; while, at the same time, extraordinary expenses were incurred for building forts, maintaining scouts and looking after the enemy. I doubt if the people of the present day would as patiently submit to equal privations to secure the benefits of religious teaching.

A modification was made, by the agreement of the parties, in Mr. Southmayd's salary, Dec. 14, 1710, and the prices which provisions were to bear were fixed, as appears by the following town action:

The town ablig themselus to pay mr. southmaid ten pound in wood at 8s per cord and fifty pounds in prouison pay: : uis [viz] whet fue shilings pr busel ry at 3s per busel indian corn at two shilings six pens per besel: porke at three pens per pound all to be good and marchantabul: befe and flaxe and other pay to be at a prise as mr southmaid and the party consarnd shal agre: : also mr southmad shal not be abligd to take aboue one thurd part of his rat in indian corn and if any man se caus to pay any part of [the] rat in mony it shal be accepted at two thirds:

Ech man is hereby obliged to pay his rat yerly by the furst of february

[Same date] that artical too thurds in mony to be of no fors: but other ways as the party consarnd and mr southmayd shal agre

Jan. 9, 1718-19 it was agreed that the ministry rate shall be sixty pound in mony for the yeare 1718 and if any pay in prouison it shall be exsepted at following prises wheat at six shillings ry at foure shillings ingun corn at three shillings and sixpence a bushull to be marchantabul pork at 3 pence a pound flax at eight pence a pound

In 1720, the minister was to have "£60 as money," wheat at 5s., rye at 3s., corn at 2s. 6d., and ten pounds in wood, at half a crown a load for oak and three shillings for walnut. "Said sixty pound shall be paid or they [the town] will do

theire endeauer that it shall be paid by march next insuing the date heare of."

Mr. Southmayd's salary, in 1729, was raised to "seventy five pounds in money," one seventh or eighth part of it, if delivered by the middle of January, to be received in wood, at such price as the parties might agree on. In 1730, it was raised to "the just sum of one hundred pounds in current money of New England."\* In 1733, the town, after having at first refused to pay more than £80, agreed to give £90 money, wheat at 8s., rye at 5s. 6d., Indian corn at 4s., pork at 6d. per pound for that weighing two hundred pounds and forty-seven shillings per hundred for that weighing less. During the remainder of Mr. Southmayd's ministry, the salary varied from ninety to one hundred pounds.

In 1738, in consequence of declining health, Mr. Southmayd asked for a dismissal from his people. The following communication, expressing his desires, was laid before the town in town meeting:

To the Deacons and Townsmen In Waterbury to communicate to the Church and Inhabitants of sd Town.

Beloved Brethren and Neighbors I the Subscriber being under great Difficulty and Infirmy of Body and it being such as I fear Will never wear off, but Increase and Grow upon me, makes my Care and Concern very Burthensome and Distressing So that the publicke work I am engaged In Is too much for me and having served you under very great difficulty now almost two years and being Quite discouraged as to getting well and finding that a sedentary life is very Destructive to my health and being very far advanced in years and willing and desirous to Retire from my Publick work In the ministry In which I have been with you About 38 years to the best of my Ability and am now Desirous to Live more privately, I take this opportunity for these reasons and many more which might be mentioned to signify to you that I am willing and heartily Desirous that you would get some person can affect and pitch upon to come among you to preach the Gospel here and to Be with you in order to a Settlement as soon as conveniently may be In the work of the ministry and I desire you would be as Speedy In the thing as may be for I think I cannot serve you any Longer, which Request I hope you will be most Ready and forward to comply with and oblige your friend and Distressed minister, who Sincerely Desires your welfare and prosperity both Spiritual and temporal and his own ease and freedome. Desiring the continuance of your prayers for me I subscribe my Self your well wisher

JOHN SOUTHMAYD.

\* In 1731, Mr. Southmayd gave a writing, dated Dec. 26th, which is recorded, by which, in view of the burdens of the town, he agreed to "acquit and discharge the town from all the rates that were granted, due, owing and payable to [him for his] labour among them from the year 1699 to the year 1723," inclusive.

In reply, the town voted to call another minister, but expressed a wish that Mr. Southmayd might continue to officiate "as far as he should be able." At the same time, a committee was appointed, consisting of Mr. Isaac Bronson, Dea. Joseph Lewis and Thomas Clark, "to call a minister to preach the Gospel in order to a settlement." In this proceeding, however, they were required to "take the advice of the Rev. Mr. Southmayd and neighboring elders of the County, and proceed accordingly." On the fourth of September following, they were instructed "to apply themselves to the Reverend Mr. Saml. Whittlesey, Mr. Joseph Noyes, Mr. Samuel Hall and Mr. Isaac Stiles for direction as to a suitable person to be applied to."

There are no facts to show at what time Mr. Southmayd's official connection with the town was dissolved; but it appears to have been soon after his communication requesting a dismission, and before Sept. 4, 1738. He had an unsettled claim against the town. Some question regarding this was submitted to "the Association convened at Meriden in Wallingford in May," (1738.) In pursuance of a recommendation by this body, Mr. Southmayd made a proposal (Sept. 4, 1738) for a settlement of his claim. He proposed that the town should pay him one hundred pounds in money on or before the first of March, 1740, "separate from any other grant already made," and that he should have the use of the little pasture during his life. If this offer was rejected, he expressed a willingness to submit the question "to some indifferent persons to say what is just and reasonable to be done, [&c.] and abide by their judgment."

The town decided, "by a full vote," to pay the one hundred pounds. Before, however, the money became due, or in January, 1740, certain persons, "calling themselves churchmen," remonstrated against paying it. This remonstrance was signed by fifteen individuals.

Thus was commenced, in an open form, a controversy between the friends of Congregationalism and Episcopacy in Waterbury, and which ended, ere long, in confusion and dismemberment. So determined was the opposition to the one hundred pound vote that Mr. Southmayd did not insist on his



legal rights, and the money was never paid. He, however, retained the use of the "little pasture."

Rev. John Southmayd graduated at Harvard College in 1697. Little is known of him before he came to Waterbury. There is an anecdote, however, of his college life, which used to be related by the late Professor Hedge of Harvard. It runs thus:—Southmayd prepared a chair which was so constructed that when an unsuspecting person sat down in it, it suddenly gave way. When the Freshman class was entered, he would invite them, one at a time, to his room, (where his fellows had gathered,) and offer them the treacherous chair. All but the discomfited freshmen of course enjoyed the laugh. In the same class with Southmayd there was one by the name of Reed who was mischievous, and one Collins who was dissolute. A wag, to lit off the three, composed some lines which ran thus:—

Bless'd is the man who hath not lent  
To wicked Reed his ear,  
Nor spent his life as Collins hath,  
Nor sat in Southmayd's chair.\*

Mr. Southmayd was chosen town and proprietors' clerk in Dec. 1721, and was continued in the office till his death, thirty-five years. He wrote a round, plain, and in earlier life, an elegant hand, contrasting pleasantly with the execrable chirography of some of his predecessors. Its jet-black characters still look fresh. All who have occasion to consult the records, must have their hearts drawn out in affection for the accomplished clerk.

Soon after Mr. Southmayd's dismissal from his pastoral charge, or in 1741, he was appointed a justice of the peace. He was again appointed in 1747, and held the office till his death. He was a justice of the quorum from 1742 to 1746 inclusive, and a deputy to the General Court from 1740 to 1744 inclusive, and again in 1754. He was much respected, and occupied a large space in the history of the town of his adoption. Intelligent and judicious, his fellow townsmen honored him and deferred to him. They gave him many testimonials (such

---

\* Manuscript letter from Rev. Daniel S. Southmayd, Concord, N. H. 1829.

as they had to bestow) of their confidence and esteem. His honorable decent, at a time when family was of more account than at present, assisted to give him character. He was one of the largest landholders of the town, having become so by purchase as well as by division. His patrimonial estate was large. As an evidence of his extraordinary wealth, it is stated that he brought from Middletown, after his father's death, fifty pounds in gold and silver—a sum which, had it been laid out in the purchase of the best lands of the plantation, at the low price then current, would, it was thought, have proved ruinous to the town, by giving the owner almost a monopoly of the soil.\*

John Southmayd died Nov. 14, 1755, aged seventy-nine years and three months, outliving all his children except Esther, and all the original proprietors, so called. He made a will appointing Rev. Mark Leavenworth his executor. He names, as his legatees, Esther Starr, Susanna Bronson's children, Anna Bronson, and his two daughters-in-law, "Meliscent Judd, my son John's wife that was, and Hannah Southmayd, my son Daniel's widow." He gave £40 to the first church of Waterbury, "to be ordered and disposed of by the pastor and deacons of said church in what way and method they shall think proper and best." His slaves he disposed of in the following manner:—

4. My negro man Sampson and my negro Girl Fillis, if they be faithful, careful and industrious in helping to bring up my Grand children, William, Samuel, Anna, John and Daniel Southmayd, till the youngest be twelve years of age, then they may be free and live with any of my children they shall choose, or any other person, and if they live with any of mine, and should live to be a charge the charge to be levied out of my estate, except it should appear that those they have lived with have been considerably profited by them.

The inventory of Mr. Southmayd's estate amounted to £1,997, 14s. 8d. The homestead was valued at £133, 6s. 8d.; library at £9, 6s. 4d.; \$250 propriety at £12, 10s.; 2 brown cows, £4, 16s. 8d.; 1 young bay horse, £5, 16s. 8d.; 12 bushels rye, £1, 14s. 0d.; 4 bushels Indian corn, £0, 6s. 8d.; 8 bushels oats, £0, 6s. 8d.; 18 sheep, £3; Sampson and Phillis' time

---

\* Manuscripts of B. Bronson.

“during the time of the will,” £40. He owned in all 818 acres of land, appraised at £1,471, 3s. 7d. The standard of value appears to have been lawful currency, which, at this period, was at least eight times more valuable than old tenor currency.

Several alterations and improvements of the meeting house were made during Mr. Southmayd’s ministry, for the better accommodation and the increasing number of the people.

[Dec. 13, 1708] the town granted to several of the young men liberty to build a small seat or gallery in the meeting house for themselves to sit in it not [to] prejudicial the town or house

[At the same meeting the] town agree there should be a bench put up for a gallery at the west end of the meeting house upon the town charge

Febry 7: 1708-9: the town grant liberty to Mr. Southmayd to alter and enlarge the seat: at the west end of the pulpit:

[Dec. 14, 1713] the town agreed that there shall be a gallery built at west end of the meeting house: and that the doors and windows be repaired

October the 26—1715 the Town Granted a rate of half a penny on the pound as money for to purchase glass\* for the meeting house and the over plus for further repairing of said house

March 7—1716 it was acted by vote that there should be a ten pound rate made out to be laid out about the gallery of the meeting house and the said rate is to be paid in proportion pay, wheat at 4 shilling per bushell and rye at two and eight pence per bushell and corn at 2 shillings and flax seven pence per pound

December the 19 (1716 at the same meeting it was acted by vote to lay the foundation of the galleries of the meeting house that is all three sides of the said meeting house

Dec 16, 1718, “agreed by vote to give to Jeremiah Peck fifteen pound for what work he has done to the meeting house already and only further he is to finish the stairs and make four window frames for the same money

As the result of these movements, it appears that a gallery was put up at the west end of the meeting house for the purpose of making more seats, particularly for “the young men;” that the house was adorned with glass windows; that the doors were repaired and the building generally remodeled (in modern phrase) to suit it to the improved tastes of the times. All this seems to have been done at an expense to the town of fifteen pounds, Jeremiah Peck being the carpenter or contractor.

---

\* Up to this time, the house appears to have been unglazed. The glass of those days was diamond shaped.

The house now had additional seats, and it was found expedient that it should be newly seated. It was customary with our fathers to go through with this formality periodically, even in the absence of special occasions like the present. The first seating of which there is a record was in 1702. At such times, the seats were all classified, and each person's place assigned him according to the rule of rank which had been agreed upon. Rank was determined partly by age and partly by list or taxable estate. The following extracts from the record of town meetings show the nature of the proceedings on this subject, after the alteration and repairs had been made.

December 14 1719 it was agreed by vote that the meeting hous should be seated and the rule to do it by shall be by list of estate and by age reaconing one yeare in age to foure pound of estate

At the same meeting there was chosen for comity to seate the meetinghous cap Judd left hopkins docter porter

December 28 1719 it was agreed by vote that the forshorte seate in the gallery shall be deamed eaquall [in rank] with the pillar or 2 [nd] seate below, that is to say the 2 long seat[s] from the upper end

At the same meeting the above written act is made voide by passing a vote that the short seate in the gallery shall be eaquall or next to the short seate below

At the same meeting there was chosan by vote ens hikcox joseph lewis stephen ubson jur William Judd to sit in [the] fore short seate in the gallerre for the yeare insuing: and to tacke their turns yearly out of the foure first seates

But the people were not long satisfied with the old meeting-house, notwithstanding the improvements which had been made. A new, and it may be, *faster*, generation had come on the stage. The old building was found to be too small, and otherwise inconvenient. It was antiquated in style, and an eyesore, doubtless, to the "young men." The matter was brought up in town meeting, and a vote was passed, Jan. 7th, 1722-3, "that we will Go about building a Meeting house as soon as we are able, and that we will build it upon the Green." It was also agreed to apply "to the General Court in May next to Get a tax on all the Land laid out within the Town Bounds, and the money to be Disposed of to the building of a meeting house."

Though Waterbury had now started on the career of "progress," its advances were yet small. The people had not recovered from the dire calamities of former days. They were

still poor—out at the elbows; and the thought of new enterprises discouraged them, (at least the more prudent of them.) At the next meeting, therefore, a disposition was evinced to be content with present accommodations and such improvements as might be added. A vote was passed, Jan. 28th, 1722-3, appointing the townsmen and Lieut. Hopkins a committee “to make some alterations in the meeting house, as has been discoursed, that there may be more conveniency of siting, and the seats enlarged by taking up part of the stairs in the gallery and making seats there, and by stopping up the east and west doars and making there what seats the place will allow, and to mend the outside of the meeting house, and to raise the pulpit.”

I am not certain that the alterations contemplated in the above vote were ever made. If they were the people were not long satisfied with them. Their hearts were set on having a new meeting house, and they believed themselves “able” to build one. As a preparation for so formidable an undertaking, the proprietors voted, Nov. 29th, 1726, that the four proprietors’ lots which remained out of the six which had been reserved, in Nov. 1722, for special occasions, should be sold. Lieut. William Hickox, William Judd and Timothy Hopkins were chosen a committee to dispose of them. They were sold, Jan. 9th, 1726-7, to John Thomson, Joseph Wells and David Judson, all of Stratford, for £262, money. The purchasers became entitled to all the divisions, past and prospective.

The following votes explain themselves. They indicate stirring times :

Dec. 12, 1726 Agreed that we will build A meeting house forty foot wide and fifty foot Long

December 26, 1726. It appearing that there was some Dissatisfaction about a vote taken Decem. 12<sup>th</sup> 1726 with Respect to the Dementions of a meeting house we did by vote conclude that we would build a meeting house as big as was then concluded

Att the same Meeting It was agreed that the Comitty chosen to order that affair should have power to proportion the House as to Lenth and breadth with the advise of the workmen they shall agree with to build the house Making it of the same bigness as we have agreed upon

Att the same meeting the Town made Choise of A Comitty to order the Affair of building A meeting house as we have agreed and to Receive the money of the Comitty when they have sold the proprietors Lotts that were Devoted to the







*H. Holmes*

*1864*





design and to Agree with the workman that shall be set About the work and for A Committy were Chosen Left. John Hopkins Serj. John Scovill Isaac Brounson Sen. Dea. Thomas Hickox and Tho Clark

[In March, 1726-7, Stephen Hopkins and Lieut Hickox were added to this committee; but in December following, they were (with some roughness, as I judge) put out of office—"put out from being Meeting house Committe," says the record.]

At the same meeting [Dec. 26, 1726] we did by vote Impower them [the committee] that what Timber should be gott by perticular persons the Committy shall have power to Cull the timber and Refuse what they shall think not sutable to be improved in the work

Att the Same meeting the Town Granted a Rate of three pence on the pound to be paid Into the Committy by the last of may next for them to begin the work about the meeting house with

Feb. 27, 1726-7 [it being represented] that the timber and Other materials that the Committy had Agreed for and procured over did the Rate of three pence on the pound Some thing Consider Able we did by A vote Agree to add three pence on the pound to the Rate Granted In December 26, 1726, makeing the Rate Six pence on the pound. the town Charge for the year 1726 shall be paid out of the Six penny Rate.

June 2d 1727 It was by vote Agreed that the stakes set down at the east End of the old Meeting house shall regulate the seting of the new Meeting house, the North west Corner at the one stake and the South west Corner att the other stake.

At the same meeting it was by vote agreed that in Laying the Sills of the Meeting house they shall be laid two foot from the Ground on the highest Ground, and the stone work or under pining to be done accordingly.

March 13 1727-8 Lef Timothy Standly Declairing before the poprietors [meeting] that if they would quietly resign A Bachelors Lot to Him belonging to his original Propriety which he had been Kept out of he would make Sale of It and dedicate the money there of to the building the meeting house we are now about building. where upon the proprietors did by their vote Declare that they did resign the above sd propriety to the Said Lift Timothy standly he dedicating of It to the use above sd.

March 18th 1728 [1727-8] the Town made choise of Mr Nathaniel Arnold and Stephen Hopkins to cul the Shingles that have been Gott by perticular persons to be laid on the New meeting house—at the same meeting the Town made choise of James Balding with them to the same work of culing the Shingles.

Jan 13, 1728 [1728-9] the Town Granted a Rate of two pence on the pound on the List In 1728 to be Employed In Carrying on the work of the New Meeting house

Att the Same Meeting the Town by Vote agreed that the Committe for the Meeting House Shall procure the under flour In the Meeting House to be Laid Double

Thus the work went bravely on. It was a great enterprise, and drew heavily on the resources of the people. The necessary funds were raised in different ways. The town laid taxes, as we have seen. Individuals made donations. Dea. John

Stanley (of Farmington) gave eight acres of land in the sequester, and the proprietors sold some of the common lands. The avails of the sale of wild horses were set apart as they had been when the former house was built, in aid of the work. The house, it will be observed, was fifty feet by forty, or of "that bigness;" and as an illustration of the greatness of the work, as compared with the numbers and consequently the weakness of the people, it has been said that, at the time the frame was raised, the entire population of the town, men, women and children, could have found seats upon its sills. This saying possibly a little exaggerates the truth; for Waterbury must have contained, in 1727, more than three hundred souls.

I find in Dea. Thomas Clark's "account book," a charge against the town for "boording Mr. Thomas Dutton and his prentic from ye 10 april to the 4<sup>th</sup> of July in 1729—£7, 16s." I suspect, but do not know, that this Mr. Dutton was the "architect" of the new meeting house; that he was of Wallingford, and the father of Thomas Dutton, who settled in Westbury, about 1757, and became somewhat celebrated as a church builder and wood carver. The Waterbury meeting-house, according to the custom of the times, had some simple carved work in the interior. There is a brace in C. D. Kingsbury's barn, over the main door, which tradition says was taken from the old house, which may be regarded as a specimen of the work which adorned that venerable building.\* It seems entirely sound.

In June, 1729, the new meeting house, which stood close beside the old one and east of it, was so far finished that it could be occupied. It then became necessary for the town to enter upon the difficult and delicate business of "seating" the inhabitants. This seems to have been conducted with a scrupulous regard to the dignity of individuals. As the minister was the most reverend and respectable personage in the community, it was meet that he and his family should be first cared for. The result is recorded by himself as clerk—"June 30th, 1729, the Town by vote gave me, John Southmayd, the Liberty of Chuseing a seat in the new Meeting-house, and I

\* It is a part of the tradition that this brace was a part of the *first* meeting house. I have had some reason to fear, however, that it belonged to the second.

made choice of the pew next the pulpit att the East end of the pulpit for my family to sit in."

It was then voted that "the men should sit in the west end and the women in the east end of the new meeting house," and that "but one head should be counted in a man's list." So much being done, the meeting adjourned for further deliberation, perhaps. The next day, July 1st, after deciding "that age should be considered" in the business of seating, "Goodman Andruss and his wife, Lieut. Hopkins and his wife, Goodman Barnes, Serg. Upson, Sen<sup>r</sup>. and the Widdow porter were voted into the first pew att the west end of the pulpit." Andruss, Hopkins, Barnes and Upson were, at the time, at an advanced age, and were the oldest proprietors and earliest settlers then living in the town. They were the surviving fathers of the plantation. Hence the propriety of their occupying this high position in the new house—a place next in dignity to the minister's. "Widdow porter" was the widow of Daniel Porter, lately deceased, one of the original thirty. To Dr. Warner, now somewhat advanced in life, was assigned the second seat from the pulpit, on the men's side.

Having thus made a suitable provision for dignity and age, it was in order to look after the people at large. Having concluded "that all the males of sixteen years and upward should be seated," a committee was appointed, consisting of Dea. Thomas Clark, Samuel Hickox and Stephen Kelsey, to determine the rank of the pews and to place the inhabitants in them, according to rule. The rule of individual rank was founded on age and list, as on former occasions, one year in age to be the equivalent of forty shillings in the list. In making out lists, the committee were directed to take the three last, "on which the three rates were granted for the building of the meeting house."

No further movement appears to have been made towards finishing the house till Dec. 1730. It was then voted "to go on to finish the meeting house galleries within six months." A year afterwards, "a rate of two pence on the pound was granted towards defraying the charge of finishing the meeting house, and also for the town charge of the year past."

This house continued the place of worship for the whole

town till 1738, and for the first society till 1795, when a new house was erected. Repairs were made from time to time. In 1752, the town "voted to repair the meeting house by having windows in front of twenty-four squares of seven by nine, or nine by ten, with window frames." The old windows were to be used for the ends and back side. In 1769, "those who are seated in the seats" had permission, "at their own expense, to turn them into pews." In the same year, I find on record evidence of growing relaxation on questions of morality and propriety. In December, the town voted, for reasons not given, "that men and their wives may be seated together in the pews!"

It was not customary "in olden time" to have a chimney or fire in the meeting house. It was cold sitting, in a winter's day, through a long sermon, but the people were tough. Those who lived at too great a distance to return home till the day's service was over, would resort, in the intermission, to the nearer neighbors. As society advanced, however, "the sabbath day house," so called, was built. There the more distant inhabitants repaired, the morning service over, to thaw their frosty limbs before a rousing fire. There they ate the dinner and drank the cider which they had brought from home. The first notice of sabbath day houses in Waterbury is in 1743. In December of that year, "upon motion by some persons for liberty to set up sabbath day houses in the highway, the town appointed a committee to hear the request and appoint what place they shall build on." Nothing, however, appears to have been done at this time, and in December, 1751, "the town gave liberty to such farmers as have a mind to build sabbath day houses of setting them in the highway against sanday hollow, on the north side, above Thomas Bronson's." They were allowed ground twelve or sixteen feet in width, and twenty rods long, which appears to have been improved.\*

---

\* The subject of burying yards may require a few remarks. The old yard on Grand street is not mentioned in the early records of Waterbury now in existence, except incidentally. It dates doubtless from the beginning of the settlement. There the dust of our fathers was laid, though no monuments identify the earlier graves. In the old ground (the northwest portion of the present yard) were deposited all the dead of the town till 1709.

"April 11 1709 the seelect men of waterbury with the presens and consent of samll hickox Layed out and sequestered half an acur of land of said hickox one the southerd end of a hill at judds medow cald the pin[e] hill one the est side the riuer between thomas judd jur his land for a

The State's committee and the proprietors of the town, from time to time, as has already been stated, made the most liberal provision for the support of religion. Notwithstanding this, it was found, after Mr. Southmayd's settlement in 1705, that there was no adequate fund remaining. One £150 propriety reserved in the beginning, had been bestowed on Mr. Peck. A like propriety had been given to Mr. Southmayd. The mistake had been made of giving to the minister, instead of for the use of the minister. Only a few acres of land had been granted specifically for this last object—a house lot of two acres, three acres in the little pasture, and fifteen acres on Steel's Brook. Under these circumstances, and to provide for the permanent maintenance of the ministry, the proprietors passed this vote :

Dec. 13, 1715. It was agreed by vote that in the division now to be laid out there shall be a division of one hundred and fifty pound propriety laid out with it to be disposed of by the town for the encouragement of the Gospel in the town of Waterbury.

This right was not entitled to the bachelor accommodations ; and yet the divisions which, at different times, have been made on it, have amounted to many hundred acres, the income of which, had the land been well selected, would have supported several ministers. But the benevolent intentions of our ancestors were defeated. The lands designed to have been kept sacred for the maintenance of religious institutions have, with a single small exception, disappeared, as have the moneys derived from their sale. Soon after Westbury and Northbury were set off as distinct societies, dissensions began to prevail ; the people grew careless of their permanent interests ; and the

---

burying plas for that part of sad town or any other as shall se cas to mak use of it for sad use thaer one sad day the wife of danell warner was buryd: layd out by us with consent of the naborhood.

THOMAS JUDD SR  
STURM UPSON } select men."

This ground is on the hill on the east side of the present New Haven road, a little above the bridge in Naugatuck. When the writer was a boy, the earth often gave way on the precipitous western bank, carrying the exposed bones far down the hill towards the road.

In December, 1734, a committee was appointed "to purchase at town cost half an acre of land out eastward near Joseph Atkins for a burying yard." This was on the Farmington road, and is, I suppose, the yard now used in East Farms district.

In 1736, March 2d, the town bought for fifty shillings, of Enathan Taylor, "one acre and fifty two rods up the river [at Northead, or Northbury] on a plain by his house, or a little northward of it, and north of Twitch Grass Brook, a triangle piece, bounded east on highway, west on Joseph Gillet's land, south on common land"—"for a Burying Place to be sequestered and set apart for that use"—"to bury their dead in as they have occasion."

town, in town meeting, decided, Jan. 7, 1739-40, "after a long discussion and much opposition," to sell the ministerial estate growing out of the grant of 1715, (as it had authority to do,) "taking mortgages for the principal and bonds for the interest." It was designed to distribute the avails among the different societies. A portion of the land was sold by a special committee (of the town)—Samuel Hickox, Timothy Hopkins and John Bronson—as early as Jan. 24, 1739-40. Other pieces were disposed of soon after, the purchaser giving "security for principal and interest yearly at some set time, either by surety or land." Mr. Southmayd, the town treasurer, was chosen to have the custody of the notes and bonds taken in payment, "and to deliver the same to the several societies' committees when orderly called for," and said committees were authorized "to sue out the notes and bonds of particular persons, if there be occasion." The special committee was also directed "to make sale of the remainder of the [ministry] land, if under circumstances that it may be sold." At the next meeting, held March 30th, 1741, it was agreed that "the ministry land sequestered by the grand committee might be sold and the use of the money be to the use of the ministry in Waterbury." This land, consisting of the three pieces already referred to, the town, it is believed, had no control over. It could not be sold by the terms of the grant. It was to "remain for the use, occupation and improvement of the ministry of the town forever, without any alteration or disposal, [or other] use or improvement whatsoever." Nothing, however, now remains, with the exception of the "little pasture," (the parsonage lot of the First Congregational Society;) and how this happens to have been preserved is a marvel. In December, 1756, after it had been set at liberty by Mr. Southmayd's death, the proprietors voted that it should "be for the use of the several schools in the town of Waterbury, to be disposed of as the other school lands heretofore hath been." Next the town concluded to try its hand. In December, 1757, it "voted that y<sup>e</sup> select men shall rent it [the little pasture] out for y<sup>e</sup> insuing year and put y<sup>e</sup> money into y<sup>e</sup> town treasury." But neither the proprietors nor the town could properly have any voice in the matter. Much less could they

divert it from its original purpose. The land was given by the colonial government by its committee, and the grant, along with others made "for public and pious uses," had been ratified and made perpetual by the action of the General Court.

Again, in 1841, when the funds with which the society was to pay for the fourth new meeting house were not forthcoming, the committee who had charge of the business proposed to sell the parsonage lot. Bennet Bronson objected to this, and stated that the property could not be sold by the terms of the gift. He, however, saw no objection to leasing the land for a series of years, by which an amount approaching its cash value might be secured for the treasury, and offered himself to take a lease for twenty years, paying for the same three hundred and forty-four dollars. The proposition was accepted. When the lease had run about eight years, Mr. Bronson died, when, by direction of his will, the little pasture returned to the society, worth, from good husbandry, and the rise of lands in the neighborhood, many fold what it was when it went into his possession. May it remain for the use originally designed, "without any alteration or disposal," forever.\*

The friends of the Church of England attempted, at an early period, to obtain their proportion of the ministerial lands, or of the moneys arising from their sale. The town, however, took upon itself the business of distributing these funds, and the Episcopalians appear to have been out-voted in town meeting. In December, 1763, the town appointed Thomas Matthews, John Welton, Samuel Hickox, Jr., Abraham Hickox and David Warner, a "committee to examine the records concerning the ministerial lands and moneys, and make report to an adjourned meeting;" but at the next meeting, in February, a proposition to hear the report was "answered in the negative." But in 1770, the strength of the new sect was much augmented. They had become numerous in Northbury, Westbury and in all parts of the town. In this year, by uniting them-

---

\* Since the above was written, the land in question, all but a fraction, has been seized and appropriated, under its charter, by the Hartford, Providence and Fishkill Railroad Co. For about three quarters of it the company paid the society six thousand dollars. The money thus obtained has been invested in a house and lot on Leavenworth street, for a parsonage, now improved by the pastor, Rev. Mr. Woodworth.



selves with the friends of an equal distribution of all the school moneys to all the societies of the town, they were able to command a majority of the votes. A sort of "omnibus bill" was framed, which was passed March 12th, 1770. It embraced the two objects to which reference has been made. That part of it which relates more particularly to the ministerial funds is as follows :

And whereas, likewise, there are certain moneys in the abovesaid town appropriated to the support of the gospel arising from the sale of lands given by the proprietors, at their meeting Dec. 15, 1715, to be disposed of by the town for the purpose above sd, and the church of England claiming their equal proportion of the same, the town, at their present meeting, taking into consideration the above sd claims with respect to the ministerial and school money, agree by vote that the above sd moneys be forever hereafter divided according to the above sd claims, and that the societies and parts of societies that shall hereafter be made shall be entitled to a like privilege.

Against this entire vote, the committees (school and ecclesiastical) of the first society protested. The school committee's protest will be found in another place. That of the society's committee runs in this wise :

Whereas the town of Waterbury formerly (when consisting of but one ecclesiastical society) was possessed of certain large quantities of lands devoted to the use of the ministry in the same. And whereas, since the sd town has been divided into several ecclesiastical societies, the inhabitants of sd societies convened in a town meeting did formerly undertake by their votes to sell part of the sd lands, and to divide the interest of the moneys raised thereby to and amongst sd societies—And now the said inhabitants have also voted that a certain party called the church of England, (which had no existence in sd town when sd lands was granted to the use of the ministry therein,) shall have their equal proportion of sd moneys, all which votes are an affragement on the property of the first society of sd Waterbury and contrary to the laws of this Colony—Therefore we the subscribers, society's committee in sd first society, do enter this our protest more especially against the last of the above sd votes made this day, as it is also against law and equity and the most important rites and interest of this society and against the common sense and practice of mankind, and request the same may be recorded in the office of the town clerk in sd Waterbury. Dated March 12, 1770.

(Signed) Andrew Bronson, Joseph Hopkins, Ashbel Porter, Dan. Welton, Ezra Bronson, society's committee of the first society of Waterbury.

In the spring of the following year, (1771,) the first society, by its agents, Joseph Hopkins and Ezra Bronson, petitioned the Assembly for relief. They said that all the ministerial lands had been sold, except the little pasture, for £303, 14s. 6d.—that the interest had been divided among the several par-

ishes till March, 1770, when a dissatisfied party of Westbury, long discontented because they had not a share of the moneys derived from the sale of the western lands, (with the aid of certain Church-of-England-men,) assembled and passed the obnoxious vote. In August past, (the memorial continued,) Capt. Samuel Hickox and Abraham Andrews, a committee of Westbury, Jotham Curtis, a committee of Northbury, and Capt. Edward Scovill and Capt. Abraham Hickox of Waterbury, "for the professors of the Church of England," "met at the town clerk's office and carried off about three quarters of the whole interest of said ministerial money," &c.

The petition, which prayed that the money might be returned, or an order passed concerning the disposal of it, was denied.

But soon the Revolutionary war broke out. The Church-of-England-men sympathized with the mother country, and the vote which gave them a share of the ministerial money, was found in town meeting to be "a very jumbled, unintelligible one, and as understood by some, illegal and unjust, and inconsistent with the design of the donors of said lands." The obnoxious vote, therefore, so far as it related to the Church of England, was "declared to be entirely vacated and of no effect." The other parts of the vote were to "stand."

There was, perhaps, some informality respecting the meeting which passed this repealing vote, or in its action in reference to the same; for at a meeting held March, 1780, the vote was again passed, and put upon record.

When it was proposed that Westbury and Northbury should be set off as a distinct town, and the consent of Waterbury was asked, it was given on condition that the new town should relinquish all claim to the ministerial and school moneys. The act of incorporation said nothing about these moneys, and the question was left to be adjusted by the parties interested. In Dec. 1786, the town of Waterbury appointed Capt. Gideon Hotchkiss, Joseph Hopkins, Esq. and Mr. Daniel Byington a committee to settle "these matters" with Watertown. In December, 1787, another committee was chosen, consisting of Joseph Hopkins, Esq., Capt. Isaac Bronson, Mr. Josiah Bronson, John Welton, Ezra Bronson and Samuel Lewis, Esquires, to meet a committee of Watertown to settle the "con-

troversy," with full power "to relinquish such part of our claim to said property as they shall judge prudent," or to agree to leave the question to referees, or arbitrators.

In April following, the committee reported that they could not agree, each party thinking right was on its side. In December, 1788, a vote was taken and passed to choose a committee "to negotiate the matter with Watertown," and to settle it in such manner as they might think prudent, *provided* they could obtain favorable terms, &c.

When Farmingbury came to apply for town privileges, in 1787 and subsequently, the people of the old town took the same position as they did in the case of Westbury and Northbury, and were met by the same opposition.

In October, 1792, pending an application to the General Assembly for an act of incorporation, the town voted that if the society of Farmingbury would within eight days give the old town "a legal acquittance of all their right in the public ministerial and school moneys and other property," &c., then the town would not appear against the memorial of Farmingbury.

---

## CHAPTER XV.

### SCHOOLS.

CONNECTICUT has been long distinguished for its common schools. The Code of Laws established by the General Court in 1650 recognized their importance.

It being one chiefe project of that old deluder Sathan [says this Code] to keepe men from a knowledge of the scriptures, as in former times keeping them in an unknowne tongue, so in the latter times by perswading them from the use of Tongues, so that at least the true sence and meaning of the originall might bee clouded with false glosses of saint seeming deceiuers; and that learning may not bee buried in the graue of o<sup>r</sup> Forefathers, in Church and Common wealth, the Lord assisting our endeauors—It is there fore ordered by this Courte that euery Township [&c.]—[Trumbull's Col. Records, Vol. I, p. 554.]

The grand committee, when they reserved the three "great lots," doubtless had reference to the interests of education. I do not find, however, the school lot particularly mentioned in any of their proceedings. It would seem that the proprietors were allowed some discretion in the disposition of at least two of the lots in question. When Mr. Peck came to be settled, as an inducement, one of the £150 proprietries was divided, equally, I suppose, (in 1790,) between Jeremiah Peck, Jr., and "the school."\* In doing this, the proprietors doubtless thought they were securing the "public and pious" ends contemplated by the committee.

There is nothing to show when schools were first set up in Waterbury. A statute, however, required "that every Town having a less number of Householders than seventy shall Yearly from Year to Year be provided of a sufficient school-master, to teach Children and Youth to Write and Read for one half of the year," and "that each Town shall annually pay *Forty Shillings* for every *Thousand Pounds* in their respective Country Lists, towards the Maintenance of the School Master in the Town," &c. The earliest town record, on the subject of schools, bears the date of 1698. Here it is:

Decembr: 19d 1698 y<sup>e</sup> town granted 30s with y<sup>e</sup> last yeirs rent of y<sup>e</sup> scooll land for y<sup>e</sup> incuragment of a scoll for four moneths or longer if it can be obtayned and deacen Thomas Judd Ensign Standly & John hopkins was chosen a committy to endeuiour to procure one to keep scool to teach in righting as well as reading

[The first volume of the record of town meetings commences with the date of the above entry, and with page 98th, the paging being continued, probably, from some former book. Whether any separate record of the proper business of town meetings was made previous to this time is not quite certain.]

The extracts below show what was done by the town, from year to year, on this subject:

December: 18d: 1699 y<sup>e</sup> town granted 30 shiling and y<sup>e</sup> scoal money for y<sup>e</sup> incuragment of a scoal for three moneths

John hopkins benjamin barns and stephen ubson was chosen a committy to hyre a scoal master for three moneths if they can

Decembr: 21: 1702: benjamin barns senor and Stephen ubson senr was chosen a committy to hyr a scoolmaster for to keep scoal for thre moneths

Att y<sup>e</sup> same meeting John Richards and john judd was chosen a committy to

---

\* This appears, not from record, but from a petition to the General Assembly, April, 1771, signed by the society's committee, in reference to the ministerial moneys. In the earlier divisions of fence, the three reserved proprietries were entered as "great lots."

hire a scoal dame for to keep scoal in y<sup>e</sup> sumer and for y<sup>e</sup> end to make use of what money shall be left y<sup>e</sup> is due to y<sup>e</sup> scool for y<sup>e</sup> scoll land after y<sup>e</sup> scool master is payd [Dec. 5, 1704] serg. Isaac brunson and benjamin berns senr was chosen scool com<sup>ty</sup> to hire a scoolmaster to instruct in wrighting and reeding as long as they can and to haue what y<sup>e</sup> country .a lows for y<sup>e</sup> end and to hire a scoal dame to teach scool in y<sup>e</sup> sumer and for y<sup>e</sup> scool to let ye scoll land at sum publick meeting to be improved for y<sup>e</sup> sumer scool [&c.]

[Dec. 9, 1706] doct<sup>r</sup> porter and iohn Richards was chosen scool com<sup>ty</sup> to hire a scool master for three moneths and a scoal dame for y<sup>e</sup> sum<sup>r</sup> as fare as y<sup>e</sup> scool money will go

[Dec. 8, 1707] stephen upson sen and john scuill and john Richason wer chosn comiti to se after the bulding a scool hous which the town by uoat pased to be bult and the sd hous is to be bult fourteen foot wide and sixteen in length

December 28 1709 [the same persons] ware chosen a comity to cary on the work of bulding a scoull hous in said town

Fabry 20 1709-10 Thomas hickox was chosen a comity with dauid scott and Richard porter formerly chosen for this year for to hire a scool master to tech scoull and a dam if need be

October y<sup>e</sup> 18 1720 it was agreed by uote that thay would haue a rate of twelue pound for the riging up the scoll hous and other charge in the town so far as it will go

Thare was chosan for comety to see that the scol hous be dun and repared dauid Scott ser thomas brunson and stephen hopkins .

10 December 1723. It was Acted that the School Committe Shall yearly Demand the Country money [the money required to be raised by the colony law ?] And the Money that the School Land was Let for and pay the School And yearly Give an Account at our great town Meeting of their Receivings and Disbursements and their account Shall be Recorded.

The School Committe for 1723 which was Thomas Hikcox and Thomas Brounson laid y<sup>r</sup> accounts before the town that their Receivings were 6—9—0 and their Disbursements to the school 6—9—0 and that there was coming to the town 25 shillings in Doc. Worners hand and seven and six pence in Richard weltons hand for school land let to them.

These votes and memoranda of the town clerk prove the earnest endeavors of the early people of Waterbury, in a time of great embarrassment, to provide the means of an elementary education for the young. Though they appeared not to do as much, in every case, as the statute required, they doubtless did all that their circumstances permitted.

It is impossible to ascertain who were the early schoolmasters and "school dames" of Waterbury. There is reason, however, to believe that Thomas Judd, Jr., taught a school before he removed to Farmington, (early in 1709,) as has already been suggested.

For more than forty years after Waterbury was settled, there seems to have been no school in the town except at the center,

and no school house except the small one sixteen feet by fourteen, first occupied, probably, in 1710. There a school was taught by a schoolmaster for three or four months during the cold season of each year, and by a "school dame," "if need be," and one was to be had, in the summer. Thus our fathers got the little schooling they possessed. Thus are accounted for their literary infirmities. They were rough farmers living in a rough country and in a rough age. They were skillful in chopping, grubbing, hoeing and "moin," but had little leisure or taste for letters. They had not, for a long time, what may be called an educated man among them, except their ministers. They furnished no graduate of college for the first forty years, and no graduate settled in the town for the first sixty-three years.

After the population of the town had extended from the center in different directions, each neighborhood that would keep up a school, and had a sufficient number of scholars, was allowed a proportion of the school money. The first notice of these outside schools is in 1730 :

[Dec. 14, 1730] It was Agreed by Vote that at Judds Meadow According to their families they Shall have their School Money According to their list—And Woster Swamp and Bucks Hill Shall have the same privillidge provided Each party Keep and Maintain A school according to the Intent of the Law In that Case.

[Then follow lists of families at these several places. It will be noticed that Isaac Bronson is]placed with the Judd's Meadow people.]

Families at *Judd's Meadow* :—Serg. Joseph Lewis, Saml. Scott, John Andruss, Jos. Lewis, Jr., Edmund Scott, Jr., John Barnes, Saml. Barnes, John Johnson, James Brown, Ebenezer Hickox, Saml. Warner, Sen., Saml. Warner, Jr., Isaac Bronson. At *Woster Swamp* :—Jonathan Scott, Sen., Jonathan Scott, Jr., Gershom Scott, David Scott, Samuel Thomas, Ebenezer Warner, Ebenezer Richason, Doct. John Warner, Geo. Welton, Jas. Williams, Jos. Nichols, Jona. Kelsey, Abraham Utter, John Sutliff, Isaac Castle, Jos. Hurlbut, Henry Cook. At *Bucks-hill* :—Serg. Richard Welton, Richard Welton, Jr., Benj. Worner, John Worner, Obadiah Worner, Joseph Judd, Wm. Scott.

Dec. 10, 1734 Voted that A School be keep by A School Master the Whole year Following As the Law Directs beginning In January Next and to Be Keep Seven Months In the Town spot And Nine Weeks In the North west farms [Wooster Swamp] And Seven Weeks in the South farms [Judd's Meadow] provided that there be not less than Seven Scholers In the School And If they fail In Any part of the Town the Money to Go to those parts of the Town that Maintain the School With Scholars.

In 1717, an amended school law was passed, requiring each

town in the Colony having seventy families to maintain a school at least eleven months in a year. The above vote is the first indication that the families in Waterbury had reached that number, bringing them within the provisions of the law.

Decem<sup>r</sup> 12<sup>h</sup> 1737 It was voted that [the School for the year ensuing shall be kept twenty one weeks in the town spott and twelve weeks at Woster Society and six weeks up the river and six weeks att Judd's Meadow and also three weeks att Bucks Hill on such Conditions that said schools shall maintain seven Scholers at each School.

It seems intended in this vote to proportion the number of weeks which the school was to be maintained, in these several places, to the number of scholars to be accommodated in each. The same schoolmaster usually taught all the schools, going from place to place.

After a new meeting house had been erected, it was ascertained that the old school house was not in keeping with the other improvements on the green. A movement was made in Feb. 1730-31, designed to secure a new school house of increased dimensions and improved style. But the project was promptly voted down in town meeting. The people were not disposed to enter into new enterprises involving expense. In December following, however, they changed their minds, "and voted to build a school house of twenty foot square on the meeting house green." They changed again on the twelfth of December, 1732, and "concluded that they would not build a school house." At the same time they "allowed the charge of five pounds 9 shillings and sixpence, for geting and drawing timber for the school house, the timber to be the towns." We hear nothing more of the enterprise till December, 1743, when the town "granted liberty to set a school house where the old house stood." Each school district or society built its own house.

In December, 1738, a vote was passed to divide the school moneys among the different societies "according to their lists of estate." In December, 1749, the first society of Waterbury was divided into four districts for school purposes, to wit, Town Plot, (town center,) Buckshill, Judd's Meadow and Breakneck, each (provided fifteen scholars were furnished) to have its proportion of schooling and school money.

The school lands which came from the half of the £150 propriety were at first rented. The rents were considered as at the disposal of the town. They were appropriated, for a time, to various public objects, besides the maintenance of schools, without apparently any show of right. I observe, however, no instance of such misappropriation after 1714.

The renting of the school lands, the repair of the fences, and the care of them generally, occasioned much trouble and some loss. A committee was therefore appointed, in 1734, to devise a plan for the legal and proper disposal of these lands. They reported Dec. 10th, and recommended

That a Committee be appointed to make Sale of All the School Land and propriety belonging to the Same And that sd Committee make Sale of all the Meadow Lotts to the Highest Bider at Some public time and that sd Committee be Impowered to Give Deeds to Such persons as Shall Give most for sd Lotts and out Lands which Deeds Shall be held Good to the Grantee for the term of Nine Hundred Ninety Nine years and that the buyer Shall pay the Money Down or mortgage Lands for the Security of the principle and Give bonds yearly for the Interest of such Sums as he Shall Give for Such perticular Lands as he Shall So buy and that the sd Committee Shall Have A Seasonable time to [dispose of] the propriety and the Lands that are to be Laid out on Sd Right and it is to be understood that the out Lands Is not to be Sold att a vandue but to be Sold to the best Chap that Said Committee Can find and that the uses of the money which the Above Sd Lands Shall Fetch Shall be Converted to the use of the School in Sd Town for the Said Term of Nine Hundred and Ninety Nine years.

[Signed] Joseph Lewis, William Judd, Sam<sup>l</sup> Hikcox, *Committee.*

The Above Written Bill was past into a Vote.

The sales commenced almost immediately. John Bronson, Jr., bought the school and in Bucks Meadow for 40s. and one penny per acre. Three and a half acres at Long Meadow brought £14, 13s., Nathan Beard being the purchaser. Many parcels of divided lands not taken up were sold, at different times, for ten shillings an acre. The money obtained from the sale of these lands was to be managed by the school committee, who were to put it out at interest, "taking mortgage security from time to time." Dec. 11, 1738, a vote was passed to associate "the town clerk for the time being" with the committee in the management of these moneys. At the same time the town by vote directed that the receipts from the fund should be distributed annually among the different societies, according to their several lists of estate.



In settling the claims of the Hartford and Windsor proprietors to the lands in Litchfield County, the Colony obtained the quiet possession of seven townships in the western part of the County—Norfolk, Goshen, Canaan, Cornwall, Kent, Salisbury and Sharon. By the act of 1733, the lands in these townships were to be sold and the money distributed for the support of the schools in the Colony :

*Viz*, those schools that ought to be kept in those towns that are now settled, and that did make and compute lists of their polls and ratable estate in the year last past, and such towns shall receive said money, every town according to the proportion of said list, and each parish to receive in proportion according to their own list given in as aforesaid the last year ; all which money shall be let out, and the interest thereof improved for the support of the respective schools aforesaid forever, and to no other use. [Old Statutes.]


The money received by Waterbury from the sale of these "Western lands," so called, remained, after Westbury and Northbury were set off, in the hands of the old society. The latter claimed, with some plausibility, that the new parishes were not entitled to any part of it, and declined to pay over any portion. The other parties contended for a share, the proportion to be determined by lists of estate. The controversy waxed warm, and the town meetings were agitated by it. In December, 1741,

There having been considerable discourse about the money coming to the town for which the western lands was sold and granted for the use of the school, and not agreeing in what method it should be disposed of, [the town] did by vote agree that they would refer it to some indifferent gentlemen to be decided by them where the said money shall be disposed for the use above said, whether it belongs to the first parish, or should be divided among the several parishes, according to what their lists show in 1732.

The "indifferent gentlemen" (who were named by vote) were Col. James Wadsworth and Col. Benjamin Hall. A committee was appointed to wait on them, consisting of Capt. Hopkins and Serg. Thomas Porter, (of the old society,) Capt. Hickox, (of Westbury,) and Dea. Blakeslee, (of Northbury.) This plan of settling the difficulty, it is presumed, was not satisfactory to the discontented parishes ; for, it will be observed, their lists were, in 1732, comparatively small.







Amos Farvel

*J. Holly Linton 43*



Nor is it probable that such a settlement, though mutually agreed on, would have been final.

In 1751, the outside societies, now comprehending Westbury, Northbury and the part of Oxford belonging to Waterbury, secured by some means a majority of votes, in town meeting, and in December of that year, the following vote was passed :

It was voted that all the monies giuen to the sd town for the use of the school in said town that said town drew by their list in 1732, upon account of the sale of the new townships, or western lands, shall, for the future, be divided by the annual list of each parish, for the use of [the] school in each parish—and that A, B and C be a committee to take care of said monies, and see that the same be made use of according to the law in that case made and provided. And if either of said parishes shall neglect to keep a school according to law, then said committee shall have full power to divide the said monies to and between those parishes that shall keep their school as aforesaid, according to law ; that is to say by their respective lists as aforesaid.

The committee afterwards named to stand in the place of A., B. and C. were Capt. Samuel Hickox, Daniel Potter and Joseph Bronson. At the same time, certain individuals belonging to the first society, to wit, Dea. Thomas Clark, Doct. Benjamin Warner, Isaac Bronson, Robert Johnson, James Nichols, Lieut. John Scovill, Samuel Scott, James Porter, Thomas Bronson, Jr. and Lieut. Thomas Porter, protested against the vote, and desired that their protest might be entered on the records.

But it was necessary that the town's committee should first get control of the money in dispute which was now in the possession of the school committee of the first society. A vote was therefore passed, which is as follows :

Whereas the first society in sd town have by their committee taken all the monies and bonds that was given to sd town for the use of a school in sd town as aforesaid into their possession, and used the same for the school of said society only, for some years past—It is therefore at this same meeting voted that A, B and C be a committee in the behalf of said town to make a lawful demand of sd monies and bonds of the said school committees of the said first society, and upon receiving of the same, they, the said A, B & C, are hereby impowered to change the same when they become changeable by taking said bonds and notes unto themselves and successors, as a committee for said town for the time being, and for want of said committee, to the select men of said town for the time being, so as said monies may be disposed of for the use of the school[s] of said town as aforesaid, and in no other way.

The subject, however, does not appear to have been finally disposed of by the preceding action, and in March, 1770, it was again brought before a town meeting. A vote was passed declaring that thence forward the moneys derived from the sale of the western lands should be forever divided among the several societies and parts of societies of the town, whether then in existence or which might be brought into existence, according to their several "claims."

This vote gave, of course, great dissatisfaction to the first society, and the school committee solemnly protested against it, as follows :

Whereas the Hon. General Assembly [&c.] granted certain moneys [&c.] to the first society in Waterbury for the use of the schools in said first society forever\* —And whereas the inhabitants, [&c.] convened in town meeting, have voted [&c.] contrary to the laws of the colony—

Therefore, we the subscribers, school committee in sd first society, do enter this our protest against sd vote as being unlawful, inequitable and injurious to posterity —and request that the same may be recorded.—Dated this 12th day of March A. D. 1770.

[Signed] Jonathan Baldwin, Isaac Bronson, Jr., Ezra Bronson, Reuben Blakeslee, committee of the first society of Waterbury.

Also Mr. Isaac Bronson protested against the sd vote and desired the same might be recorded.

When the new societies came to be made independent towns, the disputes concerning the school and ministerial moneys were renewed, the old town setting up an exclusive claim. Controversy, law-suits, derangements of the currency and bad management finally settled all questions by dissipating all the moneys.

---

\* This, it will be noticed, is not the language of the law that made the grant.

## CHAPTER XVI.

## POPULATION INCREASES: IMMIGRATION.

PREVIOUS to 1710, but a single addition had been made to the population of Waterbury from foreign sources—that of Joseph Lewis. About 1710, or soon after, Thomas Clark joined the settlement. In 1711, Zachariah Baldwin from Milford, made his appearance, and was accepted as a £40 proprietor. In about two years, however, his courage had all oozed out. He sold everything, including “building and other timber,” and slipped away quietly. With these three exceptions, there were no accessions of settlers, or intended settlers, from other towns, till after 1720. The peace of 1713, however, had brought comparative quietness and security, and was followed by brighter prospects. Removals became less frequent. The young men who had given so much trouble were with less difficulty constrained to settle around the family homestead. Some of those who had quit in the darker days of the settlement, returned. Such was the fact with Dr. Ephraim Warner, William Judd, Moses Bronson, Dr. John Warner and a few others. There was a moderate accession to the population from natural increase. Previous to 1720, much the greatest proportion of the inhabitants lived in or near the town center. A few families, considerably less than a dozen in all, probably, had settled at Buckshill, Judd’s Meadow and Breakneck. The remainder of the town was still a wilderness. From 1690 to 1713, the taxable list in the town varied from £1,554 in 1694 to £2,415 in 1712. In 1713 it was £2,154 and in 1720 £2,757. Probably the population had not increased in proportion, at the last date.

The first new name that appears on the town records, after 1720, was that of Gershom Fulford, son of Abraham, of Woodbury. He was admitted an inhabitant, Feb. 28, 1721–2, and received a grant of “eight acres of land in the sequestered land.” He entered into covenant with the town, as follows:



We the subscribers do covenant to and with Gershom Fulford that if the above sd Fulford do come and cohabit in the above said town as our blacksmith and practice his trade among us for the term of seven years next after the date above said and perform articles as our bachelors have done, that then the land given by subscription and by vote to be his own and his heirs forever—And if the sd Fulford do fail of this obligation, then the land given to him by subscription to return to the subscribers—We say this land to be taken up in the undivided land.

Daniel Porter, } Gershom Fulford.  
Samuel Hickox. }

Fulford succeeded Dea. Judd, (now somewhat advanced in life,) and was the second blacksmith of the town. In process of time, he was raised to the dignity of town brander. He had a large family and died in Watertown in 1790, aged 90.

James Brown was one of the patentees named in the town patent of 1720; but he was not then a resident of the place. He was, however, "of Waterbury" in Sept. 1722, and was, so far as can be ascertained, the fourth addition to the permanent population of the town, from outside sources, after 1700. He was the second individual (Fulford being the first) from abroad not a proprietor by grant, who became a settler. His wife was Elizabeth Kirby, by whom he had eight children born in New Haven and two born in Waterbury. He settled on the New Haven road east of Judd's Meadow and was licensed by the County Court as a tavern keeper; but sold out in 1737 to Josiah Terrel of Milford, removed to Westbury, and resided on what is now known as the "Buckingham place." He is memorable as being the first Churchman of Waterbury, and was in derision called Bishop Brown. His death took place in 1760, at the age of seventy-five. In 1722 he wrote by proxy.

The next permanent settler of Waterbury\* appears to have been Nathaniel Arnold, Sen., of Hartford. He was appointed grand juror in Dec. 1723, and at the same time received a grant from the town of ten acres of land on David's Brook, on condition that he should abide in the town four years. He married the widow (and his son Nathaniel, born in 1704, the daughter) of John Richason, deceased. He lived on the north side of West Main street, near where William R. Hitch-

---

\* Samuel Childester (so written) appears to have settled in the south part of the town in 1722, but he disappeared about 1726, after having sold land to James Brown.

cock now resides. He afterwards removed to Westbury, where he died Sept. 13, 1753. His son, Capt. Nathaniel Arnold, settled at Wooster Swamp, had a farm there, and died May 12, 1777.

William Ludington, of East Haven, and John Williams, a clothier, had grants of sequestered land about the same time as Arnold, and on similar conditions. I suppose Ludington became a resident of the town, and thus secured his grant of "eight acres in the sequestered land;" but I have yet discovered no traces of him after the grant, till 1738, when he, or one bearing his name, was living in Northbury, (afterwards so called.) I find no proof that John Williams, a clothier, accepted the offer of the town, or became an inhabitant at all.

After this, it does not seem to have been necessary to encourage immigration by land grants or other rewards. Population flowed in spontaneously and with considerable rapidity. Names yet unheard of multiply upon the records. A large proportion of the new comers "located" themselves in the northwest and north parts of the town, (Watertown and Plymouth,) these sections, till now having been entirely neglected. They came from various towns in the State, Milford, New Haven, (including North Haven and West Haven,) Derby, Woodbury, Wallingford, Branford, Wethersfield, &c., but more were from Milford than from any other place. James Blakeslee (at first written Blachly) came from West Haven, (then a parish of New Haven,) in 1723.\* He lived on the corner of East and North Main streets, but in 1733 sold out to Stephen Sanford of Milford, and bought of the heirs of David Scott, a house and three acres of land on the south side of "Centre Square," next west of Dea. Clark's. Isaac Castle, Joseph Hurlbut and Samuel Thomas came from Woodbury, and settled at Wooster Swamp in 1725. Jonathan Prindle, "son of Eleazer of Milford,"† settled in the same neighborhood in 1727. Nathan Prindle, from Newton, a clothier,

---

\* This date and those which follow, refer to the time when the individuals named are first met with as inhabitants of Waterbury.

† So says the Waterbury marriage record. Rev. A. B. Chapin, in his Sermon on the early Churchmen of Connecticut, 1839, says that Jonathan Prindle of Waterbury was of West Haven. He may have been originally so.

had a grant of two acres of land up Great Brook, in Jan. 1727-8, provided he would build a fulling mill in four years. He was a resident of the town at that date. He sold out his house and mill in 1737, to Nathaniel Arnold.

Jonathan, Stephen and Ebenezer Kelsey were sons of Stephen Kelsey of Wethersfield and grandsons of John Bronson 1st of Waterbury. Jonathan came as early as 1725; Stephen in 1727 and Ebenezer before 1732. Jonathan moved to Bethlehem, then a part of Woodbury, about 1735 or 1736, where he became a deacon.

James Baldwin, from Newark, N. J., settled at Judd's Meadow in 1727. He lived on Fulling Mill Brook in 1740, where he owned a grist mill, and died in Derby. John Johnson of Derby settled at Judd's Meadow about the same time as Baldwin. His son Silence is first mentioned seven years later. James Johnson was in Waterbury as early as 1727. Joseph Smith of Derby came in 1727. Nathan Beard of Stratford settled in Waterbury about 1728, and lived on the west side of Willow street, a few rods above Grove. Henry Cook was admitted an inhabitant in Jan. 1728-9. James Williams of Hartford and Wallingford became a resident of the town in 1729; bought a house and some land in that year near the road to Scott's Mountain on Steel's Brook; built a corn mill and saw mill near where the factory of the Oakville Co. stands, the corn mill being in the boundary line which was afterwards drawn between Westbury and Waterbury. In 1739, he sold his house and half the mills to Stephen Welton, son of George. Robert Johnson, a shoemaker and tanner, came in 1729 and settled on Burnt Hill. Ephraim Bissell of Tolland first appeared in Jan. 1728-9, when he was admitted an inhabitant. John Sutliff settled in the northwest quarter near the river, in 1730. Nathaniel Merrel of Hartford became a settler in 1730. Abraham Utter came from New Haven in 1730, and was living near Scott's Mountain in 1735. Jonathan Garnsey of Milford bought Stephen Hopkins' place, in Dec. 1729, which he exchanged with Thomas Barnes in 1735. He finally removed to Westbury and settled in the part called Garnseytown. He became a deacon of the Westbury Church and died June 14, 1776. John Garnsey, also of Milford, came several years

later, appearing first at Wooster and then in Northbury. Caleb Thomson of New Haven settled in the southwest part of the town. He was admitted an inhabitant\* in Dec. 1730. Ebenezer Hopkins, Stephen Hopkins and Isaac Hopkins, brothers, came from Hartford. They were nephews of John Hopkins, 1st, of Waterbury, and sons probably of Ebenezer. They all settled in Waterbury about 1730. Isaac died in Wolcott in 1805, aged 96. Joseph Nichols had lived on Long Island, but came to Waterbury from Derby. He settled at Wooster as early as 1730, and died 1733. Samuel Towner, Dea. Samuel Brown and Elnathan Taylor (the last from North Haven) settled in the northwest quarter about 1731. James Hull and John Alcock from New Haven, Ebenezer Blakeslee of North Haven, and Joseph Gillet were admitted inhabitants in Dec. 1731. Thomas Blakeslee of New Haven settled in the northwest quarter, near the river, with a family, in 1731 or 1732. Moses and Jacob Blakeslee appeared several years later. Ebenezer Elwell of Branford settled in Northbury about 1732 and died in 1757. Joseph Lathrop of Norwich settled in Westbury (?) about 1732, had five children born in Waterbury, and returned to Norwich after 1745. Jonathan Baldwin came from Milford in 1733. He and his son Jonathan were both leading men of our town. James Prichard from Milford settled in Waterbury in 1733, and died in 1749. Daniel Curtis from Wallingford came to Waterbury about 1733 and settled in Northbury. Samuel, James, Ebenezer and Jesse Curtis appeared at later dates. Nathaniel Gunn of Derby settled in the southwest quarter (Guntown) in 1734, and had ten children, seven of them born in Waterbury.

At still later periods came the Foots from Branford; the Woosters and Weeds from Derby; the Fords, Hotchkisses, Frosts, Royces, and later Cooks, from Wallingford; the Todds, Humastons, Tutties and Potters, from North Haven; the Reynoldses from Coventry; the Roots from Farmington; the Camps and Fenns from Milford.

---

\* There was a law of the Colony made for the purpose of protecting the people against "persons of an ungoverned conversation," who might prove "vicious, chargeable and burthensome to the places where they come," requiring that all persons before they could become inhabitants should be accepted by a major vote of the town. A few only of those admitted in Waterbury are recorded.

By means of additions from without and the natural increase from within, the population of Waterbury rapidly augmented after about 1724. According to my estimate, there were, in 1727, over three hundred souls; in 1734, nearly five hundred; in 1737, about nine hundred, and in 1749, about fifteen hundred. The first enumeration was in 1756, when there were 1,829; the next in 1774, when there were 3,536.

There is in the old town book a list of the freemen of Waterbury, which, to those not familiar with the names, is of but little value, owing to the omission of dates. The qualifications of a freeman were "a quiet and peaceable behaviour and civil conversation," twenty-one years of age, and a freehold estate of the value of forty shillings per annum, or forty pounds personal estate. The list referred to is, in its commencement, in the handwriting of Thomas Judd, Jr. His catalogue contains twenty-seven names, and bears internal evidence of having been made out between 1698 and 1702. The persons named may be regarded as the freemen of Waterbury between those dates and afterwards. Whenever a person died or removed from the town, his name was crossed with a pen.

To this list of twenty-seven freemen, were added by the hand of Dea. Thomas Judd the names of seven persons, made freemen doubtless while he was town clerk, from 1709 to 1712. Then six names are scrawled by John Judd when he was register, between Dec. 1713 and Dec. 1717. Then William Judd's record commences. He held office four years and during the time, (no date being given,) made up a new roll. Four only of the names which are entered by him are new.

I give below the lists of the four successive clerks, omitting from the last, or William Judd's catalogue, all except the four new names:

Ensign Timothy Stanley, John Welton, Sen., Dea. Thomas Judd, Thomas Judd, Jr., Benjamin Barnes, Serg. Isaac Bronson, Joseph Gaylord, Sen., Abraham Andruss, Sen., John Hopkins, Stephen Upson, Edmund Scott, John Scovill, John Richards, Isaac Bronson, Jr., David Scott, John Judd, John Bronson, Samuel Hickox, George Scott, Thomas Richason, John Richason, Ephraim Warner, Joseph Gaylord, Jr., Samuel Stanley, Stephen Welton, John Warner, Sen., Obadiah Richards.

William Hickox, Joseph Lewis, Daniel Warner, Jonathan Scott, Richard Welton, Thomas Richards, Daniel Porter, Jr.

Thomas Clark, Thomas Hickox, Thomas Barnes, Jeremiah Peck, Stephen Up-

son, Jr., William Judd, Sen., [son of Philip, sometimes called "William Judd, tailor."]

William Judd, [the clerk,] Thomas Bronson, Stephen Hopkins, Ebenezer Bronson.

[Mr. Southmayd was chosen register in Dec. 1721, and he seems to have added, from time to time, (without date again,) the names of other freemen as they were admitted.]

Obadiah Scott, Timothy Hopkins, Benjamin Warner, George Welton, Nathaniel Arnold, John Southmayd, Samuel Porter, Samuel Hickox, Ebenezer Hickox, Samuel Barnes, Thomas Richards, Jr., John Scovill, Joseph Smith, Thomas Andruss, Thomas Upson, John Upson, Jonathan Prindle, Thomas Hickox, John Barnes, Ebenezer Richason, William Scott, Samuel Scott, Jr., James Porter, Thomas Porter, Richard Welton, Jr., Obadiah Warner, Doct. John Warner, John Judd, John Bronson, Joseph Prime, Nathaniel Arnold, Jr., Henry Cook, John Andruss, William Scovill, James Baldwin, John Warner, son of Ephraim, David Scott, Joseph Judd, James Blakeslee, Stephen Kelsey, Daniel Porter, Gershom Scott, Gershom Fulford, James Johnson, Edmund Scott, son of George, Stephen Hopkins, Jonathan Garnsey, James Hull, Ebenezer Warner, Daniel Williams, Moses Bronson, Samuel Thomas, Thomas Judd, Jr., Samuel Camp, Jonathan Kelsey, Jonathan Scott, Jr., Samuel Scott, Sen., Obadiah Richards, Joseph Lewis, Jr., James Williams, James Prichard, Daniel How, Joseph Judd, Isaac Hopkins, Samuel Warner, son of Daniel, Stephen Welton, Samuel Judd, Joseph Hurlbut, Eleazer Scott, Ebenezer Warner, son of Ephraim, Jonathan Scott, son of Edmund, John Alcock, Jonathan Baldwin, Timothy Porter, Nathan Beard, Caleb Thompson, Obadiah Scott, son of David, Isaac Bronson, Jr., Edward Scovill, Stephen Scott, Joseph Weed, James Nichols, Thomas Bronson, Jr., Thomas Matthews, Mr. Mark Leavenworth, Mr. John Trumbull, Jonas Weed, John Southmayd, Jr., Caleb Clark, Edmund Thompkins, Jonathan Foot, Timothy Judd, Stephen Judd, Ebenezer Waklin, Ebenezer Richards, George Nichols, Benjamin Bronson, Gideon Hotchkiss, Jacob Blakeslee, Robert Johnson, Stephen Welton, Jr., Joshua Porter, John Richason, Samuel Hickox, William Adams, Peter Welton, Silas Johnson, Josiah Bronson, Nathan Prindle, Abijah Richards, Zebulon Scott, Abraham Warner, Mr. Samuel Todd, Daniel Southmayd, Thomas Lewis, John Garnsey, John Warner, Jr., Ebenezer Porter, Samuel Reynolds, Abel Sutliff, John Weed, Samuel Lewis, Nathan Hubbard, Richard Seymour, James Bellamy, Ebenezer Baldwin, Ebenezer Trumbull, Caleb Humaston, Andrew Weed, Abel Doolittle, Roger Prichard, Jr., Abraham Andruss, Josiah Warner.

[At this point Mr. Southmayd commences by giving dates, thus :] Freemen made April 11, 1748—Andrew Bronson, Moses Terrell, Joseph Osborn, Benjamin Matthews, Jonathan Cook, Samuel Root, John Rew, Thomas Doolittle, Stephen Matthews, Samuel Darwin. April 10, 1749, James Prichard, Jr., David Humaston, Abel Camp, Joseph Upson, Elam Brown, Daniel Potter, Enoch Scott, Moses Cook, William Hickox, Abraham Hickox, Thomas Upson, Joseph Brown, Asahel Castle, Thomas Cole, Thomas Richards, Jr., Elnathan Judd, Stephen Upson, Jr., Moses Blakeslee, 3d, John Blakeslee. April 8, 1751, Solomon Moss, Samuel Porter. Sept. 17, 1751, John Brown, Joseph Sutliff, Isaac Judd, Bartholomew Jacobs, Aaron Harrison, Zachariah Sanford. April 13, 1752, Eliakim Welton, Thomas Welton, Jr., Ebenezer Ford, Reuben Blakeslee.

## CHAPTER XVII.

## THE SETTLEMENT EXTENDS: NEW SOCIETIES.

BEFORE 1700, all the people of Waterbury lived in the town center or its immediate neighborhood. The house most distant from the meeting house was, I believe, Daniel Warner's, (supposed to have been built before 1700,) situated on the north side of the Farmington road, a little east of the dwelling marked on the map J. H. Sandland. Soon after the above date, the thoughts of the planters were turned to the more distant parts of the town.

The first permanent settlement beyond the neighborhood of the old village appears to have been made at Judd's Meadow.\* The lands here were taken up and improved earlier than any other which were so far removed from the town center. The first settlers were Samuel Hickox, Daniel Warner and Joseph Lewis. Hickox "located" himself on Fulling Mill Brook, where he had already built a house, Dec. 21, 1702. Here about 1709 he erected a fulling mill, which gave its name to the stream. His sons, Ebenezer and Gideon, settled in the same neighborhood. Daniel Warner is believed to have removed to Judd's Meadow a little later than Hickox, say about 1705. In that year he sold his house east of the village. He took up his residence near Hickox, on the brook, which was sometimes called Daniel Warner's Brook. His house is alluded to Aug. 1708. His sons, Samuel, Ebenezer, and Abraham, remained in the south part of the town. Joseph Lewis settled on the west side of the river below the present bridge, and owned much land there which extended far to the south. There are no facts which show the exact time of his settlement.

---

\* This name is first used in the Indian deed of 1634-5. It came, doubtless, from Lieut. Thomas Judd, who owned lands there at a very early date. It was first applied to the meadows upon the river, but afterwards, the whole southern section of the town was thus designated.

It may have been soon after his marriage in 1703, and may have been not till several years later.

Those who next established themselves at Judd's Meadow, (all I believe after 1714,) were John Barnes, Thomas Richards, Obadiah Scott, Samuel Warner, Ebenezer Richason, James Brown of West Haven, Samuel Barnes, John Andruss, Samuel and Edmund Scott, sons of Edmund, Stephen Hopkins and Thomas Matthews. Several came over the line from Derby, and settled near the southwest bounds—the Johnsons, the Gunns and the Weeds.

Buckshill was first settled about 1703, by John Warner, (afterwards of Westbury,) Joseph Gaylord, Jr. and John Gaylord. The Gaylords soon removed. In 1708, Richard Welton bought the house of Joseph Gaylord, Jr., and became a permanent settler. He lived next to John Warner, on the south. The latter, after several years, removed. When Dr. Ephraim Warner returned from Woodbury, about 1715, he seems to have gone to Buckshill. Several of his sons remained there, while he, after a few years, came down to the village to live. I find, in 1729, the following persons with families living on Buckshill—Serg. Richard Welton, Richard Welton, Jr., Benjamin Warner, John Warner, (afterwards of Northbury,) Obadiah Warner, Joseph Judd, William Scott, Obadiah Scott, Edmund Scott? son of George, John Welton?

Breakneck Hill is spoken of on the town records as early as 1688. Whence came the name I know not. Barber in his Historical Collections, and Cothren in his History of Woodbury, are mistaken in their accounts of its origin. The name first given to the hill was in a little time applied to all that part of the town in which it is situated.

Isaac Bronson, Sen., owned land at Breakneck at an early period, and had built a house there before April, 1702. Joseph Gaylord and John Bronson may have lived there temporarily; but the first permanent settler was Isaac Bronson, eldest son of Isaac. He became a resident at Breakneck Hill probably as early as 1704 or 1705, certainly before March 27, 1707, when his oldest son Isaac was born.

The first house which was erected in the northwest section of the town appears to have been built near what was afterwards called "the village," about 1701, by John and Obadiah



Richards, sons of Obadiah. The Indian disturbances at that period probably prevented its permanent occupation. "Richards' house" and the buildings are occasionally referred to in the laying out and conveying of land. In April, 1704, Abraham Andruss sold two acres on a hill westerly from Richards's land, where their house and barn is west of Wooster Swamp." The house is again mentioned in 1709.

"The village," (so called,) mentioned in the last paragraph, was a tract of land in the northwest corner of the town, bordering on Woodbury and Litchfield, the fertility of which had been discovered at an early period, and which at an unknown date had been sequestered to prevent its being taken up in the ordinary land divisions. In Nov. 1722, the proprietors agreed to have a division of this sequestered land. At the same time, land was reserved for roads, and provision made for a village. I copy from the record:

It was agreed by vote that in dividing of the sequestered land at the North West corner there shall be three tears of Lotts, viz, a highway next Woodbury of Two Rods wide, and then half a mile wide of Land to be laid out in lotts and then a highway of eight rods to run north and south, and then another tear of half a mile wide and then a nother highway of eight rods, and then a nother tear of lotts a half a mile wide and then a highway on the east side of eight rods, [&c.] and the Committe in laying out the lotts to leave a four or six rod highway every half mile or thereabouts through the tears, no lott to be divided.

Several divisions were afterwards made of the village lands, but no settlement seems to have been begun there for some time. They were regarded as so much more valuable than the other undivided lands that, in some of the divisions, one acre was to be equal to five acres, (or at a later period, to two and a half acres,) in the other parts of the town. The "village" is now called Garnseytown, from the name of its early settlers, Jonathan Garnsey and his sons and John Garnsey.

No permanent settlement seems to have been made in the northwest quarter till after 1720, when the superior agricultural capabilities of that section became more fully known. The first permanent settlers were, apparently, Jonathan Scott, Sen., (he who was taken captive by the Indians,) and Ebenezer Richason, son of Thomas. Scott (and his sons) lived on Scott's Mountain, and Richason on the road leading to the Mountain and near to it and to Steel's Brook, on the southwest

side of the latter, (the old Buckingham place?) 1721 may be named as the probable date of their settlement. Richason's house is first spoken of June 22, 1721. Afterwards, (1736,) I find him with the Northbury people and soon after in the southwest quarter. In 1750, he lived on the Woodbury road. In 1724, or perhaps in 1723, Dr. John Warner\* (afterwards deacon) took up his residence on or near Steel's Brook and the road leading to Scott's Mountain and Wooster Swamp. Isaac Castle, Samuel Thomas and Joseph Hurlbut, all of Woodbury, sons-in-law, the two first of John Warner, and the last of Jonathan Scott, Sen., settled at Wooster Swamp about 1725. Jonathan Kelsey made his appearance about the same time. Afterwards came George Welton, (about 1726,) David Scott and James Williams, the last from Hartford.

Besides the individuals whose names are mentioned above, there were settled at "Wooster," (as the northwest part of the town was sometimes called,) in Dec. 1730, the following persons, having families, to wit: Jonathan Scott, Jr., and Gershom Scott, sons of Jonathan, Ebenezer Warner, son of John, Joseph Nichols, Abraham Utter, John Sutliff and Henry Cook, seventeen in all, or fifteen besides Sutliff and Cook, who were not finally included in the society of Westbury. The fifteen all lived in the eastern and northern parts of the future parish, particularly along Steel's Brook and at Wooster Swamp. As early as Nov. 1727, a highway had been laid out for their convenience up the brook and so to the "village," which was afterwards continued to Litchfield. Hitherto, one half the settlers had been from other towns, and nearly the same proportion was continued in the years which immediately followed. After 1730, the population increased rapidly and spread in every direction. The people had become so numerous in 1732, and were so incommoded in attending meeting, that they began to think of obtaining for themselves "winter privileges;" that is, the privilege of hiring for them-

---

\* John Warner was the first physician of Westbury. Thomas Foot was the second. The last came from Branford to Westbury about 1736. He was the son of John and Mary Foote, and settled on the place now occupied by his descendant, Hubert Scovill. He married Elizabeth Sutliff and died Dec. 19, 1776. Both Warner and Foot were sometimes called into the old society to prescribe, as appears from "the account book" of Dea. Clark.

selves during the winter months, at their own expense, a minister, and of being exempt during the time from old parish rates. In October, 1732, they petitioned the General Court as follows :

That whereas a Considerable Number of families in the Northwest Corner of the bounds of Waterbury town, by Reason of their Great Distance from y<sup>e</sup> meeting house which is to Seuerall Nine miles and to those that are nearest about three and Exceeding bad way and more Especially by Reason of a great Riuer which is called Waterbury Riuer which for Great part of the winter and Spring is not passable, are debared the hearing of the word preached to the number of about thirty families, having mett to Gather Sepr 1732 and appointed in behalf of us Your memorialists the Subscribers then and there to petition to the town of waterbury for an abatement of our parts of the ministers Rate for the space of four months, Viz. the three winter months of this present winter coming and the month of march next in Case we Should hire a minister on our own Charge to preach the word among us which they the Rest of s<sup>d</sup> town Refusing we haue appointed Deacon Samuel Brown and Lieut: Samuel Heacock our Committee to Represent and Lay our Dificult Sircumstances before this Honourable assembly and the Humble prayers of Your memorialests Saml Brown and Saml Heacock in behalf of that part of the aforesd agrieved Inhabitants being for Considerable part of the year wholly Debared hearing the word of God preached, is that we may have the liberty to hire a minister for the space of those four months before mentioned (being the most Dificult part of the Year) at our own Charge and that we may also have an abatement of our parts of the ministers Rate and Be Discharged from paying the minister of the town of waterbury During s<sup>d</sup> four months as we haue aminister among us Either for this present Year or for alonger time as You in Your Great wisdom shall think best, and your memorialests shall as in Duty Bound Ever pray.

Dated oct. 4th: 1732.

SAML BROWN.

SAML HEACOCK.

[The preceding is from the original file, on the back of which are the following names, thirty-two in number, in one handwriting:]

Cap. Wm. Heacock,	Ebnr. Warner,	Saml. Towner,
Dr. John Warner,	Elieazar Scott,	Henry Cook,
Mr. John Sutley,	Ebnr. Kelsey,	Joseph Hurlbut,
Mr. Jonathan Scott, Senr.,	Jon'n Prindle,	Elnathan Taylor,
Jonathan Scott, Junr.,	Nathaniel Arnold,	Isaac Caswell, [Castle,]
Moses Brunson,	Wm. Scofield,	Joseph Nicols,
Ebnr. Richardson,	Thomas Jud, Junr.,	Jonath. Kelsey,
David Scott,	Obadiah Scott,	Jon'n Foot,
John Bronson,	Edwd. Scofield,	Saml. Heacock,
Gershom Scott,	Thomas Heacok,	Saml. Brown.
Saml. Thomas,	Saml. Jud,	

A committee, consisting of Mr. Joseph Lewis and Mr. Stephen Upton, was appointed by the town to appear before the Assembly and oppose the movement ; but the prayer was

granted, notwithstanding, and the privilege allowed for four years.

In the midst of the movement of population to the northwest, or March 13, 1732-3, "the centre of the society that shall there be allowed" to the extent of one mile and a half each way, making a tract of three miles square, was sequestered by the proprietors for the town's use. The act was not to prejudice former grants and divisions not laid out. What its object was does not appear; but I suspect it was designed to retard the settlement of that quarter of the town. At a meeting held Jan. 12, 1747-8, "the proprietors finding a sequestration made at Westbury of three miles square," did by their vote "set aside and make void" the same.

In the spring of 1733, "the northwest inhabitants" asked the General Assembly, in a memorial, to set them off as a distinct society. They said that they had hired a minister—Mr. Daniel Granger; that they "are universally suited in him," and flatter themselves that "he is not ill pleased" with them. The town, they continued, had already "agreed that there may be a society in the northwest quarter of the bounds in a convenient time," and had chosen a committee of six to run the parish lines. The petition was not granted.

Under date of March 14th, 1733-4, the town voted, according to the record, to make no opposition to the application of the northwest inhabitants to the General Assembly for a committee to fix the bounds of the new society, the expense being defrayed by the latter. A few days afterwards, at another meeting, the following action was had:


Voted that a Committee be Chosen by the Town to Consider y<sup>e</sup> Scircumstances of the North West part of the Town and Settle A line In order to Make A Society —And Voted that the worshipfull Joseph Whiting Sq<sup>r</sup>, Cap. Roger Nuton of Milford, Capt John Russell of Branford be a Committee to Consider the Sircumstances of the Town as Above Sd and to Settle a line as Above Sd.

When the question of the new society came before the Legislature in May, 1734, the town resisted the movement. They resisted it on the ground that the vote of March 14th, previous, was not in fact passed. The certificate of the moderator of the meeting, Isaac Bronson, was produced, which affirmed


that in consequence of the absence of the stated clerk, Dea. Samuel Brown was chosen scribe, who neglected to say that the vote placed on record was negatived. Probably there were excitement and disorder in the meeting, and it was difficult to say what was, or what was not, properly done. The selectmen furthermore certified that "the meeting was called for to procure town stock [ammunition] and no other business." Consequently, it was not competent to act on the subject of the vote, that not being embraced in the call. The result of all was that there was no action on the part of the Assembly.

At a town meeting in October following, the vote of March 14th was "nul'd and made void," it being "repugnant to the common interest of the town;" while at the same time, the meeting resolved to choose a committee among themselves to "set out" the new society, "which will be more easy and for the better contentment of the town, than to commit it to strangers." In the meantime, however, the committee selected in the spring had attended to their work and "set out" the parish asked for. A petition was presented to the Legislature, signed by twenty-three individuals, to ratify the doings of the committee and grant society-privileges; but the request was again denied.

In Oct. 1736, the northwestern people again petitioned to be set off as a distinct society. They used the same arguments they had urged before, such as their distance from the meeting house and their separation from it by a river which was often impassable. They represented themselves to number forty-five families. Their request was refused, but they were allowed five months' winter privileges for two years. The petitioners, however, were not discouraged. They renewed their efforts in May, 1737, unsuccessfully. In October of the same year, the town appointed Mr. Joseph Lewis and Mr. Stephen Hopkins, (the town's deputies,) their agents to answer another memorial which had been prepared. At the same time, a vote was passed expressing a willingness that a legislative committee should "come to view all the circumstances of the town." In answer to a petition, a committee was sent by the Assembly, consisting of Capt. John Riggs, Capt. Isaac Dickerman and Mr. John Fowler. They report-







ENGRAVED BY SAMUEL SAWYER.

*Aaron Benedict*

*J. Kelly, Printer N.Y.*





ed, in May, 1738, in favor of the petitioners and recommended a division line. The line commenced at the southwest corner of Capt William Judd's farm at Woodbury bounds, and ran in the south line of said farm to the southeast corner of Joseph Nichols' old farm, thence to [James] Williams' corn mill, [now Oakville Co.,] thence straight to Jonathan Prindle's house, thence east to Waterbury river, thence up the river to the West Branch and up the Branch to Litchfield bounds.

In connection with the report, there was given a list of the heads of families included within the bounds of the proposed society, with the number of persons in each. Thirty-seven families are thus enumerated, containing two hundred and thirty persons :

John Smith,	8.	Moses Brunson,	11.	Stephen Scott,	4.
Thomas Foot,	9.	Samuel Hickox,	12.	Obadiah Scott,	4.
Samuel Thomas,	8.	Caleb Clarke,	9.	David Scott,	5.
Thomas Hickox,	5.	Daniel How,	9.	Nathaniel Arnold,	10.
Samuel Luis,	9.	John Andruss,	6.	Ebenezer Warner,	5.
George Wellton,	10.	William Andruss,	3.	James Brown,	8.
Samuel Judd,	5.	Jonathan Scott,	3.	John Warner,	4.
Gershom Scott,	5.	Jonathan Scott,	7.	James Williams,	7.
James Smith,	2.	Eleazer Scott,	3.	George Nichols,	6.
Thomas Richards,	9.	Jonathan Foot,	5.	James Beley,	1.
Ebenezer Richards,	4.	Ebenezer Baldwin,	3.	Richard Semer	4.
William Scovill,	6.	Jonathan Prindel,	7.	Jonathan Garnsey,	10.
Thomas Judd,	4.				

The town remonstrated against the line recommended by the committee, claiming it ran too far south, and asked the appointment of a new committee. The result was, another committee, consisting of John Fowler of Milford, Samuel Bassett of Derby and Gideon Johnson, was appointed. They reported in Oct. 1738, and advised the same division line. The report was adopted and the society incorporated by the name of Westbury.

Soon after Westbury was made a distinct society, the people belonging to it began to make arrangements to build a meeting house, and applied to the General Court to direct as to its location and to fix a stake. The Court sent a committee, who selected a place one third of a mile southeast of the present churches, a few rods east from the Litchfield turnpike, where the old burying ground is.

The place for a meeting house being determined, the Westbury people applied to the town to provide the ground and the necessary public green. Accordingly, the town directed their committee for laying out highways in the "north east [it should be northwest] quarter," "to widen the highway so as to accommodate said house with a suitable green, according to their discretion, and to award satisfaction to the owners of the land." This was on the 24th day of Dec. 1739, and in February following the committee, John Judd and John Scovill, laid out the land as follows :

Beginning at the southwest corner, a heap of stones, then east ten rods to a heap of stones, then ten rods north to a heap of stones, then west eleven rods to a heap of stones, then south eighteen rods to a heap of stones where we began— butting west on land left for a highway, north on Eleazer Scott's land, south on Stephen Scott's land, east on Eleazer Scott's land, or common land as set out by us.

The land included in these lines, amounting to nearly one acre, belonged to Eleazer Scott, and as a remuneration for the same the committee awarded him "three acres of land to lay out in the undivided land, or fifty shillings in money."

At what time the meeting house was finished I am unable to say, though 1741 has been named as the year. Rev. John Trumbull was the first minister. The Litchfield County (South) Church Manual says he was settled in 1739 ; but the inscription on his monument would make the time later, which says that he "died Dec. 13, 1787, in the seventy third year of his age and the forty eighth of his ministry."

Rev. John Trumbull (called Trumble in the early records) was born in Suffield in 1715. The ancestor of the family came from England and settled in Ipswich in 1645. His son, John, removed to Suffield and had three sons, John, Joseph and Benoni. The first, John, was the father of the Rev. John Trumbull of Westbury. The second, Joseph, settled in Lebanon, and was the father of Gov. Jonathan Trumbull. The third, Benoni, was the grandfather of Benjamin Trumbull, D. D., the historian.

Mr. Trumbull graduated at Yale College in 1735 and, at length, (in 1772,) became a member of the Corporation of that institution. His attainments as a scholar were respectable.

Sometimes he fitted young men for college, as most of the ministers of that day did. He appears not to have been distinguished as a preacher; but the great influence he acquired over his people was obtained by his generosity, his hospitable manners and friendly intercourse. If one of his parishioners had lost a cow or had met with a similar calamity, he would interest himself in the matter, head a subscription for his relief and persuade others to sign the same. It was said of him, that if one of his people turned Episcopalian, he would buy his farm.\* He was a large landholder and, for the times, was considered wealthy.

Mr. Trumbull was not tall, but a stout, athletic man. He was sound, shrewd and humorous. Horses he was fond of, and bought and sold them, frequently, with success. On this account, he was sometimes, irreverently, called jockey Trumbull. He loved innocent sports, and had once been a great wrestler. A story is told of him, which, though it may not be wholly true, is probably not a pure invention. At any rate, it illustrates the manners of the times. The Waterbury and Westbury people were in the habit of meeting at some half-way place, in the long autumnal evenings, to contend as wrestlers. They met around a fire and the sport was commenced by two second-rate athletes. When one was thrown, the vanquished called in another from his own side, the object being to vanquish the victor. Thus the experts were called out in succession, and he who remained last on his legs was the bully of the night. In several contests, at the time of which I am speaking, Waterbury had proved too much for Westbury. Mr. Trumbull heard of the defeat of his boys and partook of their mortification. On occasion of the next contest, he disguised himself and went down unknown, except to two or three, to give "material aid," if necessary. The wrestlers were called in one after another, till Westbury was again "thrown out," the Waterbury champion having *grounded* the last of the rival party. At this period, when the signs of exultation on one side and chagrin on the other were becoming manifest, a stranger was dragged in from the outer circle of

---

\* Dr. McEwen's Discourse at the Centennial Celebration in Litchfield, 1852.

the ring, to contend for the Westbury boys. The parties placed themselves in position and began by "playing round," to find each other's qualities. After a little time, the stranger, watching his opportunity, caught his antagonist's foot and threw him upon the fire. Shouts filled the air and the victor disappeared. Great was the exploit and great the mystery of the affair; but the secret finally leaked out. The story reached the ears of Mr. Leavenworth, and the next time he met his brother Trumbull, he rebuked him for his levity, and censured him, particularly, for throwing his rival upon the fire, by which his clothes and flesh were scorched. Trumbull agreed that he had been guilty of levity, but as for the scorching, he thought it his duty to give his (Mr. Leavenworth's) parishioners a foretaste of what they might expect after sitting under his preaching!

Mr. Trumbull was married, July 3d, 1744, to Sarah, daughter of Mr. Samuel Whitman of Farmington. Their children, which are recorded in Waterbury, were 1. Sarah; b. June 20, 1745. 2. A son; b. Feb. 27, 1746-7. 3. Elizabeth; b. March 17, 1747-8. The two last died in infancy. The births of John and Lucy are not on record. His widow Sarah and son John were his executors. To his widow, he gave his "negro wench Lemmon; to his son John of Hartford, his negro girl named Mabel, his knee-buckles, gun and powder horns; to his daughter Sarah Perkins, wife of Dr. Caleb Perkins of Hartford, his negro girl Peg, then in her possession; to his daughter Lucy Langdon, wife of the Rev. Mr. Langdon of Danbury, one negro girl, "late now in her possession." He had a large estate of both real and personal property. He is called in deeds, "clerk," that being the legal appellation of a clergyman.

The house in which Mr. Trumbull lived, and in which his distinguished son was born, may still be seen, standing on the east side of the road to Waterbury, a little south of the old burying yard. His successor in the ministry was Uriel Gridley, (settled in 1784.)

The second meeting house was built in 1772,\* and placed

---

\* Richardson's Sketch.

in the present center of the village. A third one was dedicated in January, 1840.

The early deacons of the Westbury church were John Warner, Jonathan Garnsey, Timothy Judd, Thomas Hickox, Samuel Hickox, Thomas Fenn, Thomas Dutton.

The settlement of Northbury, (afterwards so called,) was commenced a few years after that of Westbury. The first settlers came from other towns, Litchfield, Branford, Wallingford, New Haven, North Haven, &c. Several of them took up their residences adjacent to the river on the west side. At this place and also on the opposite side of the river hard by, the greatest part of the population resided for several years. The first settler, so far as my enquiries have extended, was Henry Cook of Litchfield. He came with a family about 1728, and had a farm on which he lived on the west bank of the river, not far from the Litchfield boundary. He is mentioned as of Wooster in Dec. 1730, but that name at that period was applied, apparently, to all the northwest part of the town lying west of the Naugatuck. He had several sons, three of whom, at least—Jonathan, Ebenezer and Henry, Jr.—had families and resided in Northbury.

John Sutliff, so far as appears, was the next settler. He came from Branford about 1730, with a family, and built on the west side of the river. He too, at this date, is spoken of as one of the "Wooster" people. After Sutliff, came Samuel Towner, Elnathan Taylor, Jonathan Foot, Ebenezer Elwell, Thomas Blakeslee, Isaac Castle, (from Westbury,) Daniel Curtis, Barnabas Ford, Gideon Allen, (from Guilford,) John Humaston, (from North Haven,) John Sutliff, Jr., the three first before the close of 1731 and the others before Nov. 1736. These were immigrants from other towns. The first native inhabitants of Waterbury that appeared among them were, as far as I can learn, Ebenezer Richason, (from Westbury,) Lieut. John Bronson, Jr. and Obadiah Warner, all in 1737.

The "up river" people, few in number, living west of the river, joined themselves to the northwest inhabitants in their earliest endeavors to obtain winter privileges, in Oct. 1732. Soon, however, as population increased, they found it expedient to unite with their neighbors on the other side of the river

and to act independently. Thus united, they had become so numerous in Oct. 1734, that some of them—Henry Cook, Ebenezer Elwell and Samuel Towner—on the ground of their living so far from the meeting house, requested the town to allow them and others to hire preaching the ensuing winter, and to abate their parish rates while they should thus hire. The town voted “to do nothing in the case.” On the 26th day of Oct. 1736, the request was repeated in writing, and was signed by twelve persons—all those whose names have been given as settlers at the time, except John Sutliff, Sen. They wanted the privilege for three years, three months in each year—December, January and February—with exemption from the customary ministerial rates during the time. The liberty asked for they wished to be extended to all those living “within two and a half miles of Barnabas Ford’s now dwelling-house.” The town voted to grant the request. But it seems there was a misunderstanding about the action taken on the subject, or possibly a change of views on the part of the majority; and the proposed exemption from parish taxes was afterwards denied. At a town meeting held April 18, 1737, “it was asked whether the said [northern] inhabitants shall be exempt from ministerial charge in the town for so much time as they shall hire a gospel minister among [them]” “in addition to a grant made them Sep. 29th,” and an answer was given by vote in the negative.

In May, the disappointed northern people applied to the General Assembly by petition. They said that they lived “on a tract of land about five miles square whereof Barnabas Ford’s dwelling house was the center”—that the town voted (at the date above mentioned) that they might have a minister for three months for three years, “with exemption from ministerial charges for the said term”—that they had employed a preacher, and now are forced to pay rates, &c. They asked winter privileges and the usual exemption from taxes. The petitioners were John Sutliff, Sen., Henry Cook, Ebenezer Elwell, Barnabas Ford, Samuel Towner, Thomas Blakeslee, John How, Gideon Allen, Jonathan Foot, Isaac Castle, Samuel Frost, John Sutliff, Jr., John Humaston, Daniel Curtis, Amos Matthews, Ebenezer Richason, Phineas Royce—seven-

ten in all. The town appeared against them by remonstrance, and the request was denied. In October, however, of the same year, (1737,) nineteen petitioners, John Bronson, Obadiah Warner and John Garnsey (the last from Westbury) being new ones, renewed the application and were successful. They were released from the usual parish charges for three months, December, January and February, in each year, for three years.

In May, 1738, the up-river people again petitioned. They asked to be exempted from ministerial taxes "for such time only as they had the word dispensed ;" that is, during all the year, provided they employed a preacher of their own. The signers numbered nineteen, the names of Jeremiah Peck, Sen., Jeremiah Peck, (Jr.,) Samuel Curtis, Zachariah Sanford, William Ludington, Caleb Humaston, appearing for the first time. They said that the nearest of them lived seven miles, the greater part eight and many nine or ten miles, from the meeting house, on the way to which they were obliged to cross the river (which was often deep and dangerous) nine times. The request was denied ; but in October (1738) it was repeated. There were now twenty-three signers, Jacob Blakeslee's name appearing among them for the first time. They spoke of their three years' privilege expiring with the month of February ensuing, and asked that it might be extended for two years. They alledged that they had a population of 139, (as I read the figures,) and that to get to meeting at the town center, they had to remove bars and open gates at ten different places. (In the original, the word ten is written over the figures 17.) The petition was granted.

After Westbury had been incorporated as a distinct society, in Oct. 1738, the way seemed open for the northern inhabitants. As they no longer helped support the town minister, the town looked upon the plan of a separate organization with indifference. At the October session of the Legislature, in 1739, a memorial was presented by John Sutliff and Moses Blakeslee, agents, &c. It represented that the people were now

Desirous of being made a society with the privileges of a society that they may settle a gospel minister among them and have God's word preached and



ordinances administered ; and having prayed said old society in said Waterbury to give them certain bounds and obtained a vote that they, said old society, will not oppose them [&c.] as by the vote may appear Sep. 18, 1739—Whereupon the memorialists humbly pray that this honorable Assembly would appoint a committee and send them to view their circumstances, and state the line between said old society and sd inhabitants and to make return, [&c.]

[Attached to this memorial are the following names:]

John Sutliff,	William Ludington,	Caleb Humaston,
Moses Blakeslee,	Amos Matthews,	John Garnsey,
John Bronson,	Noah Pangborn,	John Sutliff, Jr.,
John Warner,	Matthew Ludington,	Thomas Blakeslee,
Obadiah Warner,	Barnabas Ford,	Gideon Allen,
Daniel Potter,	Joseph Clark, [Jr.,]	Samuel Frost,
Samuel Curtis,	Jacob Blakeslee,	John How,
Joseph Clark,	Daniel Curtis,	Jeremiah Peck.
Henry Cook,	Zachariah Sanford	

Only four of these twenty-six signers were native or old inhabitants of Waterbury—John Bronson, Obadiah Warner, Jeremiah Peck and John Warner. The committee asked for was appointed. They entered at once upon their duties and indicated the parish lines. On the west side, the line ran down the West Branch and Naugatuck River along the Westbury boundary to Spruce Brook, “a little below Upson’s Island,” thence (easterly) a strait line to the falls of Hancox Brook, thence “strait to south side of Mr. Noyes farm,” thence due east to the Farmington line, thence round in the old town boundary. The report was approved and accepted, and the society incorporated by the name of Northbury, all at the same session, Oct. 1739.

The first record of the society of Northbury (the third society of Waterbury) is a warning for a meeting, on the application of John Sutliff, Ebenezer Richason and Barnabas Ford, dated Nov. 10, 1739, signed by Thomas Clark, justice of the peace, &c. The meeting was to be held on the 20th day of the month, at which time the first meeting took place. John Sutliff was chosen moderator, Barnabas Ford, clerk, and Moses Blakeslee, John Sutliff and Ebenezer Richason [society’s] committee. They “maid choise” of Samuel Todd to be their minister and voted to give him £150 settlement.

That is to say, we will get or cause to get sufficient timber for a house thirty-two foot long, twenty-five wide and fifteen foot between ients [joints—was not

15 feet the length of the posts ?] frame and set it up, dig and stone up a seller under all y<sup>e</sup> biggest rume, underpin y<sup>e</sup> house, ruf it on each side fifteen inches and on each end eight inches, bord and couer y<sup>e</sup> house with short shingells, provide all y<sup>e</sup> materials therefore, couer y<sup>e</sup> sides and ends with rent clabboards and provide nales and clabords and make and put up a sutable number of Winder frames and finish all y<sup>e</sup> timber work of y<sup>e</sup> outside of y<sup>e</sup> house, find stone and build y<sup>e</sup> chimleys, two fire places below and 1 aboue, and seal the biggest loer rume and glaze it and procure all the materials for it and provide all y<sup>e</sup> hooks and hinges for all y<sup>e</sup> rume and provide all y<sup>e</sup> materials for doing y<sup>e</sup> work as above menched, and y<sup>e</sup> same to be done workmanlike for Mr. Sam<sup>l</sup> todd by y<sup>e</sup> 1<sup>st</sup> of October in y<sup>e</sup> year 1740.

[At the same meeting, Joseph Clark, John How, John Bronson, Thomas Blakeslee and Gideon Allen were chosen to superintend the building of the house; and a vote was passed freeing Jeremiah Peck, Daniel Curtis and Barnabas Ford from the charge of building.]

At y<sup>e</sup> same meeting, it was voted to give Mr. Samuel todd for y<sup>e</sup> two first years from y<sup>e</sup> first of last October £100 salary per year and his fire wood and two dayes work a man from sixteen to sixty [years of age] per year, one in summer and one in y<sup>e</sup> winter, and provide comfortable house roome for him y<sup>e</sup> first year upon our own causte, and y<sup>e</sup> £100 per year to be paid each year in y<sup>e</sup> months of Oct. Nov. and Dec.—and after y<sup>e</sup> two first years are up to give him twel [twelve] pence upon ye pound to be his yearly salary, munny or publick bills of credit, until our list at y<sup>e</sup> lay raises 100 and [ \* \* ] pounds att y<sup>e</sup> rate of siluer at three and twenty [shillings] per ounce; and y<sup>t</sup> to be y<sup>e</sup> stated salary, and two days work a man til twelue pence upon y<sup>e</sup> pound makes one hundred pounds as before specifide; and to find him his fire wood so long as he shall continue in y<sup>e</sup> work of y<sup>e</sup> minstre amonge us.

At a subsequent meeting, March 3, 1740, (1739–40,) a rate of four pence on the pound in work and one penny in money was laid. At the same time, Moses Blakeslee, Jeremiah Peck and Daniel Curtis were appointed to present to Mr. Todd the “call” of the society and to receive his answer. The following is his reply, bearing date March 3, 1739–40 :

To Mr. Jeremiah Peck, Moses Blakeslee, david curtis—having reseued your call and proposals in behalf of y<sup>e</sup> sosiati to settle with you in y<sup>e</sup> work of y<sup>e</sup> ministry, and hauing waid and considered them I declare myself willing upon them to settle with them in y<sup>e</sup> work of y<sup>e</sup> ministry, provided they proseed to a regular ordanation upon or before y<sup>e</sup> eight day of may next and pray god you may be a blessing to me and I to you.

Sam<sup>l</sup> todd.

It was decided that the seventh of May should be the day of the ceremony, at which time, probably, the ordination took place. Afterwards, (Aug. 10, 1740,) the society granted to Lieut. John Bronson, in work or money, £3, 18s. for keeping the council.

Rev. Samuel Todd, the first minister of Northbury, was the seventh child and fifth son of Samuel and Mary ("Tole") Todd of North Haven, and was born March 6, 1716-17. He was graduated at Yale College in 1734, at the age of 17.\* He married, August 31, 1739, Mercy, d. of Mr. Peter Evans of Northfield. His children were, Alathea,† (b. Dec. 7, 1740,) Mary, Irene, Eliel, Alathea, Lucy, Samuel, Lucy and Chloe. His house stood a few rods south of the meeting house built during his ministry.

About the time of Mr. Todd's settlement, the Great Revival of New England commenced. He was at first, it is stated, opposed to it, or, at least, regarded it with distrust. He went to Stockbridge to get a more intimate knowledge of its practical workings, and came back with opinions wholly changed. He at once introduced "conference meetings," and labored to rouse the feelings of his church and people. The result was, many of his parishioners and finally a majority, including some of the principal men in both the church and society, turned against him, denounced his doctrines and measures, and at length obtained the control of the meeting house and established in it Episcopal worship.

In Jan. 1742-3, the society refused to give Mr. Todd "any thing for the sink of money," (depreciation of the currency,) but they agreed to pay him five pounds old tenor for not finishing his house in the stipulated time. In December, 1743, they voted to allow him £16 yearly, in place of two days' work each, and £12 old tenor for firewood. In 1745, he was to have for his salary "owne hundred forty five pounds old tenor money;" in 1747, £180; in 1748, £300; in 1749, £250 and £30 for firewood, payable in the depreciated old tenor currency. In 1755, he was to receive £46 lawful money, (specie currency)—wheat to be valued to him at 3s. 6d. per bushel, rye at 2s. 4d., Indian corn at 1s. 9d., oats at 10½d., pork at 3d. per pound.

---

\* The Manual of the Plymouth Church and Goodwin's Genealogy of the Foote Family say he was graduated in 1834, at the age of 15. The New Haven record gives his birth as above. The Genealogy affirms, also, that he died in 1789, aged 76, and that Mary Evans was his mother.

† According to tradition, the first burial in Northbury was that of a little girl of Mr. Todd, who was drowned in a spring about 1741. It was eight years before another death took place, when the lung fever made its appearance, of which thirty died. [Manuscript notes of the Rev. H. D. Kitchell, late of Plymouth Hollow.]

Feb. 12, 1756, Mr. Todd made a written communication to the society :

Brethren and Friends—there are evidently many difficulties subsisting among us, in particular with regard to my support among you, y<sup>e</sup> which we have great reason to suspect is one great ground and rise of all y<sup>e</sup> rest y<sup>e</sup> which is just ground of great Humelation and Lemmantation as greatly threttening our ruin [&c.]

He offered to take as salary what might be raised by a contribution on the sabbath once in two months and what any might hand in at other times, with the grant of the “ministry money.” The society accepted the offer. But the plan did not work, and a parish meeting the next year again voted Mr. Todd £46. This was to be his annual salary for four years. The fifth year it was to be £51 and afterwards £56 per annum, (currency of the specie standard, doubtless.) This arrangement was satisfactory to Mr. Todd. A good understanding, however, was not obtained, and in Dec. 1763, the society voted to choose a committee of wise and just men to hear and determine whether said society had fulfilled their covenant agreement with Mr. Todd.

Mr. Todd's ministry in Northbury was now drawing to a close. After having in vain tried to settle the difficulties with his parish by a council, he at length, with broken health, asked to be dismissed. At a meeting the third Monday of April, 1764, the society voted that on account of difficulty about Mr. Todd's support, and his “prevailing bodily indisposition for some time past, whereby he is much disabled from carrying on the work of the ministry, as likewise his request to lay down the work of the ministry,” they consented. At the same time, the meeting “maid choise of Dea. John Warner and Dea. David Dutton and Lient. Danl. Potter to be a committy to apply to y<sup>e</sup> Association of this (New Haven) County for advice in order to have the pulpit supplied and to bring in a candidate to preach.” Soon afterwards, a communication was received from Daniel Humphrey, John Trumbull, Benjamin Woodbridge and Mark Leavenworth, a committee of the Association, lamenting their troubles and alienations, &c., and recommending the calling of a council to settle matters, or, if thought best, to dismiss Mr. Todd.

Mr. Todd appears to have been dismissed in August, 1764; and in Dec. following the society voted that they "would leave all their differences with Mr. Samuel Todd in his demands upon this society for and upon account of his salary from time past until this day unto indeferant gentlemen such as Mr. Todd and the society commity shall agree to have and abide by the doings of sd arbiters, and Phineas Royce and Daniel Potter to assist the society commity herein."

Mr. Todd removed from Northbury to Lanesboro, Mass., where he preached about two years. Thence he went to Adams, where he organized the first Congregational church in that place, and was its pastor till 1778. He took a deep interest in the Revolution, was an ardent Whig and, for a brief period, a chaplain in the continental army. He next lived for a short time at Northfield, with a son. About 1782, he removed to Orford, N. H., where he resided with his children, preaching occasionally in the new settlements, till his death, June 10, 1789.

Mr. Todd's ardor, in the earlier years of his ministry, sometimes got the better of his discretion; but he is believed to have been a sincere man, devoted to his work and willing to suffer if need be in the performance of a supposed duty. It is affirmed that he had great decision of character and a mind of the full average strength.

After the dismissal of Mr. Todd, Rev. Asahel Hathaway officiated for a time in Northbury. On the 24th of Sept. 1764, the society made "choise" of him "to preach as a probashuner in order for settlement," and Dec. 17, 1764, invited him to become their settled minister. He declined. Afterwards, in Jan. 1765, Mr. John Bliss was chosen to preach as a "probashuner," and in April, Mr. Ephraim Judson was selected for a like service.

At a meeting held the first Monday of July, 1765, the society, "by a unevarsal vote," expressed a desire to hear Mr. Andrew Storrs preach. A month afterwards, Mr. Storrs was requested to become a candidate for settlement, and on the last Monday of Sept., was "called to settel," by an "unevarsal vote." The society agreed to give him, under date of Oct.

28, 1765, £180 settlement to be paid in two years, £40 cash and £50 in provisions, each year; and £60 salary for two years, £20 cash and the remainder in wheat, rye, Indian corn, &c. After the two first years, the salary was to be £70 per year, £30 cash and £40 in wheat, rye and Indian corn, at the market price on the first day of January, annually, "allowing the expense of transept to market not exceeding in distance New Haven, Middletown or Hartford." Firewood was also to be furnished, and each "man" was to give two days' work yearly for two years. Mr. Storrs appeared personally in the meeting and made known his acceptance of the terms proposed. To make everything agreeable, a vote was passed "to chuse a committee to stand obliged for the payment of such purchases as Mr. Storrs shall make for a settlement."

Mr. Storrs became the settled pastor of the church and society Nov. 27, 1765, and was continued in that relation till his death, March 2, 1785. He was born in Mansfield, Conn., Dec. 20, 1735. He appears to have been indisposed for some time before his decease, so that a vote was passed, Dec. 16, 1784, "that the sositaty committey should bee urtherized to assist Mr. Storrs to sopply the pulpit as far as it can be done by inviting in the naboring jentelmen minerstors to preach."

Of Mr. Storrs, the Rev. Mr. Hart once said, in a manuscript sermon, "He is still remembered by our aged people with affectionate reverence as a wise and faithful pastor."

After the death of her husband, Mrs. Storrs was authorized by the society, March 21, 1785, "to use the wood got for Mr. Storrs." Authority was also given, June 6, to print 500 copies of the funeral sermon.

The Rev. Simon Waterman succeeded Mr. Storrs, and was installed Aug. 29, 1787. He was dismissed Nov. 15, 1809. The Rev. Luther Hart was his successor.

The early deacons of the Northbury church were Jeremiah Peck and Moses Blakeslee, (appointed 1740,) John Warner, David Dutton, Daniel Potter, John Sutliff, Eliakim Potter,\* David Smith.

\* Dec. 9, 1774, "voted that Dea. Eliakim Potter shall read the Psalm for the future." (Society Record.)

The people of Northbury, before they were incorporated as a distinct society, had built a house, designed for the common uses of the people but called a school house, in which they met for public worship. The land on which it was erected, appears to have been owned by John How. This land How conveyed, Sept. 6, 1738, "for a valuable consideration," to John Southmayd, clerk. Southmayd, "for good causes and considerations," quit-claimed the same, at the same date, to Mr. John Sutliff, Ebenezer Richason, John How, Thomas Blakeslee and Barnabas Ford and the rest of the inhabitants living within two miles and a half of said Barnabas Ford's now dwelling house," &c. The land is understood to have been a donation to the future society from John How. It is described in Southmayd's deed as

One acre near sd Ford's dwelling house in Waterbury on which said inhabitants have already set up a house under the denomination of a S[chool?] house for the sd inhabitants to meet in to carry on the public worship of God on the sabbath, [&c.] bounded to the west on land left for a highway and How's land, south on Barnabas Ford's land, east and north on said How's land. [Land Records, Vol. V, p. 15.]

Soon after the settlement of Mr. Todd, the Churchmen of Northbury obtained a majority of the votes, and took exclusive possession of the house of worship.\* The votes are alledged to have been eighteen, of which eleven were on the side of the majority; but this number could not have comprehended all the legal votes in the society. As a consequence of this movement, the Congregational minority were obliged to look for quarters elsewhere. The society therefore voted, Oct. 6, 1740, to apply to the General Assembly for a committee "to stake a place to set a meeting house," and appointed John Bronson agent to take charge of this business. The Assembly did nothing, and in the following May, (1741,) another petition was presented by Moses Blakeslee, Thomas Blakeslee and John Bronson, a committee. They asked for the interposition of the Assembly, saying "your honors are something informed of our circumstances which are truly

---

\* This house stood in Plymouth Hollow, at the intersection of the north and south (or river road) and the east and west road running through the center, near the spot where the school house lately stood.

great and very distressing," &c. It appears that the previous meetings of the society and the votes appointing the officers had been irregular. In consequence of this fact, and of the "broken and confused state of affairs," the Assembly appointed Benjamin Hall of Wallingford and John Riggs of Derby, a committee, who were authorized "to call and conduct a society meeting and to advise and give an opinion about a place for a meeting house." The committee, in pursuance of instructions, warned a meeting to be held on the 10th day of June, 1741, at which meeting, Joseph Clark was chosen clerk, and Deacon Moses Blakeslee, John Bronson and Serg. John Warner, committee. The Assembly's committee, also, "advised and directed them [the society] to meet on the sabbath for ten months in the year at the house called the school house, and the other two months at the dwelling house of Joseph Clark, namely January and February." They made a report of their doings at the October session, which was "approved and accepted." At the same session, the society again petitioned for a committee to locate the meeting house. Several influential persons disapproved of this movement. Certain of them, to the number of ten, to wit, John How, Ebenezer Elwell, Barnabas Ford, John Sutliff, Thomas Blakeslee, Daniel Curtis, Samuel Frost, John Sutliff, Jr., Abel Sutliff and Caleb Humaston, signed a remonstrance. They did not want a committee called, because—"1. The committee sent from the Honorable Assembly last May viewing our circumstances advised us not to build, and we well know that their advice was good considering our poverty." 2. Only nine were in the vote for sending for a committee. 3. The meeting was not warned "to confer about any such thing."

Notwithstanding the opposition, Capt. John Riggs and Capt. John Fowler were appointed to designate a place for a meeting house. At the next session, in May, (1742,) the committee reported that they had selected a place and set a stake "twenty rods on the westward side of the One Pine Swamp," and thirty rods south of the road leading from the river eastward. The report was accepted and approved; but nothing was done, immediately, in the way of building.

Dec. 3, 1744, the society voted to build a meeting house at



the committee's stake, and resolved for the ensuing year to meet for worship at the houses of Daniel Potter, Samuel Todd and Caleb Weed. At a meeting held Sept. 24, 1745, in consequence of a pending vote, "Barnabas Ford, Thomas Blakslee and David Blakslee declared their decent from their land being taxed for the building a meeting house for the decenters openly in the meeting." A vote was then passed to apply to the Assembly for a tax on land of 6d. per acre for four years, the lands of the Church-of-England men to be exempted. It was also agreed that an attempt should be made "to have the middle stake confirmed for the meeting house." John Warner acted as the agent of the society, and in his memorial presented in Oct. (1745) represented that about one third of the society had declared for the Church of England, and that the western inhabitants, for whose accommodation the old stake had been set, had "generally" so declared. In the name of those who sent him, he desired that the stake might be placed "farther east where the middle stake was set up," and that a tax be laid, &c. The prayer was granted and a resolution passed as follows:


Resolved that the middle stake erected by sd Committee standing by the path leading from Dea. Blakeslee's to Isaac Castle's dwelling house, about twenty rods eastward from the brook that runs from the north end of the hill called One Pine toward the river, shall be and hereby is established to be the place whereon to build a meeting house in said parish—And that all the unimproved lands in the limits of said parish (exclusive of those belonging to such persons as have professed for the Church of England) shall and hereby is taxed at the rate of 6d. old tenor currency per acre, for the space of four years next coming, to be paid by the owners of such lands, and to be improved for the building of sd. meeting house and for the support of their minister.

Much difficulty, however, was experienced in the collection of the tax; and in Dec. 1747, the society voted to pay all necessary charges for law-suits against Caleb Humaston, (collector,) for distraining for taxes.

Dec. 9, 1745, there were signs of decisive steps in the way of building a meeting house. Dea. Moses Blakeslee, Lieut. Daniel Curtis, Ens. John Warner, Joseph Clark, Jr. and Caleb Humaston were then chosen building committee, and it was determined that the house should be forty-five feet by thirty-five, on the ground.







ENGRAVED BY SAMUEL SARGENT

Respectfully Yours  
Oct 21st  
Alvin Bronson  
J. J.

J. Kelly, Printer, N. Y.



At a town meeting of Waterbury, held Dec. 8, 1746, the town voted "upon the request of Northbury parish with respect to the place to set their meeting house upon, to purchase the place as it shall be stated as to length and breadth by a committee chosen by the town." Capt. Timothy Hopkins, Capt. Stephen Upson, Serg. Thomas Porter, Capt. Samuel Hickox and Capt. William Judd were appointed the committee. Their doings are recorded under date of Dec. 10, 1746. They "set out a place or green convenient for a place of parade and burying place if need be," eight rods south and eighteen rods north "from the stake appointed by the Court for the meeting house for said parish," (of Northbury,) "and sixteen rods west at each end from the east line of John Brinsmead's farm," being twenty-six rods in length and sixteen in breadth.—[Land Records, Vol. VI, p. 252.]

The above two acres and six tenths, belonging to Mr. Brinsmead, or Brinsmade, of Milford, were paid for by the town. In order to enlarge the green, certain individuals, as it appears, purchased of Mr. B. four tenths of an acre adjoining. To the whole, Mr. Brinsmade seems to have added one acre as a donation. These four acres and one acre more, making five acres, Mr. B. conveyed, April 1, 1747, to Caleb Humaston for "£15 old tenor." The land is described as lying "north of the hill called the One Pine." Of this tract, Humaston deeded the four acres intended for a green, Dec. 3, 1747, to the society's committee of Northbury, said land being situated "about the meeting house," the same to be taken off the five acres had of Brinsmade, beginning at the southeast corner, thence running west twenty-two rods by the highway, to be twenty rods wide at the north end, butting west on Brinsmade's land, north on Humaston's land, east on Mr. Todd's land, south on highway, and running north and south far enough to make four acres.—[Land Records, Vol. VI, p. 257.]

Sept. 22, 1747, the society voted that any man of the Inhabitation may build a sabbath day house for conveniency so will, provided he sets it on y<sup>e</sup> green on which the meeting house stands, provided he sets it on the outside on the line where the society comity then standing shall say fit, and at s<sup>d</sup> meting they voted to clear the meeting house green by cutting brush and clearing it away.

Dec. 26, 1749, a vote was passed to finish the lower part of the meeting house up to the girts, and to have a Pew upon each side of the pulpit and owne each side of the fore door, all 4 in number, and the rest fitted up with seats.

From the last vote I infer that the new house was nearly ready for occupation in 1749. It was not completed, however, for many years.

At last, Dec. 4, 1752, the business of seating was taken up. Stephen Curtis and William Curtis were placed in the fore seat; Ezekiel Sanford and Phineas Royce in the pew by the pulpit stairs; Samuel Curtis and Benjamin Upson in the pew next to the north side of the pulpit; Jonathan Cook and John Humaston in the second seat; William Andruss in the third seat.

Under date of Dec. 7, 1753, I find a classification of the seats, according to rank, designed as a guide to the seating committee. Here is the record:

Dignifying y<sup>e</sup> meeting house by sositaty meeting as followeth—first, the fore seats; 2d y<sup>e</sup> pews by the pulpit staires; 3d y<sup>e</sup> pews ioining to the pulpit north; 4th y<sup>e</sup> pews by y<sup>e</sup> fore dore; y<sup>e</sup> second seat; the Little pew; y<sup>e</sup> pew at the South end windo and the pew in opposition at y<sup>e</sup> north end; corner pew at y<sup>e</sup> South west corner and the pew at y<sup>e</sup> north west corner; the 3d seat and the pew by the south dore and the pew by the north door; the 4th seat; the pew by the South staires and the pew by the north staires and next y<sup>e</sup> hind seat; y<sup>e</sup> front seat in y<sup>e</sup> galery next to y<sup>e</sup> 3d seat and y<sup>e</sup> fore seat in y<sup>e</sup> galery next to y<sup>e</sup> pews by the north dore.

From what can be gathered, I conclude that the meeting house was probably begun in 1746; that it was occupied, in mild weather, in 1750; that it was glazed and the lower part put in order for use throughout the year in 1753; that the galleries were not fitted up till 1762, and that the house was not finally finished till 1768.

Early in 1783, the question of erecting a new meeting house was agitated, and in April, a vote (63 to 20) in favor of building was passed. At the same time, a committee was chosen to apply to the County Court to say where it should be placed. But there was delay, and another Committee was selected for the same purpose, in Jan. 1788. In March, 1790, it was decided that the house should be sixty-five feet by forty-five, and a tax be laid of 1s. on the pound, to be paid in sheep, neat cattle, grain and building materials, the price of the lat-

ter to be fixed by a committee. Daniel Potter, J. A. Wright, Isaac Curtis and Zachariah Hitchcock were the building committee, and were directed to inquire what the house would cost—the work to be done by the “jobb.” They reported that Capt. Thomas Dutton and his son, Thomas Dutton, 3d, proposed to erect it, sixty-five feet by forty-five, for £727, 19s.; or, if it was made two feet smaller each way, for £700. The last proposition was accepted. In November, the society directed a committee to contract with Capt. Dutton and his son to add a steeple to the house, provided £150 could be raised by subscription for that object. In December, 1792, the building appears to have been nearly finished.

Previous to 1780, Westbury and Northbury were independent ecclesiastical societies only. It was now proposed to form them into a distinct township. At a town meeting in Waterbury, March, 1780, a vote was passed to prefer a petition to the General Assembly, at their next session, that the societies of Westbury and Northbury might be incorporated into a separate town and annexed to the county of Litchfield, said new town to quit-claim all right to the school and ministerial moneys, &c., &c. At the same time, Joseph Hopkins and others were chosen a committee to meet and consider the interests involved in the separation, and to arrange the details and report make at the next meeting. In May following, (1780,) the societies, for themselves, petitioned the Legislature for town privileges, and at the same session were incorporated, receiving the name of Watertown. Nothing is said in the act about school and ministerial moneys.

Jan. 14, 1782, Messrs. Aaron Benedict, Ashbel Porter, Dr. Abel Bronson and Capt. John Welton were chosen on the part of Waterbury to meet the selectmen of Watertown, and run the line between the two towns. Their report may be found in the second Book of Highways.

In May, 1740, forty individuals, twenty-nine of them described as living in “Derby woods,” (northwest part of Derby,) five in “Southbury woods” (southeast part of Woodbury) and six in “Waterbury woods,” (southwest part of Waterbury,) petitioned the General Court for society privileges. Those residing within the limits of Waterbury were Isaac



Trowbridge, John Weed, Jonas Weed, Joseph Weed, Thomas Osborn and Joseph Osborn.\* They stated that they lived from seven to ten miles from houses of public worship, with bad roads to travel and a river to cross, and that they were £2,000 in the list. The Assembly appointed a committee to inquire into the grounds of the petition. They reported a boundary line for the society in Oct. The two houses disagreed, and a new committee was appointed, who recommended the same bounds. Their report was accepted and approved, and the society incorporated, May, 1741, by the name of Oxford.

In the same year, (1741,) Oxford parish voted to build a meeting house, and petitioned the Assembly to send a committee to designate the place for setting it. The request was complied with, and the place selected was the south end of "Jacks Hill." In May, 1743, the people asked liberty "to embody" themselves "in church estate," in order to settle a minister. In Oct. 1743, the clerk of the parish reported to the Assembly that the meeting house was "inclosed;" in Oct. 1744, that it was "being finished;" in May, 1747, that it was glazed and the floors laid; in May, 1749, that it was plastered and the seats and pulpit "being prepared."

April 29, 1793, Joseph Hopkins, agent of the town, was directed to oppose the application of the society of Oxford to the Assembly for town privileges. In October, 1795, a vote was passed to resist a renewed attempt having the same object. A similar course was taken in April, 1796, when still another attempt was made. In October, 1796, however, the desired act of incorporation was obtained, and the new town was called Oxford.

In May, 1757, certain individuals, thirty-three in number, living in the western part of Waterbury, first society, and the contiguous parts of Westbury, Oxford, Southbury and the old society of Woodbury, petitioned the Assembly for winter privileges.† They pleaded that some of their number lived

\* About 1760, the following persons bearing lists were inhabitants of the Waterbury portion of Oxford society. They were signers of a petition of the western people for a new society to be called Middlebury. Their lists are annexed:—Robert Hale, £18; Urah Ward, £39, 7s.; Daniel Hawkins, £37, 12s.; Samuel Woodruff, £41, 16s.; Noah Cande, £18; Andrew Weed, £21; Daniel Osborn, £31, 10s.; John Weed, £36, 15s.; David Judson, £3, 8s.

† Twenty of the petitioners are recognized as belonging to Waterbury, fourteen to the first society and six to Oxford parish. More of them may have so belonged.

five or six miles and the nearest three miles from any place of public worship, and that it was extremely difficult for them and their families to attend the worship of God.

The request was not granted, and in May, 1760, the petition was renewed, this time for parish privileges. The first society of Waterbury sent in a remonstrance. In it they stated that their whole list amounted to about £8,000—that there were within the limits of the proposed new parish twenty-one taxable persons, having lists amounting to £1,282, 6s.—that there lived in the east and northeast parts of the society, three miles or more from the center, twenty-eight tax payers, with lists equal to £1,312, 5s.—and that south from the center at the distance of from four to six miles, there were thirty-six taxable persons whose lists footed up £2,226, 15s. The southern and eastern inhabitants, they contended, were, in each case, as much entitled to parish privileges as the memorialists, and might be expected to ask for them should the prayer of the latter be granted. Should the society be thus cut up, the western, eastern and southern portions, being taken away, there would be left within three miles from the meeting house [fifty-one] individuals, bearing lists in the aggregate of £3,117, 4s., without deducting £1,344, 4s. for the Church-of-England-men. “The effect” of dismemberment, the remonstrants continued, “would be to cut us up into mouthfuls ready for the devourer.”\*

\* In connection with the remonstrance and to confirm its representations, the names of the taxpayers in the different sections of the old society, with their lists, were given. Here is a copy of the document. (The shillings and pence in the original are omitted.)

“ Old Stump or Town Spot [Town Center]

James Hull,	£108	Samuel Scott, Jr.,	£60	Dea. Thomas Clark,	£144
Andrew Bronson,	93	Obadiah Scovill,	117	Benjamin Scott,	51
Elnathan Judd,	47	George Prichard,	49	Samuel Barnes,	31
Daniel Barnes,	23	Daniel Welton,	65	Ebenezer Waklee,	93
Dea. Thomas Bronson,	91	Joseph Hopkins,	90	Comfort Upson,	14
Capt. Thomas Porter,	149	John Cole,	29	William Scott,	41
David Crisse,	38	Timothy Clark,	44	William Hickox,	52
Lt. Obadiah Richards,	104	Capt. Stephen Upson,	44	Samuel Warner,	60
Abijah Richards,	51	Stephen Upson, Jr.,	114	Benjamin Harrison, Jr.,	29
Joseph Nichols,	58	Moses Frost,	11	Samuel Root,	43
Samuel Frost,	63	John Slawter,	53	Jonathan Baldwin,	45
William Rowle,	55	Benjamin Harrison,	46	Ezra Bronson,	12
David Prichard,	31	Aaron Harrison,	58	John Selkrig,	13
Timothy Scott,	38	Elizabeth Porter,	17	Isaac Prichard,	51
Daniel Killum,	45	Thomas Upson,	64	William Adams,	91
Asa Scovill,	39	Elisha Friebe,	63		
Edmund Tompkins,	110	Ebenezer Bronson,	73	No. 51.	£3,117
Samuel Williams,	50	Reuben Blakeslee,	22		

The petition was not granted. A like fate attended another presented in Oct., and still another in May, 1761. The last had fifty-four signers.

In 1786, the old society agreed to pay for preaching the then ensuing winter, eight sabbaths, at West Farms. In 1787, they appropriated £9 for the same object. In 1790, West Farms and the adjoining portions of Woodbury and Southbury were made into a distinct society by the name of Middlebury. The church was organized in 1796. Seth Bronson and Nathan Osborn were appointed deacons. The first minister, Rev. Ira Hart, was installed in 1798, and was dismissed April 5th, 1809. His successor was Mark Mead.

In June, 1800, the society of Middlebury petitioned the Assembly for an act conferring on them town rights. Wa-

---

West Branch three miles [or more] from meeting house. [These were the petitioners for parish privileges.]

Amos Scott,	£46	Benj. Wilmot,	£108	Abner Monson,	£35
James Bronson,	76	Stephen Abbott,	82	Isaac Bronson,	140
Ebenezer Richason,	69	John Scott,	39	Isaac Bronson, Jr.,	41
Ephraim Bissel,	21	Edmund Scott,	24	Eunice Scott,	18
Dr. P. [Peter] Powers,	78	Stephen Miles,	68	David Miles,	29
Thomas Mallory,	60	Ebenezer Lawton,	10		
Josiah Bronson,	168	Nathaniel Richason,	50	No. 21.	£1,282, 6s.
Benj. Bristol,	46	Thomas Richason,	56		

East Branch [afterwards Wolcott] three miles [or more] from the meeting house.

Thomas Welton,	£88	William Cole,	£9	William Monson,	£13
Benjamin Nichols,	84	Roger Prichard,	96	Daniel Alcock,	48
John Alcock, Jr.,	54	James Basset,	55	James Alcock,	49
John Alcock,	81	Joseph Beach,	54	William Woodward,	6
Benjamin Benham,	40	Isaac Cleaveland,	29	Isaac Hopkins,	151
Seth Bartholomew,	52	Joseph Suttill,	86	Barnabas Lewis,	86
Joseph Suttill, Jr.,	7	Shadrick Benham,	26	Abial Roberts,	78
Cornel Johnson,	45	Josiah Adkins,	85	Josiah Rogers,	49
Eldad Mix,	22	William Hickox,	52		
Edward Rogers,	21	Abial Roberts, Jr.,	2	No. 28.	£1,261, 1s.

South Branch [afterwards Naugatuck] three miles [or more] from meeting house.

Abraham Wooster,	£76	Stephen Warner,	£66	Charles Warner,	£47
Stephen Hopkins,	111	Issac Scott,	44	Enoch Scott,	41
Israel Terrel,	11	John Hopkins,	144	Thomas Porter, Jr.,	84
Lt. John Lewis,	161	Amos Osborn,	74	Aaron Terrell,	88
Capt. G[ideon] Hotchkiss,	174	Ira Beebe,	16	Benjamin Tinker,	29
Samuel Lewis,	119	Israel Calkins,	8	Stephen Hopkins, Jr.,	91
Samuel Porter,	65	Gideon Hickox,	158	Ebenezer Judd,	26
Isaac Judd,	56	William Hoadley,	118	Simeon Beebe,	28
Gideon Scott,	40	Samuel Hoadley,	21	John Terrell,	48
Moses Terrell	52	Benjamin Prichard,	18	Isaac Spencer,	79
George Scott,	25	Einathan Prichard,	29		
Dan. Williams,	45	Joseph Sperry,	81	No. 86.	£2,226, 15s.
Oliver Terrell,	51	Samuel Scott,	90		

terbury resolved to oppose the application ; but, at the same time, chose a committee to confer with the memorialists and "hear their propositions," &c. The committee were Messrs. Joseph Hopkins, Noah Baldwin and John Kingsbury. The society was finally incorporated, with town privileges, in 1807.

So far as ascertained, the first settler within the limits of present Wolcott was John Alcock of New Haven. He bought, March 31, 1731, of Josiah Rogers of Branford, for £82, 117½ acres of land on Spindle Hill, described as in the northeast quarter near Ash Swamp or Potuckco's Ring, (in the northwest part of the present town of Wolcott,) on which he settled with a young family in the same year. He was admitted as an inhabitant, Dec. 13, 1731. In subsequent years, he added largely to his landed estate. After Alcock, Isaac Hopkins, (tanner,) Thomas Welton, Eliakim Welton, Roger Prichard, Joseph Beach, Eldad Mix, Shadrick Benham, Abiel Roberts and others became settlers.

In Oct. 1760, certain individuals living in the contiguous territory of Waterbury, Farmington and "Southington long lots, on the Mountain," numbering twenty-eight, petitioned the Assembly to make them a distinct society. They stated that they occupied a tract of land five miles square, were £2,000 in the list and lived an inconvenient distance from places of public worship. The western inhabitants were petitioners at the same session, also asking parish privileges. Waterbury first society remonstrated. They said that the eastern memorialists (belonging to their society) numbered seventeen and stood £811, 14s. in the list—that there were twenty-five of the western memorialists (embraced in the first society) who were £1,360, 13s. in the list—and that there were thirty-four taxpayers having an united list of £2,220, not embraced in either of the proposed parishes, who lived three, four or six miles southwardly from the meeting house, and who were as well entitled to society privileges as the signers of either of the memorials.

The remonstrants farther declared that the land out of the center, for two or three miles each way, was broken and barren, so that, though the town had been settled for nearly one

hundred years, the number of those bearing lists living within two and a half miles of the meeting house, exclusive of Episcopalians, was but sixty-six, with an aggregate list of £3,669, 7s. 4d. These were the facts, they continued; and if the prayers of the memorialists are granted and two new societies made, a third would be asked for, embracing the southern inhabitants, and could not with justice be refused. If the three sections were taken off, they contended, they would be "stripped of almost all the inhabitants but those that live within about a quarter of a mile of the meeting house." Such action, "they were of the mind, must lay the foundation for the ruin of the society, since the lines [spoken of] comprehend about all the feasible land on each side."

The petition was rejected, as was another with forty-three signers, in May, 1762.

In Oct. 1762, the eastern people, numbering thirty-eight, renewed their petition, and the committee of the old society again remonstrated. The latter represented that the memorialists living in Waterbury numbered twenty-one with an united list of £998—that the west line of the proposed parish came within two miles of the meeting house, "and it might almost as well come quite to it as it includes all the inhabitants that way except two or three families"—that "there were two distant parts more (besides the memorialists) in this society, at as great a distance as they and each of them bigger in number and list (viz.) at South Farms numbering forty eight and £2,407 in list, and at West Farms twenty three, and £1,418 in list." The remonstrants continued :

So there are three several parts under just the same need, and so the whole society with £8,000 list wants to be divided into four different societies. [ \* \* ] If these distant parts are exempted from taxes, the Old Spot would have fifty seven bearing lists and £3,139 in list.

The tenor of the memorial leads to distraction and not edification, [ \* \* ] and the granting of it would be as the letting forth of waters that will soon overwhelm us in ruin [ \* \* ]. Very sorry our brethren should oblige us so often to trouble the Hon. Assembly with repeated accounts of our situation and leanness, especially in such times as these we live in.

We [the committee] being concerned in making and collecting rates, have enough to do to keep from starving out the gospel, by collecting the moderate sums granted, which is a very difficult spot of work in instances not a few, unless we would drag men to jail, or restrain from them by force what we are sensible they know not how to do without.

Notwithstanding the cogency of this reasoning, the people of Farmingbury (so called) were allowed to hire preaching five months in the year and to set up a school, and in the meantime to be exempt from other society and school taxes. But the line established as the western limit of the winter parish was not satisfactory to the first society. Their committee complained that it came within two miles of the meeting house and extended "south as far as a due east line." They prayed (May, 1763) that the act granting winter privileges might be annulled, or a committee sent to view the circumstances, &c. A committee was appointed and continued till May, 1763, when they made a report and recommended that the limits of the winter parish should be contracted, the south end of the western line being made to run farther east. The Farmingbury people, by a committee, resisted this movement. They complained that the Assembly's committee went beyond instructions, and prayed that the existing line might be confirmed, or that they might be incorporated into a distinct society, the expense to be paid by the old society. Sixteen of the inhabitants, however, to be included in the new parish remonstrated against such incorporation. The result was, the Assembly approved the report of their last committee, and denied the adverse petition.

In the spring of 1767, thirty-one petitioners of the winter parish requested society privileges, and asked that the limits of the society might be extended into New Cambridge, (since Bristol.) They said they numbered seventy-one families, and had a list of £3,872, 8s. (The list of the old society was then, exclusive of Churchmen and Baptists, £9,854, 11s. 3d.) The petition was denied, as was a new one in Oct. 1768, with fifty-two signers.

In the spring of 1770, another petition was presented, bearing forty-nine names, praying that they, the memorialists, might be made a distinct society. The subject was continued to the Oct. session, and a committee appointed to view the circumstances. They reported that they "found within the limits described about ninety persons that bare lists and about sixty eight families, exclusive of the Church of England, and the sum total of their lists to be about £3,900." The report

was accepted and a society incorporated, Nov. 1770, by the name of Farmingbury. A year afterwards, the parish asked for a land tax of 3d. an acre for four years. The request was granted.

In December, 1787, the inhabitants of Farmingbury presented a memorial, in town meeting, giving reasons why they should be incorporated into a distinct town, and asking the consent of the meeting. A committee was appointed to take the matter into consideration and hear the proposals that might be made "concerning public moneys, bridges and town's poor," &c., and report make. Josiah Bronson, Stephen Ives, Aaron Benedict, Ezra Bronson, John Welton and Samuel Lewis were the committee. "It is rather a doubt in our minds," they reported, "of the expediency of granting them their request, on any consideration whatever, but more especially upon the offers and proposals in several articles by them" made.

Oct. 8, 1792, Farmingbury applied to the Legislature for the desired act of incorporation. The town voted, that if the memorialists would within eight days give up all right to the ministerial and school moneys, pay twenty pounds in consideration of being released from supporting the great bridge on the Woodbury road, bind themselves to take care of their proportion, according to the grand list, of the town poor, and to pay their share of the town debts, then, in that case, the town would not oppose the object of the memorial.

In the spring of 1796, Farmingbury was made a distinct town by the name of Wolcott, and Waterbury "appointed a committee to settle and adjust all matters and concerns between" the two towns.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

## MR. LEAVENWORTH'S MINISTRY: THE THIRD MEETING HOUSE.

TILL 1738, when Westbury was incorporated, all ecclesiastical matters, at present considered as belonging to the society, were managed by the town. At this period, however, it became necessary that these matters should be under the exclusive direction of the different societies. As there are now no known records of the first society of Waterbury bearing an earlier date than 1806, and no church records anterior to 1795, additional difficulties are thrown in the way of writing a connected ecclesiastical history. The society's records were in existence a few years ago, and possibly may again turn up, on removing the forgotten rubbish from somebody's garret. The facts which will be given have been gleaned, in part, from some brief notes taken from the lost records some thirty years ago, by the late Bennet Bronson.

The first meeting of the first society of Waterbury appears to have been held Nov. 16, 1738, at which time, John Southmayd, Jr. was chosen clerk. Not long after Mr. Southmayd's release from his ministerial charge, a Mr. Buckingham was invited to become the minister, but he refused. In June, 1739, a "call" was made out for the Rev. Mark Leavenworth, a graduate of Yale College, in 1737, a native of Stratford, with an offer of £500 settlement and £150 salary. He was ordained in March, 1740. Towards his "settlement," several persons gave by deed certian tracts of land. Thus, Dec. 1, 1739, Moses Blakeslee, "of New Haven," (then about to remove to Waterbury,) gave ten acres in the undivided lands; Jeremiah Peck ten acres; Isaac Bronson seven acres and a half; Stephen Hopkins seven and a half acres; Stephen Upton, Thomas Clark, John Bronson, Thomas Bronson and John Judd, each five acres; all "for the use of the ministry in said society in settlement." Soon afterwards, Thomas Judd deeded seven



acres, John Southmayd ten acres and Samuel Scott three acres, in the undivided lands, and Joseph Lewis five acres in "the sequester," all for the same object.

In 1747, Mr. Leavenworth refused that part of his salary which was levied upon the Church-of-England inhabitants.\* In 1748, his salary was increased to £290; in 1749, to £350; in 1750, to £400, "old tenor," a committee at the same time being appointed to inspect and graduate the rates, and to make the salary equivalent to £150 at the time Mr. Leavenworth was settled, which action, the record says, was satisfactory to Mr. L. In 1752, his salary was still further increased to £450, and in 1753 to £500. These regular augmentations of salary were designed as a compensation for the progressive depreciation of the currency, occasioned by the repeated issues of bills of credit, or notes of circulation, to be redeemed at a future period by the colonial government. These issues were commenced in 1709, but owing to their moderate amount, the consequences were not serious for many years. Though Dr. Trumbull thinks otherwise, the currency must have been a good deal depreciated in 1739. But this had taken place so gradually, that the effect had hardly been noticed. In this year, the Spanish war broke out, and to defray the heavy expenses, a large issue of new bills was made. To keep up their value, they were made a legal tender. As a consequence, the old bills, called "old tenor bills," which had been and continued to be the standard of value in business transactions, rapidly depreciated, or, what amounts to the same thing, all other commodities quickly appreciated. The "new tenor bills" do not appear to have been employed in ordinary transactions, and the legal tender-provision, by reason of complaints made to the English government, was soon repealed. Additions continued to be made to a miserable paper currency, and prices rose to an unprecedented extent. A bushel of wheat which, in 1733, was in Waterbury worth 8s., and in 1740 10s., had, in 1752, risen to £1, 15s., and in 1753, to £1, 18s.

---

\* It will be remembered that ministerial taxes levied upon Churchmen were by the statute to be paid over to their own clergyman when they had one; but at this time I believe they were destitute of a minister in Waterbury. Consequently, the taxes, which were gathered from all alike, belonged by law to Mr. Leavenworth.

Rye was charged in 1733 at 6s., in 1744 at 18s., in 1750, at £1, in 1755 at £1, 8s. The labor of a man, in 1753, per day, commanded £1, 2s. In all cases, old tenor currency is intended. When the price of an article was to be paid in specie, or its equivalent, it was customary to bargain for "lawful money." About 1756, the paper currency system exploded, and the people returned to the specie standard. In that year, wheat was sold for 5s., rye for 2s. 6d., and a man's day's work for 2s., bearing one eighth or one tenth part only of the nominal value they had previously done.\* These enormous fluctuations were, of course, productive of the most serious mischief.

In 1755, Mr. Leavenworth's salary was £65 "proclamation money," or its equivalent in old tenor; in 1759, £54; in 1761, £65; in 1762, £82; in 1781, £55, but on account of the burdens of the society and the public taxes, Mr. L. agreed to accept £45. In 1782, the salary was £65 and £10 in wood; in 1791, £70, but Mr. L. gave the society £5 of it.

In 1792, in consequence of Mr. Leavenworth's increasing infirmities, the society appointed a committee to confer with him concerning the settlement of a colleague. An arrangement was made, and in March of the following year a vote was passed to give him, as a consideration, £80 money, twenty cords of wood and the use of the parsonage lot.

Mr. Leavenworth died Aug. 20, 1797, aged 86, in the 58th year of his ministry. A few months before his death he officiated in public, and a year before, as I gather from the MSS. of Dr. Trumbull, preached seven sabbaths.

After Mr. Leavenworth received an invitation to settle in Waterbury, and before his ordination, he purchased of Dea. Thomas Judd the Serg. Hickox place, then containing five and three quarter acres, for which he agreed to pay £250. C. B. Merriman's dwelling stands a little farther south, but mostly on the same foundation as the old house.

Mr. Leavenworth's ministry in Waterbury commenced at a

---

\* The people of Northbury, in voting Mr. Todd's salary, sometimes tried to fix the value of the currency as compared with silver or lawful money, though generally they did not make sufficient allowance for depreciation. Thus, in 1751, sixty shillings, in 1752, sixty-eight shillings, and in 1754, seventy-two shillings, were considered as equivalent to one ounce of silver. (The U. S. mint price of silver of standard purity is \$1.21 per ounce, Troy.) In 1755, twelve shillings, old tenor, were to be paid for 1 shilling lawful money.

critical period. Until a short time previous, the general interests, secular and religious, were conducted in a spirit of peace and harmony. Now, however, various causes concurred to destroy this concord. Westbury was incorporated in 1738 and Northbury in 1739. From the moment these societies were organized, separate and indeed opposing interests sprung up. The town foresaw the difficulties and for a time opposed the division; but at last yielded to the necessity and propriety of the thing. After the separation, the different societies regarded their special interests chiefly. They even went so far as to nominate, in their meetings, town officers, which were recommended to the town voters on election days. These attempts, on the part of the different societies, to forestall action in matters belonging exclusively to the town, at last became so annoying as to call forth a rebuke. The town voted, Dec. 12, 1748, that the nominations "brought in by Westbury and Northbury" were "not to be regarded; it being the proper work of this day to nominate and choose officers as the law directs."

Other difficulties grew out of the public funds. The first, or old society, claimed all the ministerial property, thus leaving the people of Westbury and Northbury without resources from this quarter, (though they or their fathers may have contributed to the original fund.) The latter were of course dissatisfied with this state of things. They also saw troubles in the future concerning the school moneys. They looked forward to the time when their parishes should be made separate towns. Then, the old town would assert her exclusive right to the school property. The discussions connected with these exciting topics, as might be expected, were not always conducted in the best temper. Much bad feeling was engendered.

In 1740, that wonderful man Whitfield appeared in New England, and preached with amazing power in several places in Rhode Island, Massachusetts and Connecticut. All classes caught the enthusiasm, and New England was in a blaze of excitement. A Revival such as modern times had not before witnessed was the consequence. With the intensity of feeling, there was the usual mixture of bad passions. Great diversity of sentiment and angry controversy followed. Strange opin-

ions and irregular and disorderly practices sprung up. Ministers forsook their pulpits and became itinerants, and lay preachers with more zeal than knowledge were common. All took sides. Those who favored the new doctrines and practices were called New Lights, while those who chose to adhere to the good old ways of their fathers, discountenancing innovation, were denominated Old Lights. The clergy were divided; "while the magistrates and principal gentlemen of the commonwealth" were on the side of the Old Lights. Oppressive laws were enacted and ecclesiastical discipline attempted, but all in vain. The excitement extended to Waterbury, and Mr. Leavenworth, a young man of warm impulses, sympathized with the New Lights, while Mr. Southmayd, more distrustful of appearances, sided with the Old Lights. Some of the meetings of the New Lights were extremely boisterous and disorderly, so that, on one occasion, John Southmayd, Jr., a constable of the town, felt himself justified in appearing in their midst and commanding the peace of the commonwealth.\* The consequence of all this was much exasperation of feeling mixed up with religious zeal. Mr. Leavenworth's ardor led him into difficulty. He, together with the Rev. Mr. Humphreys of Derby and the Rev. Mr. Todd of Northbury, had assisted in the ordination of Mr. Jonathan Lee of Salisbury, who was suspected of the New Light heresy. They were all brought before the Association, and suspended from all "associational communion."†

Owing to the general phrenzy which had taken hold of the people, the churches were convulsed and many of them rent into fragments. The old society of Waterbury suffered greatly. Many, annoyed and disgusted with what they saw, turned Churchmen. Among them was constable Southmayd, the son of the former minister. He was one of the subscribers, in 1742, to the fund for building the new Episcopal church. Soon, however, he returned to the society he had left.

Other causes, having their origin in religious differences, conspired to destroy the good feeling which had previously prevailed. The Church of England claimed to be the established reli-

---


\* B. Bronson's Manuscripts.

† Trumbull, II, p. 196.

gion of the Colony, and the Congregationalists everywhere were declared dissenters. Our fathers were provoked and alarmed by this (as they deemed it) extraordinary arrogance. They had crossed the ocean and subdued the wilderness; endured hardships and encountered dangers that they might find an asylum for their religion, where they might worship God according to their consciences. Now they saw with sorrow that they were not safe in their retreat. The same dread power from which they had fled still threatened them. Episcopacy was spreading in different quarters. Several years before, Rector Culter of Yale College and other clergymen in the neighborhood forsook their charges and went to England to receive Episcopal ordination, no other being considered valid. They returned to this country as missionaries in the service of the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts. This was a powerful society in England, with ample funds. New England was an important field of its operations, and the religious disorders of the country favored its action. Nearly all the Episcopal clergy were in its pay. The Congregationalists of Waterbury observed with apprehension the movement making among themselves in favor of Church-of-Englandism. So great were their fears from this quarter, that they required their new minister, Mr. Leavenworth, to give a bond for £500 to be paid to the society, "if he should within twenty years from that time [Nov. 21st, 1739] become a Churchman, or by immorality or heresy render himself unfit for a gospel minister, to be decided by a council." The course of their enemies in opposing the payment of the £100 voted to Mr. Southmayd, and their conduct in Northbury, showed organization and determination, and proved that their fears were something more than an apparition. Thus the elements of agitation and conflict were at work in all directions. For a long time, those of opposite religious views could not agree to differ. The doctrine of toleration in matters of religious opinion had not then been learned. It was new to the world. No living examples existed by which its real nature and practical workings could be studied. All sought religious liberty for themselves, but nobody thought of conceding it to others. At last all yielded to its advantages and its necessity, and peace







Portrait of Seth Thomas, 1847

*Seth Thomas*

1847, Boston, N.Y.





returned. In 1748-9, Mr. Leavenworth was released from his £500 bond.

Mr. Leavenworth was the chaplain of the second regiment (Col. Whiting's) in the campaign of 1760, in the old French war. The following is his bill for services, to the colonial government :

To my service from 24 March to Nov <sup>r</sup> is 33 weeks 1 day at	£99, 8s. 7d.
To my expense and carrying my baggage from home and one man and two horses,	2, 14s. 7d.
To my expenses returning home from Schenectady, being able to travel but slowly, a man and two horses,	3, 13s. 6d.
	<hr/>
	£105, 16s. 8d.

MARK LEAVENWORTH.

Mr. Leavenworth had the reputation of being what is called a "plain preacher," not having always the fear of his people before his eyes. He doubtless thought that it did good to stir them up, sometimes roughly. He had among his hearers a person of some standing, who had the infirmity of sleeping (and probably snoring) in meeting. Thinking perhaps to cure the man's weakness, he on one occasion stopped suddenly in his discourse, and addressing himself to the sleeper, said—"Wake up! wake up!"—The response quickly followed—"I am not asleep any more than you, Parson Leavenworth; so please mind your own business." Of course, a great commotion followed. Some were indignant, others amused. Two days after, or on the 10th day of June, 1760, the delinquent, Samuel Root, was arraigned, on a grand jury complaint, before Thomas Clark, for "profaning the sabbath, or Lord's day, by rude talking in time of public worship, to the disturbance of both minister and congregation, contrary to law." The culprit confessed that he did talk, &c., and pleaded in justification, "that he had told Mr. Leavenworth that if ever he spoke to him in particular in time of worship to wake up, he would tell him that it was none of his business." The Court looked upon the plea as insufficient, and ordered the guilty party to pay a fine of "five shillings money and costs of court taxed at £0-4-02, and stand committed till he comply," &c.

Mr. Leavenworth was considered a benevolent man, having

a large heart in the right place. He was lenient to his poor parishioners who could not conveniently pay their rates, and was beloved by all. He was in habits of familiarity with his people; could pass a joke and enjoy one even at his own expense. A parishioner brought him a load of green poplar wood with which to pay his taxes. Mr. L. saw the swindle and complained of the "pople." "Well," said the other, "you sometimes preach pople." When the new meeting house was building, Mr. L. took a lively interest in the enterprise, and one day went down to give assistance. He placed himself *astride* a stick and commenced knocking out a mortice. One of the workmen, noticing his position, (which the rules of the craft did not allow,) approached stealthily and nailed him by the slack of his trowsers to the timber. The mortice being finished, Mr. L. attempted to move, but found himself fast. By a stroke of the chisel he cut himself free, but damaged the instrument. In a mock trial which followed, the parties were both fined, the parson being sentenced to turn grindstone to repair the chisel.

Mr. Leavenworth preached the election sermon in May, 1772, in Hartford, which was printed. It is the only sermon of his which I have fallen in with, and is a respectable performance. Its main subject is charity. In the course of it, the author's love of liberty comes out. He repels indignantly the charges brought by the ecclesiastical dignitaries of England against the Puritans of America.

In 1794, Edward Porter of Farmington, who graduated at Yale College in 1786, began to preach in Waterbury, and in October was hired for a year for £90 and £10 in wood. In the year following, he received an invitation to settle as colleague pastor, with the offer of £100 salary and his wood, with the use of the parsonage after Mr. Leavenworth's death. He was installed Nov. 18, 1795. In December, 1797, however, in consequence of failing health, he desired to be released from his charge. He was dismissed Jan. 18, 1798. Afterwards, he continued to reside in Waterbury for many years, had some difficulty with another church-member, and at length removed to Farmington, where he died in 1828.

Holland Weeks, a graduate of Dartmouth College, was the

next minister of Waterbury. In October, 1799, he signified his acceptance of the call extended to him, with £100 salary and the use of the parsonage lot. He was installed Nov. 20, 1799. In November, 1806, he made known his wish for a dismissal. The society voted to unite with him in this object, but decided "not to submit pecuniary matters."\*

January 2d, 1795, the society voted to build a meeting house by more than a two thirds vote, and appointed a committee to fix on a plan and place. On the sixteenth of the same month the committee reported to build near the old spot, sixty by forty-two feet. It was decided that the house should have a steeple, should be covered the ensuing summer, and finished by the first of November, 1796. The committee were also directed to make a contract for the building with William Leavenworth for £850. To defray the expenses, a tax was laid of 3s. on the pound, on the list of 1794. The house was dedicated in 1796. A bell was soon added, which was to weigh from six hundred to six hundred and fifty pounds, which it was voted the Episcopal society should have the use of "on all proper occasions." A new bell was procured about 1813, to replace the old one which had been badly cracked. A new cupola steeple was added about 1811, the tall old spire having contracted a vicious habit of leaning eastward, as though earthward inclined. Its cost was not to exceed \$60. The pews, with their high backs, (with open work under the rail,) were removed at a later date, and slips substituted in their place. The house stood in front of the present residence of Dr. Rockwell, looking southward, with roads running on all sides. The growing taste of the village, consequent on thrift, however, discovered that it had an unseemly look in its then present position. It was consequently rolled back to the spot where the Second Congregational church now stands, the lot having been given by Mr. Scovill

---

\* The early deacons of the Waterbury church were as follows, the date referring to the time of their appointment :—Thomas Judd, about 1695; Thomas Hickox, about 1794; Thomas Clark, about 1728; Joseph Lewis, about 1740; Thomas Bronson, about 1750; Thomas Bronson, 2d, about 1756; Samuel Lewis, before 1763; Andrew Bronson, before 1770; Joseph Hopkins; Timothy Clark, June, 1796; Stephen Bronson, December, 1797; Daniel Bronson, May, 1800; Joseph Bartholomew, May, 1800.

The early physicians of Waterbury 1st society were Daniel Porter, Ephraim Warner, Daniel Porter, 3d, Benjamin Warner, Preserved Porter, Timothy Porter, Isaac Baldwin, Frederick Leavenworth, Joseph Porter, Edward Field.

as an inducement for its removal. Scarcely, however, had it reached its resting place, when a project was started, and after considerable delay carried through, of putting up another and more fashionable house. The old building at length passed into the hands of Mr. Scovill above named, by whom it was fitted up for offices and public rooms. It received the name of Gothic Hall. Subsequently, it was removed again to its present site in the rear of the Second Congregational church.

---

## CHAPTER XIX.

### . EPISCOPACY IN WATERBURY.

THE movement which terminated in the formation of an Episcopal church and society in Waterbury commenced at an early period, when there were but few Churchmen and three or four congregations in the Colony. It is stated that James Brown, who came from West Haven, in 1722, who had probably heard the preaching of Dr. Johnson of that place, a distinguished convert to Episcopacy, was the first of that persuasion in Waterbury. At what time Brown, profanely called Bishop Brown, was converted to the English church is not known. Probably it was not till after his removal from West Haven. In 1737, according to the Churchman's Magazine for 1807, there were in Waterbury not exceeding six or seven heads of families (Trumbull says but two or three\*) in all who were of the same belief. In the course of the year mentioned, divine service,

---

\* Dr. Trumbull appears to have obtained his information from a manuscript letter of John Welton, Esq., of Buckshill, who was an early and influential member of the church, and who died in 1816, aged 89. This letter will be found among Dr. Trumbull's papers in Yale College Library.

for the first time, "according to the rites of the church," was performed in Waterbury, by Mr. Jonathan Arnold, a missionary of the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, who was at first settled in West Haven as Dr. Johnson's successor, and who at the time was a minister in orders for West Haven, Derby and Waterbury. He baptized two infants, both of whom were living in 1807, one a respectable member of the church; and after having officiated a few times, removed out of the mission. During the period between Mr. Arnold's removal and 1740, Dr. Johnson, then of Stratford, and Mr. Beach of Newtown, visited Waterbury occasionally, preaching and administering the ordinances. Next, a Mr. Morris was appointed by the society in England to officiate in this and other places in the neighborhood; but he did not like the country, and soon (about 1742) returned to Europe. Rev. James Lyon, (an Irishman,) another missionary, succeeded Mr. Morris, about 1743. He had charge of the three parishes named above, resided in Derby, preached one third of the time in Waterbury, and after some four years removed to Brookhaven, Long Island, where he acted as a missionary many years. Following his departure there was a vacancy for a time, during which printed sermons and prayers were read by some competent person, every Sunday.

In 1749, Mr. Richard Mansfield, (afterwards D. D.,) a native of the Colony, returned from England "in holy orders," and took charge of the parishes of Derby, Waterbury and West Haven, living in Derby and officiating one third of the time in each place. While under his charge, the church flourished much. He is described as a man beloved by his people and willing to make any sacrifices for their good. "No extremity of weather or badness of roads prevented his visiting the sick, baptizing children or committing to the earth the remains of his parishioners."\* Mr. Mansfield continued in the mission till 1759, at which time he withdrew and occupied himself with the parishes of Derby and Oxford, with which he was connected many years.

The prosperity of the Episcopal church in Waterbury dates

---

\* Rev. Chauncey Prindle; MSS. published in the Chronicle of the Church, July 6, 1889. See also Churchman's Magazine, Vol. IV, pp. 128, 171.

from about 1740. In January of that year, certain persons "calling themselves Churchmen" remonstrated, it will be remembered, against paying Mr. Southmayd the £100 voted him. Their names, fifteen in number, were spread upon the town record and the list is interesting. Here it is :

Ephraim Warner,	Nathaniel Merrill,	Caleb Thomson,
Daniel Porter,	Obadiah Warner,	James Williams,
Robert Johnson,	Richard Welton,	Thomas Barnes,
James Brown,	Joseph Smith,	Abraham Warner,
Benjamin Warner,	Ephraim Warner, Jr.,	Samuel Brown.

[The above list is copied from the manuscripts of the late Bennet Bronson. There is no record of town meetings between Dec. 1738 and Dec. 1740. One leaf, perhaps more, of the record book is missing. It may have been lost in binding. The missing portion was in existence some thirty years ago, as proved by the manuscripts referred to.]

In this year (1740) came the great Revival, bringing in its train extravagances and disorders. The Episcopal church gained strength as the divisions and animosities in the old society increased. Within a short time, it is stated, twenty-five heads of families were added to their numbers, and they resolved, in 1742, to erect a church. The following persons were subscribers to a fund to defray the expense :

James Brown,	George Nichols,	Richard Welton,
John Barnes,	Thomas Osborn,	Richard Welton, 2d,
Thomas Barnes,	Daniel Porter,	Eliakim Welton,
Joseph Bronson,	Jonathan Prindle,	Ephraim Warner,
Nathaniel Gunn,	John Southmayd, [Jr.,]	Ebenezer Warner.
John Judd,		

The town was applied to to provide the land on which the new house should be set, and the following vote was passed, Dec. 13, 1742 :

Upon the request of Dr. Benjamin Warner and others, the town, by vote, gave liberty to set up a church on the high way, north of Edmund Scott's house lott against the apple trees in said Scott's lot by the highway, and appoint the present townsman with John Southmayd a committee to agree with the said Scott to get some of his lot, if they can have it upon reasonable terms, that the house may be better accommodated and the highway less incumbered.

For some reason not now understood, the ground above designated, and which is the same as that on which the present Episcopal church stands, was not obtained or not im-

proved, and a year afterwards the town gave to William Selkigg the liberty to place a house on it.

At another meeting, held April 10, 1743, in answer to a petition from those who "were about to set up a church," the town "did by vote agree that provided they purchased a place of any particular person to set their house upon and set it accordingly, they might have liberty to draw twelve pounds in money, old tenor bills, out of the town treasury to pay for the same."

A few days after the above grant from the town, or April 20, 1743, when the church had already been commenced, John Judd, who had recently become a Churchman, for £12 money,\* conveyed to James Brown, Richard Welton, Benjamin Warner, Moses Bronson, John Barnes, Richard Welton, Jr., Robert Johnson, Jonathan Prindle, Nathaniel Gunn, Jos. Bronson and George Nichols, and "to others of the denomination of the Church of England, or professors thereof," a piece of land, "to accommodate the setting up of a church," described as the southwest corner of his house lot, "where they are now raising a church," being forty-five feet on the south side, next the main street, twenty-eight feet on the west side, next to Willow street, fifty feet on the north, and thirty-nine on the east side. The church stood on a line with the east and west street near where Mr. C. C. Post's dwelling house is.

At this stage of proceedings, or in February, 1743-4, the Church-of-England-men determined on a movement to obtain parish privileges. Without such privileges they could not lay taxes for building a church. Before going to the Legislature, however, they applied to the town to secure its good will. The town, in a liberal spirit, resolved that it would not oppose them in their application. Their petition, signed by thirty-eight persons, came before the Assembly in October, 1744, and was rejected. Here is the paper :

---

\* It is understood that this land was a donation by the grantor to the Episcopal church, notwithstanding a consideration is mentioned in the deed, and this consideration corresponds with the grant which had just been made by the town to purchase ground on which to place the church.



The Memorial of the subscribers being Professors of the Church of England and inhabitants of the Town of Waterbury in New Haven county, by their agent Doct. Benj. Warner of sd Waterbury, Humbly sheweth—

That whereas your Honours Memoriallists, being Professors of the Church of England, and bound in Duty to carry on the Worship of God amongst us from which there arises considerable charges that are Necessary in order thereunto, as building a church and Keeping it in Repair with many other things of the Like Importance, Which charges (as we your Humble Memorialists think) could be Defrayed More conveniently by a Tax upon each person according to their List, as such charges are in the Parrishes established by the Laws of this colony, And there being no Law of this colony Enabling us to Lay and Gather such Taxes, Humbly pray that your Honours, in your Great goodness, would be pleased to Grant us Parrish Priveleges in Every perticular (the School only excepted) as the Parrishes have established according to the Constitution of this Government, and your Memorialists as in Duty bound Shall ever pray. Waterbury April 22<sup>d</sup>. 1744.\*

Jonathan Scott,	Stephen Welton,	Benjamin Warner,
John Barns,	Zebulon Scott,	John Judd,
Gershom Scott,	Eliakim Welton,	Obadiah Warner,
Gamaliel Terril,	John Alcock,	Jonathan Prindel,
Robert Johnson,	Joseph Brunson,	Isaac Selkrigg,
Thomas Welton, Jr.,	James Browne,	Nathaniel Merrill,
Timothy Porter,	James Browne, Jr.,	Richard Welton,
Nathan Hubbard,	Joseph Browne,	Joseph Judd,
Benjamin Prichard,	Daniel How,	Richard Welton, Jr.,
Thomas Welton,	John Browne,	Edmund Scott, Jr.,
Nathan Prindel,	Thomas Barnes,	Ebenezer Warner,
Ebenezer Judd,	Moses Brounson,	George Nikols,
Dr. Ephraim Warner,	Daniel Porter,	Josiah Warner.

This catalogue of names may be supposed to represent nearly the entire strength of the new denomination at the date of the petition. I notice, however, the absence of three names which were on the paper of subscriptions for a church, to wit, Nathaniel Gunn, Thomas Osborn and John Southmayd [Jr.]; and of five names which are on the list of those who protested to the paying of Mr. Southmayd the £100 in 1740, to wit, Joseph Smith, Caleb Thomson, James Williams, Abraham Warner and Samuel Brown. Of these eight, John Southmayd, James Williams and Samuel Brown had died and Caleb Thomson had already, probably, removed to Harwinton. If we add the remaining four, all Churchmen, (and

---

\* Of course, the Assembly could not grant this petition without abandoning their system of legislation which made Congregationalism the religion of the State. Other Churchmen of other towns petitioned for corporate privileges with a like result.

all of whom were living in Waterbury in 1744, unless Joseph Smith is to be excepted,) to the thirty-eight petitioners, we have a total number of forty-two individuals, representing probably over two hundred persons, who were "professors [or adherents] of the Church of England," at this time.

At what period the church was so far finished that it could be occupied, does not appear. It was apparently used to meet in as early as 1744 or 1745; though it was probably not completed till 1747, (or after,) in which year it is spoken of in a deed as "erecting and carrying on." It was a small building, much smaller than the Congregational house, of a mean appearance, with galleries above and pews below, and a single door next the main street. It is distinctly remembered by our old people, and stood till after the new church was built in 1795. By the courtesy of the society, the Congregationalists met in it for worship while their own house was being erected in 1795. The "sabba' day house" which belonged to the church, or to those who met in it, was standing in front and a little to the south of William Brown's house till, say thirty-five years ago.

In the mean time, accessions continued to be made to the church. A spirit of liberality animated its members, and several important donations were made to it. February 11, 1744-5, Oliver Welton, a minor, with the consent of his guardian, John Southmayd, "for £65 money old tenor" to be paid by Dr. Benjamin Warner and others, professors of the Church of England, conveyed to them and their successors, "as a gleeb for the use of the church forever," two acres of land originally John Welton, Sen's, house lot, bounded east on Edmund Scott's house lot, west on said Southmayd's house lot, &c. This deed Welton\* confirmed ten months afterwards, when he became of age. The land thus conveyed, it will be noticed,

---

\* Oliver Welton, considered as one of the most important benefactors of the Episcopal church of Waterbury, (the land spoken of being regarded as a donation,) was a son of John and a grandson of John, Sen., (an original proprietor.) He was born Dec. 24, 1724; served through the old French war; held the rank of ensign and afterwards of lieutenant; was in the action at Lake George and (according to the Churchman's Magazine) at "the repulse at Crown Point when the gallant Lord Howe was killed." Of those scenes he would speak, in his old age, with the greatest emotion, till the tears flowed and his utterance was choked. He died Nov. 10, 1809.

lay a little west of the present Episcopal church. March 6, 1644-5, Jonathan Scott and Daniel Scott deeded to the same committee, for the same purpose, (no consideration mentioned,) seventeen and a half acres of woodland, westward of the town, which is still owned by the parish, and is situated in the "Park," so called. April 19, 1745, John Judd, for £21, old tenor, deeded to Benjamin Warner, Joseph Bronson, and Jonathan Prindle and their successors, &c., "as a glebe," six and three quarter acres of land northward from the town, bounded west on the highway by the common fence, &c. The land thus described is situated on the east side of Willow street, one hundred rods or so north of Main street, and is still in the possession of the parish. At the same time, and in the same deed, Thomas Barnes gave nine acres and fifty-eight rods lying westward of the old town plot lots, (recorded in Book III, p. 326.)\* Two years afterwards, (or March 25, 1747,) the committee named in the several deeds, conveyed the lands mentioned as follows :

In consideration of £700 old tenor money truly paid by Richard Welton and sundry other persons, professors of the Church of England, [we] do hereby give and grant the following parcels of land, intending the same for the first glebe lands to endow a certain parish church in Waterbury, erecting and carrying on, for the better accomplishing the endeavours aforesaid, in great reverence and regard to the Church of England as established by law, and her excellent doctrines, service, unity and order preferable to any other upon earth, for the honor of God, the surest peace and comfort of ourselves, neighbors and posterity, have founded the parish church aforesaid for the use aforesaid, and for the endowment thereof do by these presents freely give, grant, convey and confirm unto the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts the following pieces and parcels of land and buildings in Waterbury, that is to say—two acres of land with a house and fruit trees, [here the several parcels are described, all in trust,]—as soon as there shall be a rector according to the order of the church of England by law established, instituted and inducted, the premises shall be and inure to the use of such rector incumbent and his successors as the glebe lands of the said church in fee simple forever.

Soon after Oliver Welton's conveyance to the parish, a house for a parsonage was commenced by private subscription. Mr. Lyon reported in 1745, that it was then in the course of erection and was expected to be finished in the fall of that

---

\* All the above mentioned tracts of land are considered as gifts to the church by the grantors, though a specific sum is, in some instances, mentioned as the consideration.

year.\* The deed to the Society for Propagating the Gospel, in 1747, mentions "a house," so the building was probably completed at the time anticipated.

The grand list of those connected with the Episcopal church amounted, in 1760, to £1,344, 4s.

The first known record of the Episcopal society† of Waterbury is found in a copy, made apparently about 1770, of a former record, kept by Joseph Bronson. It relates to Mr. Scovill, to his visit to England for ordination, and to his prospective settlement as the minister of the parish. This is it:

July 11, 1758, at a meeting of the uestry [or parish] voted that we would giue Mr Scouil twenty pound starling a year and the use of the Gleebe prouiding he Got nothing at hum [in England] and it was a Greed that we should haue half he Got at hum — at the same uestry, voted that we would Giue Him £22-10 Starling to Carry him hum.

Rev. James Scovill was the eldest son of Lieut. William Scovill. His father lived on the Abner Johnson place, on the west side of Willow street, just above Grove, probably in the same house which is now standing, and which I believe to be the most ancient dwelling within the limits of the old town. I had supposed that Rev. James Scovill was born in it, (Jan. 27, 1732-3,) just before the father sold out; but the family tradition is that he was born in Westbury, (on Nova Scotia Hill,) though there are no traces of the father's residence there till Oct. 1733. James learned the weaver's trade, but somewhat late in life became a member of Yale College, designing to enter the ministry. Before his graduation, in 1757, his father died, leaving him, by will, £200 to complete his education. He returned from England an ordained minister about 1759, and took charge of the mission, receiving from the society "at home," £30 annually. He preached one half of the time in Waterbury and the other half in Northbury and New Cambridge, (Bristol.)

With the exception of the copied record which has been given, the records of the parish, still in existence, begin in 1761. Here is the first entry, followed by others bearing later dates:

---

\* Hawkins' Mission of the Church of England.

† It will be remembered that the Episcopallians were not organized into a legal *society* till after the Revolution.

At a vestre holdecin St Jameses Church at Waterbury on the 6 day of aprel 1761—At sd vestry Mr. Thomos Osborn was chosen Clark by the request [of] Mr. James Scouel Timothy porter and John Welton was chosen Church Wordens—voted in sd uestry to give the widow harison £1-0-0 that was Due from her on account of sum work that her husband was to Due to the Church—voted in sd vestry that Ebenezar Warner should assist in tuning the psalm—voted in sd uestry that Sam<sup>11</sup> Brown should a sist in tuning The psalm—voted in sd uestry that hezekiah Brown Should a Sist in tuning the psalm—voted in sd uestry that we will meet in the Church on Sundays and read prayers when Mr. Scouel is absent—voted in sd uestry that Mr. Scouil shall haue what is Due for the rent of the glebe.

[March 17, 1762, David Warner, Abraham Hickox and Eleazer Prindle were chosen societies committee and Timothy Porter, Jr., collector to gather Mr. Scovill's rate. The parish also voted that] Mr. Scovell shall have the foremost pew next the Broad alley in the East End of the Church.

March 2<sup>d</sup>, 1763, the vestry [parish] voted that they will be at the cost of a uestry Book—and that the money belonging to the church shall be laid out to furnish the communion table and to get a choshan for the pulpit and other things necessary for the pulpit and reading desk.—voted that Abraham Hickox, David Warner and John Welton be a committee to take cair of the prudentials of the church—voted to raise Mr. Scovill's rate this present year, and to give him 1½ penny on the pound.

March 6, 1764, the vestry chose John Welton and Daniel Brown church wardens, and voted Mr. Scovill 1½ penny on the pound for the present year without any deduction for the glebe.

[April 14, 1765, the first recorded christening took place, a vote having previously been passed that such record be made. The name of the child was Micah son of Noah Judd—sureties, Capt. Edward Scovill, Samuel Scovill, Sarah Brown. The sixth child christened was Amasa, son of Ebenezer Bronson, May 12th, 1765. He is still living, aged 92.]

During the year 1765, the church people in Westbury erected a church for themselves, which was placed in charge of Mr. Scovill. In consequence of his new duties, his services were withdrawn, in part, from Northbury and New Cambridge. The next year John Welton and John Hickox were chosen church wardens, and Mr. Scovill was to have a rate of £30 lawful money, annually.

April 24, 1770, John Welton and Ephraim Warner were appointed wardens, and a vote was passed "that Westbury shall have their part of Mr. Scovill's services of preaching, according as their list draws, till there shall come a minister to Northbury and New Cambridge." At another meeting in October, the vestry voted "that we will pay £45 starling as a year's salary to be paid to the minister of the Church of England in case Northbury and [New] Cambridge provide for

themselves, which vote is to continue in force until the said Northbury and Cambridge obtain a benefaction from the society [in England]". In 1771, a minister was obtained for these places, and Mr. Scovill was enabled to confine his attention to Waterbury and Westbury, preaching two-thirds of the time in Waterbury.

April 15, 1772, Seba Bronson, Hezekiah Brown, Epha Warner, Ebenezer Warner, Levi Welton, Ebenezer Bronson, Lemuel Nichols, Stephen Welton and Benjamin Benham were chosen "Quirresters." In April, 1781, Richard Welton and others were appointed a committee to repair and shingle the church. April 21, 1783, it was agreed "that Mr. Scovill should have liberty to pull down the glebe house, leaving the chimney and preserving the glass for the church." At the same time, Ephraim Warner and Benjamin Benham were chosen wardens.

After the close of the Revolutionary war, in 1783, the Society for Propagating the Gospel, &c., withdrew their missions from this country,\* in pursuance of a plan which confined its operations to the dependencies of the British empire. Thus Mr. Scovill was deprived of a large share of his support; but the English society offered him, if he would remove to New Brunswick, a liberal increase of salary, while, at the same time, the English government held out encouragement to clergymen in bounties of land. Mr. Scovill hesitated long as to his duty; but he felt that he could not support his family on the salary which he had been accustomed to receive from his parishes alone. He offered to remain provided his whole income should continue to be what it had been while a beneficiary of the English society, but the offer was not accepted. His parishes had in fact become much weakened by removals and the war. His people, however, seemed anxious to retain him, and voted, Nov. 8, 1784, to give him £55 salary, "including Westbury's proportion, according to the original agreement." Afterwards, Sep. 1, 1785, a vote was passed, "to

---

\* It is estimated that during the forty-six years that the church of Waterbury was under the care of the English society, it received from it not less than six thousand dollars in money, besides liberal donations in books. ["History of the Church," in the Waterbury American, Jan. 15, 1848.]

have Rev. Mr. Scovill's services in preaching one half of the time and to pay for the same," the amount being fixed at the next meeting, in December, at £45 [annually.]

In 1785, Mr. Scovill, against the advice of some of his friends, went to New Brunswick. He did not, however, at once remove his family. For three successive years, he returned and officiated in the winter season in his old church. It is mentioned, in the parish record, that he was present at a vestry meeting March 24, 1788. Soon after, he removed, with his family, to take permanent charge of his people in Kingston, Kings County, where he died Dec. 19, 1808, in the fiftieth year of his ministry. His widow, a daughter of Capt. George Nichols, died in June, 1835, aged 93. (Sabine, in his "Loyalists," says she died in 1832, aged 90.) His son, Rev. Elias Scovill, succeeded to the mission in Kings County, and died in Kingston, Feb. 1841, aged 70.

Mr. Scovill seems to have secured the respect and the confidence of his people. Under his ministrations they continued regularly to increase in numbers and respectability until just before the breaking out of the war of the Revolution. And during the war, he conducted himself with so much discretion, that though known to be a Royalist, he escaped the indignities and the violence which the Episcopal clergy of Connecticut, with few exceptions, suffered. He had the courage to continue with his people through the war, though it is believed he did not preach.

Mr. Scovill was known for punctuality and faithfulness in the discharge of his duties. "He taught his people from house to house; comforted the aged, instructed the young, and made himself agreeable to children—no despicable qualification in a clergyman." "He had a grave and becoming deportment, and was sound in doctrine." He is believed to have been a good man, devoted to his work and anxious to do it well. One of his manuscript sermons is before me. It is written in a simple and devotional strain, and in that spirit of kindness and benevolence which so much adorns a minister of the Gospel of peace.

In the first years of his ministry, Mr. Scovill appears to have lived in the glebe or parsonage house, standing on the John

Welton lot. Afterwards, he occupied the house in which his son James lived and died, and which stood where Dr. Rockwell now resides. The old house was removed some twenty years ago and is now standing on South Main street, a little below the Baptist church.

After Mr. Scovill decided to remove, the parish, May 1, 1786, appointed a committee to confer with the parish in Watertown "about getting a minister," while another was "chosen to wait on the Bishop at Stratford and desire him to visit us."\* Sep. 25th, of the same year, a vote was passed "to appropriate any money which remains in their hands to the glazing and repairing the church." The next year, (Dec. 8, 1787,) the parish voted "to apply to Mr. Prindle to know on what terms he will settle among us," &c.

After Mr. Scovill withdrew wholly from the parish, there was a vacancy for several years, during which time sundry persons appear to have been invited to preach. Rev. Solomon Blakeslee officiated for a time, and in May, 1789, received a call to settle, with a salary of £40 a year, "for half his services" to be augmented to £45 as the list of the society increased. He declined, and afterwards Rev. Chauncey Prindle officiated for a season. In 1790, Rev. David Foot was requested to become the minister. For two thirds of his time, he to reside in Waterbury, he was offered two-thirds of £85 money, and fire wood. He also declined. The society, in truth, seems not to have been in a very flourishing condition, and the temptations it presented to a minister seeking a support were not great. The parish sought first to strengthen itself by an union with Bristol and Salem (the Episcopalians of the latter place having three or four years previously organized themselves into a distinct parish, thus weakening the present society) in the settlement and support of a clergyman, an arrangement to which the people of Salem were favorably disposed. Failing, however, in their object, they applied "to the Episcopal conven-

---

\* Bishop Seabury, then probably on a temporary visit to Stratford, had recently returned from Scotland, where he had been consecrated as the first Bishop of the United States. He was sent for, it is presumed, for the purpose of administering the rite of confirmation, not yet having visited Waterbury with that design. Oct. 1, 1786, the record says, two hundred and fifty six persons received the rite of confirmation from Bishop Seabury.




tion, and requested their advice and influence in uniting to the parish the Episcopal parishes of Woodbury and Salem, informing them that we are willing to dispense with having but half the services of a clergyman, and paying in the same proportion." At the same time, they voted to confer with Woodbury and Salem respecting an union, &c. But somehow Salem appears to have taken umbrage at some of the proceedings, and in order to make amends a committee of the Waterbury church was instructed, Aug. 29, 1791, to invite the church of Salem to join them in the support of a clergyman, "and to inform our brethren that wherever we have treated them with any kind of neglect, we are willing to recind it and give fresh assurances that we will treat them with respect in future." This was satisfactory to the aggrieved party.


In the mean time, Rev. Seth Hart, who had been reading prayers for several months to the acceptance of the people, was invited to become the minister "as soon as he shall be put into holy orders." His salary for half the time, his residence being in the old society of Waterbury, was to be £40, lawful money, annually, to be increased twenty shillings a year for five years, and thereafter to be £45, he to have the use of the glebe. He was ordained the next year, 1792, to officiate half the time in Woodbury and Salem. During Mr. Hart's ministry the society flourished. But he remained not long. By his own desire, he was removed near the close of 1794 to Wallingford, and soon after to Hemstead, on Long Island. It appears by the catalogue of Yale College that "*Seth Hart*" graduated at that institution in 1784, and died in 1832.

On Mr. Hart's removal, several individuals liberally inclined, united and bought his house (standing where John C. Booth now lives) and five acres of land, and conveyed the whole to the church forever. The old glebe house, from neglect, had gone to decay.

During the vacancy which followed Mr. Hart's removal, Rev. Alexander V. Griswold, Rev. William Green, and Rev. Tillotson Bronson officiated, successively, in Waterbury. The two first are understood to have declined proposals of settlement. Mr. Bronson, after having preached several months, accepted an invitation to take the permanent charge of the







*John Buckingham*

*J. Kees, 1840*



parish, in December, 1797. He officiated three fourths of the time in Waterbury (receiving \$250 annually) and one fourth in Salem, and continued in the rectorship till the enhanced expenses of living compelled him to ask for an increase of salary. This being denied, he felt obliged to seek a support in another field. He preached his farewell discourse in June, 1806, and retired with the approbation of the bishop and the good will of his people.

During the vacancy which followed, Rev. Horace V. Barber officiated for a season, and afterwards became the settled minister. He resigned in 1814, and was succeeded by Rev. Alpheus Geer, who continued rector fifteen years. The Rev. William Barlow followed and remained two years. The Rev. Allen C. Morgan took charge of the parish in November, 1832, but in August, 1836, resigned, and soon died.

The Rev. Dr. Bronson, near the close of his historical sketch of the church of Waterbury, remarks, as "somewhat singular," that "out of near a dozen [clergymen] who have, since the foundation of the church, officiated here, no one has died in Waterbury." This was in 1807. Now, half a century later, the same remark may be repeated.

After the old church had stood about fifty years, it was found too small for the convenience of the society. It was, besides, out of repair and antiquated in style. As early as April, 1793, a committee was appointed "to agree upon a place to set a church and the bigness of the same," and make report; and in September following, the "question was put whether this society are willing and think it necessary to build a church—voted in the affirmative by more than two thirds of the members present." At the same time, "Eli Curtis, Esq., Mr. Jude Blakeslee and Capt. Amos Bronson was chosen a committee to set a stake for the place where to build a church." In the meanwhile, the town had appointed a committee "to give the assent of the town thereto" when a place for setting "a church or meeting house" had been selected and approved. Unanimity of sentiment, however, was not yet attained, and Dec. 2, 1793, the society "voted to petition the Hon. County Court to grant a committee to come and fix or set a stake for a place where to erect a church edi-

fice for said society ; and also, by vote, nominated John Wooster, Esq., of Derby, Messrs. Thomas Atwater of Cheshire and Abner Bradley of Woodbury for the aforesaid committee, if said Hon. Court, in their wisdom, should think fit to appoint them." Preparatory to the action of the Court's committee, certain persons were chosen "to get the minds of this society where to erect a church edifice," while others were appointed "to view several places," and others still to warn the people to be present when the committee met. (At the same time, it was agreed to erect a fence around the old church.) A stake was fixed, but the place was not quite satisfactory. March 17, 1794, at a parish meeting, a committee was chosen, "to apply to the County Court and the late committee, and request that the stake might be placed five rods south of the place where the stake now stands."

In Dec. 1794, more decisive measures were taken in the way of building a church. A committee was appointed, consisting of Messrs. Ephraim Warner, Justus Warner, Heman Munson, Titus Welton and John Cosset, to superintend the work and collect a rate of 2s. on the pound. Feb. 9, 1795, a vote was passed, in parish meeting, that the above named committee

Be fully authorized and empowered to build or procure to be built a decent well finished edifice or church, 54 by 38 feet, with a decent steeple on the outside at the east end of the same, and apply the money heretofore granted of 2s. on the pound and all subscriptions that shall be made for that purpose, and that the society consider themselves holden to said committee for the residue.

The business of erecting the new church was committed more immediately to Mr. Ard Welton. "And so great was the confidence reposed in his judgment and integrity, [says the Churchman's Magazine,] that a contract was made with him to complete the building according to his own taste and present his bills for payment." In August, 1795, the frame was raised. The church was finished with great neatness. Some fresco paintings upon its walls were much admired.

Additional taxes were imposed to defray the expenses of the church. In December, 1795, a rate of 1s. on the pound ; in Dec. 1797, a rate of eight cents and eight mills on the dollar, and in April, 1799, a rate of three cents on a dollar, were

laid. In all, taxes to meet these expenses were paid to the amount of twenty-six cents and eight mills on the dollar. This single fact shows a degree of zeal and self-sacrifice which is not of every day occurrence.

In October, 1797, the new edifice was completed, and the people assembled for the last time in the old building. Mr. Bronson preached an appropriate discourse, in which he alluded affectingly to the solemn scenes which those old walls had witnessed—"On the sacred day of rest, silence is henceforth here to reign, and soon will ruin and desolation mark this consecrated spot; until in the next generation it will be unknown that here stood the house of God; that here men were wont to assemble and prayer to be made." In the preceding March, the parish had resolved to sell the old church. While unoccupied, it was sometimes used as a place for holding town meetings. The avails of its sale, it was finally decided, should go to pay for the new house.

Oct. 14, 1797, measures were taken to seat the new church. A committee had been previously appointed to act in this matter, and a rule was laid down for their guidance. They were to take "the two lists of 1794 and 1795 [on which building taxes had been laid] and add them together; then add £15 for every year, [the individual may have attained,] beginning at the age of twenty one years; and all those that had no lists of 1794 and 1795 shall take the list of 1797 and double it to make one list, with the addition of the £15 as beforesaid." The last part of the rule was intended to meet the case of those persons who had recently joined the society.

The new church was dedicated Nov. 1, 1797, under the name of St. John's church, and consecrated by Bishop Jarvis, this being his first official act after his own consecration.

An elegant house of worship being secured, an improved style of church music was demanded. The society voted to employ a singing-master, "either with or without the Presbyterian society," and in August, 1799, a committee was chosen "for the purpose of handing about subscriptions to raise a sum of money sufficient to purchase a bass viol."

According to tradition, the first time the English prayer book was used in Westbury was on the occasion of the mar-



riage of a daughter of James Brown, after his removal thither. Dr. Samuel Johnson officiated, and in the evening preached and read evening prayers in Brown's barn, parts of which are still standing. The marriage referred to may have been that of Elizabeth Brown, who, on the 16th day of June, 1742, became the second wife of Lieut. William Scovill, the father of Rev. James Scovill.

For many years, the Churchmen of Westbury, few in number, attended public worship in the first society. Soon after Mr. Scovill came into the mission, however, their numbers augmented so that, in the latter part of 1764, there were twenty whose names are known, (to wit)—Asahel Beach, Seth Blake, Samuel Brown, Joseph Brown, Daniel Brown, Thomas Doolittle, James Doolittle, Jonathan Fulford, Jonathan Garnsey, John Judd, Noah Judd, Asa Judd, John Hickox, Joseph Hickox, Joseph Prichard, Eleazer Prindle, Gershom Scott, Edward Scovill, Samuel Scovill, William Scovill. These persons entered into an agreement "to hold public worship in Westbury on those Sundays when there was no preaching in Waterbury," until a church could be built. ¶They met in the winter and spring in the house of James Doolittle, and in the summer in a chamber of Ensign David Scott. A lot was given for a church by Capt. George Nichols of Waterbury; and an edifice, forty-five feet by thirty-six, with a steeple, (the first in the town,) was erected on it, in 1765. Capt. Edward Scovill took the lead in this enterprise, and in the latter part of October the house was in such forwardness that public service was performed in it. It stood upon the rocks by the old burying yard near the meeting house. It was named Christ's church. The Rev. Samuel Andrews delivered the dedicatory sermon. An arrangement was made by which Mr. Scovill was to officiate every sixth Sunday. This continued till 1771, when the parish had so much augmented its strength that a new arrangement became expedient, and Mr. Scovill agreed to give one third of his time to the Westbury parish. The society continued to prosper, and in 1773, they finished the lower part of the house, together with the pulpit, chancel, canopy, &c.; but they never entirely completed it. Soon the Revolution came, from which the parish suffered much.

In 1779, the society received, by the will of Capt. Scovill, seventeen acres of land near the church. The land was afterwards sold and a fund established, which, with the considerable additions since made to it, now amounts to \$4,000 secured by notes. The parish also owns three acres of land in the center of the village, on which the new church, rectory and school-house stand.

After the war, prosperity again dawned upon the church of Westbury. But in a little while the pulpit became vacant by the removal of Mr. Scovill to New Brunswick. It continued so till 1788, when an arrangement was made with the Rev. Chauncey Prindle, (a nephew of the Rev. Mr. Scovill,) then in deacon's orders, who had officiated more or less, as lay-reader, at a salary of thirty pounds, "to be paid in beef, pork, butter, tallow, wool, flax, or any sort of grain." He was ordained as priest by Bishop Seabury on the 24th of the month. He gave part of his time to Northbury, but resided in Westbury.

In 1792, the society, having increased greatly in numbers, determined to erect a new church in a more desirable situation. It was "raised" August, 1793, and consecrated by Bishop Seabury as Christ's Church, Nov. 18, 1794. It was placed on ground confronting the spot occupied by the present church. A "Commemorative Discourse" was delivered in it, for the last time, Oct. 28, 1855, by the Rev. Horace H. Reid, the rector, which was published, and to which I am indebted for some facts contained in this sketch.

Mr. Prindle continued rector till 1804, when he resigned. His farewell discourse was preached on the 23d of December. He is described as a most worthy and indefatigable man. As an instance of his punctuality in the discharge of duty, it is stated that on a certain important occasion, when he was to preach in Waterbury, he found the Naugatuck much swollen by a flood. He saw his horse must swim the stream, or he must fail in his appointment. Preferring the former alternative, he plunged in.—He was a son of Eleazer and Anna (Scovill) Prindle; was born July 13, 1753, and graduated at Yale College in 1776. After he left Watertown, he was, for several years, rector of the churches of Oxford and Salem. He died in 1833. He left some manuscripts relating to the

churches of Westbury and Northbury, which were published in the Chronicle of the Church, July 26, 1839, from which I have gleaned many facts.

Episcopacy in Northbury grew out of the extravagances which attended the Revival of 1740. Mr. Todd's course was denounced by some of his people as irregular and unauthorized. His evening meetings, it is said, were disorderly in the extreme. Inquiry began to be made whether there was not another and better way of serving God. At this period, a prayer book, owned by one of Mr. Todd's parishioners, came to light. It was the first that appeared in Northbury, and was the property of Thomas Blakeslee's wife. Certain people often met together to consult it. Mr. Todd disapproved of these proceedings, and, according to tradition, told those who studied the strange book that if they did not desist they would go to a bad place! Thus matters went on, the Churchmen gaining strength, till at last they came to control a majority of the votes. They then numbered eleven and took possession of the house in which public worship was held, voting Mr. Todd's meetings out. While they did this, however, they assured the minority that they would assist to build them another house to an extent equal to their (the minority's) interest in the old one. This promise, it is affirmed, was faithfully kept, and to the satisfaction, pecuniarily, of the Congregationalists. Some of the majority, however, disapproved of this whole proceeding, and admitted that the minority were not fairly treated.\* The latter might have been permitted to occupy the house when not wanted by the other party. But it was a time of excitement, and a spirit of conciliation among rival sects is a rare virtue.

It is difficult to say who were the "eleven" first Churchmen (heads of families) of Northbury. Among them, however, were some prominent men. The following persons joined themselves at an early date to the new denomination, (to wit,) Barnabas Ford, Thomas Blakeslee, David Blakeslee, Lieut. John Bronson, and probaly Samuel Cole, Ebenezer Ford,

---

\* Manuscript letter from Noah M. Bronson of Medina, Ohio, formerly a prominent Churchman of Plymouth.

Abel Ford, and Ebenezer Allen. At what precise time the famous eleven organized themselves and appropriated for their own use the old meeting house, it is not safe to affirm. The Congregationalists, however, contemplated building a new house as early as Oct. 1740, possibly, before their exclusion from the old building.

For a considerable period, the Episcopalians of Northbury could have had but occasional and rare visits from a clergyman. They were dependent on the ministers who officiated in Waterbury, and who were in the service of the society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Rev. Theophilus Morris was in the mission from 1740 to 1743. He procured from the parent society a large folio Bible and prayer book for the uses of the churches of Derby, Waterbury, West Haven and Northbury. Mr. Lyon followed Mr. Morris, Dr. Mansfield of Derby, Mr. Lyon, and Rev. James Scovill, (about 1759,) Dr. Mansfield, as is mentioned in my account of the church in Waterbury. Mr. Scovill's services were relinquished for a stipulated sum; and in 1773, Rev. James Nichols,\* lately returned from England, where he had been for ordination, took charge of the churches of Northbury and New Cambridge, (now Bristol,) officiating alternately half the time in each, but residing in the latter place. In consequence of the war, Mr. Nichols remained but two years and removed to Litchfield. After this and till the close of the Revolution, the church was in an unsettled state and without the services of an ordained minister. Whilst the war lasted, it is not known that public services of any kind were held in the parish.

Soon after the organization of the church, several of the members raised among themselves £100 as the foundation for a church fund. This sum was invested in land and deeded as follows:

I Barnabas Ford, [&c.] in consideration of one hundred pounds money contributed to me by my neighbors, members of the Church of England, by and with their advice, [&c.] for the first glebe lands to endow the said church in Northbury, [&c.] do give, grant, convey and confirm unto the Society for the Propagation

---

\* Was he not the son of James Nichols, (of Waterbury,) who was born in December, 1748, and graduated at Yale College, in 1771?

of the Gospel in Foreign Parts,\* one piece of land containing forty acres being and lying in said Northbury eastward from the church, it being the west end of the farm that belonged to Thomas Clark of Waterbury—to have and to hold [&c.], but in trust and for this special purpose, that is to say, as soon as there shall be a rector instituted and inducted, [&c.] the premises shall then be and inure to such rector incumbent and to his successors for his and their use as the glebe lands of the said church for ever, [&c.]

This deed is dated Nov. 21, 1745, and witnessed by Thomas Blakeslee, Samuel Cole and Ebenezer Ford.

After the war, in October, 1784, a movement was made by the church to organize themselves into a society “according to an act of the General Assembly.” A warrant was issued by a justice of the peace, calling a meeting and directing that all the legal voters of the society be warned to meet at “the church house” on the eighteenth of the month, and to choose a moderator, &c. The roll of voting members at this time is recorded. They numbered 57, showing a strength hardly to be expected so soon after the war. At this first formal meeting of the parish, Lieut. Eliphalet Hartshorn was chosen moderator, Jude Blakeslee clerk and treasurer, and Mr. Asher Blakeslee, Capt. Amos Bronson and Mr. Isaac Fenn, prudential committee, with power to employ Mr. Baldwin or some other minister as a candidate for settlement. At this time, 15 persons living in the town of Litchfield attended the Northbury church.

At a subsequent meeting in December, a tax of two pence on the pound was laid, (Jacob Potter, collector,) which was renewed from year to year. Unwearied endeavors were put forth to obtain a rector, for a time without success. The Rev. Ashbel Baldwin, the Rev. Philo Shelton, and the Rev. Tillotson Bronson, officiated occasionally. After his ordination as a deacon, in June, 1787, the Rev. Chauncey Prindle officiated regularly for a time. He was afterwards settled, the articles of agreement bearing date Feb. 12, 1788, twelve days before his admission to the order of the priesthood. By the articles, the parish agreed to give him £37, 10s. lawful money for half

---

\* The reason for conveying the land to the English society may probably be found in the fact that the Episcopal churches of Connecticut were not at that time legally constituted bodies, and could not hold property in a corporate capacity. The lands conveyed in this manner to the society, appear never to have been reconveyed to the parishes. At any rate, I can find no such reconveances on the Waterbury records. After the Revolution, the English society, being alien, could not, I suppose, give a title. A title was at last probably obtained by possession-

of the time, "to be paid in produce, such as beef, pork, butter, tallow, sheep's wool, flax or any sort of grain, with a suitable proportion of each kind." A rate of three pence on the pound was imposed in December to pay the minister's salary, which the next year was raised to four pence.

About four years after Mr. Prindle's settlement, the parish was much weakened by the formation of St. Matthew's church, on the eastern border of Northbury, and by certain persons joining themselves to the church in Northfield, (Litchfield.) These movements originated, not in a want of harmony, but in a desire to promote personal convenience.

The old "church house" had become rickety and uncomfortable, particularly in wet weather, and in December, 1789, a vote was taken to make some repairs. In January, 1790, however, it was resolved to build a new church. But there were much embarrassment and delay in consequence of a difference of opinion as to the location and the manner of raising the necessary funds. Some wanted the new edifice in the hollow, others on the hill. By the persevering efforts of Mr. Prindle and others, the obstacles at length were all removed. It was agreed that the house should be placed on the hill "near the north east corner of the green or place of parade," and be adorned with a steeple. It seems to have been commenced early in 1794, under the superintendence of Messrs. David Shelton, Noah M. Bronson, Selah Seymour, Samuel Potter and Adna Blakeslee, building committee. After the frame had been erected and covered, another committee, consisting of Noah M. Bronson, David M. Shelton and Amos Ford, was chosen to complete the building. Eli Barnes was at the next meeting placed on the committee in the place of Amos Ford. The church was to be finished "in a decent and elegant manner." It was so far completed by the 14th day of November, 1796, that a vote was taken to seat it; and on the 24th of the same month the people assembled in it for the first time for public worship. The taxes levied to defray the expenses of building, amounted, it is said, to thirty-five cents on a dollar, to say nothing of voluntary contributions. The church was consecrated Nov. 2, 1797, by Bishop Jarvis, by the name of St. Peter's church, the Rev. Philo Shelton preaching the sermon.

On Easter Monday, 1806, Mr. Prindle proposed to resign his charge, in order to afford the society an opportunity to strengthen itself by an union with a neighboring church. His proposal was acceded to, and a connection was formed between St. Peter's and St. Matthew's churches.

After Mr. Prindle retired from the parish, the Rev. Nathan B. Burgess and the Rev. Joseph D. Welton officiated for a time, the latter as lay reader; but no permanent rector was secured till 1809, when an arrangement was made with the Rev. Roger Searle. The articles of settlement bear date Nov. 15th. Mr. Searle was settled over the parishes of St. Peter's and St. Matthew's, and was to receive \$450 and 30 cords of good fire wood per annum. In consideration of the rector's residence being in St. Peter's parish, that parish was to supply all the wood, and retain the use of its glebe lands. The remainder of the salary was paid in the proportion of services received.

An addition was made to the funds of the society, in 1813, by subscription of one thousand dollars, Mr. Searle to have the benefit of it during his rectorship. The subscribers' names are entered upon the record, twenty-nine in number. Elijah Warner gave one quarter of the sum. A few years later, (1821,) the same individual gave to the parish four acres of land, valued at about \$400, on which he and others erected a dwelling for the rector.

In consequence, chiefly, of a large emigration to the West and the weakening of the parish, Mr. Searle resigned his charge in 1817, the connection being dissolved Sept. 16th.

The Rev. Rodney Rossiter succeeded to the rectorship in 1818, the Rev. Dr. Burhans in 1832, and the Rev. William Watson in 1837. The Rev. S. K. Miller is the present rector.\*

---

\* In the preparation of the preceding account of Episcopacy in Northbury, I have consulted, besides the parish records, An Account of St. Peter's Church, Plymouth, printed in the Episcopal Watchman, October, 1827; the Rev. Mr. Prindle's MSS. published in the Chronicle of the Church, 1889, and a Centennial Sermon, by the Rev. Mr. Watson, delivered Jan. 1, 1848, and published.

## CHAPTER XX.

## CHURCH AND STATE: SLAVERY: OLD FRENCH WAR.

CONGREGATIONALISM was established by law in the Colony of Connecticut. In opposition to this there could be "no ministry or church administration entertained or attended by the inhabitants of any town or plantation [&c.] upon penalty of the forfeiture of five pounds for every breach of this act." Against some species of dissent, the laws were very stringent. "Quakers, Ranters, Adamites, or such like," were to be committed to prison or sent out of the Colony. No individual could "unnecessarily entertain" "or speak more or less with" such persons on penalty of five pounds, and the town that allowed entertainment to be given them must also pay five pounds per week. Quaker books were ordered to be seized by the constable, and the persons in whose possession they were found were to be fined ten shillings each. Every person in the Colony was obliged to pay taxes for the support of the established religion. If a town saw fit to go without a minister for a time, a statute (which was continued till after the Revolution) provided that a tax should, notwithstanding, be levied, "as if there were a minister there," the avails to be reserved "for the support of the ministry of that town" in the future, according to the discretion of the County Court.\*

The ministers of religion were the especial favorites of the colonial government. Their polls and estates were exempted from taxation, and stringent laws were made to secure them the advantages of their position and the respect of their flocks. It was provided that "if any Christian, so called, should con-

---

\* As an example of the almost absolute power which the Assembly exercised over the towns and individuals in matters of religion, I may refer to a case, one of a class.—After the death of Mr. Hooker in 1697, Farmington, owing to discordant sentiments, was for a season without a minister. On application, the Court, in 1702, ordered the people to seek counsel and help of Rev. Mr. Abram Pierson and five others, and "to entertain" and pay for one year the minister which they, "the reverend elders," should nominate and appoint. At this period the town officers of Farmington were appointed by the Assembly.—[Historical Discourse by Rev. Noah Porter, Jr., 1841.]



temptuously behave himself towards the word preached or the messengers thereof," he should, for the first offense, be re-proved openly, in some public assembly, by the magistrate; and for the second, should pay a fine of five pounds, "or else stand two hours openly upon a block or stool four foot high, on a public meeting day, with a paper fixed on his breast written with capital letters:—AN OPEN AND OBSTINATE CONTEMNER OF GOD'S HOLY ORDINANCES: that others may fear and be ashamed."

At an early period, almost all the educated men entered the ministry. Lawyers were not wanted, and doctors were self-taught or, oftener, untaught. Clergymen trained the youth. They were universally deferred to as a superior order of men whose displeasure it would not be safe to incur. On Sundays they were treated with special reverence. "When the minister passed from the threshold to the pulpit, the people rose; and if he formally addressed them in any part of the sermon, those in the galleries, in obedience to parental injunction and usage, in many places, stood and continued standing till the address was concluded."\*

In 1706, the law against the Quakers was repealed; and in 1708, by "An Act for the case of such as soberly dissent," persons were permitted, on certain conditions, to worship "in a way separate from that which is by law established," without molestation; but nobody was excused from paying taxes to the "established church."

When Episcopal churches began to be established in Connecticut, the colonists saw the difficulties in which their laws respecting dissenters would be likely to involve them. The mother country, it was probably thought, would not willingly see its own established religion proscribed and those who worshiped according to its forms subjected to disabilities. (Proscription loses all its beauties when its authors become the subjects of it.) The General Assembly, doubtless, considered these things and determined to modify its laws, so far as they bore harshly on the Church of England. In 1727, in answer to a petition from certain Churchmen in Fairfield, it was en-

---

\* Rev. Luther Hart, in *The Quarterly Christian Spectator*, Vol. V, p. 227.

acted that all taxes levied on the professors of the English church, in places where there was a minister of that church in orders, should be paid over to such minister. These taxes on Churchmen were gathered by a special collector from their own denomination, chosen at the town or society meetings. When the moneys thus raised were not sufficient for the support of their own clergymen, they could levy additional taxes on their own members. In addition to these privileges, Churchmen were expressly exempted from the burden of building "meeting houses." These indulgences, however, were granted more from policy and necessity than preference.

The Episcopal churches or parishes were merely voluntary associations. They had no corporate or legal existence except for the single purpose above mentioned. They could not impose rates for building or repairing their own churches, or for any purpose but the maintenance of their ministers. Congregationalism was the established religion—the religion of the state. Congregational societies were the only societies known to law, and these were territorial and exclusive.

In 1729, in an "Act for the Ease of such as Soberly Dissent," the Quakers and Baptists having divine worship of their own, and attending the same, were excused from Congregational taxation; but they had no other privileges.

Thus matters continued till after the Revolution; but in 1784, a law "for securing the Rights of Conscience" was passed, which permitted a man to join any denomination of Christians he pleased, and, if a dissenter and an attendant on public worship and a contributor to the support of the same, exempted him from taxes for the maintenance of the ministry and religion "by law established." By the same act, the dissenting churches and congregations had "liberty and authority to exercise the same powers and privileges for maintaining their respective ministers and building and repairing meeting houses, as the ecclesiastical societies constituted by law have and do exercise and enjoy." It was under this law, I suppose, that the Episcopal church of Northbury was organized in 1784. Thus, all *Christian* sects were put on a footing of essential equality.

Our fathers were rigid in their notions of moral and reli-

gious duty. They discarded the forms of the English church and endeavored to seize the essence. Still, they were unable to get rid entirely of forms, for men cannot do this, however strenuous their endeavors. Those which they did observe, they adhered to with singular pertinacity. In so doing, they jeopardized and sometimes lost sight of the substance. They were particularly exact in the observance of the sabbath, and this observance was enforced by pains and penalties. The people were required by statute to "carefully apply themselves to the duties of religion and piety, publicly and privately," on the Lord's day. They were required, on that day and also on "fast dayes and dayes of thanksgiving," to go to meeting, and they were not permitted to go anywhere else, the fine for transgressing the law being, in each case, five shillings. "Single persons being boarders and sojourners," and young persons "under the government of parents or masters," were not allowed to "meet together in company or companies," in the street or elsewhere, on the evening of the sabbath, or of fast day or lecture day, the fine being five shillings. It was made the duty of constables and grand jurors "to walk the streets and duly search all suspected places," and to bring the violators of this law to justice. These are the statutes our fathers lived under, till after the Revolution, and which assisted to mould their characters and opinions.

In illustration of what was considered "servile labour" on the sabbath, no longer ago than 1737, I would refer to a justice trial in which Isaac Bronson, a leading man of Waterbury, was arraigned before Timothy Hopkins, a justice of the peace. A conviction followed, and a fine of five shillings with the costs of court was imposed. The criminal party, not being satisfied with the decision, petitioned (ineffectually) the General Court for relief, and at the same time explained the nature and extent of his "crime," as follows :

To the Honourable generall Court [&c.] siting att Newhaven second Thursday of october 1737—the memorial of Isaac Brounson of waterbury humbly sheweth that one m<sup>r</sup> justice Timothy Hopkins of sd waterbury, [&c.] by his speisall writ caused your memorialist to apear before him on the 24<sup>th</sup> day of august Last to answer for being guilty of doing servil Labour on the sabbath or Lords day, in the site of said justice, and gaue judgment against your memorialist in the follow-

ing words viz [Here follows a copy of the execution and sentence of the court, from which it appears that the crime was committed on the 7th day of August, and that the culprit was sentenced to pay 5s. fine, and 5s. 6d. costs, "and stand committed till he comply," &c.] so that your memoriallest was forced to pay the money or go to prison, which money was paid down to the justice and your memoriallest stands Recorded guilty of the breach of the sabbath but thinks himself wholly innocent of any such crime: and can not help himself so without Remedy except this Honourable assembly giue Releafe, and he is under great disadvantage to Lay the whole matter before your Honours, m<sup>r</sup> justice utterly Refusing to giue him a copy of the writ by which he was brought before him: therefore is obliged to Declare the facts, by sd justice judged to be creminnal, which was his sister had lived sometime att his Hous about four miles out of Town but by reason of seuer illness went Home to her mother and stayed with her, but she amended, and on the sabbath day night after meeting was ended asked your memorialist if he would Let her Ride behind him home to his house which he did: this is the whole that he is charged with and it was no harme as he thought; how euer he stands Recorded as aboue and hath been already put of from Recieuing the sacrament on that account, and there upon prays this Honourable assembly to make void the sd judgment if they in their wisdom can think it just, or grant him Liberty of a hearing of the whole matter before the County Court to be holden att Newhaven in . ovember next, and order the sd justice to furnish him with a copy of his proceedings in the case in order to his hauing afaire Tryall at the sd Court, or any other way grant Releaf [&c.]

ISAAC BRUNSON.

If any man convicted of "prophaning the sabbath" refused to pay his fine, he might be publicly whipped. This was the law in 1784 and afterwards.

By an old statute, (in existence after the Revolution,) each householder was required to have at least one Bible. Numerous families were to have "a considerable number of bibles," besides suitable orthodox catechisms and other books of practical godliness. It was the duty of the selectmen to "make diligent inquiry" after these things, and constables, jurymen and tything men were to make diligent search after and presentment make of all breaches, &c.

The legislation of our ancestors was harsh, sometimes vindictive. It attempted too much. Its ends were often unjustifiable, frequently trivial. It interfered unwarrantably with personal rights. It took it for granted that a desirable object, in every case, was to be secured by some special law. That an evil existed was a sufficient reason why a statute should be enacted. The truth was not recognized, and is not yet fully understood, that there are many irreguralities in the moral

world (sin, in the language of theology) which legislation cannot reach. Man, it was conceived, was utterly depraved by nature, always inclining to go astray. He was treated as though conscience, truth, justice, honor, were no part of his moral constitution. His whole conduct and his entire business, to their minutest details, must be regulated by laws. These laws assumed a perfect uniformity of religious views, of moral principles and of opinions generally. A strict conformity was expected from all. Those who entertained peculiar sentiments, particularly on religious subjects—who presumed to differ from the ruling classes—had a hard time of it. They felt that by coming to America they had not escaped tyranny in aggravated forms.


As an illustration of the trivial, not to say ridiculous, legislation of our fathers, I may refer to the anti-tobacco laws. The use of tobacco was regarded (correctly) as demoralizing, particularly to the young. Therefore, the General Court ordered that no person under 20 years of age should use it. No other person (not accustomed to it!) could employ it without a certificate from a physician and a license from the Court. He who was addicted to its use was forbidden to indulge his appetite in company, or publicly in the streets, or when at labor or on a journey, unless ten miles from home, and then not but once a day. The penalty for each offense was six pence, to be paid without gainsaying!

It is well known that slavery was formerly an "institution" of Connecticut. Our ancestors, whom we are accustomed to revere for their virtues and religion, were "traffickers in human flesh!" Southmayd, Leavenworth, Trumbull, Scovill, Dea. Clark and Dea. Garnsey, those holy men and others like them, held their fellows in bondage! For their guilt in this regard, their descendants do not apply to them the same epithets, precisely, that they sometimes bestow on cotemporary sinners of the same class. Does this lenity of judgment come from the conscious obligation of the "higher law"—Honor thy father and thy mother?

The first settlers of Waterbury had not many slaves. It is not certain they had any; though it is probable some three or four (perhaps more) were slave owners, possibly from the first.







Green Kendrick

*Green Kendrick*

*J. Kelly, Boston*





The truth is, the great proportion of them were too poor to own that kind of property. Luxuries of all kinds were beyond their reach. They lived in the plainest manner and did their own work. Owing to a lack of tools, machinery, roads and productive lands prepared for tillage, or in other words, capital, the surplus products of labor were small. Comparatively, a man could do but little more than maintain himself. Hence the necessity that all should work, young and old, male and female. If the addition of a negro to a family increased production, it also increased consumption; and if a support in infancy and old age is taken into the account, almost in an equal ratio. Hence the inducement with the early planters of Waterbury, to own slaves could not have been great, even could they have found the means to purchase them. The profits of slavery in Connecticut were never large, and the sacrifice, when it was finally got rid of, was not serious.

The first slave in Waterbury, of which I have certain knowledge, was Mingo, who was the property of Dea. Thomas Clark, about 1730. He was then a boy. His master used to let him for hire by the day, first to drive plow, then to work with the team. At Dea. Clark's death in 1764, Mingo was allowed to choose which of the sons he would live with. He preferred to remain at the old homestead with Thomas; but after the latter commenced keeping tavern, he did not like his occupation and went to reside with Timothy on Town Plot. He had a family, owned considerable property, and died in 1800.

Parson Southmayd owned two slaves at the time of his death, Sampson and Phillis. Parson Leavenworth owned two, Peg and Phillis; Parson Trumbull of Westbury, two or more; Parson Scovill, two, Phillis and Dick. Dick died so late as 1835, aged 90. He used to tell the story of his capture on the shores of Africa when a boy, as he was playing in the sand. He was sold several times, always with the understanding that he might return when he chose. He was at one time the property of Dea. Stephen Bronson. After his old master removed to New Brunswick, he usually worked for Dea. Bronson or Mr. James Scovill, and was always regarded as a member of the family. He was a faithful negro. The writer remembers with affection his kind offices, in child.

hood. Poor man! He became blind in his old age, and the wicked boys sometimes played tricks with him. He had a wife and children and some property. Peace to his memory!—Capt William Hickox died in Westbury, in 1737, possessed of two slaves, Lewis and Phillis. Capt. George Nichols had one; Lieut. Tho. Richards one, Jack; Dea. Jonathan Garnsey one or more; Esq. Joseph Hopkins, one, Silence; Dr. Preserved Porter, two, Fortune and Dinah, &c. I. Woodruff, of Westbury, owned an "Indian woman," who died in 1774. Indian slaves appear to have been common in the earlier periods of the Colony.

By an old colonial law, men were sometimes sold into slavery for crime. Samuel Lanson was arraigned before the Court of Assistants in Hartford, May 10, 1670, and convicted of notorious stealing and "breaking up and robbing of Wethersfield and Branford mill several times," and living in a "renegade manner in the wilderness." He was fined £20 and ordered to be sent to the Barbadoes and sold as a servant for four years. Under a similar law, Joseph Lewis of Waterbury, a town pauper, was tried before Thomas Clark, Esq., May 12, 1756, on complaint of Oliver Terrell, for stealing forty shillings "proclamation money," and condemned to pay "six pounds proclamation money [three times the amount stolen] with costs of suit, and also a fine of ten shillings, lawful money, to the town treasurer, and be whipped on y<sup>e</sup> naked body ten stripes—costs taxed at £1-3-3."—He was whipped according to the judgment of the court, and bound out to the plaintiff, as a servant, till the above said sum should be paid.

By an early statute of the Colony, "all single persons [they were not favorites of our Puritan ancestors, and were watched with great jealousy] who lived an idle and riotous life," might be bound out to service. By a law passed in 1725, and which was in existence till after the Revolution, any "delinquent," in the sense of this statute, might be disposed of, or bound out to service, or in other words sold, by order of any court, assistant or justice of the peace, for so long a time as was necessary to pay the costs of prosecution.

In the volume of statutes which was published immediately after the Revolutionary war, there was an act which declared

that no negro or mulatto child, born in this State after March 1, 1784, should be held in servitude any longer than till he or she should arrive at the age of twenty-five years. In the same act, there were restraints put upon slaves similar to those we find at the South at the present day. Any Negro, Mulatto or Indian servant found wandering beyond the bounds of the town to which he belonged, without a ticket or pass from a justice of the peace or the owner, might be seized by anybody as a run-a-way. If a slave was caught out at night, after nine o'clock in the evening, without an order from his master, any person might apprehend and bring him (or her) before a justice, who might sentence him (or her) to be publicly whipped on the naked body. Without such order, the ferryman who passed a slave over his ferry, or the tradesman who bargained with him, was liable to a fine. So was the taverner who "entertained" him, or permitted him to be in his house, after nine o'clock at night. Free negroes traveling without a pass might be arrested.

In 1848, the Legislature enacted, for the first time, that no person should be held in slavery in this State.

Individually, our Puritan ancestors were very much such men as we are—little better, no worse. There were among them men eminent for virtue, knowledge and patriotism; while there was about the ordinary proportion, found in the farming communities, of the worthless and the vile. A very slight inspection of the records of the criminal courts, will dissipate the dreams of those who contend that our great grandsires were perfect beings. They were bred in a rigorous age, and were exposed to peculiar hardships, dangers and temptations. These gave origin to peculiar moral characteristics—to virtues and to vices which were a little different from those of other ages and communities. But, on the whole, they, like us, were average men. We have more science, a more widely diffused literature; better roads and bulkier ships; but our *men* are like their men—shoots from the same stock. Undistinguishing eulogy cannot properly be applied to any of the generations of New England; nor will truth justify indiscriminate censure. Saints and sinners, wise men and foolish, have been (and will continue to be) found, in fair proportion, among all.

We do rightly in judging leniently of the weaknesses, and mistakes and even the guilt of our fathers. We make allowance for their circumstances, the state of their civilization, the age in which they lived, the modes of thinking which prevailed at the time, their education, even their temptations and prejudices, and the entire group of influences which contributed to mould opinions. Were men equally tolerant and charitable towards their contemporaries, much of the wrangling which at times makes earth a pandemonium would be avoided. Were men to think more of their own infirmities and guilt and less of their neighbors, they would illustrate a practical, instead of a speculative and professed Christianity.

After the close of the war with the eastern Indians in 1725, New England was at peace at home and abroad till the breaking out of the Spanish war (in which France soon joined) in 1739. In the expedition against Cape Breton in 1745, which resulted in the capture of Louisburg, in which Connecticut had engaged nearly one thousand men, Waterbury appears to have been represented, but I know not how numerously. Capt. Samuel Hickox was chosen by the Assembly a captain of one of the companies for this service. Whether he joined the expedition does not appear. Samuel Thomas, one of the early settlers of Westbury, died at Cape Breton, Jan. 29, 1745-6, probably in garrison.

Soon after the close of the Spanish and French war, or in 1749, Waterbury was visited by a malignant and fatal disease. It took the form of a low, nervous fever, and is said to have run its course in nine days. If the sick person survived the ninth day, recovery was expected. It spread into all parts of the town and was very fatal in Woodbury, as mentioned by Mr. Cothren. It commenced in June and continued till the following January. The most fatal months were August and September. In these two months, there were thirty-eight deaths, besides two, at least, not recorded. In the whole course of the epidemic, there were sixty-four deaths that are recorded, about twenty of them heads of families. In addition to these, Mr. Richardson, in his "Historical Sketch of Watertown," gives the names of ten persons, making seventy-

four in all that are known. It is said there were thirty deaths in Northbury, some of them doubtless not recorded. In such times of terror, all business is carelessly done. There were probably not fewer than ninety deaths, in the whole, which, out of a population of 1500, would be in the proportion of one in sixteen and two thirds, or six per cent., a greater proportional mortality than has since occurred in the same length of time. In many instances, entire families were prostrated by the disease. In two of the three parishes, scarcely ten houses escaped. In several families, three died in each; and in one, that of John Barnes, four, all under nineteen years of age. Once in this sickness, there were six graves open in the old burying ground, at the same time. Often there was difficulty in procuring medicine, and sometimes the people had to go as far as Norwich for it. On one occasion, Mr. Leavenworth, the minister, performed the journey\*—in those days, no small undertaking. From the middle of harvesting time till the last of September, nearly all the inhabitants that were in health were constantly employed in watching the sick and burying the dead. The crops were neglected, and despair settled upon the countenance of all. The grass upon the meadows dried as it stood. A part of it only was mowed, and that which was gathered, on account of its having been secured out of season, was nearly worthless. Not more than half the usual acres of the winter grains were sown, and these were so imperfectly tilled, and the seed was put into the ground so late, that a famine was apprehended. Under these circumstances of discouragement, a memorial, signed by the inhabitants and dated Oct. 10th, 1749, was forwarded to the Assembly. They spoke of having "been visited by remarkable and sore sickness," and then recounted their griefs and misfortunes. They prayed for the abatement of their "country tax" for the year, on the list of 1748. Their request was granted, but they were not permitted to draw their school money for the then current year.

In 1755, the "French Neutrals," or Acadians, (the old inhabitants of Nova Scotia,) because they refused to take up arms against France and in favor of their new masters, the

---

\* Bennet Bronson's MSS.

English, were driven from their homes and country, to the number of seven thousand, and distributed among the American colonies, from New Hampshire to Georgia. Four hundred were sent into Connecticut, and apportioned among the different towns according to their respective lists. Six were received by Waterbury and nine by Woodbury.

In 1756, a formal declaration of war was made by England against France, but hostilities had been carried on between the two nations for some time previous. This was an eventful war for the American Colonies, and Waterbury was well represented in it. Capt. Eldad Lewis with his company from Waterbury marched to the scene of danger in the "Fort William Henry alarm," in 1757. His company consisted of

Lieut. John Sutliff,	Joseph Warner,	Jonathan Garnsey,
Ens. Gideon Hotchkiss,	Charles Warner,	Simeon Beebe,
Serg. Stephen Welton,	Oliver Terrell,	Thomas Hickox,
Daniel Porter, (clerk,)	Jesse Alcock,	Samuel Richards,
Thomas Richards,	Abraham Richards,	Nathaniel Edwards,
Stephen Matthews,	Samuel Judd,	Nathaniel Foot,
Samuel Lewis,	Joel Frost,	Reuben Blakeslee,
Solomon Barrit,	Thomas Cole,	Asher Blakeslee,
Eliakim Welton,	Thomas Williams,	Ambrose Field,
Hezekiah Brown,	W. Scott,	Benjamin Cook,
Shadrack Benham,	William Judd,	Benjamin Barnes.
Daniel Barnes,		

Capt. Lewis appears, afterwards, to have been at Lake George. Lieut. Gideon Hotchkiss and Enos Ford and, probably, his entire company, were with him. Some of the other officers and soldiers who were engaged in the old French war were, Lieut. Gershom Fulford, Lieut. Timothy Clark, Lieut. Joel Clark, Ensign Daniel Potter, Lieut. Samuel Judd, Lieut. Oliver Welton, Rev. Mark Leavenworth, chaplain, Israel Calkins, James Brown, James Baldwin, Jesse Baldwin, Phineas Castle, Daniel Webb, Samuel Fenn, Abner Munson, Thomas Porter, Stephen Bronson. Daniel Porter, Jr., was surgeon's mate.

When, in August, 1757, Fort William Henry, situated at the head of Lake George, and commanded by Col. Monroe, was besieged by a French and Indian force under Montcalm, the English general, Webb, was lying with an army of four thousand men at Fort Edward, fourteen miles distant. In-

stead of marching to the relief of Col. Monroe and thus saving the fort, Webb wrote him a letter advising his capitulation. The messenger and letter were intercepted by the Indian allies of Montcalm. The latter, thinking Webb's communication would promote his own interests, forwarded it, at once, to the commander of the fort. A capitulation soon followed.

Now the messenger who bore the letter of Gen. Webb seems to have been Israel Calkins of Waterbury, (above named.) He remained in the hands of the Indians after the fort was surrendered, and was by them taken to Canada. Here he was "redeemed by a French gentleman," sent to France a prisoner of war, and finally in a cartel-ship to England to be exchanged. He landed in Boston Oct. 6, 1758, and immediately petitioned the Legislature for "an allowance of wages during his captivity," and also a gratuity in consideration of the "severe calamities" he had suffered, "more than words can express or imagination paint." He speaks of his property having been dissipated during his absence, and of the extreme destitution of himself and family. He "implores the pity and compassion of the Honorable Assembly," &c. His prayer was heard and £30 granted him.—(State Papers, War, Vol. VII.) He resided in that part of the town which is now called Naugatuck, and was living in 1782.

The seven years war ended in 1763 and "gloriously" for the British Empire in America. The conquest of Canada and its cession to England secured the New England colonies from further hostile incursions from the North. But with peace came the troubles with the mother country. The British ministry undertook to carry out their plan of subduing the colonies—of making them more dependent on the crown and Parliament. It was deemed necessary that the royal government should be carried on without the assistance, and in spite of the resistance, of turbulent colonial assemblies. It was claimed that the king and Parliament in political and civil matters, and the bishops in ecclesiastical affairs, were supreme in all cases whatsoever. There could, properly, be no state without a king, or church without a bishop. What were considered to be inherent rights and chartered privileges were not to stand in the way of the proposed changes. To carry out the plans



of the ministry, it was decided that a standing army should be maintained in the colonies at their own expense. A system of taxation was devised, and the celebrated stamp act passed in 1764. In passing it, Parliament meant to affirm and establish a right. An immediate revenue was a secondary object. The colonists resisted this act, chiefly on account of the principle it involved. They saw in it a purpose to enslave them; or at least, to curtail their liberties. They claimed the exclusive privilege of levying, collecting and appropriating their own taxes. They insisted that taxation and representation should go together, and that as they had no voice in Parliament, the latter could not, rightfully, impose on them taxes. The revolutionary storm was already gathering and men's minds were stirred with profound emotion. Those who believed in the validity of Presbyterian ordination and the independence of the American churches—who abhorred prelacy almost as much as they did the pope—were quick to see the religious bearings of the questions of the day. They felt that such a measure as the stamp act must be resisted, in the beginning, as a dangerous encroachment on their just rights, and which, if not opposed successfully would end in the loss of their most cherished institutions, political and religious. The Church-of-England-men held different views and had different sympathies. They looked upon theirs as the only true church, and Congregationalism as a heresy which had ruled too long in this country. They favored the views and hoped for the triumph of the British government. The Rev. John Beach, in Oct. 1765, wrote to his friends in England, saying that he could not “discover in any of the church people the least inclination to sedition and rebellion against their mother country, on account of the stamp duty.” The Rev. Mr. Scovill of Waterbury, in a letter dated Oct. 6, 1767, wrote as follows :

The church people in my cure appear to have a serious sense of religion, and a hearty love and affection to our excellent church, which makes them greatly lament the deplorable condition of the church in these parts, for want of resident bishops to ordain, govern and confirm those of our own communion.\* They

---

\* Up to this time and till 1784, the Episcopal clergy of this country were obliged to go to England for ordination. They had long pleaded for a bishop of their own to save them this trouble.

who live in England where the church is rather triumphant, can have but a faint idea of its truly militant state here in New England, where the dissenters take occasion to insult and revile us, even for want of that discipline which they so unjustly and clamorously oppose. Though they would be thought the greatest friends of liberty, yet, I doubt not, they would think it a great degree of oppression, and even persecution, to be obliged themselves to go 3,000 miles for what they judged essential to the perfection of their church; and I trust in God, we are as conscientious in the profession of the truth, and adherence to the most pure and primitive church in the world, as they can be in their errors. They have plentifully reproached us with the hated name of Jacobites, persons disaffected to the present royal family, of blessed memory; but when the Stamp Act brought our loyalty to the test, I thank God the scale turned greatly in our favour. While we sensibly feel all these great disadvantages, it fills us with real grief and concern to find the venerable society declining to open any more missions in New England. They, under God, by their generous bounty and pious liberality, have been the nursing fathers and chief supporters of the languishing church in this land, for which unspeakable favour our warmest sentiments of gratitude and duty will always attend them; and we most humbly and earnestly beg the continuance of their patronage and kind assistance, so long as our circumstances continue upon all accounts so truly pitiable.\*

---

## CHAPTER XXI.

### REVOLUTIONARY HISTORY.

THE patriots of Waterbury took an early and decided stand against the designs of the mother country. Their own history had not tended to soften their prejudices against the English church. The two parties were more evenly balanced than in most other towns. The Churchmen were in a minority, but they were still numerous; sufficiently so to excite the jealousy and even the fears of the majority. When, at one time, they obtained the ascendancy in society meeting, in Northbury, the manner they conducted themselves had not inspired confi-

---

\* Hawkins' Missions, p. 393.

dence in their moderation. Religious denominations in power are not wont to treat the opposition with peculiar leniency. Such is the transcendent importance of religious truth, and such the wickedness of unbelief or a contrary belief, that men are apt to think any means justifiable which tend to spread the one or suppress the other. The Congregationalists cannot plead guiltless of the charge of attempting, when in authority, to "crush out" "dissent" by the exercise of power.

When at last the war of the Revolution broke out, in 1775, the Churchmen of Waterbury, of Connecticut and of New England were seen ranged upon the side of the parent country and against the rebel colonists. They were Royalists or Tories. They had reasons, satisfactory to themselves, for their opinions and conduct. They wished the success of the British government, because on that success depended their hopes of worldly distinction and religious privilege. On that, they supposed, they must rely for the permanent ascendancy of the Episcopal church in America—its doctrines, its faith and its worship. To England they were bound by the strongest ties. From that country their parish clergymen had from the first received a great part of their support. They owed it a debt of gratitude, which, if they could not repay, they were unwilling to forget. They had always been the weaker party, had been ridiculed in their weakness and sometimes been "voted" out of their just rights. Their feelings had not been conciliated and they had come to hate the Whigs most heartily. They now hoped their wrongs would be redressed. They thought, with some show of reason, that resistance would be in vain and that the rebels would soon be compelled to return to duty. It is impossible, thought they, for the American Revolutionists, without money or discipline, ill furnished with arms and not perfectly united among themselves, to resist for a long time the whole force of the British empire. And there were others—wise men—that entertained the same views. The eventual triumph of the American cause, at least as to time and manner, must be attributed mainly to the blunders of the British ministry. Had the event turned out differently, the course of the colonists would have been considered rash. The truth is, though each party was determined on its course,

neither expected, for a long time, to come to blows. So imperfectly did they understand each other.

So great was the alienation of feeling between the rival religious sects in Waterbury, that parents could not always agree to send their children to the same school. To carry out this feeling, two districts were sometimes made within the same territorial limits. In 1775, a vote was passed dividing the school district on the Farmington and Wallingford road into two, one for the "Presbyterians" and one for "the Church of England." At one period, when thick gloom had settled over the prospects of the colonists and the English or church party felt almost sure of a speedy triumph, some of the more enthusiastic of the latter met together and determined in what manner the farms of their opponents should be divided among themselves, after the subjugation of the country.\*

In Westbury, as well as in the old society, excitement ran high. The windows of the Episcopal church were demolished. The principal members were not allowed to attend public worship, but were confined to their farms. "A Presbyterian deacon" said, publicly, "that if the colonies carried their point, there would not be a church [English] in the New England states."† In Northbury, the Churchmen were numerous, every one of whom was a Tory, while all the Congregationalists were Whigs. Capt. Amos Bronson, an Episcopalian, commanded a militia company there, the members of which were about equally divided between the two parties. His commission was taken from him; but, being a moderate Tory, he was reelected. A commission was of course refused him.‡

Several influential Churchmen, early in the progress of the war, renounced the royal party and joined the Whigs. Among these were Capt. John Welton of the old society and Capt. Amos Bronson of Northbury. A certain pamphlet written by Dr. Franklin contributed materially to this result; while the superciliousness of the British officials, and the bar-

\* MSS. of Bennet Bronson.

† MSS. of the Rev. Chauncey Prindle, published in the Chronicle of the Church, July 26, 1830.

‡ A manuscript letter from his son, Mr. Noah M. Bronson, Medina, Ohio.

barous mode in which their government carried on the war, were not without influence.

The Episcopal clergy of Connecticut and of New England took the lead in opposition to the war. They kept up a correspondence with the society at home, (of which they were beneficiaries,) in which they expressed their views freely of the merits of the controversy, and gave information of the state of the country. The loyalty of their own church is a subject for frequent comment and congratulation. Dr. Richard Mansfield of Derby wrote, in Dec. 1775, that he had preached and taught quiet subjection to the king and parent state, and that he was well assured that the clergy in general of the church of the Colony of Connecticut had done the same. Of the one hundred and thirty families under his charge, one hundred and ten, he continued, "are firm and steadfast friends to government and detest and abhor the present and unnatural rebellion, and all those measures which led to it." Farther on, he remarked, "the worthy Mr. Scovill [of Waterbury] and the venerable Mr. Beach [of Newtown] have had still better success, scarcely a single person being found of their congregations but what hath persevered steadfastly in his duty and loyalty."\*

The Rev. Mr. Inglis, in Oct. 1776, wrote to the society in England as follows :

I have the pleasure to assure you that all the society's missionaries, without excepting one, in New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, and, so far as I can learn, in the other New England colonies, have proved themselves faithful, loyal servants in these trying times; and have to the utmost of their power opposed the spirit of disaffection and rebellion which has involved this continent in the greatest calamities. I must add, that all the other clergy of our church in the above colonies, though not in the society's service, have observed the same line of conduct.—[Hawkins' Missions.]

[At the North, the laymen of the Episcopal faith were commonly, like their rectors, Loyalists; but at the South it was different, and many of the most distinguished Whigs of that section were zealous friends of the established church.—Sabine's Loyalists, p. 51.]

Tory physicians were more common than Tory barristers, or even clergymen, and were treated with more indulgence than other Tories.—Ibid, p. 58.]

In consequence of the course taken by the Episcopal cler-

---

\* Hawkins' Missions.

gy, their open opposition to the war and their secret correspondence with the enemy, they were watched with jealousy and sometimes treated with the greatest severity. They would not pray for the continental Congress after independence was declared, but insisted on using the liturgy as it was, and praying for the king and royal family. At this, the Whigs were wroth and would allow no services in the English churches. Mr. Inglis wrote in Oct. 1776, that "to officiate publicly and not pray for the king and royal family, according to the liturgy, was against their duty and oath; and yet to use the prayers for the king and royal family would have drawn inevitable destruction on them. The only course which they could pursue, to avoid both evils, was to suspend the public exercises. This was accordingly done." Mr. Beach of Connecticut, alone, the writer goes on to state, continued to officiate after independence was declared, he affirming "that he would do his duty, preach and pray for the king, till the rebels cut out his tongue!" Mr. Inglis farther complained that the clergy were everywhere threatened and reviled and imprisoned on slight pretenses—"some were pulled out of the reading desk because they prayed for the king, and that before independence was declared"—"others have been warned to appear at militia musters with their arms, have been fined for not appearing and then threatened with imprisonment for not paying their fines."\*

Dr. Mansfield, already mentioned, wrote to Gov. Tryon early in the war, giving it as his opinion that if the king's troops were present to protect the Royalists, "several thousand men in the three western counties of the Colony [of Connecticut] would join him." The letter was intercepted and Dr. M. was forced to fly for his life.

In 1777, according to Mr. Inglis, all the society's missionaries in Connecticut were "either removed to a distant part of the province from their cures and there detained, or else confined in their own houses." To the credit of the parties in Waterbury, it may be said that, though the excitement was intense, no scenes were enacted here such as were witnessed in some other towns. This is doubtless to be attributed in part

---

\* Hawkins' Missions.

to the prudence and wisdom of Mr. Scovill. He was sometimes threatened. Occasionally, he had reason to fear injury. In the more critical seasons, it is stated, he often slept from home in order to be out of the way of midnight calls; but he had the courage, which the Whigs respected, to remain through the war.

It has been customary to denounce the Tories of the Revolution as the worst of people—devils incarnate. But the time has arrived when we should be able to view them impartially. They were mistaken men, but no doubt can exist that they were in the main conscientious and patriotic. They thought, doubtless, that they were in pursuit of the greatest and most permanent good of their country. They were actuated by a principle of loyalty to government and of respect for existing laws.

When the time for action came, the majority of the people of Waterbury were the fast friends of colonial rights. After the meeting of the General Congress, in 1774, a town meeting was warned to be held on the 17th day of November, 1774, "for the purpose mentioned in the eleventh article of the association of the General Congress, &c." At this meeting, Phineas Royce, Esq., was chosen moderator, and Rev. Mr. Leavenworth made a prayer.\*

---

\* Periodically and on important special occasions, our fathers met in town meetings for the transaction of the public business and for general consultation and discussion. These meetings give a good idea of American republicanism in its practical workings. In them, the people learned their first lessons in government. These assemblies formerly exercised more extensive powers, and had the oversight of more numerous interests, than now. The affairs of ecclesiastical and school societies, as well as those belonging more strictly to the whole town, were regulated in them. Voluntary associations are of comparatively modern origin. The great town meeting, so called by Mr. Southmayd, was held annually in December. A person to be qualified to vote must be "an admitted inhabitant, a householder and a man of sober conversation," and have a freehold estate of fifty shillings. After some influential man had been chosen moderator, "the meeting was opened with prayer." (The custom of opening town meeting with prayer is said to be still kept up in some of the old towns in this State. When companies met for military parade, a prayer from the minister formerly introduced the business of the day.)

A town clerk, constable and selectmen, "able, discreet and of good conversation," and other officers, were then chosen, in proper order. The penalty for refusing to serve was forty shillings. All, down to fence-viewers and town-brander, were required to take an oath, and this was generally administered in open meeting. To prevent disorderly conduct in town meetings, a statute was passed to punish the same. "At a court for ye tryal of small causes, held in Waterbury, Jan. 9, 1756, present Thomas Clark one of his Magesties Justices of the peace," Thomas Doolittle and John Barnes were arraigned for the breach of the above law, and were fined, each 5s. and the costs of court, 1s. At the next town meeting, Feb. 16, 1756, there is this entry—"Voted to give Thomas Doolittle his fine for speaking without liberty in town meeting." Barnes, it is presumed, showed less contrition, and the fine was exacted.

At the same meeting, the extracts of the proceedings of the late respectable continental Congress holden at Philadelphia having been read, (together with the resolves of the House of Representatives [of Connecticut] thereon,) and the same appearing a wise and judicious plan in the present dangerous and difficult state of our public affairs, in order to effect a happy and much to be desired union between Great Britain and these colonies—

This meeting therefore agree and resolve faithfully to adhere to and strictly to abide by the association entered into by said Congress—and appoint the gentlemen hereafter named a committee to see the same carried into execution in every article thereof.

The above unanimously voted and for a committee, Joseph Hopkins and Timothy Judd, Esqs., captains John Welton, Gideon Hotchkiss, John Lewis, Benjamin Richards, Nathaniel Barnes, Doct. Ebenezer Beardsley, Doct. Roger Conant, Messrs. Andrew Bronson, James Bronson, Stephen Matthews, Jesse Curtis, Josiah Rogers, chosen.

At the same meeting, voted that the town clerk shall get a copy of the doings of the Congress well bound at the cost of the town, and lodge it in his office, there to remain among the records of the town, for the use of future generations.

Voted also, that in case a County congress should be agreed upon and desired in the County, (which we would recommend,) then the above said committee shall choose and appoint two out of their number to attend such Congress.

Voted also that the doings of this meeting shall be published.

The articles of the Continental Congress to which the town “resolved faithfully to adhere,” pledged the delegates and the people of the several colonies they represented to a system of non-intercourse with Great Britain, this being thought the most effective means of obtaining redress of grievances. Nothing was to be imported, bought, sold or consumed which was the product of the British Islands—no East India tea, no molasses, syrup, coffee, pimento, &c. Slaves were no longer to be imported, and the trade was to be discontinued. The eleventh article recommended that every county, city and town should appoint a kind of vigilance committee, “whose business it shall be attentively to observe the conduct of all persons touching this association,” and if any one was found violating it, “the case to be published in the Gazette, to the end that all such foes to the rights of British America may be publicly known and universally contemned, as the enemies of American liberty, and thenceforth we respectively break off all dealings with him or her.” It was in accordance with the recommendation of this article, (and of the House of Representatives of the Colony,) that the town meeting above noticed was warned and the committee named appointed.



At the next meeting, which was held Jan. 12th, following, the town voted that the selectmen should procure a double stock of powder, lead and flints, and "build a house suitable to store" them in—a proof that the people were thoroughly in earnest. While they talked of "a happy and much to be desired union between Great Britain and these colonies," and felt doubtless as they talked, they were determined, as far as possible, to be prepared for the worst. At the same meeting, Col. Jonathan Baldwin, Capt. John Welton, Joseph Hopkins, Esq., Capt. Samuel Hickox, Timothy Judd, Esq., Messrs. Stephen Welton, James Porter, Jr., Stephen Seymour, Randal Evans, David Smith, Josiah Rogers, Samuel Lewis, Esq., and John Hopkins were chosen a committee "to receive the donations that may be contributed towards the relief of the poor in Boston," who were suffering at this time, from the effects of the odious Boston Port Bill. The Boston people threw the tea on which a duty had been levied by the government at home, into the harbor, and this bill was passed by Parliament in retaliation. The design was to destroy the commerce of that refractory town, and to transfer its business to Salem. It was an oppressive act, a general sympathy was awakened, and material aid was contributed, in all parts of the country, for the relief of that doomed people. Nearly all the towns in Connecticut had public meetings and sent money, provisions, live stock, or whatever they could spare.

After the skirmishes (not *battles*) at Lexington and Concord, in April, 1775, the Connecticut Legislature took immediate and decisive steps in way of preparing for the contest. An act was passed for enlisting and equipping one fourth part of the militia, "for the safety and defense of the colony." They were to be divided into six regiments, and the companies to contain one hundred men each. The eighth company of the first regiment (commanded by Major General David Wooster) was to be raised in Waterbury. The officers appointed to command it were Phineas Porter, captain; Stephen Matthews, 1st lieutenant; Isaac Bronson, 2d lieutenant; David Smith, ensign. Their term of service was not to exceed seven months. Each soldier was to have a premium of fifty-two shillings to be paid at the time of enlistment, and one month's

advance pay, amounting to forty shillings, besides ten shillings for the use of his arms, and sixpence a day for billeting money. Capt. Porter was in readiness and "about to march" late in May.

As an attack was apprehended on some of the towns upon the sea-coast, Capt. Porter was first ordered to march into Fairfield county. Afterwards, he was directed to go to the Hudson River and so north. He was in Greenbush in October. Thence he marched by way of Albany to Lake Champlain, where he was at the expiration of the time for which his company was enlisted. Some of them then returned to Waterbury. Others chose to continue with the army, went into Canada and were with generals Montgomery and Wooster at the taking of Montreal. Some were present at the storming of Quebec, under Arnold, late in Dec. 1775, when Montgomery fell. Among them were Freeman and Daniel Judd. The latter died of small pox, near Quebec, Feb. 2, 1776.

In the year 1775, Waterbury furnished, for the continental army, one hundred and fifty-two soldiers. This appears from a certificate of the town officers to the treasurer of the Colony, claiming an abatement of this number of polls (taxed at £2,736) according to an act of Assembly. Of the fifty-five towns whose returns are on record, Waterbury appears to have provided more men than any other, except Farmington and New Haven, which had respectively, one hundred and fifty-seven and one hundred and fifty-three. Woodbury had one hundred and fifty. No town in the Colony, not itself the theater of conflict, made greater personal sacrifices throughout the war than Waterbury. It contributed *men*—the rank and file of the army—and had but an insignificant share of the honors and emoluments of the war.

In March, 1776, Gen. Howe evacuated Boston, and in June following appeared before New York. Congress made a requisition on Connecticut for troops. The Legislature, then in session, (in June,) passed an act for raising, by voluntary enlistment, seven regiments to be marched immediately to New York to join the continental army.\* They were to serve till

---

\* Such was the enthusiasm for the public service, at an early period, that in many towns voluntary companies were raised, officered and equipped. July 4, 1776, a company of house-

the 25th of December following, unless sooner discharged. The officers of the fifth regiment were William Douglass, (of Northford,) colonel, James Arnold, lieutenant colonel, and Phineas Porter, major. The sixth company of this regiment was from Waterbury, and its commissioned officers were John Lewis, Jr., captain, James Warner, 1st lieutenant, Michael Bronson, 2d lieutenant and Joseph Beach, Jr., ensign. Early in August, such was the critical condition of affairs, at the urgent solicitation of General Washington, the governor and council of safety, constituting the committee of war, directed all the standing militia west of the Connecticut River and two regiments on the east side, to march forthwith to New York, "until the present exigency is over." The Waterbury militia, attached to the 10th regiment, marched under Lieut. Col. Jonathan Baldwin, the 17th of August, ten days only after the order was issued. It is estimated that full one half of Washington's army in and about New York, this year, were Connecticut men; and that during this season, (1776,) the Colony had in all full twenty thousand troops in the service, whereas, her whole available military force, (from sixteen to fifty years of age,) did not much exceed twenty-three thousand. It is notorious that Connecticut did more than her part throughout the Revolutionary war, as she had uniformly done in previous wars. This fact, however, is most likely to be conceded when stated with modesty. If other States did not do as much, they all did well. No one of them which does not institute invidious comparisons need be ashamed.

In the disastrous conflict on Long Island, which occurred on the 27th day of August, 1776, "Colonel Douglass with his regiment [the fifth] was in the thickest of the fight."\* He was afterwards engaged in several actions near New York, and was himself particularly distinguished at Harlem Heights, White Plains and Phillip's Manor. In the retreat from Long Island the night after the fight, Major Porter is said to have

---

holders was formed in Waterbury. They furnished themselves with arms and accoutrements; chose Jonathan Curtis for their captain, Timothy Pond for lieutenant and Samuel Scovill, ensign, and reported themselves ready for duty. *Hinman's War of the Revolution*, p. 569.

\* *Hollister's Connecticut*, Vol. II, p. 276.

been in the last boat. Afterwards, he was taken a prisoner in New York, and at the end of three months, was exchanged. Capt. Stephen Matthews, attached to Col. Heman Swift's regiment, had eleven of his company killed in this campaign. Lieut. Nathaniel Edwards (of Westbury) was taken prisoner at the capture of Fort Washington. He was not released for two years, and did not return to his home till 1780.

In November, the General Assembly enacted that four battalions, (regiments,) properly officered, should be forthwith raised by voluntary enlistment, (to take the place, probably, of those whose term of service was about to expire,) who were to serve till the 15th day of March, 1777. The officers of one of the companies (which was from Waterbury) in the 2d battalion, commanded by Col. Thadeus Cook, were Benjamin Richards, captain, Isaac Bronson, Jr., 1st lieutenant, William Law, 2d lieutenant, Benjamin Fenn, Jr., ensign.

At the time the British troops were making their way across New Jersey towards Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and the whole country became very much alarmed. While extraordinary efforts were being made to reinforce Gen. Washington and Gen. Lee, the General Assembly of Connecticut, in December, earnestly called upon all able bodied men, living west of Connecticut river, to go forward and offer themselves for the service. A committee was appointed "to arouse and animate the people to rise and exert themselves with the greatest expedition," and "to set on foot with all expedition an enlistment in the various parts of the State." On this committee are found the names of Mark Leavenworth and Capt. Thomas Porter, apparently of Waterbury.

Near the close of this year, (1776,) the General Assembly reorganized the militia of the State, forming them into six brigades. At the same time, "it was enacted that all male persons from 16 years of age to 60 years, not included in the trainband, and exempted from ordinary training," (with certain exceptions,) should be formed into companies, and equipped to constitute an alarm list. These were called "alarm companies." Those over fifty years of age could not be compelled to march out of the State. With this exception, they were, "in case of alarm, or orders given by a superior officer," to be liable to

the same duties, service and penalties as others of the militia.\* I find in Major Phineas Porter's "orderly book" a list of the officers of the alarm companies of Waterbury, (to wit,) 1. Capt. Phineas Castle, Lieut. Ashbel Porter, Ens. Timothy Clark. 2. Capt. John Woodruff, Lieut. Thomas Dutton, Ens. John Stoddard. 3. Capt. Isaac Bronson, Lieut. Aaron Benedict, Ens. John Slater. 4. Capt. Jotham Curtis, Lieut. Timothy Pond, Ens. Samuel Scovill. 5. Capt. Stephen Seymour, Lieut. Daniel Sanford, Ens. Samuel Parker. 6. Capt. Josiah Terrel, Lieut. Stephen Hopkins, Ens. Hezekiah Hine.

The experience gained in the campaigns in 1775 and 1776 had taught the country the ruinous effects of the system of short enlistments. No sooner had the troops acquired some discipline and efficiency, than their term of service had expired, and their places must be filled by raw recruits. Patriotic sentiments and enthusiasm, it was found, were not a safe dependence in a protracted war. They might lead to heroic deeds, as at Bunker Hill. They might sustain soldiers behind a breast-work; but would not with certainty hold them to their duty in the open field and through a campaign. America must have trained battalions before she could meet successfully the disciplined armies of England. The Legislature, therefore, in compliance with a resolution of Congress, resolved that eight battalions (regiments) should be immediately raised, by enlistment, out of the Connecticut troops then in the army and other inhabitants of the State, to serve during the war, on the terms proposed by Congress.† Among the officers which were at the same time appointed, are found the names of David Smith, captain, and Michael Bronson, 1st lieutenant, both of Waterbury. This was in November, 1776. Capt. Smith's company was made up wholly, or nearly so, of Waterbury men.

Waterbury's quota of troops for the eight regiments seems to have been one hundred and thirty-one. To devise measures to facilitate the enlistment, (which made but slow progress,) and in conformity to the recommendation of the governor and council of safety, a town meeting was called on the first

---

\* Hinman's Revolutionary War, p. 251.

† Afterwards, those who enlisted for three years were put upon the same footing as those who were engaged for the war, except the former had no part of the 100 acres of land.

day of April, 1777. At this meeting, a vote was passed to give each non-commissioned officer and soldier who should enlist, or had already enlisted, into the continental army, for three years, or during the war, twelve pounds lawful money annually, one half to be paid at the time of enlistment. To provide the means, a tax was laid of one shilling lawful money on the pound, and a committee appointed to act in the matter.

That the families of those who enlisted might be cared for, the governor and council recommended that the towns should provide for them the necessaries of life "at the price fixed by law." Waterbury resolved to make the provision and appointed a committee to see it done. The members of the committee (which was reappointed annually, in December) were Capt. Stephen Matthews, Thomas Dutton, Jonathan Scott, Benjamin Munson, Daniel Bronson, Capt. John Welton, John Thomson, Wait Hotchkiss, Daniel Sanford, Samuel Scovill, Thomas Fancher, Capt. Samuel Porter, Gideon Hickox, Stephen Warner and Josiah Rogers.

In October, 1777, the Assembly ordered that each town in the State should procure immediately for each non-commissioned officer and soldier in the continental army belonging to such town, one shirt or more, one hunting shirt or frock, one pair woolen overalls, one (or two) pair of stockings and one pair of good shoes, at certain stipulated prices. If said articles of clothing could not otherwise be procured, the town authorities were authorized "to impress" them wherever found, whenever they could be spared. A town meeting was held in October, according to recommendation, and a vote taken to comply, &c. To carry the object of the meeting into execution, a committee was appointed, consisting of Messrs. Eli Bronson, David Taylor, Moses Cook, Peter Welton, Abraham Andrews, Samuel Hickox, Phineas Royce, Esq., John Dunbar, Caleb Barnes, Joseph Sutliff, Jr., Daniel Alcock, Simeon Hopkins, Samuel Lewis, Esq., Gideon Hotchkiss and Ira Bebee. The result of the movement was that Waterbury provided (for which the selectmen presented an account against the State) 115 woolen shirts, containing  $262\frac{1}{2}$  yards of shirting; 24 linen shirts with 65 yds. of do.; 133 frocks, (hunting shirts,) having 366 yds. "toe cloth;" 130 pairs of "over halls," having

305 $\frac{3}{4}$  yds. fulled cloth; 184 pairs of stockings; 127 pairs of shoes; 5 sacks of "toe cloth" for transporting clothing. A bill was made out against the State for these items, to which was added "28s. officers fees for impressing sundries of clothing." There may have been other articles furnished besides those mentioned in the above schedule, in order to make up the apparent deficiency of some of them. The number of "frocks" named (133) may have been the whole number required, and may have represented the number of soldiers then in the regular army from Waterbury.

The frock or hunting shirt was a common article of the soldier's dress in the Revolution. It was recommended by the commanding officer of the Connecticut troops in New York, as a part of the uniform, as follows :

The General being sensible of the difficulty of providing cloth of almost any kind for the troops, feels an unwillingness to recommend, much more to order, any kind of uniform; but as it is absolutely necessary that men should have clothes and appear decent and light, he earnestly encourages the use of hunting shirts, with long breeches of the same cloth made gaiter fashion about the legs, to all those who are unprovided. No dress can be had cheaper or more convenient, as the wearer can be cool in warm weather, and warm in cold weather by putting on under clothes, which will not change the outward dress, winter or summer—besides which, it is a dress supposed to carry no small terror to the enemy, who think every such man a complete marksman.\* [Major Phineas Porter's Orderly Book, July 22d, 1776.]

Among the other articles which the American army stood in need of, and without which battles could not be won, was lead. A committee was appointed by the Legislature, consisting of Joseph Hopkins (of Waterbury) and others, to search for lead mines in the State. At the same time, it was provided that the selectmen of all the towns should purchase all the lead they could find—lead weights, bar lead, old lead, shot, &c., at a reasonable price, and to see that the same was cast into bullets of suitable and various sizes. The selectmen of Waterbury reported, March 26, 1777, that they had "collected foure hundred and fifty five lbs. and were running up the

---

\* Our ancestors were skillful in the use of fire arms. Hunting was with them an occupation. Deer abounded in our town, and were killed for food and clothing. There was a penalty for destroying them out of season, which was often exacted of the Waterbury hunters. Foxes and wild cats were also common, and for the destruction of these the town paid a premium. It was in the pursuit of game that our fathers became marksmen.

same into bullets, and had made some allowance for waste, the cost of which amounted to £16—17—6, at 9d. per lb." They asked for an order on the state treasury for that amount.

In the campaign of 1777, the Connecticut militia were not quite so severely taxed as in the year previous. Late in April, however, the State was invaded for the first time, by Gov. Tyron, when Danbury (where some military stores had been accumulated) was burnt. The neighboring militia were summoned. Many arrived the next day to take part in the action, in which Gen. Wooster was mortally wounded. Aner Bradley (then, or immediately afterwards, of Westbury) received a musket ball in the side.

In this year, Lieut. Col. Baldwin was stationed with his regiment at Fishkill and on the Hudson, as part of the force designed to guard the Highlands, and prevent the communication of the enemy below with Gen. Burgoyne, who was coming down from the north. He had several companies from Waterbury with him, much reduced in the numbers of their men. The captain and commanding officers of these, according to a return made, were Benjamin Richards, Aaron Benedict, John Woodruff, Phineas Castle, John Lewis, Thomas Fenn, Nathaniel Barnes, Josiah Terrell, Samuel Bronson, Jesse Curtis, Jotham Curtis, Joseph Garnsey, the twelve companies having but 193 men. Other companies swelled the whole number of men to 434.

Capt. John Lewis, Jr., (of Salem,) in pursuance of the orders of Lieut. Col. Baldwin, complained to the Legislature of his lieutenant, Ira Beebe. "I mustered," Lewis said, "and marched the company under my command to the Fishkills, where we arrived on or about the 8th day of October last past; and before I had opportunity to make a regimental return of my company, said Lieut. Beebe did in fact come off and lead off a large number of my company without liberty and contrary to my orders," &c. The document is dated at Waterbury, Jan. 1, 1778, and will be found in the 3d Vol. of Revolutionary papers in the State Library. Beebe was ordered to pay the costs that had arisen.

There was some difficulty about the payment of the 10th regiment, in this year. Gen. Washington wrote a letter, da-



ted April 7th, 1777, to the governor of Connecticut, declining to pay, on account of the great disproportion of officers to soldiers, &c. The Assembly desired the governor to reply to the letter, "and state the peculiar circumstances of that regiment and request payment," &c.

Many from Waterbury were in the northern army under Gen. Gates, and took part in the movements and the battles which terminated so gloriously in the capture of Burgoyne, in October, 1777. Lieut. Michael Bronson, attached to Col. Cook's regiment, acted as adjutant, and particularly distinguished himself.

In November, 1777, the "Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union" were, after prolonged debate, agreed on by Congress. These were to be proposed to the several legislatures, approved by them, and again ratified by their delegates in Congress, before they went into operation. Before the Connecticut Legislature had considered the subject, the town of Waterbury held an adjourned meeting "for the purpose of taking into consideration the Articles of Confederation." The Articles were read one by one. The first, second, third and fourth were approved. "As to the fifth article, [says the record,] it is the mind of this meeting that the power of choosing delegates to Congress is invested in the people—on this condition we concur."\* The sixth and seventh articles were approved. The eighth article was "not satisfactory," on account of "the method of proportioning the tax for supplying the common treasury." "As to the ninth article, where it mentions the number of land forces made by requisition from each state for its quota in proportion to white inhabitants in such state, we had rather choose it should be in proportion to the number of free subjects in each state." The remaining articles were approved. "After going through the whole of said articles, [continues the record,] the whole was put to vote and passed in the affirmative, excepting the above exceptions and reserves."

After the Declaration or Independence and its approval by

---

\* The fifth article provided that the delegates should "be annually appointed in such manner as the Legislature of each State shall direct," with a power reserved to each State to recall its members, at any time, and send others.

this State, in Oct. 1776, a law against high treason was enacted and defined. At the same time, an oath of fidelity to the State was prescribed and enjoined, to be taken by the freemen and officers of the same. No person could execute any office after Jan. 1, 1777, till he had taken the oath of fidelity; and no freeman could vote for any officer till he had done the same. This law was repealed in December, but another was enacted in June, 1777. At the session in August, the members of the Assembly took the prescribed oath. Mr. Joseph Hopkins and Capt. Ezra Bronson were the representatives from Waterbury. On the 16th of September following, (and afterwards,) the oath was administered to the freemen of Waterbury. The list, headed by Rev. Mark Leavenworth, will be found in the beginning of the second volume of town meetings.

During the severe winter of 1777-8, Washington was encamped with his army at Valley Forge, Pa. Hunger, nakedness, disease and discontent came near breaking up the army. Capt. David Smith, writing from the "Camp of Pennsylvania," under date of Jan. 18, 1778, made a return of the names of persons under his command, from Waterbury. They are as follows: Sylvanus Adams, John Saxton, Ezekiel Scott, Lue Smith, Joseph Freedom, Mark Richards, Ezekiel Upson, Joel Roberts, Elisha Munson, Elisha Hickox, William Bassett.

In 1778, the military companies of Waterbury were formed into a distinct regiment by the name of the 28th regiment. The field officers were Col. Phineas Porter, (of Waterbury,) Lieut. Col. Benjamin Richards, (of Westbury,) and Major Jesse Curtis, (of Northbury.) In this year and afterwards, Waterbury appears to have furnished its full proportion of troops both for the regular army or "continental line," and for militia duty. Those who remained at home contributed, according to their ability, to sustain the burdens of the war. These burdens in the form of regular taxes, provisions, clothing, camp equipage, &c., were heavier, perhaps, than were ever before borne by a numerous people, voluntarily. In the early part of the war, the men were so generally absent on military duty that there were scarcely any persons left except the aged, the infirm and the women to do the farm work—to put in and secure the crops, and take care of the farm stock.

There was danger of famine, not only in the army, but among the people at large. The disordered condition of the currency, connected with large emissions of irredeemable paper, made (to keep up its credit) a legal tender, added greatly to the embarrassments of the country. Labor was robbed of its reward; honesty and fair dealing were discouraged. Individuals took advantage of the necessities of the government and the general destruction of credit. To prevent extortion, the Legislature undertook the business of regulating the prices of all commodities (including labor) by statute. Thus the difficulty was aggravated. Few, at this time, have adequate conceptions of the distressed condition of our country in those dark and perilous days. Those who talk flippantly of our institutions; who disparage our government; who speak lightly of the blessings of union and the advantages secured by the Constitution—know little of their worth—know little of the toil and privation, the agony and the blood, which purchased them!

Much of the business in town meetings, during the war, was to provide ways and means for carrying on the contest. Committees were appointed from year to year, to furnish clothing for the soldiers and provide for their families at home, to collect provisions for the army, to make tents, &c., &c. When articles could not otherwise be obtained, impressment was resorted to. Much difficulty was experienced in complying with the demands of Congress and the State for soldiers. After the first enthusiasm had subsided, men were reluctant to enlist, particularly for three years, or during the war. To make the pay sure, the town guaranteed the wages offered and usually added a considerable bonus. Heavy fines were imposed for delinquency on those who were drafted. Eli Blakeslee, Samuel How, Ebenezer Bradley, Jr., and Joseph Bradley, were drafted to go to New Haven, but neglected to appear. They were arraigned before the County Court in April, 1779, and fined each £10, and costs amounting to £9, 9s.

Of the 1,500 soldiers which the Assembly ordered, in May, 1780, to be raised for the continental army, Waterbury and Watertown were required to furnish 26. At a town meeting held in June, a committee, consisting of Capt. Phineas Castle,

Capt. Samuel Bronson, Capt. Isaac Bronson, Jr., Mr. Ira Beebe, Capt. Josiah Terrel, Capt. Samuel Upson, Capt. Levi Gaylord, Messrs. Michael Bronson, Joseph Beach, Jr., Street Richards, Timothy Clark and Jude Hoadley, was appointed to hire Waterbury's proportion (thirteen) "to enlist into the continental army in any company, battalion or regiment, as they shall choose, for the term of three years, or during the war, and if the men cannot be obtained for so long a term, until the first of January next." At the same time, the town pledged itself that one half of the bounty or wages should be paid in provision or clothing, at the prices such articles commonly sold for in 1774, and the other half in lawful money, or its equivalent in bills of credit, payable once a year, once in six months, or once in three months, as the committee should agree. In July following, the same committee was directed "to engage ten other soldiers, which are now ordered to be raised by the governor and council of safety."

In November, 1780, Waterbury and Watertown were ordered to provide 14 soldiers for the continental army.

Early in 1781, there was a pressing demand for troops for Horse Neck. Waterbury resolved to raise its quota, agreeable to the act of the Assembly in November preceding. They were to serve one year from the ensuing first of March. Benjannin Munson, James Porter, Jr., David Taylor, Daniel Alcock, Jude Hoadley and Ebenezer Porter were chosen a committee to procure Waterbury's quota. At the same time, heavy taxes were laid, and to facilitate the collection, the tax-payers were divided into several "classes" (eighteen) and a collector appointed for each. To help out, the selectmen were desired to make a loan, on the town's credit, of a sufficient sum, in state money, for hiring the soldiers for Horse Neck. Some declined to pay the taxes. Capt. Samuel Upson and others of the third class, in Farmingbury, represented that Abraham Wooster refused to pay. His tax was 24s., and he was ordered by town vote to be assessed for double the amount, according to law. David Wooster, David Welton, Henry Grilley, Stephen Scovill and Timothy Scovill also refused, and were served in the same way.

In March, 1781, the town voted to raise ten footmen and

one mounted horseman for Horse Neck, according to act of Assembly, and engaged that the wages offered by the State should be punctually paid in silver at 6s. 8d. per ounce, or an equivalent in bills of credit. And the committee, Eli Bronson and Joseph Atkins, Jr., was authorized to pledge such additional payment as might be necessary. If said soldiers were not obtained by the first of April, (1781,) the inhabitants were to be divided into classes by Messrs. Ashbel Porter, John Thomson and Daniel Byington, committee, according to the list of 1780, each class to provide for one recruit.

In June, 1781, John Welton was chosen agent to hire seven soldiers for the continental army for one year, "on as reasonable terms as he can." A rate was also laid of four pence on the pound, payable in gold or silver, or good merchantable beef cattle, at the prices fixed by the General Assembly, for the purpose of providing for the continental army.

In July, 1781, six soldiers for continental service were to be furnished by Waterbury, and Capt. John Welton, Dr. Isaac Baldwin, Charles Upson, David Hotchkiss, Isaac Judd and Eli Bronson were chosen to divide the town into six classes, each class to provide one. Another tax was at the same time laid of three pence on a pound, payable in lawful silver money, or provisions, or clothing. In December, one soldier was wanting to complete the town's quota "for Horse Neck tower," [tour,] and he was to be provided by Stephen Bronson and others, committee.

Feb. 25, 1782, the town passed a vote to lay a tax of three half pence on the pound "for the purpose of procuring seven men for the post of Horse Neck and western frontier, according to an act of the General Assembly passed in January last," to be paid in cattle, sheep, swine or grain, "according to the true value thereof in ready money." Joseph Beach, Jr., was chosen a committee to procure them, he to be allowed a reasonable reward for his services.\* At an adjourned meeting, March 11th, measures were taken to supply seven men, "able bodied and effective," for the continental army. Charles

---

\* The town sometimes contracted with individuals to furnish the required soldiers. In 1780, for instance, Seba Bronson and William Leavenworth were the contractors, as appears from some difficulty in the settlement with them this year, (1782.)

Upson and David Hotchkiss were chosen a committee to hire them. To defray the expense, another tax of three half pence was voted, payable as before, in cattle, sheep or swine, or in wheat at 5s., rye at 3s. 4d., corn at 2s. 6d., oats at 1s. 6d.

In the war of the Revolution, no person from Waterbury attained a higher rank in the regular army than that of major. David Smith of Northbury continued an officer during the war, and for some time before its close held the commission of major. He was attached, in the commencement of 1781, to the fifth regiment of infantry of the "Connecticut line," commanded by Lieut. Col. Isaac Sherman.

I give below a list of such names as I have obtained of those persons from Waterbury who were engaged in the war of the Revolution. The list is very incomplete.

Ethan Andruss,	Daniel Barnes,	Israel Calkins,
Timothy Andruss,	Capt. Nathaniel Barnes,	Roswel Calkins,
John Ames,	Thaddeus Barnes, Jr.,	Richard Clark,
Samuel Ames,	Capt. Isaac Bronson,	Capt. Phineas Castle,
Sylvanus Adams,	Dr. Isaac Bronson,	Asahel Chittenten,
Luke Adams,	Lieut. Michael Bronson,	Amos Culver,
James Adams,	Titus Bronson,	Cuff Capenny,
Daniel Allen,	Roswell Bronson,	Lieut. Thomas Dutton,
Josiah Atkins,	Asahel Bronson,	Lieut. Titus Dutton,
Solomon Alcock,	Joseph Bronson,	Stephen Davis,
Samuel Alcock,	Daniel Bronson,	Jonathan Davis,
John B. Alcock,	Eliel Barker,	Miles Dunbar,
Lieut. Aaron Benedict,	Isaac Barker,	Amos Dunbar,
Obed Blakeslee,	Giles Brocket,	Joel Dunbar,
Enos Blakeslee,	Ebenezer Brown,	Isaac Dayton,
John Blakeslee,	Thomas Cole,	Samuel Dayton,
Amasa Blakeslee,	John Cole,	Nathaniel Edwards,
Joel Blakeslee,	Thomas Chilman,	Elisha Frost,
Benjamin Bates,	Timothy Cook,	Aaron Fenn,
Col. Jonathan Baldwin,	Joel Cook,	Capt. Thomas Fenn,
Ens. Theophilus Baldwin,	Samuel Cook,	Ens. Benjamin Fenn,
Abel Baldwin,	William Cook,	Cephas Ford,
Benjamin Baldwin,	Selah Cook,	Joseph Freedom,
Elihu Benham,	Bethel Camp,	John Fallendon,
Stephen Bristol,	Lieut. Samuel Camp,	Lieut. John Fulford,
William Basset,	Samuel Camp, Jr.,	James Fulford,
Lieut. Ira Beebe,	Eli Curtis,	Israel Frisbie,
Aner Bradley,	Stephen Curtis,	David Foot,
John Beach,	Samuel Curtis,	Moses Foot,
Thaddeus Beach,	Capt. Jesse Curtis,	Bronson Foot,
Clark Baird,	Capt. Jotham Curtis,	Benjamin Gaylord,
Benjamin Barnes,	Zadoc Curtis,	Jonathan Gaylord,

Southmayd Garnsey,	Elisha Munson,	Serg. Stephen Scott,
Jonathan Garnsey,	Nathaniel Morris,	Ansel Spencer,
Capt. Joseph Garnsey,	Levi Marks,	Elisha Spencer,
Paul Griggs,	Philip Martin,	Asa Sawyer,
Simeon Graves,	Samuel Mix,	Nathan Seward,
James Grannis,	Titus Mix,	Stephen Scovill,
Gideon Hickox,	Capt. Stephen Matthews,	Timothy Scovill,
Elisha Hickox,	Jonah Mallory,	Ezekiel Sanford,
William Hickox, Jr.,	Joseph Mun,	Stephen Seymour,
Capt. James Hickox,	Timon Miles,	William Southmayd,
Abraham Hotchkiss,	Joseph Minor,	Ezekiel Tuttle,
Truman Hotchkiss,	Abijah Osborn,	Jabez Tuttle,
Ebenezer Hotchkiss,	Joshua Osborn,	Timothy Tuttle,
Jesse Hotchkiss,	Isaac Osborn,	Ens. Timothy Tuttle,
Capt. Gideon Hotchkiss,	Maj. Phineas Porter,	Hezekiah Tuttle,
Timothy Humaston,	Truman Porter,	Asa Thayer,
Jared Humaston,	Lieut. Pendleton,	Capt. Josiah Terrell,
Lemuel Hopkins,	Daniel Pendleton,	Ichabod Terrell,
Hollingsworth Hine,	Jared Prichard,	Joel Terrell,
Benjamin Hine,	George Prichard,	Jared Terrell,
Hezekiah Hine,	George Prichard, Jr.,	Thomas Terrell,
Reuben Hine,	Amasa Preston,	Israel Terrell,
Nathaniel Hall,	Jonathan Pardee,	Isaac Terrell,
James Hull,	Luke Potter,	Elihu Terrell,
Culpepper Hoadley,	Munson Pond,	William Turner,
Philo Hoadley,	Ward Peck,	Ezekiel Upson,
Ebenezer Hoadley,	Augustus Peck,	Benjamin Upson,
William Hoadley,	Eliel Parker,	Stephen Upson,
Jude Hoadley,	Elijah Parker,	Benjamin Wooster,
Lazarus Ives,	Aaron Parker,	Edward Warren,
Elnathan Ives,	Capt. Benjamin Richards,	Samuel Welton,
Dennis Judd,	Mark Richards,	James Welton,
Samuel Judd,	Joel Roberts,	Stephen Welton, Jr.,
Daniel Judd,	Capt. Neheminh Rice,	Job Welton,
Freeman Judd,	Elijah Steele,	Increase Wade,
Chandler Judd,	John Stoddard,	Samuel Woodruff,
Stephen Judd,	John Smith,	Lambert Woodruff,
Brewster Judd,	Isaac Smith,	Edward Woodruff,
Samuel Kimball,	Levi Smith,	Capt. John Woodruff,
Capt. John Lewis, Jr.,	Allen Smith,	Abel Woodward,
Serg. Samuel Lewis,	Samuel Smith,	Thomas Warden,
Joseph Lewis,	Lue Smith,	Bartholomew Williams,
David Lewis,	Maj. David Smith,	Obadiah Williams,
Joel Lines,	John Saxton,	Philemon Wilcox,
Richard Lawrence,	Samuel Strickland,	Stephen Warner,
Charles Merriman,	Ezekiel Scott,	Justus Warner.
Thomas Merchant,	Uri Scott,	

Thomas Hickox (of Westbury) and Ezra Bronson were purchasing commissaries; the first during most of the war, and the last in 1782 and afterwards.

In the very commencement of the war, the Royalists or Tories of Waterbury, by their acts and words, aroused the jealousy of the Whigs. There was, at that time, within the bounds of the first society, two military companies. One of these was commanded by Whigs. All the officers of the other, with the exception of one sergeant, were Tories, and took no pains to disguise their sentiments. The General Court, as early as June, 1774, appointed a committee to examine into the facts and report. Thomas Mathewson (Matthews?) and Timothy Judd were the committee. The next year, a formal complaint was made of their commanding officer to the Assembly by certain members of the company, Whigs, as follows:

To the Honorable General Assembly, to be holden at New Haven, on the 2d Thursday of October, A. D. 1775.

The memorial of the subscribers, inhabitants of Waterbury, within the limits of the military company or train-band under the command of Capt. Hezekiah Brown, humbly sheweth—That your memorialists, sensible of the importance of supporting the natural and chartered rights, liberties, privileges and properties of the inhabitants of the American colonies, and anxious to find any person or persons unfriendly to the continental method of defending said colonies, think ourselves obliged to inform your Honors that the said Brown is disaffected with, and unfriendly to, the present method advised by the Continental Congress, and adopted by your Honors, for the common defence; which fully appears by the following sentence pronounced by said Brown, in the hearing of sundry people, at sundry times, viz: that the Congress ought to be punished for putting the country to so much cost and charge; for they did no more good than a parcel of squaws. And some time in the latter end of May last, did say, that he did not see the necessity of this Colony raising soldiers, as it was unnecessary expense, and the Assembly had no right to do it; and that Boston had wrongfully undertaken to quarrel about the tea, and we had no hand in it; and by his justifying his brother John Brown in exclaiming against the authority of this Colony for raising men to defend the Colony; and by saying that our General Assembly was as arbitrary as the pope of Rome, when they cashiered Capt. Amos Bronson and Ensign Samuel Scovill; by saying that the Congress, in some of the Articles of their Association, was as arbitrary as ever they were in Rome. And soon after the battle of Lexington, in April last, by saying in the time of the alarm, that he would not go one step further for the relief of the people in Boston than he was obliged to go.

Therefore, your memorialists would humbly observe, that as all military officers in this Colony hold their commissions by your Honors' authority, solely for the purpose of defending the lives, liberties and properties of the people, we think it is very inconsistent that any person should hold a commission who is inclined to use his influence against the authority that granted it; and very unsafe for this Colony at the present critical and important crisis, and is very grievous to



your memorialists to be under the command of an officer in whom we cannot confide. And therefore pray your Honors to grant such relief as your wisdom and justice shall direct; and we as in duty bound shall ever pray. Dated at Waterbury the 3d day of October, A. D. 1775.

[Signed] Joseph Beach, Phineas Castle, Daniel Bronson, Moses Cook, Amos Prichard, Thomas Bronson, Jr. [Historical Collections relating to the War of the Revolution: compiled by R. R. Hinman, 1842, p. 547.]

A warrant was served upon Brown to appear and answer to the charges; but no decisive action appears to have been had. Afterwards, however, at the May session of the Legislature, on information that Capt. Brown (of the 12th company of the 10th regiment, then commanded by Col. James Wordsworth) had refused to obey certain orders given him by Jonathan Baldwin, lieut. colonel of the regiment, to detach men for the service, said Brown was ordered to be arrested and brought before the Assembly to answer, &c. Col. Baldwin and others were summoned as witnesses. After a full hearing, the delinquent officer was cashiered, made incapable of holding military office, and his company disbanded. Soon after, or March 23, 1777 (?), Brown left Waterbury, joined the royal army in New York, received a captain's commission and before long (Aug. 27, 1777) died among his new friends. His real estate was improved, and his personal estate forfeited and sold, for the benefit of the commonwealth. After his death, the real estate was restored to the widow.

In December, 1775, the General Assembly of Connecticut enacted laws to punish persons inimical to the rights and liberties of the Colony or the united colonies. To supply the enemy ("the ministerial army or navy") with provisions, or military or naval stores; to give them information; to enlist into their service or to persuade others to do so; to pilot or assist their naval vessels, or to take up arms against the Colony or the united colonies, was punished, on conviction before the Superior Court, by a forfeiture of estate for the use of the Colony, and imprisonment not exceeding three years. If a person spoke or wrote against, libeled or defamed, the resolves of Congress or the acts of the Assembly, he was to be disarmed and disqualified for office, and be imprisoned, disfranchised or fined, at the discretion of the Court, he to give surety for good behavior. If any man sought the protection of the ene-







PAINTED BY G. H. BATE.

ENGRAVED BY SAMUEL SAMPSON.

*Vilas Brondor*



my's army or navy, or aided in the execution of the ministerial measures against the colonies, his estate was to be attached and improved for the benefit of the Colony. The selectmen and committee of inspection were authorized to cause any person, complained of as inimical to the liberties of the people to be brought before them and disarmed, if he could not disprove the charge. At the next session, in May, the old colonial law against high treason was repealed, "every part and paragraph thereof."

After the declaration of Independence, the first act that was passed by the Legislature was one against high treason, in which the "State" and the "United States of America" took the place of "our Sovreign Lord and King." Death was the penalty of levying war against the government, betraying it; furnishing its enemies with arms or intelligence, &c., &c. To attempt to join the enemies of the State or United States; to try to persuade any person to aid, assist, or comfort them, or to have knowledge of persons doing the same and concealing it, was punished by fine, and imprisonment not exceeding ten years.

In February, 1781, still more stringent laws, aimed at what is called "freedom of speech and the press," were passed. One enacted that if any person, being a citizen, "should by writing profess or declare that the king of Great Britain hath or of right ought to have, any authority or dominion in or over this State, or the inhabitants thereof, or that he or they owe allegiance to the said king within the same," &c., he shall be "put to death." Another law enacted that if any citizen shall "by words profess or declare that the king of Great Britain hath or of right ought to have any authority or dominion in and over this State," &c., (the same words are used as in the other law,) he "shall suffer imprisonment in Newgate during the present war."

Be it said, to the credit of Connecticut, that its laws directed against the enemies of the Revolution were less severe than in most of the other States.

In the course of the year 1776, after the defeat of the American forces on Long Island, when the British army was lying in and about New York, the patriot cause looking desperate enough, about eighty persons, Royalists, left Waterbury with the intention of joining the enemy. Some were taken on the way by the Americans, but most of them reached their desti-

nation. They did not, however, meet with the reception they expected. Instead of being welcomed and petted, they were treated with superciliousness and neglect. The discipline of the army they found almost intolerable, and a thorough disgust for their new friends soon took the place of former admiration. Many, taking advantage of the proclamations by Congress of pardon to such as should return to duty, deserted the royal standard, came home and took the oath of allegiance to the State. A part of these entered the American service. Numbers died or were killed while still with the British army. A few served in it till the close of the war. Of the latter number, a part, after peace was declared, settled in Nova Scotia. Others found a home in the southern states, while two or three returned to Waterbury.

The following list embraces the names of persons who left Waterbury during the Revolutionary war, with the intention of joining the enemy. The list is not complete :

John Baxter; returned to Waterbury.

Daniel Benham.

Asa Blakeslee; left Waterbury Dec. 4, 1776. His father, David, who encouraged him to go, was assessed for the support of a soldier in the American army, but died before the tax was collected.

John Blakeslee; died on Long Island while with the British.

Zealous Blakeslee.

Bela Bronson; left Waterbury Dec. 10, 1776. His personal estate was confiscated. He died on Long Island with the British.

David Brown, son of Daniel; died with the British in New York.

Capt. Hezekiah Brown. (See p. 351.)

Levi Brown; died with the British.

Zera Brown, son of Capt. Hezekiah. He went away with his father (and through his influence) in 1776, and joined the enemy on Long Island. The father died, and the son, "convinced of his error," returned to Waterbury and gave himself up to the civil authority. He was fined by the Superior Court £30, and ordered not to leave the town. In 1783, he presented a petition for a discharge—that he might labor for the support of his mother in Watertown, which was not granted.

Noah Candee, or Cambe; estate confiscated.

Samuel Doolittle. His estate was confiscated.

James Doolittle; estate improved for the benefit of the State.

John Dowd; joined the enemy at the age of 15 years; was ordered to go south and was there taken prisoner. He was confined in goal 15 months in Pennsylvania. His father, Jacob, brought a petition to the Assembly, saying that his son was seduced away, and was now willing to serve his country. He desired that he (the son) might have liberty to return home. The request was granted, bonds to be given for good behavior.

Samuel Dowd.

**Moses Dunbar.** He went to the enemy and returned with a captain's commission, to Northbury. Against the entreaties of his father, brothers, wife and children, he attempted to enlist a company of soldiers, for the enemy's service, and was taken with King George's commission in his pocket. He was convicted and hung in Hartford, March 19, 1777. The gallows, in a public place, was kept standing for a long time as a warning to others.

Elihu Grilley, } sons of Jehula;  
Daniel Grilley, } both died with the British.

Dan Finch; returned before the close of the war.

William Finch.

**Capt. Abraham Hickox.** He left Jan. 10, 1776, entered the British army; was ordered south in 1779, and was finally killed in battle. He had been a deputy sheriff in Waterbury, and his property was improved for the benefit of the State.

Darius Hickox; returned and married in Waterbury.

**Joel Hickox.** He went to Long Island with his father, in 1776, and on his separation from him, "made a cruise in the boating service," was taken prisoner and confined in Newgate during the pleasure of the Court, for not pleading to the indictment, he claiming the right of exchange as a British subject. When the prison was broken open, he escaped to Long Island, whence he returned in ten days, having released an American prisoner. He then brought a petition (from which the above facts are gathered) to the General Court, in which he confessed his error, and asked to be released. He was required to give a bond of £150 for good behavior and appearance at Court, he to remain in Waterbury.

Reuben Hickox; returned and then removed to Nova Scotia.

William Hickox.

Daniel Killum; died with the British.

William Maningirrous; estate confiscated.

**David Manvil.** He with others, Jesse Tuttle and Epha Warner, joined the enemy on Long Island, served them till Nov. 1777, and then escaped. They were examined by Gen. Parsons, and received from him a pass to return home. They were then committed to goal, but were afterwards suffered to go at large. One of them enlisted into the American service. They brought a petition to the Assembly, in which they asked pardon and prayed that their furniture might be restored to them. The request was granted, and the officers who held the goods in custody were authorized to return them, notwithstanding their seizure and condemnation, the petitioners paying the costs that had arisen.

Mead Merrell.

Richard Miles; estate improved for the benefit of the State. He deserted from the British service.

Heman Monson; deserted from the British service. A prosecution against him was dismissed March, 1778.

Daniel Nichols; died with the British.

Isaac Nichols; died with the British, in 1776.

William Nichols; estate confiscated. He went to Nova Scotia after the war, and there died.

Asahel Parker; returned to Waterbury.

Elisha Parker; died with the British of small pox.

John Parker; died with the British.



John Porter.

Timothy Porter; returned and took the oath of fidelity to the State.

Elihu Prichard; died with the British.

Elihalet Prichard of Northbury; returned after the war.

Thomas Prichard; died with the British.

Eli Rowley; deserted from the British.

Elijah Scott.

Noah Scott.

Timothy Scovill; returned, and enlisted into the American army.

Isaac Shelton; returned.

William Seeley; returned.

Jesse Tuttle; see David Manvil.

Aaron Warner; returned.

David Warner, son of Aaron; returned.

Epha Warner; see David Manvil. He took the oath of fidelity in Dec. 1777.

Justus Warner, } brothers; were taken on the way and brought back. Justus

Mark Warner, } died in Liverpool, April 16, 1856, aged 100 years and 20 days.

Seth Warner; deserted from the British.

Eben Way; returned.

Titus Way; left Dec. 4, 1776. After the war he went to Nova Scotia.

Amasa Welton; remained with the British but a short time; returned and took the oath of fidelity.

Arad Welton; went to the south and there married.

Ezekiel Welton; estate confiscated; returned after the war and removed to Nova Scotia.

Noah Welton.

Stephen Welton; returned and was one of the first to take the oath of fidelity.

Benoni Welton, } sons of Eliakim, one died in New York, and the other while

Moses Welton, } serving in Burgoyne's army.

Daniel Wooster.

Oliver Welton. He was convicted of trying to enlist Joel Roberts into the enemy's service. After the war, as his conviction rested on Roberts' testimony alone, he petitioned the Assembly to discharge him from the execution. The prayer was granted, but afterwards the vote was reconsidered and negatived. The next year, (1786,) on petition, he had liberty to pay in state securities.

[In the early part of 1780, (March 14th,) the house of Capt. Ebenezer Dayton, of New Haven, in the present town of Bethany, was broken into and robbed in the night, by a party of seven Royalists, headed by one Graham ("John Luke, otherwise called Alexander Graham") of Long Island. Several of the party belonged to Waterbury, and the affair made quite a stir. Dayton was a Whig, had lived on Long Island, and was charged (without foundation, it is alleged) with having been concerned in a robbery there. He was known to have money (which appeared to have been the main object of the burglars) and was absent in Boston at the time. Nobody was in the house except Mrs. Dayton and several children. Her hands were tied and her life threatened, if she made the least noise. £450 in gold and silver were carried off and much property destroyed, the whole loss being nearly £5,000. After leaving the house, the robbers came north and were secreted for several days, in the houses of David and Thomas Wooster in Gunn-

town. Afterwards they lay hid in a barn of Esq. John Wooster, (brother of David and Thomas,) in Oxford. They finally fled, and took a boat at Stratford for Long Island. The people of Waterbury and of other towns rallied and gave chase. The fugitives, all but one, were taken (says the Connecticut Journal of the time) on the Island, when they had nearly reached the British lines. They were brought back, examined before Esq. Hopkins, tried, condemned and sent to Newgate. Several of them—Jesse Cady, Noah Cande, David Wooster, Jr., and Samuel Doolittle (probably) were of Waterbury. Henry Wooster, Jr., one of the party, was of Derby. Doolittle, 18 years of age, was sentenced for four years, and was to pay a fine of £50 and costs. He petitioned for a commutation of punishment, on the ground that he was young, and was "seduced" by Graham. His prayer was not granted. David Wooster, Sen., was fined £500, the amount of his entire property. The prisoners, with others, finally (May, 1781) broke goal and escaped. A prison sentry was killed. David Wooster, Jr., (who held a musket to Mrs. Dayton's head, threatening her life,) was taken and confined in Hartford goal. He brought a petition for a release, in which he asked pardon, pleaded his youth, (being at the time of the robbery but 17 years of age,) claimed that he was seduced by Graham, and offered to enlist into the army. He was released on £150 bond, and permitted to live in some town on the east side of Connecticut River. Afterwards, he was released from his bond, and allowed to reside west of the river, (with a permit from Gen. Spencer,) when he returned home. He died a few years ago.]

The main east and west road through the town of Waterbury, communicating with Hartford and Middletown eastward, and with Fishkill and the Hudson river, by way of Breakneck Hill in Middlebury, westward, was much used in the Revolutionary war, (as it had been in previous wars,) for the passage of troops and the transportation of stores.\* It was the most southern of the traveled roads, at a safe distance from the sea, (the sea was in possession of the enemy,) which connected New England with the west and south. Teams for carrying goods and supplies ran frequently and regularly to and from Fishkill. In the fall of 1777, after the capture of Burgoyne, a detachment of the American army with the

---

\* In July, 1780, the town directed the selectmen to petition the General Assembly "to make provision for cost arising by soldiers when sick on the road to and from the army, belonging to this State."

Small pox prevailed extensively in the American army and was communicated to the Waterbury people. On account of several deaths from the disease, a town meeting was called in March, 1778, to consider the expediency of inoculation. Liberty to inoculate, under certain restrictions, was granted in September. A like liberty was given in Feb. 1782, to all the males of the town over ten years of age, and to all people living on the continental (or main east and west) road, till the 30th of March then ensuing. Afterwards, April, 1784, permission was given to Dr. Abel Bronson to erect a building and practice inoculation for small pox. He availed himself of the privilege, and established a pest house in Middlebury, which became somewhat famous.

enemy's splendid train of artillery passed over this road to the eastward. They pitched their tents and encamped for a night in Manhan Meadow, just above the bridge. Many people visited the ground to see the beautiful brass field pieces, all ranged in a line.

Gen. La Fayette, once during the war, perhaps more than once, passed through Waterbury. He, at one time, attended only by his aids, lodged at the house of Capt. Isaac Bronson, at Breakneck, who then kept tavern. The host introduced him to his best chamber, in which was his best bed. But La Fayette caused the feather bed to be removed, saying "straw for the soldier;" and made the straw underbed his couch for the night. He also, on one occasion, stopped at the house of Esq. (Joseph) Hopkins, then the most prominent civilian in the place. He is described as a slender, handsome youth, who sat a horse beautifully, and altogether made a fine appearance. I am unable to say whether or not his visits at Isaac Bronson's and Esq. Hopkins' occurred in the same journey. In the summer of 1778, La Fayette was detached by Washington from the continental army near New York to go to Rhode Island to assist to expel the British from Newport. The enterprise failed, and in the fall, La Fayette returned to the Hudson river, met Washington at Fishkill, and soon sailed for Europe. In these journeys to and from Rhode Island, it would have been most natural for him to pass by way of Fishkill, Waterbury, Middletown, &c.

Gen. Washington passed through Waterbury, certainly once, on his way to Hartford. He had with him Gen. Knox and a somewhat numerous escort. He rode a chestnut colored horse, came across Breakneck, and returned the salutations of the boys by the road side. His dignity of manner, set off by his renown, made a durable impression on all who beheld him. He dined with Esq. Hopkins, whose house stood on the site of S. M. Buckingham's dwelling. An anecdote is told of him which may be true, though it conflicts somewhat with the well known benevolence of his character. Mr. Hopkins made many inquiries, and at last became decidedly inquisitive. After reflecting a little on his last question, Washington said—

“Mr. Hopkins, can you keep a secret?”—“I can.”—“So can I,” the General instantly replied.

This visit of Washington to Waterbury must have occurred while on one of his journeys to Hartford to consult with Count Rochambeau and the French officers concerning the conduct of the war. These consultations occurred, the first, late in September, 1780, and the other, late in May, 1781. It is supposed to have been in September, 1780, that “the father of his country” was in Waterbury; but it may have been in May, '81. Possibly he was here at both times; for it is alledged that he passed through Waterbury at least twice. Perhaps he took our town on his way to and from Newport in March, 1781. On the sixteenth of that month he was in Hartford, on his return to the army. In the summer of 1778, Washington lay on the Hudson River, while Sullivan was in Rhode Island, as already suggested. Waterbury was in the line of communication.

I have thus indicated the different times when Washington may have found it convenient to pass through Waterbury, without intending, positively, to affirm that he visited the town more than once.

In the latter part of June, 1781, the French army under Count Rochambeau, in their march from Newport westward and south to join Washington in his operations against Cornwallis in Virginia, passed through Waterbury. They are said to have marched in four divisions, and to have encamped, for a night, just over the mountain in Southington, at a place since called French Hill. After the surrender of Cornwallis, or in October, 1782, they returned by the same route, in two divisions, (probably,) in order to embark for the West Indies. An old inhabitant says they marched two and two, and when the head of the column had disappeared beyond the hill at Capt. George Nichols', the other extremity had not come in sight on West Side Hill. The Middlebury people say that, at both times, they encamped on Breakneck Hill, making Isaac Bronson's house head quarters. On one of these occasions, probably the last, they stayed over one day to wash, bake, &c. All the wells in the neighborhood were drawn dry, and the

people, far and near, were employed, with their teams, to cart water from Hop Brook.\*

[The following items relating to the Revolutionary period may as well perhaps be introduced here.]

April, 1777. An order on Isaac Doolittle, for 625 lbs. of powder, was given to the selectmen of Waterbury by the council of safety.—[Hinman's Rev. War, p. 436.]

Of the militia which the General Assembly, in May, 1779, ordered to be raised immediately, Waterbury was to furnish ten.

At the October session of the same year, the Assembly resolved to raise wheat and rye or meslin for the army, and assigned to Waterbury, as its proportion, 360 bushels of wheat and 200 bushels of rye or meslin.

In 1780, Abner Johnson, apothecary, asked of the Legislature liberty to transport to Boston one ton of wheat flour and three barrels of pork, which he wished to exchange for medicine that could not be otherwise obtained. The request was not granted. [In order to increase the supply at home, the carrying of provisions out of the State was forbidden by law.]

STATE OF CONNECTICUT to Watertown Select Men, Dr.

To sundry provisions, &c., furnished the men under the command of Lieut.-Col. Richards ordered for the relief of West Point, viz:

	£	s.	d.
To 707 lbs. wheat flour, @ 3d. ....	8	16	9
To 514 lbs. salt pork, @ 1s. ....	25	14	0
To 1 pork barrel .....	7	0	
To 2 large flour barrels .....	10	0	
	35	7	9
To commission, @ 5 p. c. ....	1	15	4
To 2 men and horses to bring tents, &c., from Waterbury .....	4	0	
To 2 teams, 4 cattle each, to transport the above provisions, tents, &c., to Ridgefield, being forty miles @ 2s. 6d. per mile each ..	10	4	0

Lawful money £47 7 0

—[Revolutionary Papers, Vol. XVII.]

The names of forty-six soldiers who had been in the army previous to Jan. 1, 1780, are given, [Revolutionary Papers, Vol. XXX,] whose families received supplies from the town.

The names of twenty-one persons are mentioned whose families received supplies in 1780. Eleven of them were of Watertown, (which included Northbury till 1795.)

In May, 1781, Watertown was called on for twelve men for Horse Neck.

In the same year, the names of ten soldiers are given whose families received supplies from the town, five of whom were of Watertown.

Feb. 21, 1781. Whereas the officers and soldiers employed in the defense of

\* Manuscript letter from Dea. Leonard Bronson.

Cothren seems to have fallen into error in supposing that La Fayette commanded the French army.

this and the United States have suffered much by want of the article of sauce, so necessary for their health and comfort, which inconvenience cannot be remedied except by the exertions of the people :

Therefore resolved [by the Assembly] That it be recommended to the inhabitants of the several towns in this State, that they remember their brethren in the field, and endeavor the next season to raise a quantity of peas and beans, sufficient to supply the officers and soldiers in public service belonging to this State, for which they shall receive a generous reward.

And the several printers in this State are requested to publish this resolve.— [Connecticut Courant, March 27, 1781.]

Jan. 1782, Waterbury was ordered to provide four footmen and one horseman for the continental army, and Watertown five footmen and one horseman.

1782. The following persons were returned as deserters by Col. Elisha Sheldon, viz : Richard Lawrence of Waterbury and Jared Humaston and James Fulford of Watertown.

April 12, 1784, the town appointed Aaron Benedict, Mr. Prichard and Samuel Bronson a committee "to examine three five pound notes given by Ozias Cyrus and Zibe Norton to the treasurer for a fine for not performing a tower of duty when draughted, and to settle with them and the treasurer."

At the same meeting, the town directed "the selectmen to dispose of the pots, tents, camp equipage, &c., belonging to the town."

Sept. 25, 1783, the town chose Messrs. Aaron Benedict, Andrew Culver, Capt. Samuel Upson and Capt. John Welton delegates to a convention to be held at Middletown the 30th of September, then instant, "to obtain a redress of grievances on account of the commutation of five years half pay granted to the officers of the continental army in lieu of half pay for life."

---

## CHAPTER XXII.

### AFTER THE WAR: MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.

THE surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown, in Oct. 1781, virtually closed the war; but peace was not finally proclaimed till April, 1783. The country came out of the conflict thoroughly exhausted. Waterbury was poorer than ever. During the struggle, Westbury and Northbury, its richest portions, had been made into a new town. The poverty of her agriculture promised a slow and uncertain recovery. Old people tell,

or used to tell, a sad tale of those days. In 1774, the population of the whole town was 3,526 and its grand list £39,826, 18s. In 1779, the grand lists of the different societies stood, according to my notes taken from the State papers in Hartford, as follows, viz: Waterbury, £12,181, 17s., 6d.; Westbury, £13,427, 10s. 9d.; Northbury, £10,070, 15s. 10d.; Farmingbury, £2,862, 12s. 6d.; Salem, £5,657, 12s. 3d. Total, £44,200, 8s. 10d.

This last sum, in consequence, perhaps, of abatements not being deducted and the whole of Farmingbury being included, exceeds very considerably the amount regularly returned for the entire town in that year, which is £38,504, 18s. 9½d.

In 1790, the population of Waterbury was 2,937 and of Watertown 3,170, in the whole 6,107; an increase of 73 per cent. since 1774, the greatest part of it probably in Watertown. The grand list of Waterbury, in this year, stood as follows, viz: first society, £12,093, 12s. 10d.; Farmingbury, £2,401, 3s. 9d.; Salem, £5,302, 3s. 6d. Total, £19,797, 0s. 1d., about the same as in 1782, but £3,000 more than in 1788.

In 1800 the population of Waterbury had risen to 3,256, notwithstanding several hundred people had been lost when Wolcott and Oxford were incorporated. Watertown contained, at this time, 1,615 souls and Plymouth 1,791; together, 3,406. The three towns numbered 6,662, to which an important addition should be made of those set off with Wolcott and Oxford. There must have been, in 1800, within the limits of original Waterbury, over 7,000 persons.

There is to be found among the papers in the town clerk's office a series of taxable lists of the first society of Waterbury and of Salem society, commencing in 1782, from which much instruction may be gathered. I will give some extracts from the list of the first society, (which then included present Waterbury and those parts of Middlebury and Prospect which belonged to the old town,) bearing date Aug. 20, 1783, the first year after the peace. Here is the summary of polls and estate. The items were put in at a fixed rate regulated by statute.

Polls—above 21 years,	No.	189	at	£18	£3,402	00s.	00d.
“ under “	“	54	“	9	486	00	00
Neat Cattle—Oxen,	“	237	“	4	948	00	00
“ Cows and 3 year olds,	“	516	“	3	1,548	00	00
“ 2 year olds,	“	159	“	2	318	00	00
“ 1 year olds,	“	198	“	1	198	00	00
Horses—3 year olds and upwards,	“	270	“	3	810	00	00
“ 2 year olds,	“	14	“	2	28	00	00
“ 1 year olds,	“	14	“	1	14	00	00
Swine,	“	363	“	1	363	00	00
Houses,*	“	135	“Price,”		124	19	07
Inclosed land—plough land,	acres	1850½	at	10s.,	925	05	00
“ upland meadow and pasture,	“	2425 <sup>4</sup> / <sub>80</sub>	“	8	970	5	05 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>5</sub>
“ lowland,	“	512½	“	7s. 6d.	192	03	09
“ bog-meadow,	“	54½	“	£5	13	12	06
“ bush-pasture,	“	2933½	“	2	293	07	00
Uninclosed land—1st rate,	“	2221 <sup>0</sup> / <sub>10</sub>	“	2	222	08	09 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>5</sub>
“ 2d “	“	3141	“	1	157	01	00
“ 3d “	“	1271½	“	6d.	81	15	10½
Clocks, &c.—steel and brass- wheeled clocks,	“	4	“	£3	12	00	00
“ wooden clock,	“	1	“	1	1	10	00
“ watches,	“	7	“	1 10s.	10	10	00
“ riding chair,	“	1	“	3	3	00	00
“ silver plate, 20 ounces and 10 pennyweights, [“at 6 p. c. on the just value thereof,”]					8	02	00
Money on interest,	£33 at 6 p. c.				2	00	00

Total, £11,075 02 01<sup>7</sup>/<sub>10</sub>

In dollars, at \$3 33½ to the pound, \$36,917 02.½

\* “Each dwelling house in good repair [was assessed] at fifteen shillings for each fireplace therein,” and the listers might “abate for old and decayed houses one quarter, one half, or three quarters of the sum aforesaid,” &c.

† It may be interesting to compare the above figures with the following, as published in the Waterbury American :

LIST OF POLLS AND TAXABLE PROPERTY IN THE TOWN OF WATERBURY, RATABLE BY LAW ON THE FIRST DAY OF OCTOBER, 1856.

1197 1-2 Dwelling Houses,	. . . . .	\$1,192,854 00
14,111 3-4 Acres of Land,	. . . . .	890,139 00
29 1-4 Stores,	. . . . .	92,900 00
89 Mills and Manufactories,	. . . . .	39,015 00
358 Horses and Mules,	. . . . .	28,513 00
1,228 Neat Cattle,	. . . . .	28,213 00
Sheep, Swine and Poultry,	. . . . .	164 00
Coaches, Carriages and Pleasure Wagons,	. . . . .	10,963 00
Farming Utensils,	. . . . .	50 00
Clocks, Watches and Jewelry,	. . . . .	10,788 00
Piano Fortes, &c.,	. . . . .	10,251 00
Furniture and Libraries,	. . . . .	8,900 00
Bank and Insurance Stock,	. . . . .	188,791 00



The polls of all male persons between the ages of sixteen and seventy\* were placed in the list, except ministers of the Gospel, professors and tutors of colleges, constant school-masters, students at college, persons disabled by sickness or other infirmity, &c. The estates of ministers lying in their own society were exempted, and the polls of all the members of their families. In the list from which the summary is taken there are in all, 294 names, including 10 of females, 41 of non-residents, and 53 of residents, whose polls are not entered. Add the 53 non-taxable, to the 189 £18 polls, and we have a total of 242 males above 21 years of age, all of whom, except Moses Frost, Richard Nichols, Jr., Selden Scovill and Eben W. Judd, had taxable estate. The names of those who had the largest lists, are :

Timothy Clark,	£167, 3s. 0d.	Stephen Ives,	£100, 8s. 0d.
Joseph Hopkins,	156, 11 8	George Nichols,	98, 9 0
Wid. Abigail Gunn,	148, 4 6	David Bronson,	98, 6 0
John Welton,	135, 17 6	Nathaniel Richardson,	96, 4 0
Seba Bronson,	131, 7 6	John Thompson,	92, 11 6
Amos Scott,	124, 7 0	Richard Welton,	92, 4 0
Jonathan Baldwin,	111, 16 6	Isaac Bronson, Jr.,	92, 3 0
Stephen Bronson,	109, 3 3	James Bronson,	91, 6 6
Benjamin Upson,	106, 8 6	Abraham Hotchkiss,	90, 19 0
Aaron Benedict,	102, 18 6	Phineas Porter,	86, 5 0

Manufacturing Stock, . . . . .	\$2,305,343 00
State and other Stocks, . . . . .	620 00
Railroad and other Bonds, . . . . .	9,790 00
Amount employed in Trade and Merchandising, . . . . .	140,672 00
Amount employed in Mechanical and Manufacturing Operations, . . . . .	111,000 00
Investment in Vessels and Commerce, . . . . .	800 00
Money at Interest, . . . . .	150,886 00
“ on Deposit, . . . . .	10,480 00
All other Taxable Property, . . . . .	2,050 00
Additions by Board of Relief, . . . . .	16,617 00
	Amount,
	\$4,664,094 00
	Deduct indebtedness, &c.,
	148,052 00
	\$4,521,042 00
Amount of Assessment at 8 per cent.,	135,631 26
1772 Polls at ten dollars each,	17,730 00
	Taxable amount for 1856,
	158,351 26
792 Military subjects at 50 cents each,	351 00

\* One of the great principles for which our fathers contended in the war which had just closed, was that taxation and representation should go together; and yet, they taxed minors, as they always had done.

Ezra Hull,	£86, 8s. 0d.	James Porter, Jr.,	£85, 8s. 0d.
Thomas Richardson,	86, 2 6	Samuel Bronson,	84, 10 0
Eli Bronson,	86, 1 6	David Clark,	79, 12 6
Benjamin Hine,	85, 19 0	Phineas Castle,	78, 2 0
Joseph Beach, Jr.,	85, 14 0		

Of the acres of land listed, Joseph Hopkins owned the greatest number, 442 standing against his name. Roger Prichard owned 249, Seba Bronson 240, Stephen Bronson 233, Jonathan Baldwin 217, Wid. Abigail Gunn 213, John Welton 200, Timothy Clark 196, Aaron Benedict 168, Amos Scott 163, Stephen Ives 163, Benj. Upson 119. Of inclosed lands, Roger Prichard had 172 acres, Seba Bronson 150, Wid. Gunn 148, Joseph Hopkins 144, John Welton 122, Jonathan Baldwin 114, Stephen Bronson 110, Timothy Clark 96, Aaron Benedict 88, Amos Scott 73, Benjamin Upson 69. Of the 1st and 2d quality of inclosed land, Joseph Hopkins had 91 acres, Seba Bronson 90, John Welton 81, Wid. Gunn 74, Timothy Clark 72, Roger Prichard 60, Stephen Bronson 53½, Amos Scott 50. Of the 1st quality of land, Seba Bronson seems to have had the greatest number of acres, and the most valuable farm. He had 80 acres of first quality land, John Welton 40, Roger Prichard 34, Benjamin Upson 30, Timothy Clark 26, Joseph Hopkins 25. Of uninclosed land, Joseph Hopkins had 298 acres, Lemuel Nichols had 160, Stephen Bronson 133, Stephen Ives 120, Jonathan Baldwin 103.

Now let us look at the luxuries which our fathers enjoyed. There are, in the list of which I have been speaking, four steel and brass clocks. These were owned by Jonathan Baldwin, Joseph Beach, Jr., Wid. Abigail Gunn and Joseph Hopkins, (who was a watch-maker.) There are also seven watches, (silver,) and these were the property (much valued doubtless) of Ezra Bronson, Dr. Abel Bronson, Wid. Abigail Gunn, Joseph Hopkins, Stephen Ives, Abner Johnson and Ephraim Warner. The column for wooden clocks is blank except in a single instance. Far down, against the name of Benjamin Upson, the space is filled by "1." This rare piece of mechanism was originally the property of Thomas Clark, (2d.) It was bought by Mrs. Clark for their convenience in keeping tavern, as early as 1772, and cost about \$20. It was made by

Solomon Crittenden of Kent. Abraham Truck of Waterbury made the case. It is thought to have been the first of its kind brought into Waterbury.

Mr. Clark died, and Benjamin Upson married his widow, in Jan. 1781, and thus came into possession of the wooden clock. It is the only one that appeared on the taxable lists till after 1790. Its face, with the maker's name on it, is still in existence (or was a short time since) in the safe keeping of Mrs. Aurelia Clark, the daughter of Thomas Clark.

The only wheeled vehicle of any sort in the list, is "a riding chair," set down to the account of Ezra Bronson. I suppose it was a two wheeled carriage without a top, for a single person, which the owner, who was much engaged in public life, used in business. It is affirmed that Parson Leavenworth also had a two wheeled carriage, without a top, with a double seat, which, being exempted from taxation, does not appear in the list; and that this was the first thing of the kind which was owned in Waterbury. Bronson's "chair" is on the lists of 1782 and 1783, but after that disappears. The column for carriages is then wholly blank till after 1791; except, in one instance, (1789,) a "sulkey" is entered against the names of the administrators of George Nichols.

Joseph Hopkins owned the "silver plate" which is mentioned in the summary I have given. It consisted, probably, of silver spoons of his own manufacture. No other person had any "plate" till after 1791.

The person who stood highest in the town list, in the town of Waterbury, in 1782, and for several years afterwards, so far as I have examined, was Jobamah Gunn of Salem society. In 1782, he owned 418 acres of land, and stood in the list £191, 17s. 6d. In 1791, he had 563 acres of land, (363 of which were inclosed,) and stood in the list £245, 5s.

Of the 242 names of male persons over 21 years of age found in the list of 1783, 82 will be identified as those of original families, representing less than half the old names. Several of them were not descendants of the first settlers. Of the 82, there are of the names of Barnes 2, Bronson 25, Clark 2, Gaylord 1, Hickox 5, Hopkins 2, Judd 4, Peck 1, Porter 11, Richards 1, Richardson 2, Scott 7, Scovill 6, Upson 1, Warner 7, Welton 5.

On the list of the voters of Waterbury, published in the *Waterbury American*, Oct. 24, 1856, all the above names, with the exception of Richardson, are found, and three others that were borne by original families. I give the number of persons represented by each of these names, as they are entered in the *American's* list. There are of the name of Andrews 4, Barnes 1, Bronson 22, Carrington 1, Clark 12, Gaylord 1, Hickox 4, Hopkins 1, Judd 8, Peck 7, Porter 12, Richards 1, Scott 10, Scovill 5, Stanley 2, Upson 10, Warner 20, Welton 20, (including in the last number five names printed Welon.)

The adoption of the Constitution of the United States, and the organization of the government under it, in 1789, put a new aspect upon affairs. At that period, our existence as a nation, and our greatest good and prosperity as a people, began. The blessings of that constitution were felt in every hamlet of the land and have extended to the present time. No sooner was its influence perceived than order came out of confusion. Discord was exchanged for harmony, uncertainty for confidence, poverty for plenty, humiliating and confederated weakness for national strength.

---

[The following miscellaneous items, being chiefly extracts from records, for which I have not found a fitting place, in the preceding pages, I introduce here by themselves.]

Nov. 14, 1702 y<sup>e</sup> town by uoat order y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> new books should be sold in y<sup>e</sup> town to ym y<sup>t</sup> will by ym at 1<sup>s</sup> 6<sup>d</sup> in cash or half a bushill of wheat down payd to y<sup>e</sup> town treasurer only y<sup>e</sup> bound book to be kept for y<sup>e</sup> town yours to be kept in y<sup>e</sup> hands in [of] y<sup>e</sup> justis in being fro.m time to time. [The preceding vote seems to refer to certain law books, copies of the statutes, doubtless, received from the Assembly. There are frequent votes ordering the sale of the "law books."]

Jany wary 6 1718-19 it was agreed upon by uote to grant a ratt of five pounds as money to be raised on the present list of estat as a town stock [or charitable fund] for the nesesity of the pore or distrakted parsons to be disposed of at the discretion of the present townsmen according to law.

— of Buckshill was married in April, 1736, and his first child was born in September following. For his misfortune, he and his wife were summoned to appear before the County Court, in April, 1737, to show cause, &c. Such cases were very common in the courts 100 years ago. The penalty was £5 or ten stripes (for each offender, I suppose.) Afterwards, in cases in which married offenders pleaded guilty on trial, the courts were ordered to exact but half the penalty.

One poor fellow, John Tuttle, of New Haven, confessed 12 years after the offense. His confession is entered on the N. H. County Court Record, Vol. II, p. 486.

Dec. 14, 1741, the prayers of Daniel Scott, Ebenezer Elwell and Gideon Allen for the abatement of their fines for killing deer were "negatived" by the town. March, 1755, Samuel Warner was excused from paying his note for £2, 10s., given for killing a deer. In 1765, Zera Beebe's note for £3, given for destroying a deer was ordered to be given up. The town was equally lenient to Samuel Williams, in 1767.

Jan. 1756, William Selkrigg of Waterbury was killed by falling with a stick of wood which he was carrying on his shoulder.

June, 1760, Miles Wooster and Samuel Sperry were brought before a justice's court and fined each 3s. for "rude and profane behaviour between meetings in the meeting house on the Lord's day."

December, 1760, the town voted to give a premium of three shillings for "killing or destroying any grown wild cat, and half so much for their whelps, and two shillings for a fox and half so much for their whelps," the selectman or men to cut off the right ear of such cat or fox to prevent fraud.

In 1761, the premium on wild cats was raised to five shillings, and on their whelps to two and six pence. In 1763 and 1773, 1s. only was paid for foxes.

In 1765, Isaac Frazier broke into the shop of Joseph Hopkins and stole £123 value of goldsmith's work. He was sentenced to be executed, but asked for perpetual imprisonment, banishment or slavery instead. The request was not granted.

Feb. 1768. The town voted to give the French family in this town, in order to transport them into the northward country, not exceeding ten pounds, including charitable contributions, to be paid in provisions.

At the same meeting, voted that Obadiah Scott should have liberty to live in this town.

Dec. 7, 1771. Moses Paul, a Mohegan, while at the house of Mr. Clark in Bethany, (then New Haven,) and under the influence of liquor, seized a flat iron weighing 4½ lbs., (Paul said "a stick or clubb,") and while aiming, it is alledged, at Mr. Clark, missed him, and the blow fell upon Moses Cook of Waterbury, who was standing by. The wound terminated fatally Dec. 12. The Indian was tried in February, and sentenced to be hanged June 17; but the General Assembly, on petition, postponed the execution till Sep. 17, 1772. Sampson Occum, at the request of Paul, preached the funeral sermon, which was published.

1783. Peter Gilkley was sentenced to two years imprisonment in Newgate and forfeiture of estate. The only evidence against him was the tools found in his house. He denied that he had counterfeited, though he confessed that he had intended to do so. He said that his wife and children were destitute; that he was wounded in the hand, the use of which he had lost; that he was sick and worn out, and asked for a remission of punishment and a restoration of his estate. He was discharged from prison.

Isaac Hine was charged with being an accomplice of Gilkley and arrested, but for want of evidence was acquitted.

Dec. 27, 1784, at a town meeting, a memorial was received from Isaac Bronson and others, asking liberty to erect a saw mill "on the Great Brook where the old one now standeth," (which would accommodate the neighborhood of Breakneck,) and to build a dam which would cause the water "to flow across the public road," on condition that they maintained a bridge, &c. The request was granted.

1785. John Porter and Elnathan Jennings of Waterbury were apprehended for counterfeiting coin. They escaped twice and were rearrested and imprisoned. They then broke goal and fled.

Dec. 21, 1786. Two of the five selectmen were to collect the town rate and provide for the poor, and "be allowed a reasonable reward;" but the other three were to "have no reward for their service except for laying out highways, and a dinner on such days as they are employed in the service of the town."

Dec. 8, 1788, Noah Cande asked for liberty of the town to set up a blacksmith's shop for his own use, "at the west end of a cider mill yard, a little east of Col. Baldwin's dwelling house, against the southeast corner of Col. Porter's pot-ash lot."

Dec. 30, 1789. On motion of John Welton, Esq., the selectmen were instructed to purchase a piece of ground, in the northern part of the town, for the purpose of a burying yard, if they thought proper.

Sep. 20, 1791, Doct. Abel Bronson Capt. Isaac Bronson, and Col. Phineas Porter were chosen a committee to confer with Woodbury and the neighboring towns on the subject of a new county and to hear proposals, &c. Another committee was appointed, April 9, 1792, "to treat with the neighboring towns eastward and westward respecting a new county."

Jan. 27, 1794. On petition of Mr. Eli Bronson praying for a burying ground for Middlebury society, the selectmen were authorized to purchase ground for that purpose.

Jan. 16, 1797, the town directed the selectmen to pay the selectmen of Wolcott £3, 10s. 0d., lawful money, to be applied to the payment, in part, of their burying ground.

April 22, 1801. The selectmen were "authorized to purchase so much land as they shall judge necessary for the convenience of the public to be improved as a burying ground on the east side of and adjoining to the present burying ground, at the expense of the town," and to sell so much land at the south end of the old yard as they judged unsuitable for the purpose of a burying ground.

Feb. 21, 1803. The town voted to prefer a petition to the next General Assembly praying said Assembly to quiet the present possession of land in the said ancient town of Waterbury, in the full and peaceable enjoyment of the same, so far as their titles may be defective in consequence of the usual custom of locating lands within said town without a title to the common lands by deed, with which said surveys or locations are filled up.

# A P P E N D I X .



## I. BIOGRAPHY.\*

### AMOS BENEDICT,

Son of the late Aaron Benedict of Middlebury, and an elder brother of Aaron Benedict of Waterbury, was born July 6, 1780. He was graduated at Yale College in 1800; studied law at the Law School in Litchfield; married a daughter of Capt. Stone of that place, and settled in Watertown, Jefferson County, N. Y., in 1807, where he soon became a leading member of the bar. He was the second district attorney, being first appointed in 1810, and again in 1813 and 1814.† The district then comprised the counties of Jefferson, Lewis and St. Lawrence. In 1816, he returned to Connecticut, visited his friends in Litchfield, was taken ill, and after a week's confinement, died of "a carbuncle on the back." He was buried in Litchfield.

### ISAAC BRONSON,

The son of Isaac and Mary (Brocket) Bronson, was born at Breakneck, now Middlebury, March 10, 1780. His father, grandfather, great grandfather and great, great grandfather, (the original planter,) all bore the name of Isaac, and all except the last, were eldest sons.

The subject of this notice was extensively known for his intimate acquaintance with the principles of banking, currency and finance. His father was a farmer of highly respectable character, and often a member of the Legislature. A small farm was his chief source of revenue,

---

\* Several of the biographical notices in the following pages have been furnished, wholly or in part, by others. For those of Isaac Bronson, Reuben Holmes, Samuel L. Hopkins and Mark Leavenworth, I am indebted to friends who have taken a special interest in this work.

† See Dr. Hough's History of Jefferson County.

and to support the expenses of his family required all his industry and economy. For this reason, neither of his sons received a collegiate education, but they had the best advantages which his limited means would afford. There are few country places where intellectual culture was more highly prized than in Middlebury. The people were considerate, industrious and moral, and united their efforts to provide means for the general diffusion of knowledge among themselves. The influence of such a community was favorable to the development of the talents and virtues of Mr. Bronson, and had a salutary effect in forming his character. Few persons of regular education were more familiar with the history of the world, and with those branches of information which constitute useful and practical knowledge.

While a youth, Mr. Bronson pursued the study of medicine with the late Dr. Lemuel Hopkins of Hartford, and entered the army as a junior surgeon in the Revolutionary war, on the 14th of November, 1779, in the 2d regiment of light dragoons, commanded by Col. Elisha Sheldon, in the Connecticut line, under the immediate command of General Washington. He continued constantly in the discharge, not only of the duties of that office, but he also acted as the senior surgeon until the end of the war. The senior officer was, from his age and infirmities, unable to endure the hardships incident to the peculiar service required of that regiment—the protection of the inhabitants of the country lying between the outposts of the two contending armies, unprotected by the civil or military power of either, and exposed to the perpetual incursions of the enemy. This service required the troops to be constantly moving, as well for the protection of the inhabitants, as to guard against surprise, which a stationary position of twenty-four hours would at all times have exposed them to. Not a single tent belonged to the regiment, nor had they any other covering except the occasional shelter which uninhabited houses and barns afforded. These privations of course exposed the troops to unusual hardship. The wounded, as well as the sick, were frequently left under the protection of flags of truce, attended by the surgeon only; the New York levies being without any medical officers even in name. Mr. Bronson, though a junior surgeon, performed all the medical duties for several campaigns for all the troops attached to Sheldon's command.

At the close of the war, Mr. Bronson abandoned the profession of medicine, made a voyage to India, traveled in Europe, returned about 1789 and married. About the year 1792, he settled with his family in Philadelphia; but after two years residence in that city, removed to New York, where he continued the business of a banker, which



had been commenced some time before, in connection with Mr. Fowler of New York and Mr. Pomeroy of Hartford. In 1796, he purchased the property of the late President Dwight on Greenfield Hill, in this State, for a summer residence, to which place he retired during a large portion of each year.

Mr. Bronson was distinguished for his great intellectual power, a moral courage that nothing could intimidate, untiring industry and the most scrupulous integrity. Upon any subject to which his attention was at any time directed, his views were clear and profound, and on all proper occasions, expressed with great frankness and freedom.

Having closed his partnership firm, he engaged in the banking business in Bridgeport, Conn. He possessed the controlling influence in a bank in that place, and managed its affairs for more than thirty years. His bank was opened on the 21st day of May, 1807, and a rule was established on that day of the following import.—“No paper, offered at this Bank for discount, will be accepted having more than 60 days to run to maturity, and every note or bill discounted must be paid at maturity. No renewal or new discount will be made in substitution for or in aid of the payment of an existing indebtedness.” There was no set form of by-laws enacted. This simple, searching and effective rule was the solitary but inflexible law for the government of the institution. In the outset, some of its debtors, regarding a bank in the light of a benevolent institution, possessing recognized and special privileges, and therefore bound to accommodate the public, (a heresy alike fatal to the country and the banks,) denounced the rule as arbitrary and unaccommodating. It however was invariably enforced, and its requirements obeyed. It induced and compelled debtors to carry out the same conservative principle in all their private transactions. Each trader conducted his business, not on borrowed bank credit, but on his own capital, and thus brought the amount of his transactions within his own means—short credits and quick returns were characteristic of the transactions of the customers of the bank. The gains of the people, the fruit of honest and patient industry and well considered economy, were not sudden and spasmodic, but sure and steady. The bank, in short, only cashed sales, and it was soon proved, after the bank was fairly in operation, that its ability to discount had no sort of connection with or dependence on the amount of the capital, and that the latter was of no use except to inspire confidence. A currency fully equal to the demands of trade was sustained, and more could not have been sustained, however large its capital. Its circulating notes were issued only in exchange for business paper, representing commodities in transitu, and

were, as has already been observed, practically secured by a lien on those commodities. Once in every 60 days the whole debt due the bank was canceled by payment. There was no attempt by the bank to regulate trade or exchanges, but it was itself regulated by them. It was the servant of trade, not its master. Its circulation vibrated largely. At certain seasons, when the products of the country were coming forward to market, it expanded; at others it shrunk within very narrow limits, as the records of the bank will show.

The foregoing is a brief sketch of the principles of banking employed by Mr. Bronson, and the result bears ample evidence of their soundness and safety. The bank maintained its credit and solvency through the war of 1812 and two financial crises, during which all the banks of the country suspended specie payment; and at no time in that long interval, and during the severe financial difficulties that disturbed and embarrassed the commercial world, did its notes or obligations ever fall below the specie standard.

Mr. Bronson carried out the principles which have been explained and exerted his influence to secure their general adoption. His courage and greatest energy were put to a severe test. He had engaged against him the wealth and influence of the mercantile classes, sustained by most of the legal talent of the city of New York, when he, at two important commercial crises, persisted in his efforts, and succeeded by legal proceedings, in compelling the banks of that city to contract their circulation, and finally to resume specie payments. His discernment in whatever related to political economy has seldom been equaled. He would foretell the effects of a given measure upon the general system of trade, with all the precision of past events. The fulfillment of his predictions, in regard to the result of many momentous steps taken by the banks or the government, seemed almost to indicate the supernatural gift of prophesy. No political bias, or regard for public opinion, or sinister motive connected with his own interests, ever seemed to influence his judgment. In all his opinions and actions, he was swayed by truth and rectitude. Hamilton and other distinguished men connected with the federal government, in its early annals, confided in his talents and virtues, and often consulted him, with great deference for his opinions, especially in regard to financial questions. His wealth acquired in the pursuit of his business, was the result of his financial wisdom.

His liberality was great but unostentatious, and whenever he conferred a favor, he endeavored to conceal it from the world. In his own family, he was beloved for all that could endear a husband and father.

For thirty years prior to his death, he devoted much attention to the Christian religion, and never for a moment was shaken in his clear conviction of the great truths of the Bible. He lived and died with a firm reliance on its promises. His great age cast no shadow over his mental powers, which continued in their full force and brilliancy to the close of life.

After his return from India and Europe, Mr. Bronson married Anna, daughter of Thomas Olcott of Stratford. By this marriage, he had ten children. 1. Oliver; died in infancy. 2. Maria; died in infancy. 3. Maria; born Aug. 18, 1793, in New York city; married, Dec. 27, 1814, Col. James B. Murray of New York city; had seven children, and died Dec. 21, 1851. 4. Harriet; born Jan. 14, 1798, in New York city, and died, unmarried, in November, 1835, in Switzerland. 5. Caroline; born Jan. 14, 1798, in New York city; married Doctor Marinus Willet of New York, son of Col. Marinus Willet, and died of consumption, March 1, 1853, leaving six children. 6. Oliver; born Oct. 3, 1799, at Greenfield, Conn.; married Joanna Donaldson and has four children. 7. Arthur; born Jan. 14, 1801, in New York city; married Anna Eliza, daughter of Gen. Theodorus Bailey of New York, Nov. 20, 1823; died of pneumonia, Nov. 19, 1844, leaving three children. 8. Frederic; born May 2, 1802, in New York city; married, March 1, 1838, Charlotte Brinckerhoff of New York, and has three children. 9. Mary; born Aug. 2, 1806, at Greenfield; unmarried. 10. Ann; born March 25, 1810, at Greenfield; died July 19, 1840, unmarried.

Isaac Bronson died of a neuralgic affection of the heart, at Greenfield Hill, May 19, 1839. His widow died, at the same place, May 17, 1850, in the 86th year of her age.

#### ETHEL BRONSON,

A younger brother of Dr. Isaac Bronson, was born in that part of Waterbury which is now Middlebury, July 22d, 1765, and married Dec. 30, 1787, Hepzibah, daughter of Joseph Hopkins, Esq. He became a prominent citizen of his native town, was a justice of the peace, and a member of the Legislature for six sessions.

In May, 1804, he removed to Jefferson County, N. Y., and became the agent of his brother Isaac for the sale of lands. He went with his family in company with David Tyler and Josiah Tyler. The journey occupied three weeks, over roads barely passable with teams, and through uninhabited forests. The party were obliged to walk much of the distance, to encamp in their wagons, and to subsist, in good part, on wild

game. They settled in Rutland, near Watertown, Bronson in the center of the town.

Ethel Bronson was one of the leading men of Jefferson County. He was three times elected to the Legislature, and in 1813 was judge of the County Court. At the time of his death, in 1825, he was president of the Jefferson County Bank. "He was not ambitious for public office; but in those qualities that make a good citizen, a kind neighbor and a valued friend, he was preëminent. He was kind and liberal almost to a fault; yet public spirited, and enterprising, and possessing a character marked with integrity and probity. He was beloved by his friends, and respected by all who knew him."\*

### ISAAC H. BRONSON,

Son of Ethel Bronson, was born in Waterbury, parish of Middlebury, probably in 1802. An obituary notice, published in the *New York Journal of Commerce*, Aug. 29, 1855, says that he was born in Rutland, Jefferson Co., Oct. 16, 1802. At this period, his father had not removed from Middlebury. The *American Almanac*, for 1856, gives his age at the time of his death, in 1855, as 48. He must have been several years older.

Mr. Bronson, according to the *Journal of Commerce*, was admitted to the bar in 1822. He rose rapidly to eminence, as a lawyer, in Jefferson County. He was elected to the twenty-fifth Congress, in 1836, and was a candidate, in 1838, for the next Congress, but was defeated. In the last named year, he was appointed Circuit Judge, but being in delicate health, he declined to serve, and retired to private life.

In 1840, Mr. Bronson was appointed United States Judge for the Eastern District of Florida, and retained the office till 1845, when Florida became a State. His residence during this period, and afterwards, while United States Judge, is set down as St. Augustine. At the first session of the Legislature of the new State, he was chosen unanimously Circuit Judge of the Eastern Circuit of Florida. Soon after, he was appointed United States District Judge of the State; and a year later, when the State was divided, he retained the Northern District, and was continued in office till his decease. He died at his residence, Sunny Point, Palatka, (a few miles from St. Augustine,) Fla., Aug. 13, 1855.

Mr. Bronson is described as a most able judge—a man of high moral principle, of liberal and patriotic views, of energy, sagacity and busi-

---

\* Hough's History of Jefferson County, N. Y.

ness capacity. For fifteen years his name was identified with the history and prosperity of Florida.

#### TILLOTSON BRONSON, D. D.,

The fourth in descent from Isaac Bronson, the original planter of Waterbury, was the sixth child and eldest son of Capt. Amos and Anna (Blakeslee) Bronson, and was born at a place called Jerico, on the Naugatuck River, in Northbury, Jan. 8, 1762. His father was one of the leading men of the Episcopal society of the place. Being a regular attendant at church, and living at some distance, he was accustomed, on Sunday morning, to provide himself as follows:—Taking a common brown corn bag, he would put the dinner in one end and a wooden bottle of cider in the other. Placing this across the saddle, he mounted the horse, took his wife behind him on a pillion, placed "Tilly," or some of the other children, before, and thus equipped for the day, rode to church. This was the common method of traveling in those days. Sometimes a second child would be taken in the lap of the mother. Occasionally, still another, it is stated, was added to the load; but I know not where it could have been placed, unless in the bag to balance the oats which were sometimes carried. A horse fully freighted in this way, with provision, live stock and cider, was said to carry a "Judd load," after some of the Judds who were remarkable for these demonstrations.

Capt. Bronson was a respectable farmer, and very naturally desired that his eldest son, who could be of most assistance to him, should follow his own occupation. The son acceded to the wishes of the father, and labored upon the farm; but his heart and mind were somewhere else. Refraining wholly from amusements, it is stated that he spent all his leisure hours in the perusal of the few books which he could command. His mother encouraged him in his studies, and desired he should have the benefit of a public education. But the father was still averse to gratifying these inclinations, thinking perhaps he could ill afford the expense. But the mother persevered, and the result was Tilly, at the age of eighteen, was put under the care of the Rev. Mr. Trumbull of Westbury to study Latin and Greek, and prepare for college. He afterwards taught school in Waterbury, in order to aid in defraying the expenses of his education. While a member of Yale College, his mother, persevering in her purpose, made great exertions for his support. She spun, and wove, and carded wool. Often she rode into New Haven on horseback, carrying the rolls (of wool) which she had prepared, behind her, with

which she paid her son's quarter bills. He assisted by keeping school; the last year of his college course, in New Milford. He graduated in 1786, having for classmates, Stanley Griswold, Frederick Wolcott, John Kingsbury, (afterwards of Waterbury,) &c. Little is known of his scholarship at this time, except that he was a laborious student. Immediately after graduation, he was admitted as a candidate for holy orders.\* He prosecuted, for a time, his theological studies under the direction of the Rev. Dr. Mansfield, but completed them under the immediate superintendence of Bishop Seabury. By the latter, he was ordained as deacon, Sept. 11, 1787, and priest, Feb. 24, 1788.

In the first year of his ministry, Mr. Bronson officiated in the churches at Stratford, Vt., and Hanover, N. H. Afterwards, he went to Boston and supplied the place of Rev. Mr. Montague, Rector of Christ's Church, during a temporary absence. At a later period, he officiated in Hebron, Chatham and Middle Haddam, in this State. In 1795, by invitation of the Episcopal Convention, he opened a school in Cheshire, which was designed to prepare the way for the Academy in that place. In December, 1797, he accepted an invitation from the Episcopal society of Waterbury, and became its first settled pastor after the completion of the new church. Here he labored three-fourths of the time, for which he received \$250 per annum. The remaining fourth, he preached in Salem. He resided in the old "Barlow house," the house next east of Almon Farrel's, on Grand street. His parochial duties were discharged with faithfulness, ability and success. The parish prospered under his teachings, and a strong affection grew up between minister and people. He was wont to recur, in after life, to the period he spent in Waterbury, in charge of St. John's church, as the happiest and most satisfactory of his life. At last, however, the inadequateness of his salary, and the unwillingness or inability of his people to raise it, compelled him to seek a new situation. He preached his farewell sermon in June, 1806.

From Waterbury, Mr. Bronson removed to New Haven, and became the editor of the *Churchman's Magazine*. Soon after, in the same year, he was appointed, by the Episcopal Convention, principal of the Academy in Cheshire, where he took up his residence. He continued, however, in the management of the *Magazine*, arranging the papers, and furnishing much of the matter, editorially and in the way of communications. The interesting sketch of the history of the church in Waterbury, of which I have made a liberal use on a previous occasion, ap-

---

\* See Rev. Dr. Beardsley's *Historical Address*, giving an account of the Episcopal Academy in Cheshire—also, the Rev. Dr. Noble's *Memoir of Dr. Bronson in the Churchman's Magazine*, Vol. V. To both of these sources, I am indebted for facts contained in this sketch.

pears to have been furnished by him. After two or three years, the place of publication of the periodical was removed to New York, and Mr. Bronson's connection with it ceased. At a subsequent period, he once more became the editor, the work having, in the mean time, been discontinued and again revived. He was acting in this capacity when fatal disease overtook him. The volumes which were published under his supervision, are regarded as the ablest and most valuable of the whole, and creditable to American literature.

About the time Mr. Bronson was appointed principal of the Academy, he was chosen a member of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. In 1813, he received from Brown University the degree of Doctor of Divinity. His influence in the councils of the Diocese was uniformly great, and for twenty years he was chosen by the Convention their standing committee. He held other offices of honor and responsibility, all of which his broken health compelled him to resign or decline in June, 1826. At this time, an affecting letter was addressed by him to the Convention, in session at Newtown, from which the following is an extract. I give also some remarks by Dr. Beardsley.

Next October will complete forty years that I have been in the ministry. During the whole of which time, I have been blessed with such a measure of health as never to have been absent from Convention through bodily indisposition; rarely from any other cause; and never more than on three or four occasions, from the public service of the Church, until within a few weeks past. At this time, there is but one clergyman in these states, whose letters of orders, from the American Episcopate, are dated earlier than mine. During twenty years past, just one half of my clerical life, I have been honored with the confidence of the Convention in their choice of standing committee. It is thus full time I should wish to retire from the trust. To this I am loudly admonished by increasing years, and more by a bodily infirmity which threatens to render me incapable of discharging the incumbent duty. It is therefore my earnest desire no longer to be considered as a candidate for any appointment in the gift of the Convention. With all proper sentiments of respect and gratitude for the past, I beg the acceptance of my best wishes and prayers for the harmony, peace and prosperity of the Church and Diocese, in which I have so long ministered.

As a scholar, [says the Rev. Dr. Beardsley,] his reputation was deservedly high. He was profound and correct, without being brilliant or polished. His love of the classics increased with his years, and the glow of enthusiasm into which he would kindle while commenting on beautiful passages in Homer and Virgil, often transported him, like Priam's zeal for fallen Troy, beyond the necessities of the occasion. But his favorite studies were mathematics and natural philosophy; and to these he would devote himself for hours, unconscious of external things and unmindful of his bodily comfort. [He delivered to the pupils of the Academy of which he had charge till the close of life] a series of lectures on the rise and progress of the *manual arts*, which, begun at an early period of his labors as an instructor, were perfected as the advancement of science and his own

researches furnished materials. Detached parts of these lectures appeared in the *Churchman's Magazine*; and so highly were they esteemed by his pupils, that the project was once suggested of securing the publication of the whole series.

He wrote and published, in his magazine, several short pieces of poetry. One, entitled the "Retrospect," (Vol. V, p. 158,) describes the wild scenery which surrounded his youthful home on the Naugatuck; and if it does not reach the highest standard of excellence, it is superior to much that goes by the name of poetry.

Dr. Bronson was not an orator. He did not study the graces of elocution. Still, his sermons were always good. Their characteristics were clearness and fulness. As a teacher, he acquired a wide reputation; and the Academy of which he was the head, a degree of respectability which had then been obtained by few similar institutions. The number of students ranged, for a long period, from eighty to one hundred, a great proportion of whom were preparing for college, or pursuing a professional course of theology.

The subject of this notice was distinguished for modesty, simplicity, sincerity. He was mild, amiable and indulgent, and is charged with being lax in discipline. At the same time, he is described as inflexible in principle. After having suffered several months from stone in the bladder, he had repeated paralytic attacks, and died Sept. 6, 1826, in the 65th year of his age.

### BENNET BRONSON

Was the youngest son of Dea. Stephen Bronson, a thrifty farmer, and was born on the old Isaac Bronson place, Nov. 14, 1775. In childhood, he worked upon the farm in the summer, and attended a district school in the winter. In 1786, he went to the town Academy, then recently opened, having for a schoolmate Jeremiah Day, afterwards president of Yale College. From an early period, his father had intended he should go to college; but at the age of twelve years he had a long course of sickness, from which he did not recover till after the death of his eldest brother, Jesse. Being now an only son, his father wanted his assistance on the farm, but at length concluded to put him upon a course of study. With this object, he was sent to Cheshire, at the age of fifteen, to study with the Rev. John Foot, the Congregational minister, in whose family he resided. After six months, he returned home, and alternately labored on the farm and studied, till May, 1793. He then went back to Mr. Foot's, completed his preparatory studies, and entered Yale College. In 1797, he graduated, having for classmates, Lyman



Beecher, Thomas Day, Samuel A. Foot, James Murdock, Horatio Seymour, Seth P. Staples, and other distinguished men.

The first year after leaving College, Mr. Bronson spent in teaching school and working his father's farm. In September, 1798, he engaged in a school at Derby Landing; but before the end of the first quarter received the appointment of first lieutenant in the provisional army of the United States. He finished the quarter, and entered on the recruiting service in May, 1799. In August following, he joined his regiment at New Haven under Col. Timothy Taylor. In October, the regiment was ordered to New Jersey; but the packet at Hurl Gate ran upon sunken rocks and filled. Small boats came and rescued the passengers, who were in great peril. They were quartered in New Jersey with two other regiments, at a place called Scotch Plains, for the winter. The three (11th, 12th and 13th) were commanded by Col. Smith of New York. But "John Adams' war" was a short one. The army was disbanded by act of Congress, in 1800, and Lieut. Bronson doffed his epaulets and returned to Waterbury.

The next week after his return, Mr. B. commenced the study of law under the Hon. Noah B. Benedict of Woodbury. In April, 1802, he was admitted to the bar in Litchfield County, and the next summer opened an office in his native town.

In May, 1809, Mr. Bronson was appointed a justice of the peace, and was reappointed annually till 1818. In May, 1827, he was again selected for that office, and held it for three successive years. Afterwards, he refused to serve. In May, 1812, he was made one of the assistant judges of the New Haven County Court, and was continued in office two years. In 1824, he became chief judge of the same court and held the office six years, when a change of political parties caused his removal. Once only, in May, 1829, he represented the town in the Legislature.

In the spring of 1814, Mr. Bronson became interested, for the first time, in the manufacturing business. He connected himself, for one year, with the late Mark Leavenworth. They made, with a good profit, five thousand wooden clocks. In the spring of 1823, he became a limited partner, in the company of "A. Benedict," for the manufacture of brass and gilt buttons. Of the \$6,500 capital, he took \$2,000, and his friends in New Haven, Nathan Smith, William Bristol and David C. De Forest, 3,000. He besides lent the company money and supplied it, to a limited extent, with credit. Though not, at that time, a man of large means, he was better known for his pecuniary reliability than any man in his neighborhood. Thus the company started with a good

credit, which, under the skillful management of the general partner, it ever afterwards maintained. His interest in the business, carried on under various names and organizations, continued till his decease.

When the Waterbury Bank was organized in 1848, Mr. B. was one of its most influential friends. Its stock was taken up with the understanding that he was to be its chief officer. He subscribed largely himself, and was the president till his death.

From an early period, the subject of this notice was an extensive land owner. Indeed, farming was the only business, except his profession, to which he gave his personal attention. He soon discovered, or rather re-discovered, the superior value of the river over the hill lands, and their greater susceptibility of improvement by good husbandry. While the latter would yield say three or four per cent. on the buying price, the former might be readily made to pay seven or eight. He declined, therefore, to till his uplands, and bought in the meadows, adding to his purchases from year to year, till he finally owned about one hundred acres up and down the Naugatuck River. These lands were near at hand and easily worked. Manure could be got upon them with much less expense than upon the uplands. His first work was to clear up the bushes which had been gradually extending from many points, and to fill up the holes with brush-wood loaded with stones. He thus removed the impediments to the current of water which, in flood time, had made such havoc with the soil. He selected the more elevated and least valuable ground, covered the surface deeply with manure, plowed and planted it with corn, and then, in the fall, sowed it with rye and grass seed. Thus he obtained excellent crops of corn, rye, oats and grass, and made lands which were nearly worthless—which had lain neglected for a long time—quite valuable. Sometimes his plowed fields would get washed by the floods, but not often.

Mr. Bronson's professional business, though not extensive, was respectable. He was a good lawyer, sound, discriminating, and in early and middle life studious. He was confided in by members of the bar, and as a draughtsman had few superiors. He never encouraged litigation, and never engaged in a suit which should injure the reputation of an honest man. As an advocate, he always addressed himself to the point; but his language did not flow easily and was not always accurate. His words were not as clear as his thoughts; and yet he often made an able argument.

Upon the bench, Judge Bronson was thoroughly competent, discharging his duties with uprightness and ability. His naturally strong and discriminating mind, and his thorough acquaintance with legal

science, well fitted him for this position. No man was better proof against ingenious sophistry; less likely to be imposed upon by refined legal subtleties. There doubtless have been more learned jurists; but a sounder or better judge has rarely sat in the courts of this State. This opinion prevailed inside as well as outside the bar. Consequently, his decisions commanded respect.

As a man, Judge Bronson was known for truth, fidelity and probity—for his prudence, good judgment and admirable common sense. For truth he had such veneration that he never indulged in the common luxury of exaggeration. Nor would he speak carelessly, in way of statement, even on unimportant matters. He did not allow himself to *guess*. So far as he knew, he would say, but would not go a step beyond. No man knew better the limits of one's own knowledge. If his opinion was required, he would give it, cautiously, as a judgment, aware of the responsibility. He did not confound facts with inferences. Rigidly and exactly just, it is believed he never took an unfair advantage of the necessities of his fellow men, or of his own position or knowledge. If he wished to buy, he was willing to give a fair price, and if he desired to sell, he would ask no more than the thing was honestly worth. He never cried down another man's goods or praised his own, in order to get a good bargain. With him, there was no haggling or chaffering about prices. What he would do, he said at the beginning, and that was the end of it. If a person tried to beat him down in his price, he would sometimes raise it, and then get what he asked. If he was cheated, he remembered it, and would have no more to do with the cheater. If a man tried to get an undue advantage, he considered himself at liberty to make him pay for it. For instance, he and another person, whom I shall call Mr. A., owned between them a large amount of mixed property. When they came to divide, they agreed to assort it, throw it into two parcels and then draw lots for the parcels. If either did not like his allotment, he might bid for a choice. The lot was drawn, and each got the parcel he desired, and the only parcel he could use. This both understood. After a minute's silence, Mr. A. turned to Mr. B. and said—"Well, shall you bid?" Mr. B.—"I will think of it." Mr. A.—"I think I shall bid." Mr. B.—"Well, what will you give?" Mr. A.—"Ten dollars." Mr. B.—"I will take it, and you shall have your choice." Mr. A.—"When will you execute the necessary papers?" Mr. B.—"Now." Mr. A.—"Well, perhaps we will put it off till tomorrow." The result was as had been foreseen. Mr. A. *chose* the property which had been distributed to him by lot, and paid the ten dollars.

Judge Bronson's opinions and judgments on common affairs, and on all those subjects with which his life had made him familiar, were more relied on, perhaps, than those of any man in the section of the State in which he lived. Few, for instance, could estimate with equal precision the powers and capacities and money value of a tract of land, with which he had been unacquainted. He could tell with great accuracy what land would produce, and on this knowledge grounded his judgment. And this accuracy was extended to all subjects to which he gave his attention. As appraiser, arbitrator, commissioner and referee, his services were much sought.

Judge B. was hard headed, rather incredulous than the contrary, and was not often deceived by appearances. Those epidemic excitements which overthrow the reason and carry down the masses did not move him. If there was a truth at the foundation, he usually found it and accepted it, but could see no good from getting wild over it.

Mr. B. always had a taste for reading. For a resident of a country town, he had a large law library, and a good collection of miscellaneous books. He was familiar with theology, history and politics. He studied thoroughly the masterly volumes of Edwards, and was conversant with Bellamy and Dwight. Chalmers' essay on Christianity, in the Edinburgh Encyclopedia, he admired; but the later productions of that distinguished author were too gorgeously ornamented for his severe taste. As a historian and writer, Hume was his pattern-man. The style of Robertson was too much adorned. Bancroft was ambitious and affected; but Prescott he liked. Few men were better acquainted with New England history. He read old Benjamin Trumbull, Hutchinson, Cotton Mather; and was at home among the chroniclers of the Puritan faith. He was himself a Puritan, and revered the stern simplicity, the deep piety and unswerving constancy of the fathers of that sect. Of the traditional and record-history of his native town—of the genealogy of its old families—he knew far more than anybody else. His memory for facts, dates, numbers and statistics in general, was unsurpassed. He had a good mathematical mind, and would carry more figures in his head than anybody the writer has happened to know. He was particularly well provided with geographical information. In fact, his reading and inquiries took a wide range. His favorite papers were the old Hartford Courant and the old Connecticut Journal. These he read from the first to the last line. After the New York Observer was established he took that. In politics, he was an unflinching Federalist, and did not live long enough to repent of it. Washington and Hamilton were his great men in the general government. At home, he associated himself

with such men as Nathaniel Smith, Roger Minot Sherman and David Daggett. He thought honesty and capacity the important qualifications of a public officer. Demagogues and trading politicians he despised. He flattered nobody; never laid aside his principles for a temporary advantage; never shaped his opinions to the company he was in. For these reasons, he was not popular with the masses. Nor were his manners calculated to ingratiate him with the multitude. Those who knew him well liked his plain blunt way; but others were repelled by it.

Judge Bronson was a friend of order. Slipshod ways—looseness in business, or statement, or opinion, or faith, he could ill tolerate. He liked to see everything done in an orthodox and proper manner; or in other words, "according to law." Though not particularly attached to forms and never blinded by them, he still liked "the good old ways." When it was proposed, thirty years ago, to warm the old meeting house by stoves, he opposed it. When, ten years later, in consequence of the new fashions having crept into the place, a general wish was expressed that the congregation should sit in prayer and stand during singing, he objected to the change mildly—saw no reason for it, and became a non-conformist. Thenceforth, he stood when others sat, and sat when others stood. At first, a few old people kept him company; but at length, he was alone. He took no pride in being singular, but was not afraid to be so. Once, in a fit of abstraction, he stood during the reading of the chapter, but this did not discourage him. He always went to "meeting," and the appearance of his bolt, upright form, near the pulpit, during the first prayer, will never be forgotten. He united with the church of which his father, grandfather and great grandfather had been deacons, in Jan. 1833. He was himself made a deacon, in 1838, which office he held six years and then resigned.


In person, Judge Bronson was tall, in early life straight and athletic, about six feet high, with sunken eyes, shaggy eye brows, a capacious forehead and a swinging gait. He had a good constitution, and with few exceptions, enjoyed uninterrupted health. In September, 1850, he was taken slightly ill, first with a boil upon the knee. This was followed by erysipelatous inflammation. His fine physical powers gradually gave way, and he died Dec. 11th, 1850.

#### ENOS BRONSON

Was the eldest son of Eli and Mehitable (Atwater) Bronson, and was born in that part of Waterbury, since called Middlebury, March 31, 1774. He was first cousin of Isaac Bronson, the financier and banker. Somewhat late in life, he became connected with Yale College and







*Isaac Holmes*





graduated with distinction in 1798. I have examined in manuscript what appear to have been some of his college exercises in composition. They evince the same clearness of diction and thought which distinguished his writings later in life. After leaving college, he commenced the study of law; but in the summer of 1799, I find him in Philadelphia. He taught there, for a time, the old Episcopal Academy. Conceiving the idea of starting a political paper, he entered into a very free and somewhat protracted correspondence with President Dwight on the subject. As a result, the *United States Gazette of Philadelphia* was established, and he became its editor\*—a position which he occupied till his death. His manifesto, or declaration of principles, was published March 5, 1801.

Under Mr. Bronson's management, the *Gazette* became the leading newspaper of Philadelphia, and exercised a powerful influence throughout the country. The editor was a strong Federalist, bold and fearless in the expression of his opinions. Early in his career, he used to write to President Dwight for counsel and advice. The President, in reply, counseled prudence. In a letter, under date of February 26, 1801, he said—"I advise you to avoid exposing yourself to a prosecution. There is reason to believe that measures of this nature will, not reluctantly, be pursued; and it will be necessary for a *young* writer to be more cautious than usual. I advise you, also, by all means, to do full justice to the [incoming] administration, and to commend it whenever truth will permit."

The day after Mr. Jefferson's inauguration, (March 5, 1801,) Mr. Bronson came out with some remarks addressed to his "readers," conceived in the spirit of Dr. Dwight's recommendation. He promised to make no factious opposition to the new President—"Should Mr. Jefferson [he said] commence his administration with a view to support the constitution in its genuine spirit and energy, and to uphold the system established and pursued by WASHINGTON with so much honor to the country, the Federalists will join hand and heart with him and support him against the machinations of those unprincipled demagogues who have already reviled and belied the character and administration of WASHINGTON, and are now struggling to raise themselves to wealth and importance upon the ruins of the government itself."

Mr. Bronson was an earnest Federalist and able political writer. He found occasion to oppose Mr. Jefferson's administration, and he did it

---

\* The name of the business firm was, for a time, Bronson & Chauncey. Mr. Chauncey's name was not in the firm in 1805.

with a will. He denounced the Democratic party and its leaders, in unmeasured terms. He was a master of irony, sarcasm and invective, and was not always free from personalities. About the time of the declaration of war against Great Britain, party spirit ran higher, perhaps, than has since been known in this country. In Baltimore, a riot occurred, and the printing office of a Federal newspaper was destroyed. Mr. Bronson's office was threatened with a similar fate. He received many anonymous letters, warning him of his danger. Some were from enemies threatening to serve him as some of his party in Baltimore had been served, if he did not desist from his abuse of the administration and the Democratic leaders. Others, apparently friends, counseled moderation and discretion. These letters, gathered into a bundle and inclosed in a wrapper, are now before me. On the wrapper is written, in the hand of the receiver, "Good Advice, or wholesome Lessons on Prudence." On one occasion, the Gazette office was threatened, and a night appointed for its destruction. On that night, Dr. Chapman, Charles Chauncey, Horace Binney, Dr. Bird Wilson, John B. Wallace, Thomas Biddle (all intimate friends of Mr. Bronson) and others are stated to have stood guard in and around the menaced building, prepared to resist an attack.

Mr. Bronson wrote with great vigor and directness, in a pure, lucid and simple style, wielding old Saxon with great effect. In reference to his habits of composition, Dr. Nathaniel Chapman is affirmed to have said that his editorials were written in his office, while he was surrounded by friends engaged in political discussions, in which he would at intervals join. When the printer's devil came down for more copy, he would tear off the sheet on which he was writing, at the last word, seldom finding it necessary to make the smallest correction. Dr. Chapman was his family physician, and told a friend that he was the only yankee he ever knew who never learned the value of money.

Soon after Mr. Bronson became connected with the Gazette, the office issued, under his supervision, an edition of William Roscoe's *Life of Lorenzo de Medici*. One object of the undertaking was to cultivate in the American mind a taste for literature and history. The publication led to a correspondence with Mr. Roscoe, and to the subsequent issue from the Gazette office of an edition of *Leo X*, by the same author. The correspondence, which is in my possession, is honorable to both parties.

Mr. Bronson married, in Philadelphia, Mary White, a daughter of the late Bishop White, by whom he had five daughters and two sons. But two of them are now living; one the widow of the late Professor

H. Reed who was lost in the Arctic; the other the Rev. William White Bronson, an Episcopal clergyman, now of Reading Ridge, Conn.

The subject of this notice died April 17, 1823. Immediately afterwards, the following notice appeared in the Baltimore Chronicle :

“Then burst a noble heart.” It was with peculiar and painful awakening of old reminiscences, while turning over the Philadelphia papers of yesterday morning, that we discovered the death of Enos Bronson announced, formerly the editor of the United States Gazette. Under an extreme coldness of manner, amounting almost to an appearance of apathy, dwelt a warm and benevolent heart, alive to all the tender impulses, blended with uncommon boldness and decision. His character reminds us of those tracts of mountainous country described by geographers, where, passing from the region of frost and snow, we discover verdure, glittering cascades, and all the forms of vernal beauty. Misfortune could make him wretched, but could not make him dishonest. His manner, his countenance, his personal appearance, are brought so forcibly to our fancy, that it requires some effort to believe him now a cold, motionless, speechless corpse, slumbering beneath the sods of the valley.

#### DEA. JAMES BROWN

Was a son of Stephen and Eunice (Loomis) Brown, and was born in Windsor, Dec. 2, 1776. He learned of his father the trade of a blacksmith, and at the age of twenty-one, removed to Canton, where he remained one year. He then came to Waterbury and made an engagement with Lieut. Ard Welton, who manufactured fire arms in the Sawmill Plain District, at the place now or recently owned by Sherman Bronson. After about two years, he removed into the village, where he labored at his trade the remainder of his life.

Mr. Brown in early life connected himself with a military company, and finally became the colonel of his regiment. He was an original partner in the third rolling mill which was erected in Waterbury, in 1830, afterwards known as the Brown & Elton Co., and continued in the connection till his decease. He was a member of the first Congregational church and was made a deacon in 1818. He was also a member of the masonic order.

Dea. Brown was remarkable for his truth, industry and sobriety. He was a most exemplary man, faithful in all the relations of life. Long after his frugal habits and success in business had secured him a competency, he continued to labor in his calling, believing he could thus best fulfill the ends of existence. He was a constant attendant upon the services and duties of the church, with which he was connected thirty years. He died in 1848.

## CALVIN BUTLER

Was born in Wolcott, Oct. 6, 1772; removed in childhood with his parents to New Marlborough, Mass.; entered Williams College in 1795, but took a dismissal at the end of sophomore year; read law at Norwalk with Edmund Akins and Augustus Pettibone, Esquires; was admitted to the bar of Litchfield County in December, 1799; commenced practice in North Canaan, Conn., but removed in February, 1801, to Bristol, and in 1806, to Plymouth; was a state representative several times in 1815 and afterwards; was a member of the constitutional convention in 1818; a state senator in 1832; judge of probate from 1832 to 1842, and a judge of the Litchfield County Court in 1839. He died several years since.

## REV. AARON DUTTON,

The son (the youngest of nine children) of Thomas and Anne (Rice) Dutton, was born in that part of Waterbury, which is now Watertown, May 21, 1780. He pursued his classical studies under the direction of Rev. Azel Backus of Bethlem; graduated at Yale College in 1803; was instructed in Theology by President Dwight; was licensed to preach in Oct. 1805, and ordained Dec. 10, 1805, as pastor of the First church and society in Guilford. He resigned his charge June 8, 1842, mainly on account of a difference of opinion between himself and his people on slavery. He was a member of the Corporation of Yale College from 1825 till his decease.

A few months after his separation from his people, he went, in the service of the Home Missionary Society, to Iowa, (then a Territory,) and was invited to settle over the church and society of Burlington. When about to return to New England to make arrangements for a permanent removal to the West, he was taken sick. He reached New Haven with difficulty, and had a long and dangerous illness, from which he never completely recovered. He died in June, 1849, and was buried in the midst of his former people in Guilford. His wife, Dorcas, (daughter of Samuel Southmayd of Watertown,) to whom he was married in April, 1806, died in Sept. 1841.

Mr. Dutton was an earnest, faithful and fearless man, respected among the churches, and true in all the relations of life. He was an early and consistent friend of temperance and emancipation, and was ready to suffer, if need be, in the discharge of what he esteemed his duty. He published a few sermons, and was a contributor to the old Christian Spectator.

## REV. MATTHEW RICE DUTTON,

The son of Thomas, and the grandson of Dea. Thomas Dutton, was born in Watertown, (Westbury parish,) June 30, 1783. When about eleven years of age, his father removed to Northbury parish, and thence in two years more, to Northfield, in the town of Litchfield. At the age of seventeen, he entered the law office of Ephraim Kirby of Litchfield; but in consequence of bad eyes and broken health, he was obliged to abandon his studies. He afterwards changed his plans and concluded to enter Yale College, where he graduated with high honor, in 1808. He then took charge of the Academy in Fairfield, and after a year joined the Theological Seminary of Andover. From 1810 to 1814, he was a tutor in Yale College, suffering severely all the time from weak eyes.

Mr. Dutton was ordained pastor of the church in Stratford in the autumn of 1814, where he remained, universally beloved, till his election to the professorship of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy in Yale College, in the fall of 1821. He accepted the appointment, and devoted himself with ardor to his duties. Mathematics was his favorite study. His constitution, always delicate, was not equal to his labors. "The hours of sleep were spent, apparently with great satisfaction to himself, in solving difficult theorems in Mathematics, or abstruse questions in Metaphysics. No physical machinery could have lasted long under such constant pressure."\* His physical powers were soon prostrated, and he died in July, 1825. His funeral sermon was preached by Professor Fitch.

Professor Dutton was married, soon after he became a pastor in Stratford, to Maria, daughter of Dr. Asa Hopkins of Hartford, by whom he had two sons. His widow and sons still survive.

## ALMON FARRELL.

He was the son of Zeba Farrell of Waterbury. He learned of his father the trade of a mill-wright, and for many years was the leading mill-wright, machinist, engineer, builder and contractor, in his line, in the Naugatuck Valley. There is probably no man in the State who has superintended the construction of so many first class mills and manufacturing establishments. He was noted for the strength and permanency of his work. Monuments of his skill may be seen in Waterbury, Seymour, Ansonia, Birmingham, Plymouth Hollow, Wolcottville, Bristol, Westville, Pequonnock, Newtown, &c. At the time of his death, he

---

\* See Sprague's Annals of the American Pulpit.

had a large contract in Chicago, Ill. Whatever he put his hand to was carried through successfully; not always inexpensively, but with good judgment and thorough workmanship.

Mr. Farrell was a self-taught man, whose success was owing to his own native genius, and whose services in building up the manufacturing interests in his native town and the Naugatuck Valley could hardly have been dispensed with. He died in the prime of life and the midst of his usefulness, May 31, 1857.

#### DEA. THOMAS FENN,

The son of Thomas Fenn, was born in Wallingford in 1735, and removed to Westbury in early life with his father. April 19, 1760, he married Abi, (or Abiah,) daughter of Richard Welton of Waterbury, by whom he had six sons and two daughters. He was a captain in the Revolutionary war, and a representative, first from Waterbury and next from Watertown, in all, thirty-five sessions, beginning in 1778. He was also a justice of the peace and a deacon of the Congregational church of Watertown for many years. Through a long life he was an influential and much respected citizen. He died Aug. 1, 1818.

#### EBENEZER FOOTE.

He was the eldest son of Capt. John Foote by his second wife, Mary Peck. He was born in Westbury, July 6, 1773, on the farm on which his grandfather, Dr. Thomas Foote, first settled in 1736, which his father owned and which still remains in the family, being now in the possession of Hubert Scovill. His father was an industrious and successful farmer, and died July 5, 1809, aged 66 years. His eldest sister by the same mother married Thomas J. Davies of Watertown, afterwards of St. Lawrence County, N. Y., who were the parents of the first wife of the late William H. Scovill of Waterbury. His next younger brother, John, received a liberal education, was a man of brilliant parts, studied the profession of law, which he had not health to pursue, and died at his father's house in 1806, aged 31.

Ebenezer worked on the farm till he was twenty years of age, it being the intention of his father that he should be the farmer of the family. At this time, however, he changed his purpose. He desired to acquire an education and to enter the legal profession, his brother John, at that period, expecting to become a minister. His parents did not oppose his wishes, and after the farm work of the season was over, in the fall of 1792, he went to Cheshire and began his classical studies under the direction of the Rev. John Foot, the Congregational minister of that town,

with a view of joining the sophomore or junior class of college. For nearly two years he devoted his time to these studies, and to teaching school for the purpose of paying expenses. Finding it required a large share of his time to earn the means of support, and that a regular college course would delay, for several years, the period of his entering the profession, he concluded to abandon the studies he was then pursuing, and to enter at once his chosen pursuit. Accordingly, he joined the celebrated law school in Litchfield, then under the charge of the Hon. Tapping Reeve, with which he was connected two years, though he was obliged still to devote a part of his time to school-keeping. In December, 1796, he was admitted to the bar of the State of Connecticut, and removed to Lansingburgh, Rensselaer Co., N. Y. In the ensuing February he sold the land which his father had given him on reaching his majority, and which he had reserved for an emergency, and devoted the proceeds to the purchase of an outfit for professional life.

After the study of a few months, or in Nov. 1797, he was admitted to the Court of Common Pleas of Rensselaer County, and soon after to the other and higher courts of the State. "A strong constitution, a large and vigorous frame, a full and manly voice, a mature intellect, a ready and rough wit, together with uncommon self-reliance, fitted him for success in the profession he had chosen," and he obtained it at once. He early acquired the confidence of the old Republican party of his adopted State, and became an active and influential member of it. In consequence of the friendship and intimacy which existed between him and the late Chief Justice Spencer, the ruling spirit of the party at that day, his political opponents used to call him "Spencer's Foote." As early as 1801, Mr. Foote had acquired considerable reputation in his profession, and attracted the notice and obtained the friendship of Gov. George Clinton. So high an estimate did the Governor put on his talents and worth, that in August of the year named he caused him to be appointed assistant attorney-general for the district comprehending the counties of Rensselaer, Columbia and Greene. The duties of this office, requiring high professional talents, Mr. Foote discharged for several years, and with entire satisfaction to the public.

In process of time, Mr. Foote removed to Troy, the shire town of the county, and more advantageously situated for business than Lansingburgh. Soon after his change of residence, he entered into copartnership with John Bird, Esq., which lasted for several years. The early death of Mr. Bird, a gentleman of brilliant intellect and finished scholarship, dissolved it. After that, Mr. Foote pursued his profession alone for some time; but, finding that his extensive practice in the courts render-



ed it impossible to give the requisite attention to the attorney's business in the office, he formed a new connection. Thenceforth, he acted as counselor and advocate, his partner staying in the office performing the duties of attorney and solicitor. They did a large and very prosperous business. In 1808, however, the partnership was dissolved, and Mr. Foote removed to Albany, the capital of the State, on account of the greater facilities it afforded for the practice of his profession. There he continued till his death, having generally a junior partner in his office. During this period, he took an active part in politics, and was an ardent and able supporter of the principles of his party. He wrote for the press, and his influence as a politician kept pace with his professional reputation. On one occasion, he was a prominent candidate for United States Senator, with a prospect of election; but his friends did not succeed in their object.

In July, 1814, Mr. Foote attended the Circuit Court of Rensselaer County, held in Troy, and was engaged in several important trials. His temperament was ardent and the weather unusually warm. A bilious fever came on, perhaps as the consequence of over-exertion. He returned home, obtained medical aid, and nothing serious was apprehended for several days. But on the fourth or fifth day of his illness, the disease began to assume an alarming aspect. It terminated fatally, after a violent and painful struggle, which his robust constitution maintained for hours, on the 21st of the month and twelfth day of his sickness.

Mr. Foote was a large man, full six feet in height, with a well formed, muscular and manly frame and a good constitution.

Mr. Foote had a strong and active mind, and "had he enjoyed the advantages of an early and thorough education, would have had few equals in this country. As he was, he had no superiors in the State of his adoption in those contests at the bar where ready wit, strong and discriminating judgment, powerful reasoning and great intellectual resources were essential to success. He excelled particularly in trials before juries. He wrote as he spoke, with vigor and wit, but without the elegance or polish of a finished scholar. A brief notice like the present will not permit a reference to any of the important causes in which he was engaged, nor extracts from his speeches, many of which were published in the newspapers and pamphlets of the day, nor even a recital of the many anecdotes told of him, but which show the force and brilliancy of his unpolished but exhaustless and spicy wit."

Mr. Foote had a warm and generous heart, and was more ready to help his relations and friends than provide for himself. He was liberal to a fault. He contributed freely in aid of his brother, Samuel Alfred,

in obtaining an education; and though the latter afterwards repaid his advances with interest, they were not made with the expectation of any return.

Mr. Foote's name deserves to be mentioned in connection with the Albany Female Academy, which has long been one of the most important institutions of the kind in this country. It was established in February, 1814, under the name of "Union School in Montgomery street." Mr. Foote started the project and obtained most of the subscriptions.\*

### REV. LUTHER HART,

The son of David and Hannah (Hudson) Hart, was born in Goshen, Conn., July 27, 1783. His parents were persons of worth and respectability, and his mother a woman of a superior mind, descended from a family of Long Island. In childhood, he was distinguished for his fondness of books, his facility of learning and his love of music. In his sixteenth year, he became religious, joined the church in Torrington, where the family then resided, and felt a desire to enter the ministry. The expense, however, was an effectual barrier to his desires; and he remained, contentedly, at home, and learned of his father the trade of a house-carpenter. In the mean time, he became familiar with the rudiments of an English education, and obtained an intimate knowledge of men and things—of human nature, as seen in the affairs of common life—of which clergymen, as a class, are lamentably deficient. His trade he never forgot. He continued to exercise his skill as a worker in wood through life—during his early and preparatory studies, for the profit, and at a later period, for exercise and recreation. Only a few months before his death, he put his house in complete repair, making several alterations to add to its convenience, and doing the work mostly with his own hands.†

Late in 1802, or early in 1803, Mr. Hart commenced a course of study preparatory for college, under the direction of his pastor, Rev. Alexander Gillet; and in September of the latter year, became a member of Yale College. He at once took a high rank as a scholar; and at his graduation in 1807, received one of the highest honors of the institution, having the appointment of orator. The succeeding year, he spent in Litchfield, South Farms, as teacher of the Academy, and then commenced his theological studies with the Rev. Dr. Porter of Wash-

---

\* For the materials of this sketch, I am indebted to a biographical notice in Goodwin's *Genealogy of the Foote Family*.

† See a sketch of the Life and Character of the Rev. Luther Hart, in the *Quarterly Christian Spectator* for September, 1834, which I have used freely in the preparation of this notice.

ington, Conn. Soon after, however, he went to the seminary at Andover, Mass., finished his preparatory course, and was of the first class of its graduates. A short interval passed, and he was invited to preach in Plymouth, where he was ordained and installed over the Congregational church and society in September, 1810, and where he remained till his death. The society was somewhat distracted, at the time, in consequence of a difference of opinion as to the merits of different candidates; but all became united and harmonious, in a short period, under his ministry. The year after his settlement, he married Minerva, the only daughter of Gen. Daniel and Martha (Humaston) Potter. She still survives.

The following extract from the article in the *Christian Spectator* describes graphically some of Mr. Hart's characteristic traits :

Together with rich and various learning, and habits strictly intellectual, he had an uncommon measure of native sagacity—a kind of intuitive discernment of character—and quick sense of propriety. He had also a lovely temper and a warm and generous heart. He called himself impetuous—he was really ardent—yet his self-government, for aught that appeared, was uniform and complete. The quality, however, which, more than almost any other, was prominent in him, and will most readily suggest itself to his acquaintances, with the mention of his name, was his sprightliness of fancy, his aptness for pleasant and humorous associations, and delicately keen and pithy satire. At the same time, he was not found in this respect, either transgressing the law of kindness, or sinking the dignity of the Christian or ministerial character. One would be often struck with the rapid and easy manner in which he would glide away from the happiest sallies of pleasantry into the most serious and tender strain of religious remark. There was often, too, a meaning in his tones and modulations of voice, in the cast of his eye, and the entire expression of his countenance, which words could not convey. In general it may be said of him, that his good sense, his pleasant wit, his fund of knowledge, his openness and benignity of heart, and his unaffected and consistent piety, made him a most engaging friend and companion, and his house an ever-loved, as it was an ever-welcome resort. One who was his companion in youth, and more intimately conversant with him in professional life than almost any other, has said of him—"I always found it impossible to be long with him, without feeling myself to be in the presence of a great and good man; and yet with his friends, as is well known, he often manifested the playfulness and simplicity of a child."

Mr. Hart was an interesting and able preacher. Few in the part of the State in which he lived were so generally acceptable. The writer well remembers the lively pleasure with which his presence used to be greeted in the pulpit of his own parish, thirty-five years ago. He would fix the attention of all classes—a certain evidence of talent—and would utter sentences which penetrated the mind and burned in the heart. At the

same time, he was dignified and decorous, resorting to no stratagems, practicing no deception. His sermons were thoroughly studied, but in the latter part of his life, not written at length. They were original in thought, compact and clear in argument, nervous in expression and simple in language.

In conversation, Mr. Hart was lively, easy and familiar, with an abundant flow of spirits, putting those in his company in the same frame of mind. His sallies of wit, his pleasantries, his piquancy and originality, his homely and often quaint expressions, combined with his artlessness and kindness of manner, made his society exceedingly agreeable.

In the year 1818, Mr. Hart was associated with Dr. Tyler, Dr. Taylor, Professor Goodrich and one or two others, as a committee for the publication of certain doctrinal tracts. He wrote the third of the series, a tract of forty-three pages, entitled, "Plain Reasons for relying on Presbyterian Ordination," in a letter to a friend, of which one competent to judge, remarks—"We doubt whether the language affords a better manual for common Christians, on this much agitated subject." This enterprise led, in another year, to the establishment of the *Christian Spectator*, to some of the early volumes of which he was an important contributor. When this periodical, a few years later, became the *Quarterly Christian Spectator*, he continued his connection with it, and furnished for it several able and interesting articles. For the June number of 1830, he prepared the "Review on the Early history of the Congregational Churches in New England." In the next number, appeared his review of Bellamy, entitled "Review of True Religion Delineated." In June, 1833, he furnished the paper called "View of the Religious Declension in New England during the latter half of the Eighteenth Century;" and in September of the same year, the article on the "Character and Writings of Dr. Strong." These four articles, making over one hundred pages, are consecutive portions of a complete history of the religious declensions and revivals in New England during the eighteenth century, and present, it has been said, a more clear and authentic, and more comprehensive and complete account than is to be found elsewhere in the same compass. The whole was the result of a very laborious and thorough investigation.

Mr. Hart was a Fellow of Yale College, and died, leaving no children, April 25, 1834. His funeral was attended, on the 28th, "amidst the bursting grief of a large concourse of ministers, and other friends, from the adjoining towns, together with the bereaved church and people of his charge. Few persons have ever witnessed a more deep and gen-

eral expression of sorrow, than was manifested by that people when, for the last time, they hung upon those lips that were to speak no more."

#### DAVID HOADLEY

Was the second son of Lemuel and Urania (Mallory) Hoadley, and was born in Waterbury (old society) April 29, 1774. He learned the trade of house-carpenter, and soon became distinguished as a builder. He was employed upon the Congregational meeting house, in 1795, and erected the dwelling of the late Judge Kingsbury. He afterwards constructed a Congregational house in Milford. The reputation he thus obtained was the occasion of his being invited to superintend the construction of the North Congregational church in New Haven, to which place he removed with his family, in 1814. He afterwards erected the "Don DeForest" house on the corner of Elm and Church streets, in New Haven, and the house next adjoining on the west, then owned by Hon. Nathan Smith. He also built the Tontine, so called, and a large mansion house in Middletown, owned by Samuel Russel, Esq.

As a self taught architect, Mr. Hoadley had few superiors. He broke down, however, while still in the vigor of manhood, and returned to Waterbury late in life to spend the remnant of his days. He had a sound judgment, a well balanced mind, a generous and honest heart, and died about 1840. His remains were deposited in the old burying yard, over which a monument was erected, on which there is only the brief inscription "Hoadley." His widow, Rachel Hoadley, died at the house of her son-in-law, John C. Palmer, in Hartford, April 12, 1857, aged 77.

#### CAPT. REUBEN HOLMES,

Son of Israel and Sarah (Judd) Holmes, was born at Waterbury, Feb. 11th, 1798. While a boy he was distinguished for great activity of body and mind. Few of his youthful companions were able to compete with him, either in his studies or in boyish and athletic sports. He entered the Military Academy at West Point, in June, 1819. He sustained a very high standing there, never having been numbered lower than fourth on the merit roll of his class at its annual examinations. He was assistant professor of Drawing one year, and of Mathematics one year, while at the Academy; and when he graduated in June, 1823, he delivered the valedictory address. He was immediately commissioned as second lieut. in the 6th infantry U. S. army, and ordered to

join his regiment, then stationed at Council Bluffs. The route lay through the lakes to Green Bay; thence up the Fox River, and down the Wisconsin to the Mississippi River, thence across the country, then a wilderness, to Council Bluffs. On the Fox River, the Indians were somewhat troublesome. One night, after the party had camped, the Indians gathered in large numbers about them and commenced the war dance. The men were terribly frightened, expecting a bloody skirmish, if not a general massacre; but Holmes, taking a sergeant and file of men, started for their camp. He left the men a short distance in the rear, out of sight, with orders to come up if any difficulty ensued, and then proceeded to the chief and demanded the reason of their dancing the war dance. The chief answered in an insolent strain, when Holmes caught the chief's rifle and tried to discharge it. The savage seized him, but Holmes discharged the rifle, and after a short scuffle, tied the savage's hands behind him, and returned to his men with his prisoner. The cowardly soldiers had not dared to show themselves. The Indians were then informed that any hostile demonstration would be followed by the immediate death of their chief. There was no more trouble from the Indians on this route. When crossing the country from the Mississippi to the Missouri River, the party lost the trail, wandered about until out of provisions, and were compelled to eat their dogs. After enduring all the hardships incident to such a situation, they finally reached the fort at Council Bluffs.

Lieut. Holmes was stationed at Council Bluffs for four years. Meantime the Indians on the Yellow Stone were threatening hostilities, and Gen. Atkinson with a body of troops was sent up the river to quiet them. On this trip, Holmes was attached to the corps of topographical engineers, with the command of the artillery. Having encountered a large body of hostile Indians, Holmes with three others was detached to hold a talk with them. At first unarmed Indians met them in council, but soon armed Indians gathered around, and those unarmed began to drop off and returned with their arms, until they were surrounded by four or five hundred well armed savages. The General now learning their situation immediately beat to arms. This made their situation much more critical; as they must either disobey the order of their general and run the risk of a massacre where they were, or proceed through a gang of armed hostile savages with no means of defending themselves if attacked. Holmes decided the dilemma instantly; and in obedience to orders, deliberately arose and walked out of the Council ring, not a savage laying a hand on him. He immediately headed his artillery, but Gen. Atkinson gave orders for no firing, and after a long parley,

finally concluded a treaty with them, thus consummating the object of the trip without bloodshed.

On returning to Council Bluffs, Holmes was transferred to the commissary department, where he remained until the Black Hawk war broke out, in 1852, when he obtained leave of absence and went up the Mississippi River with the troops as a volunteer. Soon after his arrival in the enemy's country, he was elected and served as colonel of a regiment of Illinois volunteers. He was subsequently appointed one of Gen. Dodge's aids, by whom he was spoken of in the highest terms. Gen. Dodge sent him down the river for supplies for the army, and on his return on the steamboat Warrior, forty miles above Prairie Du Chien, the party fell in with the savages, with whom they had a severe conflict. Holmes was the senior officer, but the troops were under the immediate command of Lieut. Kingsbury. Their little force, consisting of fifteen soldiers, six volunteers, three passengers, two discharged soldiers and the crew of the steamboat, had to contend with at least three hundred Indians. After the Indians had had twenty-five killed and more than fifty wounded, they retreated. The battle lasted two hours. Gen. Atkinson, in his official despatch to Gen. Scott, made honorable mention of Holmes for his conduct in the affair.

On his return from this expedition, Holmes was immediately promoted to a captaincy in the dragoon service, when he went to Louisville, opened a recruiting office, and raised a company of dragoons. While in Louisville, he was attacked with cholera, but after a partial recovery, he took his company to Jefferson Barracks, ten miles from St. Louis. Here he had a relapse, and died Nov. 4th, 1833.

Capt. Holmes was a man of undoubted genius; bold, enterprising and chivalrously brave. Had he lived, he would have acquired a brilliant reputation. He was buried in St. Louis, "and there awaits the last review." A monument was erected by his "companions in arms."

#### REV. SAMUEL HOPKINS

Was the fifth son of John Hopkins, the miller, and was born in 1693. He was graduated at Yale College, in 1718, and was ordained at West Springfield, Mass., June 1, 1720, being the second minister of that town. His wife was Esther Edwards, a sister of President Edwards, a woman of superior intellect and great moral excellence, whom he married, June 28, 1727, and by whom he had four children. One of these was Dr. Samuel Hopkins, a distinguished clergyman, who was the minister of Hadley from 1755 to 1811. A daughter, Hannah, married

Jan. 10, 1759, John Worthington, LL. D., an eminent lawyer of Springfield. *Their* daughter married Fisher Ames, the orator and statesman.

Mr. Hopkins is spoken of as a prudent, benevolent, devout man and faithful minister. Dr. Sprague says of him, in his *Annals of the American Pulpit*, "I have read Mr. Hopkins' diary, as well as a number of his manuscript sermons; and have conversed with several persons whose early years were spent under his ministry; and from all I have been able to gather, I conclude he must have been a man of excellent judgment; of fine moral qualities; an evangelical and instructive, but not very popular preacher; a faithful pastor; and held in high estimation by his brethren in the ministry, and by the community at large." He must have been an industrious man, for it is said he wrote 1500 sermons. In 1753, he published a small, but interesting and valuable book, entitled "Historical Memoirs relating to the Housatunnuk Indians; or an account of the methods used for the propagation of the Gospel among that heathenish tribe under the ministry of the Rev. John Sergeant," &c., &c. These Indians were Mohegans, and resided in the Housatonic Valley, chiefly at Stockbridge.

#### SAMUEL HOPKINS, D. D.

Was the eldest son of Timothy and Mary (Judd) Hopkins, and was born on the old Hopkins' place, Sept. 17, 1721. Coming of good stock on both sides, it behooved him to give a good account of himself. He did not disappoint expectation. In his *Autobiography*, he congratulated himself for having been born of Christian parents and that his ancestors, on both sides, had "been professors of religion, without interruption, during the course of two hundred years or more; and many of them, if not all, *real Christians*." At the time of his birth, his father determined to give him a public education, and to make a minister or Sabbath-day man of him, he being born on the Sabbath. Of himself, in childhood, he remarks in his *Autobiography* :

I have considered it a great favor of God that I was born and educated in a religious family, and among a people in a country town, where a regard to religion and morality was common and prevalent, and the education of children and youth was generally practiced in such a degree that young people were generally orderly in their behavior, and abstained from those open vices which were then too common in seaport and populous places. I do not recollect that I ever heard a profane word from the children and youth with whom I was conversant, while I lived with my parents, which was till I was in my fifteenth year.\* I from my

---

\* I suspect he did not associate much with the boys of the village; or, that the *boys* of that day were a good deal better than the generations which followed them.



youth was not volatile and wild, but rather of a sober and steady make, and was not guilty of external irregularities, such as disobedience to parents, profanation of the Sabbath, lying, foolish jesting, quarreling, passion and anger, or rash and profane words, and was disposed to be diligent and faithful in whatever business I was employed; so that as I advanced in age, I gained the notice, esteem and respect of the neighborhood.

At an early period of his life, young Hopkins manifested no particular inclination for study. He worked on his father's farm, liked the occupation, made proficiency and was contented. At the age of fourteen, however, his mind underwent some change. Farm work became less attractive, and learning more so. His father perceived this, encouraged him to study, and told him he might go to college. He was put under the care of the Rev. John Graham of Woodbury, and in September, 1737, was examined and admitted a member of Yale College. While thus connected he made a public profession of religion in Waterbury, and embraced the Calvinistic doctrines. He led a retired, sober and studious life, and had the name of being, in his own language, "a better scholar than the bigger half of the members." According to President Stiles, he was "a good classical scholar, well versed in logic, metaphysics and ethics, and in rhetoric and oratory." In a word, "he was a man of splendor!" Logic was the most important college study in those days, and in this Hopkins particularly excelled.

While Mr. Hopkins was a member of college, Mr. Whitfield appeared in New Haven, and in October, 1740, preached to crowded assemblies. Hopkins\* heard him "and was somewhat impressed," and "justified him with those who were disposed to condemn him." The next spring, Gilbert Tennant, the famous itinerant, made his appearance and stayed about a week, preaching seventeen sermons. He was, says Hopkins in his Autobiography, "a remarkably plain and rousing preacher," "and every person in the college appeared to be under a degree of awakening and conviction." Hopkins admired his preaching, thought him the greatest and best man he had ever seen or heard, and determined, when he should leave college, to go and live with him wherever he might be found. But, on the seventeenth day of September, just before he was to take his degree, Jonathan Edwards, of Northampton, (whose sister his uncle Samuel had married,) visited New Haven, and preached his celebrated sermon on The Trial of the Spirits. The young man heard it, and such was the effect upon him, that he changed his mind in respect to Mr. Tennant, and resolved to go and reside with Mr. Edwards when he should have an opportunity.

---

\* Autobiography.

Immediately after leaving college, Mr. Hopkins returned to his father's in Waterbury, gloomy and dejected in mind, and lived a recluse. He considered himself a sinful and lost creature, and spent many days in fasting and prayer. In December, (1741,) being furnished with a horse, he set out for Northampton, "an utter stranger," with a view to live with Mr. Edwards. Mrs. E., in the absence of her husband, received him kindly, and encouraged him to think he could spend the winter with them. Here, after a period of despondency, his views became clearer and more satisfactory. He pursued his theological studies, and after a period of four months, returned to his father's, and received, April 29, 1742, "a permit to go forth and preach the gospel." He preached a few times in Waterbury and adjacent towns, and returned once more to Northampton. Here, he continued his theological studies with Mr. Edwards, and preached for him occasionally. Sometimes, he officiated in neighboring pulpits, once in Westfield. He spent, this time, over three months with Mr. Edwards, having the benefit of the instructions of the greatest metaphysician of America.

In the fall of 1742, Mr. Hopkins supplied Mr. Bellamy's pulpit, in Bethlem, for several sabbaths, while the latter took a "preaching tour" as far as Philadelphia. In December, he accepted an invitation to preach in Simsbury, where he continued till May, 1743. The last of May he was again in Northampton, where he opened a school, and at the same time prosecuted his studies. But in four weeks he was seized with a rheumatic affection, and felt compelled to change his residence. In June, he began, on invitation, to labor at Housatonnoc, then a parish of Sheffield, afterwards (1761) incorporated as a town, with the name of Great Barrington. In August, he had the fever and ague, and the pains made him think of the "everlasting pains." He was invited to settle, being offered £60, lawful money, settlement, and £35 salary, for the first year, and an annual increase of £1 each year, till he received £45.\* He accepted the offer in November, and was ordained December 28, 1743. His parish then contained but thirty families, several of them Dutch, and was situated on the frontiers of civilization—not a very inviting field, one would think, for the display of the kind of talent which Samuel Hopkins possessed.

Soon after Mr. Hopkins' ordination, (1744,) a French and Indian war broke out, and the western frontier towns were kept in a state of almost perpetual alarm. He took much interest in the war, shouldered his

---

\* Prof. Park, in commenting on the smallness of these sums, and comparing them with what other ministers received, forgets that Hopkins was paid in *lawful* money, while Mr. Judd with whom the comparison is made, and who received £130 per annum, (to be increased annually £5,) was paid in *old tenor* [bills], a much depreciated currency.

musket and joined scouting parties, in cases of emergency ; and in his correspondence, sometimes handled severely the conduct of the government and the military. In December, 1744, he received the news of the violent illness of his mother. He started for Waterbury about noon, and finished his journey at bed time. His mother died next day, Dec. 5, 1744, and was buried on the day following. After the funeral, Mr. Leavenworth preached a discourse on the duty of resignation to God's will, from 2 Kings, IV, 26. A few days later, Dec. 9th, a "young brother," aged three weeks, died. Four years afterwards the father was taken ill, and the son was again summoned to his house to witness the closing scene, which happened Feb. 5, 1749. Samuel was the executor. Upon him devolved the care and education of his three youngest brothers, James, Daniel and Mark. The two first, the father had provided with a farm and tools of husbandry, designing they should be farmers. But they became discouraged, when their brother Samuel sold the farm and undertook to educate the three, taking them all to his house. James made great proficiency and entered Yale College. "He was a promising young man, much esteemed, especially by his classmates." But before the close of his first year, he sickened of a fever and died in New Haven. In three years more, two sisters, Hannah Upson and Sarah Clark, were removed by death.

Mr. Hopkins continued the minister of Great Barrington, under the most aggravated discouragements, for many years. The Indian wars, the smallness and poverty of his parish, his meagre support and the opposition he met with, would have made almost any other man discontented. His high toned Calvinism was distasteful to many. He opposed the "half way covenant" system, and gave offense by the terms of church communion which he enforced. Many "unconverted" persons, particularly among the Dutch, wanted their children baptized ; and when he refused to administer the rite, an Episcopal minister was invited to do it, and an Episcopal society was established. When the troubles with the mother country commenced, he espoused the cause of the colonists and became a warm Whig. His course was viewed with disapprobation by the Tories, who were numerous in the town and sometimes in a majority. They threatened to stop his salary, and if possible, to drive him out of town. His church adhered to him, and adopted various expedients, without success, to raise his salary. At length, as his usefulness seemed to be at an end, they united with him in calling a council to decide the question of his continuance among them. A decision was made, and the connection which had lasted twenty-five years between a desponding pastor and an afflicted people was dissolved,

Jan. 18, 1769. Long afterwards, on looking back to the distracted condition in which his parish was left—their divisions and destitution for many years—he feared he did wrong to leave them. He might, he said, have given up study and supported himself by laboring on his farm, and at the same time, preached to his people, “after a sort,” without compensation. Nothing better illustrates the simplicity of his character, his honesty and self-denying nature, than these reflections. At this distance of time and place, it would seem obvious enough that the evils which Hopkins deplored were not of a sort to be removed by *his* ministrations.

Our theologian was not fortunate in his early matrimonial enterprises. An engagement which he formed at Northampton was broken off “without any fault of his.” Another, made in Great Barrington, terminated in the same way, the young lady, “rather of a belle” in the place, and of a bright intellect, preferring, at the critical time, another lover. This, he said, “was a trial, a very great trial;” but he was, as usual, resigned. At length, however, he conquered adversity, and married, Jan. 13, 1748, Joanna, daughter of Moses Ingersoll of Great Barrington. She is described as delicate in her person, sprightly, intelligent, of much decision of character; but of a consumptive tendency and a great sufferer from ill health after marriage. About 1786, she was afflicted with temporary insanity, and died Aug. 21, 1793, aged 67. She was the mother of eight children, all born in Great Barrington. The eldest son was General David Hopkins, an influential and wealthy man who lived near Baltimore, Md., and died leaving several children. The second son, Moses, was a magistrate and farmer in Great Barrington, eminent for his strength of mind and sterling virtue. He was County register, and died at the age of 84, having had nine children. The third, Levi, lived and died in Virginia, leaving six children. The fourth, Samuel, was a thrifty farmer, resided on the homestead in Great Barrington, and left three children. The fifth, Daniel, died in Maryland, in 1788, aged 24. The eldest daughter, Elizabeth, was an accomplished lady, married Dr. John Sibley, an eminent surgeon in the Revolutionary army, and died at Fayetteville, N. C., in 1790, leaving two sons. The second, was Mrs. Joanna Fisher of Medway, Mass., who died in 1786, leaving one daughter. The third, Rhoda, married Capt. John Anthony of Newport, and died 1792, aged 26, leaving one child.

Mr. Hopkins' second wife was Elizabeth West, principal of a celebrated boarding school for females in Newport, a woman of rare endowments, to whom he was married, Sept. 14, 1794. She died in Taunton, Mass., April 9, 1814, aged 75.

ton, Conn., attempted an answer to the "Inquiry," in 1767, in reply to which Hopkins wrote his celebrated book of one hundred and eighty-four pages, octavo, entitled, "The true State and character of the Unregenerate, stripped of all Misrepresentation and Disguise: printed at New Haven, 1769." Mills was effectually silenced. Afterwards Rev. William Hart\* entered into the controversy, and Hopkins answered him in "Animadversions on Mr. Hart's late Dialogue; in a letter to a Friend:" New London, 1770. In 1773, he published a book which he called "An Inquiry into the Nature of True Holiness, with an Appendix. Containing an Answer to the Rev. William Hart's Remarks," &c.

Dr. Hopkins published several other theological works; but the most important of them was a system of divinity, entitled, "System of Doctrines contained in Divine Revelation, explained and defended; showing their Consistence and Connection with each other. To which is added a Treatise on the Millennium." On this work, in two large octavo volumes, the author spent more than ten years. He was seventy-two years old when it was published. It is regarded as one of the ablest treatises in the language.

Besides his theological works, Dr. Hopkins published a memoir of his friend and instructor, Jonathan Edwards. He also, at the request of the family, prepared himself by six years study of the manuscripts to edit Edwards' works. He succeeded in getting through the press one small volume containing the two dissertations "Concerning the End for which God created the World," and the "Nature of True Virtue," with a preface by the editor. The enterprise was then abandoned for the want of encouragement.

Dr. Hopkins was an active and practical philanthropist. He was one of the earliest opposers of the African slave trade and of African slavery, in this country. He devoted himself to the work of elevating the black race with unwearied devotion, and continued his efforts till the infirmities of age obliged him to desist. They who had been the objects of his solicitude, testified their gratitude by attending his funeral in large numbers.

Edwards, Hopkins and Bellamy—the New England triumvirate—were the great theologians of their day and country. They represented American Calvinism. If Hopkins was not the greatest, he certainly was not the least of the three. For close reasoning and sturdy strength, for deep views and keen analysis, he had few superiors. He was a bold, adroit man, who, with masterly logic, pursued investigations to their results. He

---

\* Mr. Hart is stated to have been the first who applied the term Hopkinsian or Hopkintonian, to Mr. Hopkins' Theology.

was an unflinching Calvinist. He has been called hyper-Calvinistic, because he was more consistent and more fearless than some of his class. He was not afraid to carry principles out and encounter the consequences. If two distinct trains of consecutive thought, in which he could see no logical defects, came in conflict and threatened mutual annihilation, he was not affrighted. He reviewed the arguments, examined critically each link in the chain, and if he could see no imperfection—no want of logical sequence—he adopted the conclusions and stated them boldly. With consequences and seeming contradictions, he conceived he had nothing to do. The Calvinistic doctrine of divine sovereignty, he believed in its fullest extent. He adopted it as a metaphysical principle, and put it into his logic mill. Whatever came out was truth. It did not avail to tell him he destroyed human liberty. He affirmed the freedom of the will on different grounds, and left others to reconcile the conflicting dogmas.

Dr. Hopkins did not trim his words. He was not skilled in the use of oily phrases. He had a direct way of stating his conclusions. The truth he liked to present naked, even though repulsive in its features. His honesty would not permit him to use ornament. Hence, he was accounted blunt, severe; his doctrines stern and harsh. His reasonings led him to the conclusion that a Christian ought to be willing to be damned, if thereby the glory of God would best be promoted; and he was intrepid enough to say so. In his work on Future Punishment, he says of the wicked—"The smoke of their torment shall ascend up in the sight of the blessed for ever and ever; and serve as a most clear glass, always before the eyes, to give them a constant, bright, and most affecting view of all these. And all this display of the divine character and glory will be in favor of the redeemed, and most entertaining, and give the highest pleasure to all who love God, and raise *their* happiness to ineffable heights, whose felicity consists, summarily, in the knowledge and enjoyment of God." The sentiment expressed in this passage is not new. It is a part of old fashioned Calvinism; but the language is original. Nobody but Hopkins would have thought of the word "entertained." But with him, it was the word, and he dared to use it. He thus excited prejudices. Caricature prints were got up representing him as being "entertained" by the woes of the damned. Ridicule and obloquy he heeded not. Denunciation did not disturb him.

Though plain spoken and uncompromising, Dr. Hopkins was an inoffensive man. He had no guile in his heart. Simple minded and affectionate, his whole life was spent in self-denying labors for the good of others. No man had more of the milk of human kindness in him. No man was more unselfish in whatever he did.

Dr. Hopkins was a hard student of theology and metaphysics, but no rhetorician. He never learned the graces of style—never acquired a full knowledge of his mother tongue. His language was forcible, sometimes pithy; but his words were often badly chosen, and generally clumsily arranged. As a preacher, he was the most uninteresting of men. His tones were drawling and monotonous, his voice sometimes resembling a cracked bell. His pronunciation was ungraceful and inaccurate, and his manner ungainly. The children were sometimes frightened by his appearance.

In his person, Dr. Hopkins was more than six feet high, erect, with a large chest, broad face, capacious forehead and gigantic proportions generally. He wore a white, full bottomed, powdered wig, a three cornered hat, and silver knee buckles and shoe buckles. His manner was awkward, but his figure was on the whole so commanding, that "strangers, presuming he was a great man, would at once take off their hats when they met him." In early life, he was distinguished for his agility and athletic feats.

In 1853, an edition of Dr. Hopkins' works was published by the American Doctrinal Tract Society, in three volumes, with an interesting memoir by Professor Park. To this memoir and to Dr. Hopkins' autobiography and works I am mainly indebted for the materials of this sketch. By the way, the genealogy of the Waterbury branch of the Hopkins family, contained in that memoir, was furnished by the author of this volume.

#### DANIEL HOPKINS, D. D.,

A younger brother of the preceding, was born Oct. 16, 1734. He pursued his preparatory studies with his brother Samuel, and entered Yale College in 1754. During his college course, he was much distinguished as a scholar, and graduated in 1758 with the highest honors of his class. His theological studies were pursued under the direction of his brother, whose distinctive views he adopted and afterwards earnestly inculcated. He was licensed to preach by the New Haven Association.

Soon after receiving his license, he went to Halifax, Nova Scotia, being recommended to a vacant parish there by President Clap of Yale College. He preached with acceptance till his health broke down, when he was obliged to intermit his ministerial duties for eight years, during which time he was occupied in traveling and manual labor, preaching occasionally when his strength allowed.

In 1766, he was invited to preach to the Third Congregational society of Salem, Mass., the former pastor, Rev. John Huntington, having

recently deceased. "The doctrines he preached, and the plain, direct, and pungent manner in which he preached them, procured for him warm friends and bitter enemies. Such was the opposition awakened against him, that a committee, consisting of some of the most influential men in the town, waited upon him at his residence, and made a formal and earnest request, that for the peace of the community, he would leave the town. With characteristic shrewdness he closed his eyes, smoothed down his face, and mildly said,—'Gentlemen, I smoke my own tobacco.' The committee withdrew and gave him no further trouble."\* He continued to preach for eight years before he became the settled pastor. During this period, he spent a portion of his time in the instruction of youth. Often, he preached in the neighboring vacant parishes in Essex county; and from Hamilton, received a call to settle in the ministry, which he declined on account of delicate health.

Mr. Hopkins interested himself in the early struggles of the colonies for independence, and was chosen a member of the Provincial Congress in 1775. His counsels were wise and patriotic, and he is said to have received some peculiar marks of confidence from General Washington.† In 1778, "he was elected a member of the council of the Conventional Government," and served faithfully and honorably.

In the mean time, a disruption took place in the Third church. The majority of them went over to Presbyterianism, while the Congregational minority, recognized by an ecclesiastical council as the original Third church, adhered to Mr. Hopkins. Over the latter, Mr. H. was ordained, Nov. 18, 1778. He continued the sole pastor till 1804, when a colleague was settled; and died, after a distressing illness, Dec. 14, 1814.

The subject of this notice was married in 1771, to Susanna, daughter of John Saunders of Salem, by whom he had six children, four sons and two daughters. His widow died March 16, 1838. He published two sermons; one on the death of Washington, in 1800, and one at the dedication of the New South meeting house in Salem, in 1805. The degree of Doctor of Divinity was conferred upon him by Dartmouth College in 1809.

Doctor Hopkins is described as a laborious and faithful minister, a discriminating and interesting preacher, who toiled in season and out of season for the spiritual good of his flock. He had a quiet, peaceable, affec-

---

\* Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit*—sketch by Brown Emerson, D. D.—Ministers in those days generally raised their own tobacco.

† Prof. Park's *Memoir of Samuel Hopkins*, p. 56.



tionate and forgiving spirit. His talents were of a high order. His brother Samuel acknowledged himself indebted to him for some important views and reasonings contained in his "System of Divinity." He was thoroughly "Hopkinsian" in his opinions and preaching; still, he was not an indiscriminating follower of any man. He is said to have differed from his brother on "the subject of submission," but chiefly in the mode of explanation.

In his social intercourse, Dr. Hopkins was distinguished by affability and courtesy; in conversation by originality, good sense and pleasantry. His language was simple, pure and spicy; rich in anecdote and illustration; so that his company was very generally sought. "His tall and manly figure, surmounted by a high triangular hat, gave such dignity and grace to his movements, that no man who walked the streets was looked at with more respect and veneration. The remark was often made that, in his appearance and bearing, he strikingly resembled Washington." In the latter part of his life, he became much interested in benevolent enterprises. He was a pioneer in the cause of Home Missions; took an active part in the formation of the Massachusetts Missionary Society; assisted Dr. Spring and others in editing its magazine; was a member of its Board of Trustees, and for the two last years of his life, notwithstanding his advanced age, performed the duties of its president.

#### MARK HOPKINS.

He was the youngest son of the family of Timothy Hopkins, Esq. The father at his death (in 1748-9) committed him to the care of his brother Samuel, with the charge to give him a public education, for which there was a sufficient estate. The brother took him to his own house and fitted him for college, bestowing on him the greatest care. After spending five years in Great Barrington, Mark entered Yale College, where he graduated in 1758, having for his classmates his brother Daniel and Silas Deane. About 1761, he commenced the practice of law in Great Barrington, and resided a near neighbor of his brother Samuel. He rose quickly to eminence in his profession. He gave instruction to many law students, among whom was the distinguished Theodore Sedgwick. In 1765, he married Electa Sergeant, the daughter of Rev. John Sergeant, the missionary at Stockbridge. When the Revolutionary war broke out, he became distinguished as a patriot, entered the army and received the commission of colonel. He was taken sick at White Plains of a typhoid fever which prevailed there at the time; and to prevent his falling into the hands of the British army

which was marching upon the place, he was borne from his sick bed in the arms of the soldier who attended him to a place of safety, and died, it is thought, in consequence of the fatigue and excitement, Oct. 26, 1776, aged 37,\* two days before the memorable fight at White Plains. He was much beloved and respected, and left a family of six children, the eldest of whom, Archibald, became the father of President Mark Hopkins and Professor Albert Hopkins, of Williams College.

### JOSEPH HOPKINS

Was the third son of Stephen and Susanna (Peck) Hopkins, and grandson of John Hopkins, the miller. He was born in the southeast quarter, (in the limits of present Naugatuck,) June 6, 1730. His father was a man of influence and a frequent representative to the General Court; and the celebrated Samuel Hopkins of Newport was his first cousin. He learned the silversmith's trade, married, Nov. 28, 1754, Hepzibah, a daughter of Dea. Thomas Clark, and settled in the town center as a silversmith and watchmaker. He made plated knee buckles and shoe buckles, silver sleeve buttons and other silver and plated ware. A set of silver vest buttons, worn by Mr. William Garnsey of Water-town, (and previously by his father, Mr. Abijah Garnsey,) made ninety years before by Mr. Hopkins, was lately shown to the editor of the Waterbury American. They are described in that paper.

Mr. Hopkins was appointed town treasurer in 1758, and held the office six successive years. In 1762, he was made a justice of the peace, and was continued in office till 1776. In the spring of 1764, he was chosen a representative to the General Assembly, and from that period till 1796, was reelected forty-four times, or for nearly two thirds of the sessions. He was an active and earnest patriot during the war of the Revolution, and for most of the time was a respected member of the lower house. In consequence, probably, of his knowledge of metals, he was put at the head of a committee, in 1775, to visit the lead mines of New Canaan, and examine the quality of the ore, the state of the mines, &c. In 1776, he was selected for a similar service, the committee being charged to search for lead mines. (Great, at that time, was the dearth of lead.) He was one of those appointed, in 1777, to sign the small bills for currency.

In the year 1777, Mr. Hopkins was appointed one of the "justices of the quorum," which post he held till his decease. When the Probate District of Waterbury was established, in 1779, he was made its first

---

\* Manuscript letter of President Hopkins of Williams College.

judge, and was continued in office during his life. He was also a deacon of the church, to which office he was chosen, probably, about 1780, though there are no known records in existence which inform us of the exact date. He was a man of affable manners, of good intellect and kind heart. By a mild, conciliating and persuasive way, he sometimes subdued hard-headed men when arguments were of no avail. For more than thirty years before his death, he was more widely and advantageously known than any other man of the town.

So numerous were Mr. Hopkins' public engagements, that he gave up his trade many years before his death. He lived in a house which stood a little in front of that in which Scovill M. Buckingham now resides. It was built, it is said, (and occupied for a time,) by Ebenezer Warner, the father of Justus, and was taken down in 1834. After Mr. Hopkins' death, it was occupied successively by Rev. Edward Porter and Rev. Luke Wood. His shop stood a little distance west, and was erected after an older one was burnt, soon after the war. It was removed in 1834, when C. C. Post's house was built, and now stands on the west side of Willow street, south of William Brown's. It bears on the map the name of "J. J. B. Kingsbury."

At the time of Mr. Hopkins' death, the following notice of him was published in a New Haven newspaper :

Died in the city of New Haven, Conn., on Friday, March 27, 1801, of angina pectoris, Joseph Hopkins, Esq., senior assistant judge of the County Court for the County of New Haven, in the 72d year of his age. He had attended the Court during the session until the Tuesday before his death, when, complaining of ill health, he left the bench. On Saturday, the corpse was conveyed to Waterbury, attended by some of his family and other connections, accompanied a part of the way by a respectable procession composed of the judges of the Court, the clergy, the gentlemen of the bar, the sheriff and other officers of the Court and citizens of New Haven. The procession stopped in front of the court-house, and a prayer well adapted to the occasion was made by the Rev. President Dwight, in the presence of a large collection of the inhabitants, sympathizing in the loss of a man endeared to them by a long course of public service. Possessing a sound mind and honest heart, he faithfully discharged to general acceptance, the duties of a deacon in the church of the first society of Waterbury, a justice of the peace, a representative in the Legislature, a judge of Probates of the District of Waterbury, and of assistant judge of the County Court for about 30 years.— From early life, he adorned his course in an exemplary manner with the profession and practice of Christianity.

### JESSE HOPKINS

Was the third son of Joseph Hopkins, and was born May 20, 1766. He learned his father's trade, and in his youth showed a versatility of

talent beyond his years. "At the age of seventeen, on the visit of Generals Washington and La Fayette, at the residence of his father, La Fayette was so pleased with the youth that he made him his aid during a series of military operations in that quarter. His youth prevented him from enlisting in the army, and his love of country from accepting the invitation of La Fayette to visit France."\*

He says of himself, in a volume published in 1828, entitled *Patriot's Manual*, on Revolutionary topics: "I was in childhood at the commencement of the Revolutionary war, and at its close had just arrived at that age which entitled me to shoulder my musket—an age alive to all the interesting events of the day. Being a son of a Revolutionary patriot who was a member of the State Legislature, I had an opportunity of acquiring considerable political information, for many years, as well as inhaling that spirit of patriotism which was characteristic of the times."

Mr. Hopkins set up his trade in Waterbury, using his father's shop. He made silver plated shoe buckles and other articles. About 1791, he erected for himself the house owned and occupied by the late Bennet Bronson. In Dec. 1794, he married Betsey, the daughter of Nathaniel Goodwin of Hartford, by whom he had two children, Betsey and Sally Goodwin. His wife died Feb. 4, 1799. Business, somehow, went not very prosperously with him. He left Waterbury, and spent five years in the West Indies, engaged in speculation. After his return, "he married his cousin, (a granddaughter of Samuel Hopkins, D. D., the celebrated divine of Newport, R. I.) who is still living in Vermont."—[Hough, 1854.]

In 1805, Mr. Hopkins was appointed the agent of William Henderson of New York, the owner of a large tract of land in the western part of Jefferson County, N. Y. He removed thither and opened a land office. When the town of Henderson was organized in 1806, he was elected supervisor, and held the office till 1810. In 1813, he became County judge. He engaged largely in speculation, being sometimes fortunate and sometimes the contrary. "He erected a fine seat at the head of the bay, commanding a prospect of unrivaled beauty." At length he became involved in pecuniary difficulties, and in 1822, was re-

---

\* Hough's History of Jefferson County, N. Y. The notice from which this extract is taken states that Hopkins "received a liberal education." I believe he did not graduate at any college; though he doubtless received a better education than most of the other town boys. At seventeen years of age, however, he was not too young to enlist into the army; but the war had then (1778) closed. Nor is it understood what military operations were carried on in or about Waterbury, at any time during the war. Washington and La Fayette, it is believed, were never in Waterbury together.

moved from his agency by Henderson, and his improvements taken to apply on his liabilities. His great energy of character sustained him through all his reverses, and he died at Henderson, in the seventy-first year of his age.

Dr. Hough says of Mr. Hopkins, that he "often wrote poetry with much taste and fluency, several pieces of which still exist; but although meritorious, he never allowed them to go beyond the sacred precincts of the family circle." He published the book already referred to—the Patriot's Manual—and, in 1823, a pamphlet relating to his difficulties with Henderson. He complained of bad usage.\*

#### DR. LEMUEL HOPKINS

Was a son of Stephen and Dorothy (Talmadge) Hopkins, and was born in that part of Waterbury which is now Naugatuck, June 19, 1750. He was the fourth in descent from John Hopkins, the miller. He studied medicine with Dr. Jared Potter of Wallingford, and afterwards with Dr. Seth Bird of Litchfield. He commenced practicing medicine in Litchfield, about 1776; but about 1784, (it is said,) removed to Hartford, where he spent the remainder of his life.

Dr. Hopkins was one of the most distinguished physicians of this State, and had an extensive private and consultation practice. He had a wide reputation in chronic diseases, and particularly in pulmonary consumption. He possessed great originality of genius, and a happy facility of investigating obscure maladies, and finding out their seats and causes. He had the greatest confidence in himself, and rarely failed to secure it in others. Having a just sense of the influence of the mind on the body, he encouraged hope and administered consolation, whilst life remained. He was eccentric in his ways, and ugly and uncouth in his appearance, and these things sometimes contributed to his success. On a pleasant summer's day, he was called, a perfect stranger, to visit a child, ill of scarlet fever. He entered the house in his usual abrupt manner, and found the sick room hot, the key hole and cracks stopped, and the little sufferer loaded with bed clothes. He rolled his big, staring eyes about the room, and without uttering a word, took the child in his arms, and walked quickly out of the house. The household and neighborhood followed with broom sticks. He kept them off, however, seated himself in a refreshing shade, ordered wine to be brought, and

---

\* I am much indebted, in this notice, to Dr. Hough's History of Jefferson County. In that work, however, there are many errors relating to Hopkins, and I may have copied some of them.

soon restored the child. In another case, he visited a female in the crisis of a fever, whom her friends supposed to be near her end. The father said, "My daughter is dying, had I not better send for the minister?" "No!" replied the doctor, "but you may call an undertaker and have her measured for a coffin." The father, indignant at the harshness of the reply, remonstrated in severe language. The doctor explained, "My meaning is, you may as well send for the one as the other. If your daughter is allowed to be quiet, she will certainly recover; but if you disturb her, as you propose, she will, in my opinion, surely die." The suggestion was followed, and the patient recovered.\*

Whenever he [Dr. Hopkins] became much interested in a case, his attentions were unceasing; denying all other calls he would devote his days and nights, often for many days in succession, to the case, and not unfrequently administer every dose of medicine with his own hand. In one case, about a critical period, he was suspicious that the medicines might require variation. He could not sleep, got up in the night, rode four miles to his patient, felt his pulse and skin, made signs for him to put out his tongue, and being satisfied that all was right, left the house without speaking to the patient or nurse.—[Thacher's American Biography.]

Dr. Hopkins was indefatigable in literary and scientific pursuits. When engaged on a subject which greatly interested him, he became abstracted and sometimes forgot to go to bed. His wife occasionally found him in the morning sitting in the precise position in which she had left him the evening before. His memory was peculiarly retentive; and so familiar was he with the great English poets, that he would often entertain his friends by repeating the more valuable portions of their writings. Milton and Pope were favorite authors.

Dr. Hopkins was well known as one of a circle of distinguished literary characters and poets, who, out of the State, were called the "Hartford wits." He was associated with Trumbull and Barlow in the composition of the "Arnachiad," a satirical poem, designed to show the precarious condition of the State under the old confederation. He was afterwards concerned in the production of the "Echo," and "The Political Green House." The last was first published in pamphlet form; the other papers in the gazettes of the day, in Hartford and New Haven. The more celebrated of the poems known to be exclusively Hopkins' are the Hypocrite's Hope, and an Elegy on the Victim of a Cancer Quack. After Trumbull, he was the most eminent satirist of his day. He published nothing with his name.

---

\* See a biographical sketch in Thacher's American Medical Biography, prepared by Drs. Thomas Miner and Samuel B. Woodward.

In person, Dr. Hopkins was tall, lean, stooping. His features were large, his eyes light, with a strongly marked countenance and uncommonly long limbs. In youth, he was muscular and athletic. When a volunteer in the army of the Revolution, a party of officers were attempting to fire a "king's arm" held in one hand with the arm extended at full length. What others could not do, Hopkins, to the astonishment of all, accomplished with ease.

Dr. Hopkins received from Yale College the honorary degree of A. M. in 1784. He was one of the founders of the Connecticut Medical Society, and while he lived, took an active part in its proceedings. He died, in the midst of his usefulness, April 14, 1801.

### SAMUEL MILES HOPKINS, LL. D.

The subject of this memoir, the son of Samuel and Molly (Miles) Hopkins, and a descendant in the fifth generation of John Hopkins, was born at Salem, in Waterbury, on the 9th May, 1772. At his death, which occurred in the village of Geneva, New York, in Oct. 1837, he left behind him an autobiography in manuscript, from which it will be most convenient to draw an account of his early years and recollections.

The house in which I was born [he writes] stood about a quarter or half a mile south of the principal dwelling on the Hopkins farm, and was occupied by my father as it had been by his father and perhaps grandfather before him. I mention it on account of a tradition, which I imperfectly remember, to this effect. My grandfather's oldest brother, John, was to have removed to some far distant place, (Stockbridge, I suspect;) but going there he found danger from the Indians, and so returned and lived in this house, the one my grandfather did or was to occupy. This great uncle John, I remember. I have therefore seen a man who in effect was driven back by fear of Indians to within fourteen miles of New Haven. In 1826, I visited the old Hopkins place—no change except the slow workings of time upon wooden buildings a century old. But the grape vine was gone, and the huge apple and pear trees were rotting down with age. I remember a scene, which must have happened at the house where I was born, in the spring of 1774, when I was twenty-three months old; memory now presents to my view that house; the door yard and the stone foundation and embankment as they were; and when more than fifty years after I saw the same place, I found the picture entirely faithful. I well remember hearing my grandfather, in the fall of 1774, read much in the papers about "Ty," for so the name of Ticonderoga was written for brevity, and I remember feeling a sentiment of feverish dislike at the frequent repetition of the senseless sound. From that time my recollections furnish a good many pictures of men and things pertaining to Revolutionary times. Hence my frequent remark that perhaps the period of my life embraces up to this time the most interesting period of sixty years in civil history that has yet occurred.

I remember something of the young men hurrying off to meet Burgoyne; and

the deep and anxious solicitude with which my father and his neighbors would talk of public affairs. I remember my father being absent with the militia who marched in defense of New York, in 1776, when I was a few months more than four years old. I very well remember the rejoicings at the capture of Cornwallis. I have seen General Washington; been a little acquainted with the elder Adams, and with Jay, Schuyler, Clinton and Pickering; have been a good deal acquainted with Charles Coatesworth Pinkney and John Marshall; and have been conversant in business of the bar with that very extraordinary man, Aaron Burr, and that very admirable and wonderful man, Alexander Hamilton. If then we add, that the entire history of the Federal constitution, and the entire revolutions of Europe from 1789 come within my fresh recollections, you will admit that we must look forward and not backward for a more important period in temporal affairs.

After spending several years with the family of his uncle, Dr. Lemuel Hopkins, attending the free Grammar School, and reading medicine, Mr. Hopkins, in 1787, entered the Sophomore class in Yale College.

I passed three years [he says] at New Haven; ardent, intensely studious, factious, infidel, opinionated; loving my friends devotedly, and beloved by them. I scarcely doubted but I was to accomplish some great thing upon the earth. By the diligent improvement of time I laid in a stock of knowledge upon many subjects, particularly history, for the study of which I have had no other opportunity. The spirit of Yale College was at that time a spirit of literary ambition and of infidelity. I was not in good favor with the Faculty, and took no pains to conciliate their good will. But they gave me one of the three English orations, which were then reputed the highest appointments. I refused to attend at commencement; and they refused me my degree; and the degree of Doctor of Laws, conferred when my second son entered Yale College, was the first and only one I ever received. Having resolved on the profession of the law, I entered, in the fall of 1791, the office of Judge (then Mr.) Reeve in Litchfield. His law school contained more than twenty pupils and was already celebrated throughout the union. He was altogether an admirable man, of a purity, sincerity and guilelessness of heart, such as I have seen in few men in this world. His daily lectures were most happy, from his admirable faculty of carrying always on a view of the history and reason of every principle. I have no doubt but his lectures are yet felt and long will be, in their happy influence upon the juridical department of our country's public economy. At a subsequent time he became a most devoted Christian.

After only eighteen months' study, Mr. Hopkins was unexpectedly, and in violation of a general rule, offered an examination for admission to the bar. In April of the same year, (1793,) he removed to Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and put himself under the tuition of two young lawyers of excellent reputation, well known subsequently as Chancellor Kent, and Judge Radcliff of Brooklyn; with both of whom he maintained an uninterrupted friendship of forty years. In three weeks of intense application, he acquired such a knowledge of the practice of the New York courts, then reputed a mystery demanding three years clerkship, as to



pass a successful examination. His license was dated May 9th, 1793, the day he was twenty-one years old. Col. Burr, who aimed to attach to himself young men of talent and energy, made the motion for his admission, and subsequently presented him a library of choice law books, saying he "might settle it in his will, if he chose." Mr. Hopkins, however, insisted on paying him the full value of the books.

He began business as a lawyer in the young village of Oxford, Chenango Co., where he drew his first law draft "on the head of a barrel, under a roof made of poles, and in the rain, which was partly kept from spattering the paper by a broad-brimmed hat."

In 1794, he removed to New York City, on the invitation of James Watson, Esq., who entered into an extensive and liberal arrangement with him for the survey and sale abroad of Virginia lands. In the prosecution of this scheme, Mr. Hopkins visited England and the continent of Europe during the years 1796 and '97.

I had obtained [he says] upwards of 300,000 acres, such as I thought I could safely and honorably recommend. American lands had become disgraced by the operations of Robert Morris and others, and I finally failed of my object. But I lingered in Europe with the assent of Mr. Watson, partly with the distant hope of better success, but more to seize that opportunity of enlarging my knowledge of men and things. Besides my business, my object was to see and learn all I could. I attended Parliament, and heard Pitt, Fox and Sheridan; the House of Lords, and saw Loughborough on the woolsack; the King's Bench, and saw Lord Kenyon, Ashurst, Gross and Lawrence; the Common Pleas, and saw Buller and heard him give an opinion, and no man in England gained my admiration more than he. Once or twice I was on the point of concluding a great operation. The Bank of England stopped paying specie. Then came the mutiny at the Nore, the reverses of the Duke of York in Flanders and the success of the French. Many capitalists thought of seeking some safe investments in America, but did not love very plainly to avow it; and on the whole, the firmness of the British nation under accumulated difficulties inspired me with great respect for the national character.

The summer and autumn of 1797 he spent in Paris, attending the lectures of Fourcroy and Charles, and studying the French character and objects of curiosity in art and science. He witnessed the coup d'état of the 18th Fructidor, and the reception of Bonaparte on his return from his Italian campaign, and observed to Joel Barlow, his fellow lodger, that he was satisfied the French never could maintain self-government. His account of the manner in which the elections were conducted, by ordering bodies of troops into all the large towns and placing opposition candidates under arrest, would serve as a very accurate description of the freedom of elections under Louis Napoleon.

Returning from abroad, Mr. Hopkins engaged in the practice of law

in the city of New York, where in the year 1800 he married Sarah Elizabeth, daughter of Moses Rogers, Esq., who still (1857) survives.

In 1810, in company with his brother-in-law, Mr. B. W. Rogers of New York, Mr. Hopkins purchased two tracts of land on the Genesee River, and engaged on a large scale in the business of farming. Though conducted with great energy and skill, the enterprise, from the overthrow of credit and the disappearance of currency following the war, turned out unfortunately.

One of the most delightful dreams of my fancy, [he observes,] in going to the West, was to have my parents near me, so that we might live in each other's society, and some in turn might close the eyes of the others. It was otherwise ordered; and I already began to see the clouds of disappointment gathering around my establishment. I cleared land, fenced fields and multiplied my sheep. I built a house, a village, and mills and farm buildings. From the river, my operations extended back to the pine woods, near three miles. But I made these improvements at the enormous war prices of labor and produce; and when in turn I had the wheat of one hundred acres to sell, it would not command, in cash, twenty-five cents per bushel, for any quantity, great or small. The wool of fifteen hundred sheep sold proportionally low, or nearly so. Of these sheep, a select flock of three hundred, full merinos, were bred with more care, I presume, than any other man had ever used. Losses came upon losses like the beating of hail; but the greatest was that money disappeared from the country, and property ceased to have any but a very low exchangeable value. When afterwards I came to sell my Moscow estate, at a loss of \$50,000 compared with its late saleable value, I deemed the sale rather a fortunate escape.

Mr. Hopkins removed to the city of Albany, and resumed the practice of law. His studies had led him to pay particular attention to the subject of crime and punishment; and in 1826, he was appointed by the Legislature commissioner, with two associates, to arrange and superintend the whole penitentiary system of the State. He engaged in this work with characteristic enthusiasm. He corresponded, traveled, experimented with great pains in relation to prison diet and rations, enlightened public opinion by a series of essays, recommended the Auburn or silent system of penal labor, and with his fellow commissioners built and governed the State's prison at Sing Sing. The subject of prison discipline continued greatly to interest, and more or less to occupy him, during the remainder of his life. He withdrew entirely from legal practice, removed to the village of Geneva, and spent his last years, enjoying an ample competence, in literary pursuits, horticulture, the society of friends and religious and philanthropic labors. He died a triumphant Christian death, October 8th, 1837.

At different times of his life, Mr. Hopkins represented his fellow citi.

zens in the state and national Legislatures, and presided as one of the judges of the western district of the State of New York. He left behind him at his death an unfinished work on jury trials, and another nearly complete consisting of aphorisms in ontology, exhibiting the application of demonstrative reasoning to moral truths.

Some of the above details may perhaps be more minute than the interest of the subject will justify to ordinary readers. But supposing the object of these memoirs to be to furnish in a limited compass a distinct impression of the men described, it was judged this would be best effected in the present instance by leaving him in part to speak for himself. The autobiography from which the brief extracts of this sketch are taken was by the writer merely designed for the instruction of his children; but it is believed the use here made of it will involve no breach of confidence.

Mr. Hopkins, though admirable as a converser and the delight of the social circle, was not distinguished as a public speaker, either at the bar or in the senate. In politics, he had no success, and indeed almost no ambition. He had a generous kind of instinct which always made him a member of the losing party. He was a Federalist; a Clay man; an Anti-Mason; a Whig; a zealous advocate of Temperance; a colonialist and a hater of slavery. For near the last twenty years of his life, he was a member of the Presbyterian church, and a living, exemplary Christian. He was generous minded and careless of his own interests to a fault; naturally impulsive, but thoroughly self-disciplined; full of warm sympathies and a model of refined courtesy in social life. Few men have had more attached friends or left a larger circle of genuine mourners.

In person, Mr. Hopkins was about six feet in height, and perfectly formed for strength and activity. He was a rapid walker, a bold rider and was fond of a good horse. He retained possession of all his physical and mental activity up to the seizure of the attack which terminated his life. His biography contains little or nothing of attractive incident or public interest. It is the life of a man of fine powers, who was never highly successful in the pursuit of either fame, honors or wealth; but who was unspeakably happy in this, that the discipline of life chastened his spirit, and brought him through many trials to the experience of a peace that passeth understanding and a hope full of immortality.

#### DR. AMBROSE IVES.

He was the son of Abijah, and the grandson of Abraham Ives; was born in Wallingford, Dec. 30, 1786, and died in Waterbury, Jan. 31,

1852. He studied medicine with Dr. Cornwall of Cheshire, and settled in Wolcott about 1808. Here he married, March 30, 1817, Wealthy U. Upson, and was engaged in an extensive practice till 1827. He then removed to Wallingford to look after his deceased father's estate. After an interval of two years, he resolved to resume his professional business, and settled in Plymouth. There he soon obtained a large practice. In 1834, he became interested in the manufacture of gilt buttons at Waterville and took charge of the business. In 1837, he removed to Waterbury, and in 1839 sold out his interest at Waterville. Soon after, he bought into the company of Brown & Elton, and continued in this connection till his decease, but without himself engaging in the management of the business.

As a physician, Dr. Ives was sound, discriminating and skillful. No practitioner in the vicinity in which he lived was more deservedly esteemed for strong common sense and matured judgment. As a business man, he was enlightened, sagacious and stable. Few men understood human nature more perfectly, or could see farther into the course of events depending on the human will. By able management and financial skill he succeeded in acquiring a large property.

Dr. Ives was not tall, but stout, and in the latter part of his life became somewhat corpulent. He preserved the plain and economical habits of his early life. In conversation, he was shrewd, intelligent and facetious. He had a fund of anecdote and illustration, and abounded in witty and humorous remarks. Few were more companionable or instructive.

#### REV. JONATHAN JUDD

Was the third son of Capt. William Judd, and the grandson of Dea. Thomas Judd, and was born in the village of Waterbury, Oct. 4, 1719. He entered Yale College, and was graduated in 1741, being the classmate and bosom friend, as well as first cousin, of Samuel Hopkins, 2d. He became the first minister of the second precinct or parish of Northampton, now the town of Southampton, where a church was gathered and he ordained June 8, 1743, a few months before the ordination of Mr. Hopkins. The two were correspondents for many years; but at last an alienation of feeling, followed by non-intercourse, took place, in consequence of a difference in theological views. Mr. Judd remained the faithful pastor of the Southampton church for sixty years, and died July 28, 1803. The house which he built in 1743, and which was surrounded by a palisade in the French and Indian wars for security against surprise, is still standing in a good state of preservation. By direction of

his will his sermons were burned, to the number of nearly three thousand. Two or three had been published.\*

Mr. Judd married, Nov. 28, 1743, Silence, daughter of Capt. Jonathan Sheldon of Suffield. He had seven children, all of whom survived the father. Of the sons, the second, Sylvester Judd, was the father of Sylvester Judd now of Northampton, extensively known for his historical and genealogical researches. The last was the father of Rev. Sylvester Judd, (recently deceased,) of Augusta, Maine, celebrated as a preacher, public lecturer and literary man, and the author of several books of much merit.

### JOHN KINGSBURY

Was the son of Nathaniel Kingsbury, and was born in that part of Norwich now called Franklin, Dec. 30, 1762. In his boyhood, he labored on the farm with his father; but at the age of seventeen, was sent to his uncle, Dr. Charles Backus, an eminent minister of Somers, to prepare for college. In the following year, he entered Yale College; but he soon left, and engaged as a marine on board a privateer. He made two cruises, and assisted in taking two prizes. Before his return from the last cruise he was taken dangerously ill, and was in a critical condition for a long time. After recovering, he returned to college and graduated in 1786. He then went to Waterbury, and taught in the new academy about one year. In the spring of 1788, he entered the Law School of Judge Reeve, at Litchfield, and in 1790, was admitted to the bar in Litchfield county. His health was poor, and he did not immediately enter upon the practice of his profession; but in the fall of 1791, he settled in Waterbury and opened a law office. Three years afterwards, (Nov. 6, 1794,) he married Mercy, the eldest daughter of Dea. Stephen Bronson, by whom he had four children, Charles Denizen, Julius Jesse Bronson, John Southmayd and Sarah Susanna, all of whom except the last survived their father. His wife died of pulmonary consumption, March 21, 1813.

In 1793, Mr. Kingsbury was chosen town clerk, and held the office much of the time till 1818. In 1796, he was appointed a justice of the peace, and was continued in office till 1830. Seventeen times between 1796 and 1813, he represented the town in the Legislature. On the death of Judge Hopkins, in 1801, he was appointed to fill the vacancies in the Probate and County Courts. He was continued as judge of Pro-

---

\* Genealogy of the Judds; by Sylvester Judd, 1887.

bate for the District of Waterbury till 1834, and as a judge of the County Court (the last year presiding judge) till May, 1820.

Judge Kingsbury acquired, in an eminent degree, the confidence and respect of the community in which he lived. He held many public offices, and always discharged his duties ably, faithfully and acceptably. From the death of Judge Hopkins to the time of his decease, no man in the town was more honored, respected and beloved.

Judge Kingsbury was a popular man, but he became so in consequence of the benevolence of his character, his kindly sympathies, his agreeable manners and many excellent qualities. He never sacrificed principle or consistency. He was a good neighbor and trusty friend. Lively in his manner, easy in conversation, often facetious in his remarks, his company was sought by persons of all ages and classes. His long aquiline nose, the benevolent smile which usually played upon his countenance, and his winning way, can never be forgotten by those who knew him.

Judge Kingsbury was always delicate in health, and for the last twenty years, or more, of his life, had strong consumptive tendencies. He died at the house of his son-in-law, William Brown, (with whom he had resided several years,) of an obstruction of the bowels, August 26, 1844.

#### MAJ. JULIUS J. B. KINGSBURY

Was the second son of John Kingsbury, and was born Oct. 18, 1797. As in his youth there was no school in Waterbury of a higher grade than a district school, he was sent from home and pursued his studies at different times with the Rev. Dr. Tyler, then of South Britain, the Rev. Mr. Hart of Plymouth and Daniel Parker of Ellsworth, a society of Sharon. In 1819, he obtained through the influence of David Daggett, then a member of Congress, the appointment of cadet at the Military Academy at West Point. He left this institution, in regular course, in 1823; was attached as lieutenant to the second regiment of infantry, and ordered with a detachment of troops to Sault Ste. Marie, at the outlet of Lake Superior, to assist in building the fort called Fort Brady. Here he remained three or four years, under Maj. afterwards Col. Cutler, during which time (while on leave of absence visiting his friends at the East) he married Miss Jane Stebbins, of New York, sister-in-law of Capt. W. Becker, also of the 2d regiment. Next, he was ordered with a detachment by sea to New Orleans and Nacogdoches, then on our southwestern frontier. Afterwards, he was stationed for a time at Mackinaw and Fort Gratiot. During the Black Hawk war in 1832, he was at Chicago,

attached to the commissary department, and saw much hard and dangerous service. While there, he purchased for \$700 about 36 acres of land on the North Branch of the Chicago River, near its junction with the South Branch, and about two acres on the south side of the Main River, the latter tract in the heart of the present city, and the former but a little way distant. The land is still in the possession of the family, and is now thought to be worth several hundred thousand dollars. When the purchase was made, Chicago was in its infancy, containing, in 1832, according to M'Culloch, but five small stores and 250 inhabitants.

Kingsbury was afterwards at Fort Niagara. Still later, during the disturbances on our northeastern frontier, he was stationed at Hancock Barracks, Houlton, Maine. Thence, after the breaking out of the Seminole war, he was ordered, with his command, to Tampa Bay, Florida. There he remained three years, (with the exception of a short interval;) and his constitution was so broken by the combined influence of climate, exposure and fatigue, that he never recovered. On his return to the North, he was stationed at Sacketts Harbor, and afterwards a second time to Fort Brady. He left this last post early in 1847, to join Gen. Scott before Vera Cruz. He assisted in the capture of that place, and was more or less engaged in all the battles which occurred on the march to the city of Mexico. For his good conduct in one of the engagements near the city, he was breveted. Throughout the campaign, he acted as lieutenant colonel of his regiment, though he was at that time only a captain.

While in Mexico, Capt. Kingsbury was attacked by a severe brain fever, which seriously threatened his life. When he had recovered sufficient strength, Gen. Scott sent him home "on sick leave." In Dec. 1848, having partially regained his health, he was ordered with a part of his regiment to California, where he remained nearly two years. While there, he was promoted and transferred to the sixth regiment. He returned home in the summer of 1850, but too much out of health to be fit for duty. He spent the next two years at Washington and with his friends at the East, on sick leave. He then started to join his regiment at St. Louis; but was detained at Detroit by the illness of himself and family, where he was compelled to spend the winter, (1852-3.) While at Detroit, owing to some misunderstanding with the War Department, not implicating his integrity or honor, his name was stricken from the army roll. Conceiving himself to have been unfairly treated, he declined to make any explanation, or to hold any communication with the department. Before his death, however, he settled all his accounts with the government and received a balance which was

found due him. He died in Washington, when on the point of leaving for the East, of malignant dysentery, July 26, 1856. His remains were brought to Waterbury, where he was buried, according to his expressed wishes, in the old burying ground by the side of his father.

Maj. Kingsbury was a brave and skillful officer, who was always equal to the duties imposed upon him. He was nearly thirty years connected with the army, and though sometimes charged with indolence and procrastination, was ever distinguished for honorable conduct. He lost his health and ruined his constitution in the public service. Long before his death, the seeds of certain dissolution had been planted in his system. His loss was a sore bereavement to a large circle of friends and acquaintances. He was estimable and respectable in all his relations, and his memory will not soon be lost. He left behind him a widow, a daughter who married Capt. Buckner, recently of the U. S. Army, and a son named Henry, who is now a cadet at West Point. His eldest son, Julius, died in California several years ago.

#### MARK LEAVENWORTH

Was born in New Haven, August 31st, 1774, and died in Waterbury, Sept. 5th, 1849, aged 75 years. His father, Jesse Leavenworth, a graduate of Yale College and a captain in the Revolution, was a man of much enterprise, and previous to the war was largely engaged (for the times) in the shipping interest. His mother, Katharine Leavenworth, was a woman of great spirit and firmness, as was instanced by her insisting on remaining at her residence, during the invasion of New Haven by the British, while her husband was absent conveying their children to a place of safety, and when nearly all the inhabitants had fled.

At the age of ten years, the subject of this notice removed with his father to the county of Caledonia, in Vermont, at which time there was not a white man living within thirty miles in the direction of Canada, and but one family within many miles of their residence. The father owned what are now the towns of Danville and Peacham. At the age of fourteen, becoming dissatisfied, he determined to return to Connecticut. He performed the journey on foot and alone. The distance was near three hundred miles. After his return to New Haven, he resided in the family of his uncle, Mark Leavenworth, Esq., who sent him to a school, (Mansfield's,) where he studied geometry, navigation and surveying, intending to go to sea, an idea which he afterwards relinquished. Further than this, his school education was limited, being confined to reading, writing, geography and a good knowledge of arithmetic.



After leaving school, he was engaged in mechanical pursuits. He was employed for a number of years with Jesse Hopkins of Waterbury, in that branch of the silversmith business which was applied to making knee and shoe buckles. Near the period of his majority, the fashions having changed, this branch of the business became worthless. At the age of twenty-one years, he married Anna, the daughter of Moses Cooke of Waterbury, (a woman of placid temper, excellent sense and great moral worth,) and commenced life with no other capital than great energy, a determined will and uncommonly industrious habits. They had seven children, six of whom arrived at the age of maturity, of whom the eldest two alone survive. After his marriage, he engaged in the manufacture of axes and steelyards, and also the mountings of small arms, (guns,) such as ramrods, bands and bayonets. At this business he employed a number of hands until the year 1800. In the fall of that year, he left for South Carolina and Georgia with steelyards and axes. This was an adventure which at the time called forth more remark and excited more wonder than the circumnavigation of the globe would in our day. In the year 1801, in company with his brother, Dr. Frederick Leavenworth, he collected a drove of mules in Vermont and New Hampshire, which were driven to South Carolina and Georgia. He continued in this business about five years. He returned in the summers, and employed himself in constructing one or more of Whitney's cotton-gins. The gin was then a recent invention. After ceasing to go South, he commenced the manufacture of clocks, in which business he was for many years extensively engaged. In 1829, in addition to the clock business, he became interested with his son, B. F. Leavenworth, and his son-in-law, Green Kendrick, in the manufacture of gilt buttons. In 1835, he ceased to manufacture clocks, and engaged personally in the manufacture of gilt and cloth buttons, with his son-in-law, C. S. Sperry, which he continued till his death. He was a pioneer in manufacturing in the town of Waterbury. By reading and observation, he became a man of much intelligence. He was benevolent and public spirited. He was a member of the Congregational church, with which he and his wife united in 1817.—She died April 9th, 1842.

In person, Mr. Leavenworth was of middle stature, his frame compactly and firmly knit together, and his constitution good. Though not always fortunate in business, he was a man of untiring industry, and indomitable energy and perseverance. It was when laboring under embarrassment that these traits were most conspicuous. When others would have despaired, he saw reason for redoubled effort and more untiring application. Under a load which would have broken the back

or crushed the spirit of an ordinary man, he moved with freedom and cheerfulness. If bad luck overtook him, he was always ready to try again, and never failed to find something to comfort him. When the storm came upon him in 1837, and he was obliged to yield, he consoled himself with the reflection that he "stood it longer than the United States Bank." And it may be added that he recovered sooner.

Mr. Leavenworth had one of the kindest of hearts. He was well informed, sociable, sensible and shrewd. There was sometimes an archness and a dry humor in his remarks, particularly on character, which rendered his familiar conversation quite attractive.

#### GEN. DANIEL POTTER

Was one of the thirteen children (the twelfth, chronologically) of Dea. Daniel Potter, and was born in Northbury, Feb. 15, 1758. He graduated at Yale College in 1780, married, Jan. 25, 1781, Martha, daughter of Caleb Humaston, Esq., and settled, as a farmer, in Northbury, then a parish of Watertown. He was a representative to the General Assembly several times, both before and after Northbury was made (in 1795) a distinct town. He was a man of a vigorous intellect and a sound judgment, and exerted a wide influence. His tall, erect and manly figure was a fitting tabernacle for a mind like his.

Gen. Potter had four children, Horace, Ansel, Minerva and Daniel Tertius. He died April 21, 1842, and his wife April 28, 1842.\*

#### MARK RICHARDS

Was the youngest child and fifth son of Abijah Richards, and was born July 15, 1760, in a house which stood on the west side of Cook street, near where Noah Bronson now lives. He was the great grandson of Obadiah Richards, one of the first planters of Waterbury. His mother was Huldah Hopkins, the eldest daughter of Timothy Hopkins, and sister of Samuel, Daniel and Mark Hopkins. She possessed the strength of mind which belonged to her family, and attended personally to the proper training of her son, who was not quite thirteen years of age when his father died.

When the Revolution broke out, in 1775, Richards was too young to enter the army; but he caught the spirit of the times. When he became sixteen, an age which entitled him to shoulder a musket, he de-

---

\* ISAIAH POTTER, the son of Dea. Daniel and Martha (Ray) Potter, was born in Northbury, July 28, 1746; graduated at Yale College in 1767, in the same class as John Trumbull; was ordained at Lebanon, N. H., in Aug. 1772; retired from his charge in Sept. 1816, and died by his own hand in August, 1817. He published a Masonic sermon delivered at Hanover, N. H., 1802.

terminated to join the army. That his design might not be defeated by the interference of friends, he left his bed in the night, passed out of the window, and repaired to the camp of Gen. Wooster and enlisted. In the morning, the family was, of course, much alarmed. At last, information was received where the truant boy could be found, and his eldest brother, Street, was sent to bring him back, without fail. On application to Gen. Wooster, and after a statement had been made of the circumstances of the case, permission was obtained for the young recruit to return. He declined doing so, however, most preemptorily; and declared that, as he had made an engagement with his country, he would fulfill it, and see the game played out. As he was of a determined and persevering disposition, importunity was seen to be useless, and the disappointed brother returned reluctantly to his sorrowing friends. The soldier-boy remained with the army through the war; was with the suffering troops at Valley Forge, in the winter of 1777-8; was present in many battles, and died a pensioner.

After the war, Mr. Richards went to Boston and became the partner of his brother Giles,\* a man of enterprise and mechanical skill, who carried on the business of making wool and cotton cards by hand. The Messrs. Cutters and William and Amos Whittemore, the last the inventor of the famous card making machine, were also partners. The business was prosperous.

In 1796, on account of his wife's health, Mr. Richards removed from Boston and settled in Westminster, Windham County, Vt., where he became a tradesman. He was soon chosen to represent the town in the Legislature of the State, and was eight years a member of that body, between 1801 and 1834 inclusive. In 1806, 1807, 1808 and 1809, he was high sheriff of the County; in 1812 and 1824, one of the electors of president and vice-president of the U. S.; in 1813 and 1815, a member of the State Council. He served four years as a representative in Congress, being elected in 1816 and reëlected in 1818. In 1830, he was chosen lieutenant governor of the State.

Mr. Richards was distinguished for good sense, great industry, method in business, and punctuality in all his engagements. Till the close of his life in 1844, he retained the high respect and entire confidence of his friends and fellow citizens. Soon after he went to Boston, he mar-

---

\* Giles Richards, second son of Abijah, married Sarah, the youngest daughter of the Rev. Thomas Adams of Roxbury, Mass., and had children—1. Giles, Jr.; 2. Adams, who removed to Ohio; 3. George, of Paris, (France;); 4. Sarah, the first wife of Amos Lawrence, Esq., Boston; 5. Mary, who married John K. Adan, Boston.

Giles Richards was ultimately unfortunate in business, and died at Dedham, Mass., much respected.

ried Ann Dorr, widow of Joseph Dorr of Boston, and daughter of Joseph Ruggles of Roxbury, Mass., a woman of good family, by whom he had several children. Two only, daughters, survived him, one of whom married the Hon. William C. Bradley, formerly member of Congress from Vermont, and the other Hon. Samuel W. Porter of Springfield, Vermont.

#### JAMES MITCHELL LAMSON SCOVILL.

He was the eldest born of James and Alatheia (Lamson) Scovill, and the grandson of Rev. James Scovill. He was born Sept. 4, 1789, and died May 16, 1857. His early education was obtained at the district schools. According to his own account of himself, he was a "wide awake" youth, and kept the pedagogues busy. At the age of seventeen, he became a clerk in his father's store. In 1811, Sept. 19, he and Frederick Leavenworth bought out the factory, machinery, tools and stock of Abel Porter & Co., and in connection with David Hayden commenced the manufacture of gilt and brass buttons, under the name of Leavenworth, Hayden & Scovill.\* Some of the work was done in the old grist mill. Mr. Hayden was the only practical button maker in the company. Mr. Scovill sold the goods and attended to the out-of-door business. When traveling, he improved every chance to pick up old copper. About once a month, he made a journey to the iron mill at Bradleyville, Litchfield, and waited to have his brass rolled. On one of his return trips he had an old copper still in his sleigh. As there was no other place to ride, he got inside. Afterwards he was overturned, but drawing his head within, he rolled down the hill uninjured.

About 1811, the Waterbury Woolen Co., under the superintendence of Austin Steele, commenced operations. James Scovill and Leavenworth, Hayden & Scovill were stockholders. When peace was declared, woolen goods went down, and this investment was a total loss.

Leavenworth, Hayden & Scovill continued business, with very moderate success, till the fall of 1827, when Dr. Leavenworth and Mr. Hayden sold out, and William H. Scovill bought in. Dr. L. got for his one third

---

\* The names of all the partners were introduced into the partnership name at the particular request of Mr. Hayden. He had had some painful experiences which made him strenuous on this point. His name was not known in the firm of Abel Porter & Co. While a member of this company, without much knowledge of the forms of business, he went to New Haven to draw money out of the bank. He drew a check, signed the company's name, and presented it to the old New Haven Bank. The officers did not know him. He must bring evidence of his individual identity and partnership relation. The day was spent in fruitless endeavors to find the needed proof. Of course he was in a towering rage, and showered epithets upon the stupid bank officials. He returned home without money enough to pay gate fees, unburdening himself to the rocks and trees on the way.

interest about \$6,000. The new firm took the name of J. M. L. & W. H. Scovill. They went on prosperously till 1829, when they met with a severe loss by the burning of their factory. It was immediately rebuilt, and the business soon became more extensive and flourishing than ever. In 1840, S. M. Buckingham and Abram Ives became interested in the button business, which was now carried on under the name of Scovill & Co. J. M. L. & W. H. Scovill continued the manufacture of rolled brass and plated metal, which had now become an important interest. They also associated themselves with John Buckingham, under the name of Scovills & Buckingham, in the making of patent brass butts, the business being carried on at the place now owned by the Oakville Pin Co., on Steel's Brook. About 1842, they began the manufacture of Daguerreotype plates, and soon did an extensive business in that line. In Jan. 1850, a joint stock company was formed under the name of Scovill Manufacturing Co., into which all the interests named above, those of J. M. L. & W. H. Scovill, Scovills & Buckingham and Scovills & Co., were merged, some of their employees being admitted as stockholders. The Scovills owned a majority of the stock. The capital was at first \$250,000. It is now \$300,000. The operations of the company have been upon a large scale and successful.

The present manufacturing interests of Waterbury are perhaps more indebted to Lamson Scovill than to any other man. He was bold, energetic and sagacious. He had enlarged views and that degree of confidence in the future which ensured success. So soon as he got strength of his own, he was ready to lend assistance to others. Many enterprises have been carried forward to a successful result by his kindly aid. Not only his relations, but his friends, in the largest sense, shared in his financial prosperity. He was foremost in all the improvements of his native village. His own generous impulses he did not hesitate to follow, even when indulgence was expensive. He was a large-hearted man with social, kindly feelings. Few persons have been equally respected or more beloved. He was a member of St. John's church, of which he was an important benefactor. His generosity and that of his brother William founded a professorship in Washington College, which is named after the donors. At the time of his funeral, the factories, stores and public places of the city were closed, and the countenances of the citizens, assembled in large numbers, wore an aspect of honest grief.

## WILLIAM HENRY SCOVILL,

A younger brother of the preceding, was born July 27, 1796. His mother was Alatheia, the daughter of Mitchel Lamson of Woodbury, a woman of excellent character and superior endowments, who died a few years ago, aged about 80.

Mr. Scovill spent his early life at home on the farm and in the store of his father. When about seventeen years of age, he went to school at the Academy in Cheshire, then taught by the Rev. Dr. Bronson. He was there in the winter of 1812-13. In the following year, he became a clerk in a store in New Haven, first in the employment of Mr. Brush, and then in that of Mr. Peck. When about 20 years of age, he returned to Waterbury and opened a store, the capital being furnished by Mr. Peck. The business not proving successful, it was abandoned after two years' trial, and Mr. Scovill again engaged himself as a clerk to his uncle, William K. Lawson, of Berwick, Pennsylvania, in whose employment he remained about two years. The next year, after leaving Berwick, he went into trade on his own account at a place called Turner's Cross Roads, near the Roanoke, in North Carolina, where, in addition to the usual articles of a country store, he dealt somewhat in cotton. Here he remained several years, and accumulated five or six thousand dollars. In 1827, he visited Waterbury and made an engagement with his elder brother, J. M. L. Scovill, to become his partner in the business of manufacturing metal buttons.

On the 2d day of July, 1827, Mr. Scovill was married at Black Lake, near Ogdensburgh, N. Y., to Eunice Ruth Davies, daughter of Hon. Thomas J. Davies. By this marriage he had four children, two of whom still survive, Mrs. F. J. Kingsbury of Waterbury and Mrs. Curtis of New York City. Mrs. Scovill, a woman of many virtues, of uncommon intelligence and great force of character, died, much lamented, of pulmonary consumption, Nov. 25, 1839.

Mr. Scovill was again married, March 22d, 1841, to Rebecca H. Smith, second daughter of Hon. Nathan Smith, deceased, of New Haven, by whom he had three children, one of whom, a son, still survives. He died at Charleston, S. C., whither he had gone for the recovery of his health, (which had been for several months declining,) March 27, 1854. His second wife died the 4th day of August following.

Mr. Scovill, for many years before his death, filled a large space and exercised a wide influence, in the community in which he lived. He was a sagacious business man of comprehensive views, who assisted his brother in conducting one of the most extensive and prosperous man-

ufacturing establishments in Waterbury. He was a man of intelligence, of generous sympathies and inflexible principle. His wealth he distributed with a free hand in the way of both public and private charity. To every good cause, he was ready to give material aid. He was emphatically a public benefactor, and his loss was a public calamity. He was one of the most active and influential members of St. John's church, Waterbury; was senior warden for many years, and was among the foremost in the work of erecting the beautiful edifice in which the society now worship. Throughout the State, he was known as the liberal patron of the church and its institutions.

Mr. Scovill was not less distinguished for his social and private than for his public virtues. At his own fireside, in the bosom of his family, among his intimate friends and in all the most sacred relations of life, he was faithful, affectionate and true.

#### JUNIUS SMITH, LL. D.,

The third son of Major-General David Smith, (a major in the Revolution,) was born in Watertown, Northbury Parish, Oct. 2, 1780. He graduated at Yale College in 1802, studied law in the Law School in Litchfield, and settled as a lawyer in New Haven. In 1805, he had occasion to go to London on business, and being detained beyond his expectations, engaged in commerce, maintaining his connection with Tallmadge, Smith & Co., of New York. In 1810, he visited his friends in this country, but soon returned. On the 9th of April, 1812, he married Sarah Allen, the daughter of Thomas Allen, Esq., of Huddersfield, Yorkshire.\*

Mr. Smith continued his mercantile pursuits with varied success, till 1832. He then interested himself in the great cause of Transatlantic Steam Navigation, in connection with which, his name has become widely celebrated. He sailed for New York in August, his thoughts intently occupied with the subject. He became convinced that the Atlantic could be traversed by steam, and when he arrived at New York, endeavored to awaken an interest in his plans among merchants and others. He was met by a smile of incredulity, and returned to London in Dec. (1832.) Here he first applied to the London and Edinburgh Steam Navigation Company, whose steam vessels were the largest afloat, and tried to enlist it in his undertaking. Failing in this, he made efforts to find and charter a vessel for an experimental trip,

---

\* See Kilbourne's Biographical History of Litchfield County, &c., a work of which I have made free use in the preparation of this sketch.

but met with no success. He then began to consider whether he could not compass his object by the formation of a joint-stock company for the purpose of constructing steamships for Atlantic navigation. On the first of June, 1835, a prospectus of a company proposing a capital of £100,000 was issued, in his own name, and widely distributed, at considerable expense, among the London merchants, particularly those engaged in the New York trade. A very few regarded the plan with favor; but generally it was made the subject of gibes and jeers. Its author was ridiculed as a visionary. Men of science regarded the enterprise with incredulity, and declared that it must fail as a practical thing. No steamer, they said, could survive those terrible storms which sweep the Atlantic. The result was, as might have been foreseen, and as Mr. Smith himself apprehended, "not a single share was taken." Men of capital are slow to embark their means in untried experiments. Were it not so, they would soon cease to be capitalists. This habitual caution (conservatism) of wealth may retard, but will not prevent the birth of discovery and improvement.

Mr. Smith, nothing daunted, now revised his prospectus, raised the capital to £500,000 and named the association The British and American Steam Navigation Company. But he could get nobody to stand as directors. At length, however, after numerous and various discouragements, such as would have disheartened ordinary men, a company was organized with eleven directors, (Mr. Smith one of them,) with Isaac Solby, Esq., for chairman. The capital was increased to £1,000,000, and subscribers were readily obtained. It was proposed to cross the Atlantic in fifteen days. In July, 1836, the company advertised for proposals, and in September a contract was made with some ship builder to construct a steamer of 2016 tons, the keel of which was laid April 1st, 1837. It was afterwards called the *British Queen*. But there was delay in getting in the boilers, and the *Sirius*, of about 700 tons, was chartered to take her place. The latter sailed from Cork on the 4th of April, 1838, and arrived in New York on the *morning* of the 23d. She was the first vessel that *steamed* her way across the Atlantic. It is true, the steamer *Savannah*, sailing from Savannah, Georgia, had performed the voyage, in 1819; but steam was used only when sails could not be employed. As a practical thing, the great question of Transatlantic Steam Navigation was solved by the persevering efforts and dauntless energy of Mr. Smith. If he is not, in strictness, entitled to the name of a discoverer, he merits little less. He saw, more clearly than others, the bearing of certain great scientific truths, and was the first to turn them to practical account.

On the *afternoon* of the same day that the *Sirius* reached New York,



the Great Western, of 1340 tons, arrived; having sailed from Bristol, April 7th. The appearance of these two steamships, at about the same time, from another continent, was the cause of the most lively and exciting demonstrations. Subsequently, (July, 1839,) Mr. Smith himself embarked from London, in the British Queen, and was received in New York with hearty congratulations. Soon after, he received the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws from Yale College, and was made the president of his company.

Having secured one great object of his ambition, Mr. Smith turned his attention in a new direction. He had visited China and made himself familiar with the Tea plant, its habits, mode of cultivation, &c. He satisfied himself that it would grow and thrive in his native country, and resolved to make the experiment. He purchased an extensive plantation, in all respects favorable to his object, in Greenville, South Carolina, and began the work, which he prosecuted for the several remaining years of his life. His immediate purpose was to propagate and naturalize the plant, and he supposed he had succeeded; but his illness and death, and the subsequent neglect of his plantation, put an end to the hopes of those who had watched, with the greatest interest, the progress of the undertaking. He died in Astoria, N. Y., Jan. 23, 1853, from the effects of an injury which he had received a year before. His wife had died previously, (1836.) He had one child, a daughter, (now deceased,) who married the Rev. Edward Knight Maddox, an English clergyman of the Church of England.

#### CAPT. DANIEL SOUTHMAYD

Was the son of the Rev. John Southmayd, and was born April 19, 1717. He received a liberal education at Yale College, and was graduated in 1741. On leaving college, he returned to his native village, and gave his attention to farming and public business. He became a selectman, a moderator of town meetings, a captain of militia, a justice of the peace, &c. For eight sessions, beginning with 1751, he was a representative to the General Assembly. He was much beloved for the qualities of his heart, and greatly respected for soundness of mind and force of character. He was vastly popular, and in the opinion of his contemporaries and immediate successors, had extraordinary talents. Long after his decease, it was a common remark that he was the greatest man ever born or reared in Waterbury. At the time of his death, Mr. Leavenworth preached a funeral discourse; and such was the combined effect of the sermon, the occasion and the theme, that the whole congregation were thrown into tears.\*

---

\* B. Bronson's MSS.

Mr. Southmayd died Jan. 12, 1754. He had married, March 24, 1749, Hannah, daughter of Samuel Brown, who bore him three children. The widow married Gen. Spencer of East Haddam.

### SAMUEL W. SOUTHMAYD

Was the eldest son of Samuel, the grandson of John, (the constable,) and the great grandson of the Rev. John Southmayd, and was born in Westbury, Sept. 1773. His mother's name was Dorcas Skinner. He made choice of the legal profession, pursued his studies at the Law School in Litchfield, under Judge Reeve, was admitted to the bar in 1795,\* and settled in Watertown. He had not the advantages of an academical education; nor had he the disadvantages too often arising from the seclusion, the inexperience, the constraints and artificial methods of a college life. He was a self-made man, as all men of unusual intellectual proportions are. Mere literature comes of good schooling, but not greatness.

Mr. Southmayd soon rose to eminence in his profession. At the bar, he was considered as a man of rare talents. But he was unusually modest, and before a court, his diffidence sometimes interfered with his success as an advocate.

Out of his profession, Mr. Southmayd had, to an unusual degree, the respect, the confidence and the friendship of his acquaintance. He was known for his equanimity of temper and kindness of heart. To his near friends, he was greatly endeared. To his clients, he gave excellent counsel. He never encouraged litigation, but used his influence to restore peace when it had been broken, and perpetuate friendship. He was much engaged in public life, and represented his town seventeen times in the Legislature. In 1809, he received from Yale College the honorary degree of A. M. He died in early manhood, greatly lamented, March 4, 1813. The writer well remembers the time when his death was announced in Waterbury, and the signs of grief which followed.

### ELI TERRY,

The fifth in descent from Samuel Terry, who came to some part of ancient Springfield, (Mass.) in 1654, was born in East Windsor, now South Windsor, April 13, 1772. Samuel Terry, 1st, married Anne Lobdell in 1660, and had a son, Samuel, who settled in Enfield, in this State. The latter, Samuel, 2d, married, in 1682, Hannah Morgan, and afterwards Martha Credan. By the first marriage, he had Samuel and Ebenezer; and by the second, Benjamin, Ephraim, Jacob, Jonathan and Isaac. The son Ephraim (born 1701) married Anne Collins, and had Samuel, Ephraim, Nathaniel, Elijah, Eliphalet. Samuel, the third of

\* Stated on the authority of the late Asa Bacon of New Haven.

that name, son of Ephraim, was born in 1725, married Mary Kellog, and had Samuel, Alice, Mary, Aseph, Rhoda, Levi, Solomon, Sybil, Ezekiel. Samuel, 4th, (born 1750,) married Huldah Burnham, and had Eli, Samuel, Silas, Huldah, Lucy, Anne, Naomi, Horace, Clarissa, Joseph.

Mr. Terry was instructed in the business of clock making and watch repairing by Daniel Burnap\* of East Windsor and a Mr. Cheeney of East Hartford. He interested himself in the arts and sciences which have a bearing on the construction of instruments for measuring time. He read the standard works on astronomy, natural philosophy and chemistry, (then a new science.) He kept up his acquaintance with these subjects till late in life, reading the modern treatises on their first appearance. He knew more of them than is usually known by graduates of colleges. His attention, however, was principally confined to those points which had a practical relation to his business.

Mr. Terry came to Plymouth (then Watertown, Northbury parish) on the first Monday of Sept. 1793, and set up the business of clock making. Around him, Timothy Barnes of Litchfield, South Farms, James Harrison of Waterbury, and Gideon Roberts of Bristol, were already known as clock makers. The price of a wooden clock, with a long pendulum, at that time, was £4, or \$13.33. If it had a brass dial and a dial for seconds and the moon's age, the price was \$25. Brass clocks brought more—from £10 to £15, without a case.

Mr. Terry made clocks both of wood and brass in the then ordinary way, having a hand engine for cutting the teeth or cogs of the wheels or pinions, and using a foot lathe for doing the turning. It is probable he used a knife, as well as many other tools then in use, in doing some part of the work; but that the different parts of the clock "*were cut out with the penknife*" is a tale of many years' growth, having no foundation, and ought not to be stereotyped as part of the history of clock making in this country. So limited was the demand for clocks at this time, and so inadequate his means for making them, that after finishing three or four he was obliged to go out with them on horseback, and put them up where they had previously been engaged or sold. His usual way was to put one forward of the saddle on which he rode, one behind, and one on each side in his portmanteau. During this day of small things, however, there was an attempt at something more. As early as the year 1797, he procured a patent for what he then supposed to be an important improvement in clocks. This patent was for a new construction of an equation clock, showing the difference between the mean and apparent time. The patent is now in the possession of the writer, as executor of his estate. \* \* \* This invention proved to be a useful one to him in no way save the discipline he acquired by it; for the secret in money-mak-

---

\* Mr. Burnap was the maker of some of the best American clocks. Some of them are met with even now, said to be seventy years old, of excellent quality, not inferior to the best English clocks, and far better than many that are made at this day, with a more costly exterior.

ing at that time, as well as at the present day, was in not manufacturing so expensive clocks as this kind must necessarily have been. The greater demand was, and still is, for a less costly article.

The business was prosecuted by him in this old way until about the year 1802 or 1803, when, finding he could sell his clocks without being an itinerant himself, he made provision for manufacturing them more extensively. He erected a small building on a small stream, [half a mile west of the central Congregational church,] where he had the benefit of water power and additional machinery for doing some portion of the work. At this time, he made arrangements for manufacturing clocks by the thousand. It was regarded by some at the time as so extravagant an undertaking as to subject him to considerable ridicule. A conceited wag of the town offered to become the purchaser of the last one of the thousand, thinking he would never be able to finish that number. The clocks, however, were soon finished.

We come now to the era when the grist mill, four miles south of the central village, was converted into a factory for making clocks. At this place, Mr. Terry, in 1807-8, made still more extensive arrangements for the business. He had obtained a contract with the Rev. Edward Porter, a Congregational minister and ex-pastor of the Congregational church and society of Waterbury, and Levi Porter, his partner, for making four thousand clocks. It took a considerable part of the first year to fit up the machinery, most of the second year to finish the first thousand clocks, and the third to complete the remaining three thousand. The success attending this enterprise was such as to give a new impulse to clock manufacturing as a money-making business, and was so successfully brought to a close that the idea of retiring from business was entertained, although he was still a young man. He accordingly sold the factory, machinery and other property there, to Messrs. Seth Thomas and Silas Hoadley, who had been employed during the three years in making these clocks, and then removed to his former residence, in the central part of the town. The business had at this time been commenced in Winsted by William Hoadley, and had been revived in Bristol, Waterbury and elsewhere. Asa Hopkins, a man residing in the parish of Northfield, town of Litchfield, had erected a factory on the Naugatuck River. This Mr. Hopkins was a man of considerable mechanical skill and a successful manufacturer of clocks. He obtained a patent, about the year 1813 or 1814, on a machine for cutting the cogs or teeth of the wheels. This invention or improvement was for the use and introduction of three arbors or mandrels, by means of which one row of teeth on a number of wheels was finished by one operation—a machine still in use, although superseded at the time by the construction of an engine by Mr. Terry, with only one mandrel, which was used for many years afterwards, and has not been abandoned to this day. Messrs. Thomas and Hoadley prosecuted the business as partners for three years or more, when they dissolved, Mr. Hoadley retaining the factory and other property, and which he still improves. Heman Clark, who had been an apprentice to Mr. Terry, built a factory about the year 1811, in the place now known as Plymouth Hollow, where he pursued the business two or more years. Mr. Thomas purchased this factory, Dec. 1813, where he again embarked in this calling, and where he has been eminently successful in making clocks, and is at this time, at an advanced age in life, extensively engaged in this and other business. Mr. Hoadley has done less business, but has been successful, and more so than many who subsequently engaged in this occupation.

[Mr. Terry commenced manufacturing on the Naugatuck in 1813 and 1814, at the old place known as "Sutliff's Mills," but owned by Miles Morse at the time of the purchase.]

In 1814, the short or shelf clock was devised, made and introduced by Mr. Terry, who had then removed to a site on the Naugatuck River, where he commenced the making of these clocks; Mr. Thomas being then engaged in making the common or old-fashioned clocks, and also, to some extent, the new shelf or mantle clock. A patent was procured for this improvement in clocks, by Mr. Terry in 1816. For a few years from this time, the old or long clocks were made by Mr. Thomas and others, but gradually the sales declined, as the demand increased for the others. The patent was a source of no little trouble, strife and litigation. Patents were not unfrequently granted at that time, with very imperfect specifications, the inventors not being aware of the importance of an exact definition of their claims, independent of a general description. An inventor, however meritorious, could be easily deprived of his just rights. A patentee needed a more thorough acquaintance with the laws relating to patents than with anything pertaining to the art or improvement which might be the subject of his patent. So far as the writer has any means of judging, the remark holds true to this day. The less meritorious are as likely to derive pecuniary benefit from a monopoly of this kind, as the most deserving inventor. That day of strife, however, has gone by. The writer was familiar with all the difficulties and conflicting claims of the contending parties, and knows full well that the improvements made by Mr. Terry, at this time and subsequently, marked distinctly a new era in clock making, and laid the foundation for a lucrative business by which many have gained their thousands, however unwilling they may be to acknowledge it. Some of the important improvements which should have been secured by this patent, are in use to this day, and cannot be dispensed with in the making of low-priced clocks, nor indeed any convenient mantle clock. The mode or method of escapement universally adopted at this time, in all common shelf clocks, was his plan or invention. The construction of the clock so as to allow the carrying of the weights each side of the movement or wheels of the clock to the top of the case, bringing the pendulum, crown-wheel and verge in front, the dial-wheels between the plates, making the pendulum accessible by removing the dial only, was his arrangement and invention. These things cannot now be dispensed with, even in the clocks driven by a spring, as the motive power, much more in those carried by weights. Millions of them have been made during the last ten years, the precise model in these particulars of the one now in possession of one of his family, and made by him in 1814. No clock, either in this or any foreign country, was made previous to this time with the weights carried each side the movement the whole length of the case; the dial-wheels inside the plates, the pendulum, crown-wheel, verge or pallet together in front of the other wheels. This mode of escapement is one of great value still, and will probably never be abandoned, so long as low-priced clocks are needed. It is true, *time-pieces* of a small size were imported many years before. It is also true that *time-pieces* were made in Boston (Willard's *time-pieces*) and are made to this day with one weight back of the movement, and moving below it; but this and the imported smaller sized article, were mere *time-pieces*, that is, were destitute of the parts striking the hour, and had none of the *three* peculiarities above mentioned, so universally adopted at this time.

Chauncey Jerome commenced his career in clock making at a later period, gaining his first knowledge of the business under the tuition and encouragement of Mr. Terry. He commenced some part of the clock business in Plymouth, as early as the year 1821. He afterwards removed to Bristol, where he embarked in making clocks, introducing clock-cases of different sizes, and clocks adapted to the new form of cases made. At a still later period, and according to the recollection of the writer, not far from the year 1837, he introduced or did much towards the introduction of the most common form of the brass clock now in vogue. The pinion leaves or cogs are made of round wire. This is a cheap way of making pinions, never before practiced, whatever may be said as to the quality and durability of the clock so made. The present form of the brass count-wheel, so divided as to allow the stop-dog to drop between the teeth, and being driven by a pin in the fly-wheel, Mr. Jerome claims as his improvement, for which he obtained letters patent.

In justice, however, it should here be stated, that certain individuals anterior to, and others soon after the period Mr. Jerome commenced business in Bristol, embarked in this occupation, to wit: Mark Leavenworth, of Waterbury; Samuel Terry (afterwards of Bristol) and Eli Terry, Jr., of Plymouth; Chauncey Boardman, Ives Brewster and others of Bristol; filling the market with a great variety of clocks, of an exterior in every conceivable form, until some of those who had immediately succeeded Mr. Terry were ready to abandon the business, and did so on account of the very reduced price of clocks, and the interminable credit it was then customary to give. The writer was one of this number, who had until then very little acquaintance with any other business, having been a witness to all the improvements in clocks and the machinery for making the same, from the time the shelf-clock was first introduced, in the year 1814, to the period in question, or the year 1836.

[For many years before his death, Mr. Terry was not actively engaged in business. Still, he never abandoned the work-shop. He occupied himself in making now and then a] church clock, a few watch regulators, and the like. The church clocks were made in three parts, independent or nearly so, the connection between each being such as not to be injuriously affected by the other. The time-keeping part was of the ordinary size, and moved by a separate weight. The striking part was moved by one large weight, and the dial-wheels by another, while that of the time-keeping part weighed only three or four pounds. The dial wheels, hands or pointers, moved only once in a minute. Church clocks constructed in this way were thus rendered as perfect time-keepers, and were as little affected by wind or storm, as any house-clock or watch-regulator could be. These clocks were made with compensation pendulum rods of his own design, and the escapement after a model of his own. During these years of comparative leisure, his time was mostly spent in making this description of clocks, chiefly in reference to accuracy as time-keepers, making a variety of regulators with new forms of escapements and compensation rods. No year elapsed up to the time of his last sickness, without some new design in clock-work, specimens of which are now abundant.

[By industry and prudent management, Mr. Terry accumulated a large property. He distributed to] his family, and gave away to different objects during the latter part of his life, not less than one hundred thousand dollars, retaining at the same

time an amount of available property sufficient to afford him an annual income of three thousand dollars. This he regarded as sufficient for all *his* temporal wants. When commencing business in early life, he never once indulged the thought of accumulating one-tenth the amount.

It is unnecessary to add much in regard to clock-making, as it is prosecuted at this time. It is scarcely to be credited that half a million of shelf-clocks are now annually made in Connecticut, and places not far distant. We have reason, however, to believe that this estimate is not an exaggeration.

The improvements in machinery, and the skill attained in manufacturing, gradually reduced the price of clocks. Thus it is, that a brass clock which formerly cost from \$38 to \$80 is superseded by a more neat and convenient shelf-clock, and afforded and sold at the very low price of \$5, \$3 or \$2. Some may suppose these clocks to be a poorer article and not as durable. This may be true of many of the clocks now manufactured; still it is equally true, that a clock as good and durable can now be made and sold at a profit, at these low prices. What is true of the entire clock, is well illustrated by the reduction in price of several of the separate parts of the clock, as now made. Such parts as at one time cost ten, twenty, or even fifty cents, to each clock, are now manufactured for one-fourth the amount, and in some instances for less than a tithe of what they formerly cost. Spring clocks are made more extensively than they were a few years since. The springs for one clock that cost, only six or seven years ago, seventy-five cents or more, are now made and sold for eight and seven cents. It is proper to add here, that this description of springs cannot be imported, nor is the secret of manufacturing them known in foreign countries.\*

Mr. Terry had not the advantages of an early education, but he was a man of strong mind and sound judgment. Though his reading did not take a wide range, he understood his business thoroughly. He was a plain, practical man, and esteemed that knowledge of most account which had a direct bearing on the concerns of life, or which, in other words, bore fruit. His success in the manufacture of clocks when the business was in its infancy, and the important mechanical improvements which he introduced, demonstrate his enterprise, his sagacity, his inventive genius. Success as the result of the skillful use of means and the powers of nature—persistent success—always proves ability. Judged by this standard, Mr. Terry was no ordinary man. He died, with a character for strict integrity, late in February, 1852. His manners were blunt, his ways peculiar and original, but he had the confidence, respect and esteem of a large circle of acquaintances.

---

\* Extracted from a Review of Dr. Alcott's History of Clock-making, by Henry Terry, published in the *Waterbury American*, June 10, 1853.

## JOHN TRUMBULL, LL. D.,

The only son of Rev. John Trumbull, was born in Westbury, April 13, (old style,) 1750.\* Being of a delicate and sickly constitution, he was the favorite of his mother. She learned him to read, and also taught him all the songs, hymns, and other verses with which she was acquainted. He discovered an extraordinary memory for this last exercise, and even took to composing verses himself. Unknown to any body but his mother, he began the study of the Latin language, and soon made great proficiency. During all this time, however, he was a boy and liked boyish sports. Mr. Trumbull smoked and raised his own tobacco. One day, he set his son to suckering the plant. The latter filled his hat with the unsightly worms that infest the tobacco, and then persuaded his little sister that he had found a hen's nest on the scaffold in the barn, and could not get down with the eggs. "Parading her below with her apron spread, he let fall the contents of his hat. She fainted. The father was soon on the spot, and exclaimed, 'now, John, you shall be whipped.' 'Father, father,' cried the excited urchin, 'I deserve it, but I beg you will not whip me till Madam Pritchett is gone.'"<sup>†</sup> After a course of preparatory study, under the direction of his father, the two started on a horse for Yale College, the boy, of course, behind. The latter, says the Connecticut Gazette of Sept. 24, 1757, "passed a good examination, although but little more than seven years of age; but on account of his youth his father does not intend he shall at present continue at college." After an interval of six years spent in reading Latin, Greek and English authors, and in writing verses, he returned to New Haven, and received the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1767. He remained as a resident graduate for three years longer, devoting his time to polite literature, and sometimes to less dignified occupations.<sup>‡</sup> In 1771, he was appointed a tutor, which position he held two years. It was during his connection with Yale College that his acquaintance with Dwight and Humphreys commenced.

In 1772, Trumbull published the first part of "The Progress of Dullness;" and in the following year, two other parts. The object of the

\* His birth is not recorded in Waterbury.

<sup>†</sup> Dr. McEwen's Discourse, published in the proceedings at the Centennial Anniversary in Litchfield, 1852.

<sup>‡</sup> "After he had graduated, at the age of sixteen, [seventeen,] being small of stature, he was sometimes seen seated in the road with other children, scraping up sand-hills with his hands." (Dr. McEwen's Discourse.)



poem was the prevalent method of education, which the author censured and ridiculed.

Mr. Trumbull was admitted to the bar in Connecticut, in November, 1773, and immediately went to Boston and entered the office of John Adams, afterwards President Adams. Here he studied law, and in his leisure hours wrote essays on political subjects for the gazettes. He became an ardent Whig; published without his name, his "Elegy on the Times;" returned to New Haven, and commenced the practice of his profession in 1774. Here, though fully occupied as a lawyer, he found time, at the solicitation of certain members of the Continental Congress and other Whig friends, to compose and publish the first part of his most celebrated work, "McFingal," a burlesque epic poem. He designed it as a satire on English officials and Tories in general, and to help prepare the way for the independence of the Colonies. His business in New Haven was broken up by the war, and an invasion of the town was almost constantly apprehended. He, therefore, removed in May, 1777, to his native town, where he remained about four years. Here, he appears to have lived in the house with his father, and to have continued, to some extent, the practice of his profession. He had previously married (Nov. 1776) the daughter of Col. Leverett Hubbard of New Haven.

In 1779, he was chosen by the town one of the "inspecting committee," whose special business it was to look after the Tories and all "inimical persons," to discover their plots, and to inform against them. But, at length, his health gave way, owing partly to the fatigue and exposure of attending the courts at a distance; and in June, 1781, with the hope of improving his chances of recovery, he removed to Hartford. Soon after, he finished, and in 1782, published, an edition of his *McFingal*, some part of it, tradition says, being written in the old Trumbull house in Watertown. He also became a member of a literary club, to which Col. Humphreys, Barlow and Dr. Lemuel Hopkins belonged, which met weekly for the discussion of interesting questions, political, philosophical and literary. They were called the "Hartford wits," and after the peace in 1783, published a series of essays, called "American Antiquities," pretending to be extracts from an ancient poem which had been disinterred, entitled "The *Arnachiad*." These papers first appeared in the Hartford and New Haven gazettes, and were widely circulated. They were intended to check the progress of disorder and a sceptical philosophy, and help prepare the way for a more stable government.

In 1789, Mr. Trumbull was appointed State's attorney for the County

of Hartford, and in 1792, represented the town of Hartford in the Legislature. His impaired health compelled him to resign the office of State's attorney in 1795, and to retire wholly from business. A severe and dangerous course of sickness followed, in November, 1798. At length, however, he was able to resume his professional life, and in May, 1800, was elected, a second time, State representative. In the following year, he was chosen a judge of the Superior Court of the State, and in 1808, was made a judge of the Supreme Court of Errors. He remained in office till he was "rotated" out of it, May, 1819, a new constitution having been formed and a new party installed in power. In 1818, he received from Yale College the degree of LL. D.

Judge Trumbull was esteemed a good but not a very learned or profound judge. The dignity of his office did not always repress his wit or his satirical propensities. An advocate from the eastern part of the State made a very boisterous speech. After it was over, in some miscellaneous conversation, he remarked to the court that his case was a hard one, as the wind and tide were against him. "I don't know how it is with the tide, but the *wind*, sir, seems to be in your favor," replied the judge.

Judge Trumbull remained in Hartford till 1825, when he removed to Detroit, and resided for his remaining life in the family of his daughter, the wife of Hon. William Woodbridge. He died in May, 1831.

#### BENONI UPSON, D. D.

He was the eldest son of Thomas, the grandson of Thomas and the great grandson of Stephen Upson. He was born in the part of Waterbury since called Wolcott, Feb. 14, 1750; was graduated at Yale College in 1776, and became the settled minister of Kensington. In 1809, he was made a Fellow of Yale College, became a member of the Prudential Committee, and in 1817 received the degree of D. D. His death took place Nov. 13, 1826.

Dr. Upson was considered as a prudent, safe man, without brilliancy. He was known for his urbanity and hospitality.

#### STEPHEN UPSON

Was the only son and child (except one that died in early infancy) of Capt. Benjamin Upson. He was the grandson of Benjamin, the great grandson of Stephen and the great, great grandson of Stephen Upson, the original planter, and was born in the "old Clark house," June 12, 1783. His mother, before marriage, was Mary Clark, the widow of Thomas Clark, (2d,) and daughter of Daniel Hine of New Milford. He pursued

his classical studies, for a time, with Rev. Mr. Woodward of Wolcott. He also studied with Thomas Lewis of Salem society, and entered Yale College. While he was a student there, the sea of politics raged vehemently. Those in authority in College, and particularly the President, were strong Federalists; and it was considered rash for a young man, who expected college honors, to avow republican opinions. Before the close of his junior year, young Upson embraced these opinions. As he had already received many honors and was a candidate for more, his father became alarmed, and remonstrated with him by letter, telling him how much he was in the power of the President, and how unwise it was to adopt adverse political sentiments. The son defended his views at length, also by letter. One of his epistles is before me. In it, he acknowledges his perilous condition, but asks—"Do you wish me to dissemble the real sentiments of my heart for the paltry reward of a collegiate honor?" &c. Both the correspondents, probably, exaggerated the danger of holding the proscribed opinions.

Mr. Upson graduated in 1804, having for classmates John C. Calhoun and other distinguished men. He commenced the study of law with Judge Chauncey of New Haven; but feeling the necessity of earning something for himself, he left in March, 1805, and went to Virginia. In Richmond, he met his classmate and room-mate, Royal R. Hinman, who had taken charge of an academy in that city. The two went together a few miles north, to visit Gen. Guerrant, who had advertised for a family teacher. Upson made an engagement for six months, and entered upon his duties April 22d. He was to receive £50 and board, washing, lodging, &c. When the six months had expired, he entered the family of Nathaniel Pope, Esq., a distinguished lawyer of Hanover, (about twenty miles from Richmond,) as teacher. He engaged for one year, and was to receive £90 and board, &c.; and also legal instruction and the use of law books. Before the time had expired, Mr. Pope was killed in a duel, and Upson, at the solicitation of his friend and college mate, Addin Lewis, then living there, went to Georgia, and entered the law office of the celebrated William H. Crawford. He was admitted to the bar and became Mr. Crawford's law partner. His connection secured him immediate business, and he rose rapidly to the highest eminence in his profession.

Mr. Upson interested himself in the politics of his adopted State. As early as 1808, he wrote a series of articles which were published in the Georgia Express, and republished in the Savannah Advertiser, on the *stay laws* just enacted in that State, (made necessary, it was claimed, by the Embargo laws of Congress,) which attracted much notice at the

time. They were entitled "An enquiry into the constitutionality, the necessity, the justice, and policy of the EMBARGO lately laid upon LAW in this STATE," and were signed "LUCIUS." They denounced, in unmeasured terms, the obnoxious laws and the men who concocted them, and evince a good deal of legal knowledge and argumentative force for so young a man. In 1813, alluding to some recent acts of the Legislature of Georgia, he said, in a letter to his father, that the country "appeared to be in a rapid progression from a representative republic down the grades of Democracy to a perfect state of anarchy."

In the latter part of his life, Mr. Upson, having accumulated considerable property, purchased a plantation and cultivated wheat, oats, corn, &c., and was intending, had life been spared, to raise cotton. He did not, however, neglect his profession. Some attention he continued to give to politics, and became, as I gather from his letters, a member of the Legislature. When his old friend, Mr. Crawford, came to be talked of, and was finally nominated, for the presidency, he gave him his hearty support. To this course he was prompted, not only by friendship and a sense of gratitude, but by a belief that Mr. C. was "eminently qualified for the office." Could he see him elected, he declared, he should "be perfectly satisfied, without further interference in political matters." He became famous for his political harangues, and had the entire confidence of the Democratic party; and at the critical period of his death, it is stated that his party had settled the point that he should be the next senator in Congress, to be chosen by the Legislature then about to meet.

Mr. Upson married, Nov. 12, 1813, Hannah Cummins, the youngest daughter of Rev. Francis Cummins of Georgia. They had five children, all of whom survived their father, viz, Francis Lewis, (for a time a member of the Law School of New Haven,) Mary Elizabeth, Sarah Eveline, William Benjamin and Stephen. All are believed to be now living, except Wm. Benjamin. Stephen, the youngest, (born Nov. 8, 1823,) graduated at Yale College in 1841, and is now, or was recently, in New York. The mother, after she became a widow, married Elijah Boardman of Connecticut, (then of New York.) After Mr. Boardman's decease, she returned to the South, and is still living.

Mr. Upson resided at Lexington, Oglethorpe County, Ga., and died August 3, 1824, aged 41. He had acquired more reputation as an advocate, perhaps, than any other man in the State, of his age. "Had he lived ten years longer," says one of his admirers, "he would have been *the great man of the South.*" He was a fine scholar, an arduous student of law, an elegant and persuasive speaker, and a high minded,

honorable man. He had, too, a large and kind heart. This appears in his letters to his parents, and to his sister who lived with them. They are full of anxious solicitude and tender feeling. After the decease of his mother, he, for the first time since he left Connecticut in 1805, visited his father, then (July, 1821) somewhat infirm with age, and made the most liberal provision for his permanent comfort. He had previously made his friends at home, to a large extent, the sharers of his prosperity. While he was an affectionate son and brother, he won the esteem and the confidence of all who knew him. His form was good, his person somewhat tall and slender, his dress and mode of living plain, and his manners gentlemanly and agreeable.

#### CAPT. JOHN WELTON.

He was the eldest son of Richard Welton, and was born Jan. 1, 1727. He was a farmer of Buckshill, and had only the ordinary advantages of an English education; still he possessed a strong mind and exerted a wide influence. From an early period, he was a prominent member of the Episcopal society and held the office of senior warden. In the beginning of the Revolutionary war, he espoused the patriotic cause, became a moderate Whig, and was confided in by the friends of colonial independence. In 1784, he was first appointed a justice of the peace. He was a useful and much respected member of the Legislature fifteen sessions, beginning in 1784. It is stated that when he arose to address the house, few men were listened to with more deference.

Esquire John Welton, as he was called, died Jan. 22, 1816.

#### REV. BENJAMIN WOOSTER

Was the third son and fourth child of Wait and Phebe (Warner) Wooster, and was born in Waterbury, Oct. 29, 1762. He was a soldier of the Revolution, and was taxed as a minor in the first society in 1782. Subsequently, he entered Yale College and graduated in 1790. His theological studies were pursued under the Rev. Dr. Edwards of New Haven. After being licensed to preach, he occupied himself for a time in missionary labor; but in 1797, was ordained pastor of the church in Cornwall, Vt. He gave up his charge in 1802, and spent three years in the service of the Berkshire Missionary Society. On the 24th day of July, 1805, he was installed in Fairfield, Vt., where he labored assiduously till bodily infirmity, in 1833, compelled him to desist. During this time, he was once a representative to the General Assembly of the State, and twice a member of the "Septennial Convention convened by the Board of Censors." He died, says Dr. Sprague's "Annals," at St. Albans, Vt., in February, 1843.

~~I~~ I here, contrary to my original purpose, introduce a few names of persons still living. The very brief sketch of Mr. Israel Holmes has been furnished by a friend of that gentleman.

#### AMOS BRONSON ALCOTT,

Son of Joseph C. Alcott, was born in Wolcott, Nov. 29, 1799. He is a well known literary man, lecturer and "conversational teacher." His name is identified with what is termed the transcendental philosophy in Massachusetts. He is the friend of Ralph Waldo Emerson, and has written some books on human culture and his favorite philosophy. Boston has hitherto been his home.

Mr. Alcott was married, May 23, 1830, to Abigail, youngest daughter of Col. Joseph May of Boston. Samuel Sewall, chief justice of the Massachusetts Colony from 1718 to 1728, was the ancestor of his wife's mother, Dorothy Sewall.

#### WILLIAM A. ALCOTT, M. D.,

Son of Obed Alcott, was born in Wolcott, Oct. 6, 1798. In boyhood, he attended the common district schools, and finally, a private school for two terms. Afterwards, he taught a district school for several years. Finally, he commenced the study of medicine, and after three years, or in 1826, received at New Haven a license to practice. He then returned to teaching, but his health breaking down, he became a practitioner of medicine in Wolcott till 1829. Subsequently, he connected himself with Mr. Woodbridge, the geographer, removed to Boston, and devoted his time to the cause of education and literary pursuits. In 1832 he went to Boston and soon became the editor of the "Annals of Education," &c.

Dr. Alcott is the author of many books on education, temperance, moral reform, domestic medicine, &c. Among these are the *Young Man's Guide*, *House I Live in*, *The Young Mother*, *The Young Wife*, *The Young Husband*, *Young Woman's Guide*, *The Young House-keeper* and *Mother's Medical Guide*. He has also written largely for the periodicals, and has edited several beside the *Annals*—*Parley's Magazine*, *Library of Health*, &c. He has also lectured on his favorite topics in several of the States. Notwithstanding his severe labors, he is, in his own language, "a water-drinker and a bread and fruit-eater, eschewing all seasonings and mixed dishes, and rejecting all medicines." He is now, he continues, "in his thirty-second year of respite from the grave by consumption, of which he has always had a dread, with which he is still threatened, and to which some day he will fall a victim."

## DEA. AARON BENEDICT,

The son of Aaron and Esther (Trowbridge) Benedict, was born in that part of Waterbury which is now Middlebury, Aug. 9, 1785. At an early age he became a member of Yale College, but after eighteen months was obliged to leave on account of ill health. He removed to Waterbury (first society) in 1804, and became a partner of Joseph Burton in mercantile business, which they carried on, without much profit, till 1812. He then commenced the manufacture of bone and ivory buttons; but this business, after several years' trial, not proving satisfactory, he became connected in 1823, with Bennet Bronson of Waterbury, and Nathan Smith, William Bristol and David C. DeForest of New Haven, in the gilt button business, under the partnership name of "A. Benedict." He was the general partner and had the exclusive management of the concern. The prosperity of Waterbury, as a manufacturing town, may be said to date from the formation of this company; though the gilt button business had been established, and carried on to a limited extent for many years. The capital was \$6,500. Many discouragements, at first, embarrassed the enterprise; but perseverance finally secured success. Skillful artisans were obtained from England. It was the first aim to make a good article, and the second, to obtain good prices. Buttons, gilded with something better than "dandelion water," were first sent to market in the spring of 1824. Goods of the value of about \$5,000 were made during this year. Soon after the formation of the company, Benjamin DeForest of Watertown and Alfred Platt of Waterbury became members by purchase. The partnership was renewed in 1827, and the capital increased to \$13,000.

The second partnership expired Feb. 2d, 1829, when a new one was formed under the name of "Benedict & Coe," with a capital of \$20,000. Mr. Benedict's partners were Israel Coe, Bennet Bronson, Benjamin DeForest, Alfred Platt and James Croft. In addition to their old business, they dealt in merchandise, and rolled brass for market. They had previously, as early as 1825, made brass for their own use and sold some, but this was not then considered an important branch of their business. Thenceforth it became so.

On the 10th day of February, 1834, the copartnership of Benedict & Coe expired, and a new one, with a capital of \$40,000, was entered into, with the name of Benedict & Burnham. The partners were Aaron Benedict, Gordon W. Burnham, Bennet Bronson, Alfred Platt, Henry Bronson, Samuel S. DeForest and John DeForest. The two

first were the general partners and agents of the company. Mr. Benedict continued to have charge of the business at home, which was prosecuted with great energy and success for the next three years. By his prudence and skill, the company was carried through the financial crisis of 1837, without dishonor or serious loss. The copartnership was renewed March 16, 1838, with a capital of \$71,000, and again, March 11, 1840, with a capital of \$100,000. Previous to this last date, or in 1839, the second financial crisis came on, which was followed by a prolonged depression in business. The company made nothing for three years.

On the 14th day of Jan. 1843, the company of Benedict & Burnham gave place to the "Benedict & Burnham Manufacturing Company," a joint stock corporation, the first formed in the town, under which name the business is still carried on. The capital was \$100,000. Mr. Benedict was chosen president, which office he has held ever since. In 1848, the capital was augmented to \$200,000, and in 1856, to \$400,000. The business has been regularly and constantly increasing, (with slight exceptions,) from 1824 to the present time. The making of German silver became an important branch of it, at an early period. So did the drawing of brass and copper wire. The company now manufactures almost exclusively, sheet brass, German silver, brass and copper wire, and brass and copper tubing. A business which was started thirty-two years ago, on a most diminutive scale, has now become the most important in the place, employing six first class mills and over \$1,500,000 capital.

The Benedict & Burnham Manufacturing Company has from time to time become the parent of several other joint stock companies. Whenever a branch of its business could be better carried on by itself, the property necessary for its prosecution was detached, and distributed as a dividend to its stockholders, in the form of stock in a new company. Thus originated, in 1846, the American Pin Company, with \$50,000 capital,\* (afterwards increased to \$100,000;) in 1849, the Waterbury Button Company, with a capital of \$30,000, (afterwards increased to \$45,000;) in 1852, the Benedict & Scovill Company,† (a mercantile corporation,) with a capital of \$50,000, (now, 60,000;) and in 1857, the Waterbury Clock Company, with \$60,000 capital.

Mr. Benedict has twice represented the town in the General Assembly, and in the spring of the present year, (1857,) was a candidate for State

---

\* The partners in the firm of Brown & Elton took one half the stock in this company. They had previously been interested in the business.

† The stockholders of the Scovill Manufacturing Co. took one third of the stock.



senator; but, as a common thing, he has peremptorily declined political office. For many years, he has been a deacon of the 1st Congregational church of Waterbury. He is widely known for integrity, soundness of judgment and strong common sense; for his matured opinions and wise, considerate action, under all circumstances. Though now over seventy years of age, he is still vigorous, and attends to his business duties with as much regularity as he did thirty years ago.

## BIOGRAPHICAL MEMOIR OF ALVAN BRONSON;

PREPARED BY HIMSELF.

I am the second son of Josiah and Tabitha (Tuttle) Bronson, and was born in Waterbury, (since Middlebury,) May 19, 1783. As soon as I could be made useful, I worked on the farm in the summer, attending a district school in the winter. When thirteen years old, I spent twelve months in the family of Capt. Isaac Bronson, being engaged as shop or errand boy in a small country store. About this time, I became interested in a small juvenile library, and contracted a fondness for books. I was kindly treated by Capt. Bronson, who by the way, though in humble life, was no ordinary man. He had a strong mind, well cultivated for his station; was benevolent, ardent, eloquent. In politics, he was a warm Federalist. I recollect hearing him say, with hands clenched, his massive, bony figure drawn up to its full height, his musical, bell-toned voice pitched to its highest key, "I solemnly declare I would rather be taxed a yoke of fat oxen every year than see the nation disgraced by this paltry gun-boat system." Hammond, in his Political History of New York, has alluded to my Federal propensities. Perhaps they may be traced partly to this good old man.

For the greatest part of the next two or three years, I was employed as youngest clerk in the store of Mr. Terrell, of Salem. Afterwards, for one quarter, I attended the select school of Esquire Morris, of Litchfield, South Farms, and completed my education by spending a year with our clergyman, the Rev. Ira Hart. Thus qualified, and before I was seventeen, I taught a district school in Woodbridge three months.

About this time, I accepted a clerkship in the store of Reuben Rice, of New Haven, who had been the head clerk of Tyrrel, where I remained about eighteen months. At the end of this period, I and Joseph N. Clark formed a connection with Isaac & Kneeland Townsend, merchant tailors, and Gilbert & Townsend, West India shippers, and

went into business on Long Wharf. Clark managed the sailors' clothing department, while I was the merchant. The other partners furnished the capital. The business was extensive, arduous and prosperous; but after three or four years, Mr. Clark and I declined to go on with it, on the original footing.

In connection with Mr. Clark and our former patrons, Gilbert & Townsend, I then undertook an adventure for the winter. I proceeded to Charleston, S. C., with Gilbert & Townsend's schooner, the *Antelope*, chartered and loaded on joint account, with northern products. We encountered a three days' gale, and were wrecked on Portsmouth Beach, between capes Fear and Hatteras. Having paid salvage to the wreckers and observed all the forms due to the underwriters, I purchased at the sale of the wreck, and that of three others resulting from the same gale, a large amount of materials, obtained a master builder, and constructed a brig and schooner suited to the West India trade. The enterprise consumed two years. The schooner made several voyages. The brig was completed and loaded just in season to be overtaken by Mr. Jefferson's embargo, which changed her destination from a West India to a Connecticut voyage. The adventure was then closed. Mr. Clark and myself took the schooner, and Gilbert & Townsend the brig.

After the embargo was repealed, I made a voyage to the West Indies, as supercargo of the brig *Julius Cæsar*. On my return, I brought home the first intelligence of the capture by the French of my schooner (*Philander*) under Bonaparte's Berlin and Milan decrees, for having been bound to a British port. She was condemned, sold and bought in by the captain; and afterwards captured, under the British orders in council, *for having been to a French port*, and again condemned!

Jacob Townsend, of the house of Gilbert & Townsend, now proposed to me to unite with him in the coasting trade of the lakes. I assented, and with Shelden Thompson, shipmaster, and our ship-carpenters, proceeded to Oswego River. At the falls, we cut the frame for a schooner of one hundred and odd tons, on the ground now occupied by the thriving village of Fulton. I then visited, for the first time, the hamlet of Oswego, my future home, which has swelled from 300 to a city of 16,000 inhabitants. Thompson proceeded to Lake Erie to provide materials for another vessel on the Niagara River.

With our joint capital of \$14,000, we built two vessels, established a store at Oswego and another at Lewiston, and in connexion with General and Judge Porter and Major Barton, (who held from the State a lease of the Niagara portage,) we conducted a major part of the commerce of the lakes for the two years preceding the war with Great Britain. In 1812, we found we had escaped Bonaparte's decrees and the

British orders in council, to be involved in a vindictive and desolating war. Our business was broken up; our homes were invaded, plundered and burned.

I was appointed military and naval store keeper at Oswego. When the port was threatened in 1814, the entire disposition of the public stores was committed to my discretion; and after the capture, I received the thanks of the quarter-master's department for the skill and success with which I had discharged the trust. I was myself captured with the remnant of stores on hand, nor was the manner over-gracious. Commodore Sir James Yeo asked me to furnish pilots to conduct his boats out of the harbor to the fleet when laden with salt and military stores. I stated that our inhabitants had left the village and I had no one under my command. He replied with an oath, "Then go yourself, and if you get the boats aground, I'll shoot you," putting his hand on my shoulder and conducting me to a boat. Col. Harvey, on the bank above, called out to Sir James, "that is the public-store keeper, and may be useful to us," when he called me back. Subsequently, he said to me, "You are our prisoner. I shall expect you to inform me what public stores are on hand, what have been secreted in the neighborhood, if any, and what have been deposited in the rear of the port." I replied I could not give the information, my books and papers having been sent away for safety; nor would it be proper, if I could. He rejoined that he had nothing to say about my duty; that if I gave him this information correctly, he should allow me to remain; if not, he should send me to Quebec. He gave me leave to take my trunk, and ordered me on board his flag-ship, the Prince Regent, a fine frigate. I found my wardrobe and books plundered to the last article. After securing their plunder, and burning the barracks, the officers came on board, about midnight, when Lt. General Drummond enquired for the store keeper. When pointed out to him, he lavished upon me a profusion of vulgar epithets, and concluded by saying, "d—n you, you ought to be strung up to the yard arm. You said there were no stores secreted, and we found sunk in the river, at your wharf, three or four cannon and as many ships' anchors." Col. Harvey was evidently mortified by the rudeness and vulgarity of his superiors, and in a walk on the quarter-deck next day, apologized for them by saying their loss was severe, and among the killed and wounded were some of their best officers. Col. Harvey was a gentleman in manners, and a brilliant officer.

In 1815, I married the youngest daughter of Capt. Edward O'Conner, a Revolutionary soldier.

After the war, our business was resumed and extended by a branch at

Black Rock, conducted on the part of Townsend, Bronson & Co., by Thompson, and on the part of Porter, Barton & Co., by Nathaniel Sill, under the firm of Sill, Thompson & Co. Our connexion was closed in 1822.

In 1822 my neighbors procured my nomination to the State Senate, without consulting or even confiding to me the secret. Being duly elected under the new constitution, I drew two years, during which time the principle service rendered my constituents was to procure a law authorizing the construction of the Oswego Canal; a small appropriation for the improvement of the Oswego River having been extorted from the Legislature before, and this partly through my agency.

Identified early with the Oswego Canal, I became its advocate and defender through a stormy conflict of twenty-five years. During all this period, it had to meet and counteract the hostility of Western New York, headed by the jealous and sharp rival interest of Buffalo. So much was I connected with this work in public estimation, that when I repaired to Albany with a remonstrance against the resolution of Mr. Hickox of Buffalo, to repeal the Oswego Canal law, while little progress had yet been made, in its construction, meeting Aaron Burr in the hall of the capitol, he saluted me by saying, "Ah! you are here to defend your canal," and added, "I am with you;" I said I believed all sensible men were with us; to which he replied characteristically, "Ah, my young friend, if that's all, you have a vast majority against you." If this protracted warfare did not improve my temper, it sharpened my pen, as I was charged with all the memorials, remonstrances, and newspaper battles incident to the conflict for these twenty-five years, and down to the last half dozen years, when I resigned in favor of younger heads and stronger hands.

The other events which signalized my two years' service were a report I wrote for the chairman of the committee on manufactures, and my connexion with the famous seventeen who defeated the Electoral law. Gen. McClure of Steuben introduced the annual resolutions calling on Congress to encourage and protect manufactures. They contained the usual fallacies and appeals to public prejudice, alledging that importations impoverished the people, that England monopolized our public securities, loaded us with debt, robbed us of our specie, and degraded us to a tributary, &c. Mallory, chairman of the committee in the Senate, to whom these resolutions were referred, (which had passed the Assembly almost by acclamation,) entertained doubts as to the soundness of this popular theory, and proposed to me to try my hand at a report, which, if approved, he would offer to his committee. I pre-

pared the report with care. He approved it, and one of his committee, Wooster of Herkimer, applauded the work, but said popular prejudice would not tolerate such doctrines, which were out and out free trade. His committee, therefore, reported the resolutions from the Assembly, and Mallory offered his substitute and defended it ably, with such aid as I could afford him. It received one vote, that of Wheeler of White Hall, a merchant, in addition to those of Mallory and myself. Mallory frankly disclaimed the authorship. It was published and applauded by the city press. Indeed, it was well received by some of the senators, and among them Gen. Root, our president.

In 1829, I was returned to the Senate again; took my seat in 1830, and was placed at the head of the finance committee. The subject which occupied the largest share of my time, was the usury question. John C. Spencer introduced a bill to enforce the usury laws by new and additional penalties. This bill passed the Assembly, and was referred by the Senate to my committee. It had some able opponents in the Senate, foremost among whom were Maynard of Utica and Tracey of Buffalo. There were others opposed in principle to the bill, but unwilling to act, believing the measure popular. The policy adopted therefore was to procrastinate, and enlist friends by arguments and reports. I therefore had occasion to report more or less elaborately against the usury penalties during each of these four winters.

In my second winter the Senate by resolution instructed my committee to report to the next Legislature the history of the usury laws and their penalties as modified from time to time. Aided by Senator Maynard and Cashier A. B. Johnson of Utica, circulars were addressed to prominent men throughout the Union, which brought a valuable amount of information, together with the opinions of the writers. All the parties addressed, with a single exception, favored repeal or amelioration. Among them were John Quincey Adams, Gen. Cass, Gov. Burnett of Ohio, Saml. A. Foot of Connecticut, Professor McVickar of New York and Saml. Smith of Baltimore. The latter, an old merchant and United States senator, was the exception.

In my third senatorial year, the important question was agitated whether the general fund should be preserved and fortified by a small tax; or exhausted and the government be thrown upon the canal revenues for support thereafter. Hammond says, (*Political History of New York*, Vol. 2, p. 411,) "Mr. Bronson, in accordance with the views of the governor and comptroller, on the 28th February, 1832, brought in a bill to levy a tax of one mill on the dollar for three years." He adds, "For myself, I think the general fund ought to have been replen-

ished by a temporary tax, [&c.] This immensely important question was elaborately debated, and with great ability, in the Senate. Beardsley, Maynard, Seward and others opposed, and Bronson and Tracey supported the bill. On the final vote a very large majority were opposed to the tax, five members only, Bronson, Fisk, Fuller, Halsey and Tracey voting in favor."

Near the close of my last session, a bill came from the Assembly reducing the legal rate of interest to 6 per cent. and bank discount to 5½ per cent., guarding these rates by the existing usury penalties. Against this bill, were presented remonstrances from New York, Hudson, Albany, and the County of St. Lawrence. All were referred to the finance committee, on which I made an elaborate report, "Senate document No. 106, 12th April, 1833." This report embraced the subjects of CAPITAL, CURRENCY, BANKING and INTEREST. It received, from the city press particularly, liberal commendation; but was pronounced by some rather ambitious. I learned that Mr. Gallatin said it was an able and well reasoned document—an opinion that might well gratify any one of much more pretension than the chairman of the finance committee.

My political and public life closed with my second term in the Senate, when I resumed my mercantile pursuits, giving some thought and labor to public measures connected with my pursuits; particularly to the debenture or drawback law of Congress, and the Treaty of Reciprocity with Great Britain and her American Provinces. The former measure originated at Oswego, and simply provided for refunding duties paid on importations at the sea-board, on proof of exportation over land or by canal to Canada and New Mexico.

In 1834, Gen. Cass, Secretary of War, on the nomination of Silas Wright, appointed me one of the visitors of the West Point Academy. Subsequently the State of New York commissioned me, with two others, to settle for Otsego an exciting court-house question. With these slight interruptions, my last twenty years have been devoted assiduously to commerce. Indeed, this pursuit has never been wholly intermitted since I became a merchant.

#### HENRY DUTTON, LL. D.

Is the son of Thomas and a younger brother of Rev. Matthew R. Dutton, (see page 389,) and was born in Plymouth, Feb. 12, 1796. He was graduated at Yale College in 1818, and made a tutor in 1821. He has since been a representative and senator in the State Legislature, a judge of the County Court of New Haven, and governor of the State. In 1847, he was appointed a professor in the law department of Yale College,

which office he still holds. The degree of LL. D. was conferred upon him in 1854.

### SAMUEL ALFRED FOOTE

Was the youngest child of John and Mary Foote. He was born in Watertown, Dec. 17, 1790, and resided with his parents till Sept. 1805, when he went to live with his elder brother, Ebenezer, (see page 390,) then residing in Troy. After a little more than a year spent in the law office of his brother, the latter sent him to the Grammar School connected with Union College. He entered this school in Dec. 1806, and the Freshman Class of Union College in Sept. 1807. He left college in Dec. 1810, and graduated in July, 1811. After leaving college, he read law nearly a year with James Thomson, Esq. of Milton, Saratoga Co., and then entered the office of his brother in Albany, to which place the latter had removed. He took charge of the business of the office after Feb. 1812, when his brother's partner, Samuel North, Esq., was disabled by sickness. Mr. North died in Jan. 1813, when a partnership was entered into by the brothers. Samuel A. had then not studied law the required time. His brother made for him a special application to the Court; and in consideration, in part, of the time he had spent in the study while a youth and before entering college, the rule was dispensed with, an examination permitted, and a license to practice as an attorney in the Supreme Court of the State was granted in Jan. 1813. He was admitted counselor in Jan. 1816. While connected with his brother, he attended to the business of the office. The partnership was prosperous, but of short duration, on account of the early death of the senior brother. The survivor, however, continued the practice of law in Albany.

Mr. Foote was appointed district attorney of the City and County of Albany, under the administration of Gov. Clinton, in July, 1819, and held the office till Feb. 1821, when he was removed and Benjamin F. Butler appointed in his place. He continued in Albany till May, 1828, when he removed to the City of New York.—(See *The Foote Genealogy*.)

### DAVID HOADLEY, (2D.)

A son of David Hoadley, (see page 396,) was born in Waterbury, Feb. 13, 1806. While still a minor, he was a clerk in the drug store of Hotchkiss & Durand, and afterwards, of Lewis Hotchkiss, in New Haven. In April, 1827, he commenced business on his own account in New York, and was engaged exclusively in the wholesale drug trade till 1848. At this time, on account of impaired health, he relinquished active business. He was chosen vice president of the American Ex-

change Bank, and as his health improved, consented to take an active part in the management of the business. While connected with that prosperous institution, he became widely known for his prudence and skill.

Resigning his place in the American Exchange Bank, Mr. Hoadley accepted the office of president of the Panama Railroad Company, and entered upon his duties, Nov. 1, 1853. He still occupies that responsible and difficult position. Few men in the financial circles of New York have a higher reputation for ability, integrity and successful enterprise.

### ISRAEL HOLMES

Is a younger brother of Capt. Reuben Holmes, (see page 396,) is a descendant of Lieut. Thomas Judd, and was born Dec. 19, 1800. He received an ordinary common school education, and was himself a teacher of the school in the West Centre district in Waterbury when he was quite young. Afterwards, he became principal clerk in the store of J. M. L. & W. H. Scovill, and while engaged in the business of these gentlemen, was sent by them to England, in 1829, to procure workmen for their button factory and the brass business.

In 1831, Holmes & Hotchkiss built the brass mill afterwards occupied by Brown & Elton. Mr. Holmes was desirous of connecting wire making with brass rolling, but could find no person in this country who had any knowledge of the business. Foreseeing the importance of the interests connected with the successful introduction of this new branch of manufacture into the country, he made a second voyage to England in 1831, and returned with men and machinery enough to make a beginning—small, it is true, but, viewed in its results as we now see them, of great value to Waterbury and to the country. In 1834, Mr. Holmes removed to Wolcottville, and in the same year made a third voyage to England, and procured workmen and machinery for the manufacture of brass kettles in Wolcottville, by the only method then known. This was the origin of this branch of business in the United States. In 1845, Mr. Holmes returned to Waterbury, and as president of the Waterbury Brass Co. occupied himself in building and putting in operation their works in the east part of the town, and afterwards of their "West Mill," which is located near the railroads in the western part of the city.

He also superintended the erection of a brass mill in Bristol, and is now actively engaged in business as superintendent of the brass rolling mill of Holmes, Booth & Haydens, of which corporation he is the president. He is a man of great energy and untiring industry. It is hoped it will not offend his well known modesty if it be added, that he has much of the natural genius and brilliancy of intellect which belonged to his brother Reuben.



## II. GENEALOGY.

---

### ADAMS.

1. WILLIAM ADAMS settled in Waterbury, m. Susanna, dau. of Ebenezer Bronson, Feb. 14, 1739-40, and d. April 23, 1793. His wife d. March 22, 1812, aged 94. His ch. were: I. Samuel, b. Aug. 9, 1740; II. Prudence, b. March 31, 1742, d. Oct. 16, 1743; III. William, b. July 1, 1744, d. Oct. 12, 1747; IV. Prudence, b. April 24, 1746, d. young; V. William, b. June 1, 1748; VI. Susanna, b. Nov. 4, 1749, m. Roswell Bronson; VII. John, b. Feb. 2, 1751; VIII. James, b. Feb. 11, 1754, d. unm. Feb. 1789; IX. Luke, b. March 8, 1756; X. Sylvanus, b. June 22, 1759; XI. Ruth, b. Dec. 14, 1761, d. Nov. 26, 1767; XII. Asahel, b. July 28, 1764, m. Eunice Prichard.

2. SAMUEL, son of William, (1,) m. Mary, dau. of Edmund Tompkins, March 1, 1764, and d. Dec. 13, 1773. Ch. as follows: I. Prudence, b. Aug. 10, 1765; II. Reuben, b. April 18, 1767, d. Oct. 6, 1838; III. Ruth, b. April 8, 1769, d. Oct. 28, 1791; IV. Samuel, b. July 10, 1771; V. Mary, b. Aug. 18, 1773, m. Danl. Upson, and d. June 29, 1830.

3. WILLIAM, son of William, (1,) m. Sarah Goodwin of Lebanon, Conn., Feb. 22, 1775, who d. Feb. 18, 1788, and he m. 2d, Orpha Cosset, Dec. 29, 1788. He d. Jan. 25, 1829. Ch.: I. Merick, b. Aug. 30, 1776, d. 1785; II. Sena, b. June 5, 1778, m. John Hull; III. Sarah, b. Jan. 3, 1780, d. 1784; IV. Jesse, b. Jan. 4, 1782, d. Aug. 27, 1825; V. Merick, b. March 2, 1786, d. 1794; VI. Roxa, b. Oct. 3, 1791; VII. Chauncey, b. Dec. 3, 1796; VIII. Augustus, b. Feb. 28, 1799; IX. William Hopkins, b. Feb. 12, 1802.

4. John, son of William, (1,) m. Sarah, dau. of James Bronson, May 25, 1780. She d. Nov. 21, 1793, and he m. Cynthia, dau. of Ebenezer Fitch of Wallingford, May 21, 1794. His ch. were: I. Esther, b. March 21, 1781; II. Fanny, b. March 7, 1783; III. Benoni, b. Feb. 25, 1785; IV. Sarah, b. Feb. 6, 1787; V. Hannah, b. Dec. 1, 1789; VI.

Juliana, b. June 24, 1793, d. 1793; VII. Luther, b. May 31, 1795; VIII. Amanda.

5. LUKE, son of William, (1.) m. Lucy, dau. of Joseph Nichols, Jan. 3, 1782. Ch.: I. Anne, b. Aug. 31, 1782; II. Susanna, b. Sept. 16, 1784; III. Betsey, b. Dec. 21, 1786.

6. SYLVANUS, son of William, (1.) m. Sarah, dau. of Dea. Timothy Hopkins, Dec. 4, 1783. Ch.: I. Mark, b. Sept. 16, 1784; II. Chloe, b. Feb. 4, 1786; III. Mark, b. Oct. 18, 1787; IV. Timothy Hopkins, b. Sept. 29, 1789.

### ALCOCKE.\*

ALCOCK, ALLCOCKS, ALLCOX, ALCOX, ALCOTT.

1. JOHN ALCOTT was b. at Beverly, Yorkshire, Eng., was Bishop of Rochester, Worcester and Ely, in the time of Henry VII; also Lord Chancellor of Eng. He founded Jesus College, Cambridge, and was distinguished in his day for his learning and piety. He d. Oct. 1, 1500, and was buried in a sumptuous tomb of his own designing, in Ely cathedral—now much defaced.

2. Mr. GEORGE ALCOCKE came to this country in 1630, and settled in Roxbury, Mass., where he was a deacon of the church, and an important man in the Colony.

3. Mr. THOMAS ALCOCKE, the progenitor of all bearing the name in Conn., came from Eng. in Winthrop's company in 1630, with his brother George. In the covenant of the First church of Boston, dated at Charlestown, August 27, 1630, Thomas Alcocke stands forty-sixth on the list of original members: "Ano, 8: 7: 1639, our brother Thomas Alcocke and sister Margary were recommended to Deddam," where he settled. In 1650, he removed to Boston, and d. Jan. 1657. His wid. Margary, m. John Benham of New Haven, to which place she removed about 1660. His ch. were: I. Mary, bap. Nov. 3, 1635, and d. 1644; II. Elizabeth, bap. Dec. 10, 1637, d. the same year; III. Elizabeth, b. Oct. 4, 1638, m. May 6, 1656, Joseph Soper of Boston; IV. Sarah, b. Dec. 28, 1639; V. Hannah, b. May 25, 1642; VI. Mary, b. June 8, 1644, m. Sept. 27, 1664, James Robinson of Dorchester, d. March 13, 1718; VII. Rebecca, b. 1646, was grandmother of the wife of the first Gov. Trumbull of Conn.; VIII. Phillip, b. 1648, settled in New Haven; IX. John, bap. Aug. 6, 1651, m. Constance, dau. of Humphrey Milane of Boston, where he resided, and d. before 1712. He had two sons and six daughters.

---

\* For the materials of this notice I am indebted to Amos Bronson Alcott of Boston, Mass.

4. PHILLIP, son of Thomas, (3.) went to New Haven with his mother, who had married John Becham, in whose family he was brought up. He m. in Dec. 5, 1672, Elizabeth, only dau. of Thomas Mitchell, one of the early planters of New Haven. He possessed a large estate. He m. at Wethersfield, his second wife (in 1699, April 4.) Sarah, wid. of Nathaniel Butler, and afterwards lived there. He, Phillip, d. in 1715, aged 58. His ch. were, I. John, b. July 14, 1675; II. Thomas, b. 1677; III. Elizabeth, b. Feb. 6, 1679, and m. — Gray; IV. Phillip, b. Nov. 19, 1681, d. before 1712; V. Agnes, b. 1683, m. — Harriman.

5. JOHN, son of Phillip, (4.) lived in New Haven. m. Susanna — who d. in 1737. He d. March 1722-23, aged 47. Ch.: I. Abigail, m. Caleb Thomas of New Haven, Jan. 6, 1736; II. John, b. Jan. 14, 1705, settled in Waterbury; III. Elizabeth, b. July 31, 1708, m. July 21, 1737, Samuel Hummerston of New Haven; IV. Sarah, b. Aug. 12, 1711, m. June 23, 1746, John Alling of New Haven; V. Stephen, b. Aug. 10, 1714, m. Jan. 16, 1737, Abigail Hummerston, and lived at Amity, now Woodbridge; was a large land owner, and had two ch., Stephen, b. Aug. 22, 1738, and Sarah, who m. Solomon Gilbert of New Haven; VI. Mary, b. Aug. 10, 1717, m. Nov. 11, 1736, Daniel Lines, of New Haven.

6. THOMAS, son of Phillip, (4.) m. 1st, Mary Gedney, April 1706, and 2d, Abigail Austin of East Haven, at which place he resided, and where he d. April 2, 1757, aged 80. He had two sons and two daughters.

7. JOHN, son of John, (5.) was m. by Rev. Isaac Stiles of North Haven, Jan. 14, 1729-30, to Deborah, dau. of Isaac Blakeslee of the same place. He d. Jan. 6, 1777. His wife d. Jan. 7, 1789, aged 77. They had 12 ch., eleven of whom were b. in Waterbury. They were as follows: I. Lydia, b. Nov. 24, 1730, m. Isaac Blakeslee of North Haven, Nov. 23, 1757, where she settled, and d. Nov. 15, 1796, aged 66. She had 8 ch. II. John, b. Dec. 28, 1731; III. James, b. June 1, 1734; IV. Jesse, b. March 23, 1736; V. Daniel, b. March 25, 1738; VI. David, b. Jan. 12, 1740; VII. Deborah, b. 1741, m. 1st, Isaac Twitchell, 2d, Wait Hotchkiss, and settled near the "mill place" on Mad River; VIII. Mary, b. 1744, m. Obed Bradley of North Haven, where she lived and d. March 6, 1825; IX. Thankful, b. 1748, m. Thaddeus Baldwin of Plymouth, where she settled, and d. March 1, 1839; X. Hannah, b. 1751, m. Joel Norton of Bristol, and d. March 1, 1821; XI. Anna, m. Abel Curtiss of Wolcott, and d. Feb. 5, 1822; XII. Stephen, d. young.

8. JOHN, son of John, (7.) m. Aug. 28, 1755, Mary, dau. of Solomon Chatfield of Derby, and settled near his father. He was a leading

man in the society of Farmingbury. Both he and his wife were members of the church there, which was organized by Rev. Mr. Gillett, Nov. 18, 1773. Mrs. Alcox d. Feb. 28, 1807, a. 71, and Mr. Alcox d. Sept. 27, 1808. Their ch. were: I. Lydia, b. Dec. 8, 1756, m. 1st, Charles Frisbie, 2d, Nathaniel Lewis, both of Wolcott, and d. Sept. 23, 1830. II. Solomon, b. May 8, 1759; III. Samuel, b. Nov. 29, 1761; IV. John Blakeslee, b. June 24, 1764; V. Mary, b. Sept. 8, 1766, d. Feb. 18, 1770; VI. Isaac, b. April 12, 1769, m. Isabel Lane of Wolcott. He lived near the east church, Plymouth, where he d. 1809. He had an only child, which d. in infancy; VII. Joseph Chatfield, b. May 7, 1771; VIII. Mark, b. May 11, 1773; IX. Thomas, b. Oct. 16, 1775, d. April 27, 1778. Of the preceding, Solomon, Samuel and John B. served in the Revolutionary war.

9. JAMES, son of John, (7,) m. Hannah Barnes, and settled near the homestead of his father. He d. Aug. 9, 1806, aged 72. Ch.: I. Obedience, m. John Kenea, who d. aged 88; II. Rosanna, m. John Frisbie, and d. in 1830; III. Meliscent, m. Nathaniel Lane; IV. James, m. Esther Castle; V. Mehitable, m. James Bradley; VI. Lois, m. John Smith; VII. Deadima, m. Joshua Minor, and d. Jan. 15, 1852, aged 69; VIII. Hannah, m. Osman Norton; IX. Olive, m. Edward Good-year; X. Rhoda, m. Lewis Sanford.

10. JESSE, son of John, (7,) m. Patience Blakeslee, and settled in Wolcott. He d. Oct. 29, 1829, aged 74. His wid. m. Zachariah Hitchcock, and d. in 1840, aged 97. Ch.: I. Sarah, m. David Churchill; II. Lyman, d. Nov. 17, 1781, aged 16; III. Susan, m. John Beecher, and d. Nov. 3, 1836, aged 69; IV. Jesse, m. Lucy Minor; V. Joel, m. Elizabeth Johnson, and d. May 27, 1810, aged 32; VI. Hannah, m. Daniel Byington; VII. Chloe, m. Solomon Shelley; VIII. Ithamer, d. Aug. 9, 1798, aged 3.

11. DANIEL, son of John, (7,) m. Elizabeth Dutton, moved to Colebrook, Conn. and d. May 24, 1805. He had nine children.

12. DAVID, son of John, (7,) m. Abigail Johnson, who d. Feb. 23, 1793, aged 55, and he m. Feb. 5, 1795, Sarah Pratt. He lived on the homestead, where he d. Jan. 29, 1821. Ch.: I. Amy, b. Sept. 16, 1768, d. May 5, 1830, aged 62; II. Abigail, b. Dec. 14, 1770, m. Asahel Lane; III. Daniel, b. April 16, 1774, m. Feb. 22, 1805, Anna Fenn; IV. Obed, b. Sept. 8, 1775, m. July 13, 1797, Anna Andrews of Watertown; V. and VI. Eldad and Medad, b. Sept. 14, 1779. Eldad m. Jan. 29, 1817, Sybil Bartholomew, and d. June 4, 1850. Medad m. Sylvia, dau. of Capt. Amos Bronson of Plymouth. She d. at Medina, Ohio, Sept. 18, 1855, aged 80; VII. Eunice, b. Oct. 17, 1782, m.

April 24, 1806, Archibald Mosher; VIII. Deborah, b. Nov. 25, 1784, m. Feb. 18, 1808, Isaac Minor, who d. March 22, 1813. She m. Lorrin Fancher, March 4, 1820.

13. SOLOMON, son of John, (8,) m. 1st, Pamela Roberts, who d. in 1810, aged 49, and he m. 2d, Abigail Goodyear. He lived at Potucko's Ring, near his father's, and d. May 21, 1818. Ch.: I. Lydia, m. and d. in Ohio; II. Hannah, m. 1st, Richard Wethington of Waterbury, and 2d, Capt. Gates Upson of Wolcott; III. Seth, went to Ohio; IV. Solomon, d. in childhood; V. Leonard, d. near Cleveland, Ohio, where Seth now resides.

14. SAMUEL, son of John, (8,) m. Lydia Warner of Waterbury, settled in Wolcott, and d. June 9, 1810. Lydia, his wife, d. May 2, 1848, aged 82. Their ch. were: I. James, m. Sarah W. Warner of Waterbury, and resides in Monrovia, N. Y.; II. Mary, m. Isaac Hotchkiss of Wolcott, and d. Dec. 1840; III. Cleora, d. Feb. 16, 1826, aged 33; IV. Statira, m. Oct. 4, 1819, Amos Shepherd of Southington; V. Candace, m. Geo. Griswold, and lives in Iowa.

15. JOHN BLAKESLEE, son of John, (8,) m. Lois Gaylord of Wolcott, and settled at Spindle Hill. He d. Sept. 17, 1837. His wid. d. April 7, 1839, aged 70. Ch.: I. Riley, m. 1st, Ruth Frisbie, 2d, Olive Warner, and resides in Waterbury; II. Almon, m. twice and lives in Wolcott; III. Jedediah G., m. 1st, Sophia Roper of Wolcott, 2d, Lois Gaylord of Harpersfield, N. Y. He lives on Spindle Hill, where his father died.

16. JOSEPH CHATFIELD, son of John, (8,) m. Oct. 13, 1796, Anna, dau. of Capt. Amos Bronson of Plymouth. Joseph C. first lived near his brother Solomon at "Potucko's Ring,"\* but in 1805, settled near his brother John B., at Clinton Hill or New Connecticut. He d. April 3, 1829. His wid. Anna still lives. They had the following ch.: I. Betsey, b. April 4, 1798, d. Nov. 5, 1798; II. Amos Bronson, (see p. 447,) b. Nov. 29, 1799; III. Chatfield, b. Oct. 23, 1801, m. 1st, Nancy Comstock of Paris, N. Y., and 2d, Miranda Baily. He lives at Oriskany Falls, N. Y.; IV. and V. Pamela and Pamila, b. Feb. 4, 1805. Pamela m. James Baily of Wolcott, moved to Pennsylvania, and d. Feb. 11, 1849. Pamila m. Ransom Gaylord of Bristol, went to Stockbridge, N. Y., and d. June 14, 1833; VI. Betsey, b. Feb. 14, 1808, m. Linus Pardee of Wolcott, and lives at West Edmeston near Oriskany Falls, N. Y.; VII. Phebe, b. Feb. 18, 1810, m. William Norton of Wolcott, lived on the family homestead, where she died July 28, 1844, aged 34; VIII.

\* So called from Potucko, an Indian, who having fired a ring of brushwood to surround and catch deer and other game, was himself entrapped and consumed. So says tradition.

March 26, 1812, d. July 10, 1812; IX. Junius, b. July 6, Nancy Jane Pritchard of Litchfield, Conn., lived at Oriskany d. April 16, 1852, aged 34; X. Ambrose, b. Sept. 10, 1820, Upson of Wolcott, and lives at Plantsville in Southington.

ARK, son of John, (8,) m. Mary Lane of Wolcott, who d. Oct. aged 61. He d. Nov. 21, 1846. Their ch. were: I. and II. Manda, (twins,) d. in infancy; III. Thomas; IV. Emily, m. Newton; V. Alvin, m. Chloe Finch of Wolcott, and lives near place, on Mad River, in Wolcott; VI. Salina, m. James, son of Alcox, and lives in Wolcott; VII. Isaac, m. and lives at Plain-Conn.

OBED, son of David, (12,) m. Anna, dau. of William Andrus, a of the Revolution and descendant of Abraham Andrus, one of original settlers of Waterbury. He, Obed, d. Aug. 9, 1847. His ere: I. William A., (see p. 447,) b. Aug. 6, 1798, m. Phebe L. son of Wolcott, Jan. 14, 1838; II. Lovina, b. Jan. 17, 1801, m. iam Knowles of Haddam, in 1820, d. March 1, 1821; III. Florence, ug. 9, 1804; IV. George, b. March 25, 1807, m. Harriet Nichols has five children.

#### BENEDICT.

1. WILLIAM BENEDICT lived in Nottinghamshire, about A. D. 1500, and had an only son, William, who resided in the same shire.\*

2. WILLIAM, the son of William, (1,) had a son William, b. in Nottinghamshire.

3. WILLIAM, son of William, (2,) had by his first wife, Thomas, b. in England, in 1617. His 2d wife was a Mrs. Bridgum.

4. THOMAS, son of William, (3,) m. Mary Bridgum, dau. of his father's second wife, and was a weaver by trade. He came to Mass., where he resided for a time. Thence he removed to Southold, L. I., thence to Huntington and thence to Jamaica, on the same island. On the 26th of Sept. 1664, he applied, with others, for liberty to settle at the place which is now Elizabethtown, N. J., and the petition was granted. Gov. Nichols issued an order for an election, dated Feb. 8, 1664, at James Fort, N. Y., to the magistrates of the towns on L. I., to elect two delegates in each town, sober, able and discreet persons, to meet at Hemstead on the last of February, to enact laws, &c., and Thomas Benedict was chosen one of the delegates by the town of Jamaica. He held a lieutenant's commission from Gov. Nichols,

---

\* The early generations of this family are taken from a parchment record, now in possession of the family, which has the appearance of being an ancient document.

dated April 7, 1665. During the same year, he removed to Norwalk, Conn., with his family. In 1666, he was chosen town clerk and selectman of Norwalk. The office of town clerk he held many years at 20s. per year, and was deputy to the General Court in May, 1670 and 1675. The office of deacon he held many years in the church of Norwalk, and "used the office to the satisfaction of the church, until his death," which occurred in his 73d year. Ch.: I. Thomas; II. John; III. Samuel; IV. James; V. Daniel; VI. Betty, m. John Slanson, of Stamford; VII. Mary, m. Lieut. Olmsted of Norwalk, Nov. 11, 1670; VIII. Sarah, m. Dec. 19, 1679, James Beebe, who was one of the early settlers of Danbury; IX. Rebecca, m. Doct. Samuel Woods, who was born and educated in England, and settled in Danbury.

5. THOMAS, son of Tho. (4.) m. Mary Messenger of Jamaica, L. I., and settled in Norwalk. Ch.: Mary b. 1666; Thomas, b. 1670; Hannah, b. 1676; Esther b. 1679; Abigail, b. 1682, and Elizabeth.

6. Dea. JOHN, son of Tho. (4.) m. Phebe, dau. of John Gregory, of Norwalk, Nov. 11, 1670, and d. at the age of 89. His wife d. 1749. Ch.: I. Sarah; II. Phebe, b. 1673; III. John, b. 1676; IV. Jonathan; V. Benjamin, settled at Ridgefield, about 1720, was deacon and selectman; VI. Joseph, settled at Ridgefield; VII. James, b. 1685, settled at Ridgefield; VIII. Mary; IX. Thomas.

7. SAMUEL, son of Tho. (4.) m. Rebecca Andrews, of Fairfield. He purchased, with his brother James, and others, in 1685, lands in Danbury and began a settlement there. Ch.: Joanna, b. Oct. 22, 1673; Samuel, b. March, 1675; Thomas, b. March 27, 1679; Rebecca, Esther, Nathaniel and Abraham (?)

8. JAMES, son of Tho. (4.) m. Sarah Gregory, of Norwalk, May 10, 1676, and settled at Danbury. Ch.: Sarah, b. June 16, 1677; Rebecca, Phebe, James, John, Thomas and Elizabeth.

9. DANIEL, son of Tho. (4.) m. Mary Marvin of Norwalk, settled at Danbury. Ch.: Mary, Daniel, Mercy and Hannah.

10. THOMAS, son of Tho. (5.) m. Rachel, dau. of Mr. Samuel Smith of Norwalk. Ch.: I. Mary, m. Daniel St. John, of Norwalk; II. Thomas, m. Deborah, dau. of Jonathan Waters, Esq., of Jamaica; III. Samuel; IV. Daniel; V. Rachel, m. Eliasaph, son of Danl. Kellogg of Norwalk; VI. Nehemiah; VII. Sarah, m. Daniel Hayt, of Norwalk.

11. JOHN, son of Dea. John, (6.) had John, Matthew, Caleb, Nathaniel, Annah and Phebe.

12. JOSEPH, son of Dea. John, (6.) had Joseph, Gideon, Anna, Pitman, Jonathan, Mary, Ezra and John.

13. BENJAMIN, son of Dea. John, (6.) had Benjamin, Timothy, John, Samuel, Daniel, Amos, Elizabeth, Mary, Rachel and Thankful.







14. JAMES, son of Dea. John, (6,) had Sarah, Ruth, Peter, Hannah, Phebe, James, Martha, John and Thomas.

15. THOMAS, son of Dea. John, (6,) had Ebenezer, David, John, Thomas, Betty and Seth.

16. SAMUEL, son of Thomas, (10,) m. Jemima, dau. of John Kesler, of Norwalk. Ch.: Jemima, Samuel, Mary, Daniel, Stephen, Sarah, Abigail, Esther and Rachel.

17. DANIEL, son of Samuel, (16,) m. Sarah Hickox. He lived in Danbury. Ch.: Samuel, Daniel, Amos, Noah, b. 1737, Aaron, b. Jan. 17, 1745, Ruth, Sarah and Mary.

18. Rev. NOAH, son of Daniel, (17,) graduated at Nassau Hall, in 1757, was ordained pastor of the First Congregational Church in Woodbury, Oct. 22, 1760, and died in 1813. Ch.: I. Ruth, m. Hon. Nathaniel Smith; II. Hon. Noah B., b. April 2, 1771, was an eminent lawyer; III. Gen. Thomas.

19. AARON, son of Daniel, (17,) m. Esther Trowbridge,\* of Danbury, Dec. 13, 1769; removed to Waterbury the same year, and settled in the east part of what is now the town of Middlebury; became a leading man in the town; was active in the Revolutionary war; represented the town in the Legislature, and was a member of the Constitutional Convention. He d. Dec. 16, 1841, aged 97. His wife d. March 16, 1833. Ch.: I. Rebecca, b. Aug. 31, 1772, m. Eli Clark of Waterbury, and had Joseph, Polly, Maria, Harriet, Edward, Eli B., Timothy, James; II. Daniel, b. Jan. 17, 1774, d. Nov. 5, 1781; III. Polly, b. April 24, 1777, m. Asa Lyman, and had Elizabeth, Mary Ann, Caroline, Louisa, Theodore and Dwight; IV. Amos, (see p. 370,) b. July 6, 1780, m. Ann Stone, of Litchfield. Ch.: Harriet Ann, Amelia C. and George Amos; V. Sally, b. Aug. 22, 1782, is unmarried, and lives on the old homestead, in Middlebury; VI. Aaron, b. Aug. 9, 1785; VII. A son, b. March 16, 1788, died April 25, 1788; VII. Esther, b. Aug. 11, 1789, m. Dr. Jacob Linsley, of Middlebury; is a widow and lives in Waterbury.

20. AARON,† son of Aaron, (19,) m. Charlotte Porter, of Waterbury Sept. 1808. Ch.: I. Charlotte Ann, b. March 27, 1810, m. Scovill M. Buckingham, May 18, 1835; II. Frances Jennette, b. Nov. 22, 1812, d. Feb. 13, 1830; III. George W., b. Nov. 26, 1814, m. Caroline R., dau. of Austin Steele, of Waterbury, Feb. 8, 1838. Ch.: Mary Caroline, Frances Jennette, George Henry, Aaron Austin, and Clara Louisa; IV. Charles, b. Sept. 23, 1817, m. Cornelia M. Johnson, of Waterbury, Oct.

\* She was a descendant of William Trowbridge, of New Haven, who was a son of Thomas Trowbridge, the progenitor of all of the name in this country.

† See p. 448.

1, 1845. Ch.: Amelia Caroline, Charlotte Buckingham, and Cornelia Johnson; V. Mary Lyman, Sept. 24, 1819, m. John S. Mitchell, of New Haven, Jan. 3, 1838, and had Charles B., b. 1840, d. 1854.

#### BLAKESLEE.\*

1. THOMAS BLAKESLEY first appeared at Hartford about 1641. He took the oath of fidelity at New Haven in 1644, but was at Branford in 1645, where he lived some years. He removed thence to Guilford, and died at Boston in 1674, leaving a wife, Susanna, and ch. as follows: Aaron, Moses, Miriam, wife of Samuel Pond, and Abigail, wife of — Ball.

2. SAMUEL,† probably a brother of Thomas, (1,) and ancestor of the Blakeslees who settled early at Woodbury, Waterbury, &c., was a planter at Guilford in 1650, and m. Dec. 3, the same year, Hannah, dau. of William Potter of New Haven, to which place he removed, and d. in 1672, leaving four ch., viz: John, Mary, Samuel and Ebenezer. The births of his ch., as found on record, were: I. John, b. Oct. 22, 1651; II. a son who d. 1672; III. Hannah, b. Oct. 22, 1657, d. 1669; IV. Mary, Nov. 2, 1659; V. Samuel, April 8, 1662; VI. Ebenezer, b. July 17, 1664; VII. Hannah, May 22, 1666; VIII. Jonathan, March 3, 1669, d. 1669.

3. JOHN, son of Samuel, (2,) lived at New Haven, and d. in 1713. He had by his wife, Grace: I. John, b. July 15, 1676, d. 1723, leaving a family; II. Hannah or Anna, b. Aug. 6, 1681, m. Moses Sperry, Jan. 1, 1705; III. Moses, settled in Waterbury.

4. SAMUEL, son of Samuel, (2,) settled at West Haven, m. Nov. 20, 1684, Sarah Kimberly, and removed to Woodbury. The first six of his ch. were bap. at Woodbury, Aug. 1697. The births of his ch. recorded at New Haven are as follows: I. Samuel, b. Jan. 28, 1685, settled in Woodbury, (Roxbury soc.); II. Miriam, b. May 2, 1688; III. Jonathan, b. Jan. 6, 1690–91; IV. Sarah, b. Sept. 1692; V. Anna, b. Dec. 2, 1694; VI. Mary, b. Sept. 6, 1696; VII. James, b. April 27, 1699, settled in Waterbury; VIII. Mehitable, b. Aug. 31, 1702; IX. Tilly, b. March 18, 1705, settled in Woodbury, (Roxbury soc.) He m. Mary Brown of New Haven, Feb. 7, 1728–9.

\* This name, on the early records, is written in twenty-five or more different ways. It is now generally spelled as above.

† There is a tradition among his descendants, that two brothers of the name of Blakeslee came from the west of England, designing to settle in the Plymouth Colony, and that one of them died on the passage. The other came to Plymouth, where he died in the early days of the Colony, leaving one son, who was placed with a blacksmith in New Haven, Conn., to learn the trade. It is also asserted that the brothers brought an anvil with them, and that it was seen but a few years since in Roxbury, Conn.

5. EBENEZER, son of Samuel, (2,) d. Sept. 24, 1725. His ch. were : I. Ebenezer and II. Hannah, (twins,) b. Feb. 4, 1685 ; III. Susannah, b. May 21, 1689 ; IV. Grace, b. Jan. 1, 1693-4, m. Ebenezer Humberston, Oct. 13, 1718 ; V. Abraham, b. Dec. 15, 1695 ; VI. Isaac, b. July 21, 1703.

6. Deacon MOSES, son of John, (3,) m. Sarah Benton of Hartford, Jan. 1, 1702. He removed to Waterbury about 1739, and settled on land previously (about 1722) laid out to him, on what is now called Town Hill, in the east part of the present town of Plymouth. His house stood near the residence of the late Oliver Stoughton. He was appointed deacon of the church at the time of its organization in 1740, in which he was an active and influential member, as he also was in the society and town. His ch. as recorded at New Haven were : I. Moses, b. Sept. 2, 1702, d. 1728 ; II. Aaron, b. April 25, 1704, d. young ; III. Abner, b. Jan. 25, 1705, d. 1726 ; IV. Sarah, b. March 31, 1708 ; V. Jesse, b. March 30, 1710, had a family in New Haven ; VI. Dinah, b. Jan. 21, 1711-12 ; VII. Job, b. Dec. 8, 1713 ; VIII. Job, Dec. 18, 1714 ; IX. Aaron, Feb. 18, 1716-17, remained at New Haven, had a family ; X. Hannah, b. March 25, 1718-19 ; XI. Phebe, b. March 12, 1721-2, m. Henry Cook, Aug. 30, 1744 ; XII. John, b. Dec. 15, 1723, settled in Waterbury, Northbury soc. ; XIII. Marah, b. Jan. 29, 1726-27, m. Benjamin Upson, May 30, 1743 ; XIV. Moses, b. Jan. 25, 1728-29, settled in Waterbury.

7. JAMES, son of Samuel, (4,) settled in Waterbury, m. Thankful, dau. of Sergt. Stephen Upson of Waterbury, Sept. 15, 1724, and d. Jan. 12, 1784. His ch. were : I. Reuben, b. Jan. 18, 1726, m. Rhoda —, and d. Jan. 4, 1813. Ch. : Reuben, b. 1763 ; Mehitable, b. 1765 ; Louis Anna, b. 1768 ; Rhoda, b. 1771 ; Samuel, b. 1773 ; James, b. 1775, and Griswold, b. 1777. II. Tilly, b. June 10, 1728, and had Archibald, b. 1752, and Thankful, b. 1755. III. Mehitable, b. Aug. 12, 1732. IV. James, b. Feb. 5, 1735.

8. JOHN, son of Moses, (6,) settled near his father, m. Olive, dau. of Samuel Curtis, March 14, 1745. Ch. : I. John, b. March 3, 1746 ; II. Amasa, b. Jan. 15, 1748, m. Esther Barker, and had Miles, b. 1772, Lyman, b. 1774, Eneas, b. 1776. He settled in Plymouth. III. Joel, b. Aug. 19, 1750, m. and settled in Plymouth. He had Linus, Ransom, Betsey, Erastus and Amanda ; all dead except Ransom and Betsey. IV. Enos, b. July 12, 1752 ; V. Obed, b. Aug. 29, 1754 ; VI. Olive, b. March 29, 1758, m. Elnathan Ives ; VII. Lettis, b. 1760, d. 1761 ; VIII. Lettis, b. May 27, 1763, m. Ira Pond ; IX. Jared, b. July 8, 1765. He is living and has a family in Plymouth ; X. Sally, b. Aug. 20, 1768, m. Stephen Seymour ; XI. Curtis, b. Feb. 16, 1770, d. young

9. MOSES, son of Moses, (6,) m. Dec. 24, 1753, Hannah Dunbar of Wallingford, and had : I. Asa, b. Sept. 30, 1754 ; II. Caleb, b. Oct. 22, 1756, d. 1757 ; III. A daughter, b. April 1, 1758 ; IV. Moses, b. May 12, 1760.

10. I have not been able to find the connection of the following with the preceding. I presume, however, they are descended from Samuel, (2.) Capt. THOMAS B., son of Ebenezer of New Haven, settled in Waterbury. His first four ch. are recorded at New Haven, the others at Waterbury. He was the first captain in Northbury society. He d. Jan. 2, 1778, and his wid. Mary d. April, 1792. Ch. : I. David, b. Nov. 2, 1722 ; II. Reuben, b. March 9, 1724-5 ; III. Moses, b. June 30, 1727 ; IV. Mary, b. Sept. 7, 1729, d. 1750 ; V. Submit, b. 1731, d. 1750 ; VI. Experience, b. Jan. 3, 1734-5 ; VII. Lydia, July 6, 1737, m. Stephen Blakeslee, Jan. 1757 ; VIII. Esther, b. Aug. 6, 1739 ; IX. Abigail, b. Dec. 22, 1741.

11. DAVID, son of Capt. Thomas, (10,) m. Nov. 29, 1743, Phebe Todd of New Haven, who d. Oct. 4, 1744. He m. 2d, Abigail, dau. of Jonathan How, May 18, 1752, who d. May 6, 1799. Ch. : I. Thomas, b. Sept. 17, 1744, m. Lydia Bradley, Aug. 14, 1764, and had Aseneth, b. March 28, 1765 ; Bethiah, b. March 30, 1767 ; Chloe, b. Feb. 13, 1769 ; Mabel, b. March 31, 1771 ; II. Eli, b. March 22, 1753, m. L. Curtis, Oct. 31, 1773, and had Prue, b. June 25, 1775, and Orpha, b. Nov. 3, 1776 ; III. Asa, b. May 23, 1756 ; IV. Phebe, b. June 14, 1758 ; V. Ede, b. Oct. 21, 1760, d. 1771 ; VI. Bede, b. Nov. 9, 1762 ; VII. Adna, b. Jan. 31, 1765 ; VIII. David, b. July 22, 1771.

12. REUBEN, son of Capt. Thomas, (10,) m. Mary, dau. of Barnabas Ford, Sept. 19, 1748. Ch. : I. Ruth, b. Feb. 4, 1749 ; II. Submit, b. Feb. 14, 1751 ; III. Silas, b. Nov. 30, 1752 ; IV. Enos, b. May 11, 1755 ; V. Lois, b. Oct. 30, 1757 ; VI. Eunice, b. Feb. 14, 1760.

13. MOSES, son of Capt. Thomas, (10,) m. Nov. 17, 1746, Mehitable, dau. of Gideon Allen. Ch. : I. Hezekiah, b. Jan 27, 1748 ; II. Keziah, b. Sept. 20, 1749, d. in 1755 ; III. Amos, b. Jan. 10, 1752, d. 1755 ; IV. Mary, b. Feb. 20, 1754 ; V. Keziah, b. May 21, 1756 ; VI. Rachel, March 31, 1758 ; VII. Vodice, b. July 4, 1760, d. 1760 ; VIII. Vodice, b. Sept. 8, 1761 ; IX. Amos, b. Nov. 26, 1763 ; X. Zuar, b. Feb. 1766 ; XI. Grace, b. July 21, 1768.

14. JACOB BLAKESLEE had the following ch., four of whom are recorded at New Haven. He removed to Waterbury, where his two last ch. are recorded. He d. March 25, 1767. Ch. : I. Abner, b. May 15, 1731 ; II. Anna, b. Oct. 6, 1733 ; III. Gad, b. Dec. 13, 1735 ; IV. Asher, b. May 23, 1738 ; V. Noah, b. Dec. 13, 1740 ; VI. Sarah, b. Aug. 19, 1743.

15. **ABNER**, son of Jacob, (14.) m. Thankful, dau. of Samuel Peck, Sept. 25, 1755, and had : I. Samuel, b. Nov. 22, 1756 ; II. Jacob, b. Sept. 14, 1758 ; III. A son, b. Sept. 4, 1761, d. young ; IV. Clement, b. June 30, 1763 ; V. Micajah, b. April 22, 1766 ; VI. Ziba, b. July 9, 1768 ; VII. Abner, b. May 21, 1771.

16. **ASHER**, son of Jacob, (14.) m. Oct. 26, 1762, Mary, dau. of John Humaston of Litchfield, and d. May 3, 1814. Ch. : I. Selah, b. Jan. 30, 1764 ; II. Salmon, b. Jan. 30, 1766 ; III. Anna, b. Nov. 15, 1767 ; IV. Gad, b. Jan. 10, 1770 ; V. Asher, b. Nov. 17, 1771.

## BRONSON.

1. **JOHN BRONSON** of Hartford and Farmington, had ch. : Jacob, John, Isaac, Abraham, Mary, Dorcas and Sarah. (See p. 137.)

2. **JACOB**, son of John, (1.) had Samuel, Jacob, of Kensington, Roger, of New Milford, Isaac, of Lyme, Elizabeth and Rebecca.

3. **JOHN**, son of John, (1.) was one of the first settlers of Waterbury. Ch. : John, Sarah, Dorothy, Ebenezer, William, Moses and Grace. (See p. 138.)

4. **Serj. ISAAC**, son of John, (1.) had, I. Isaac ; II. John ; III. Samuel ; IV. Mary ; V. Joseph ; VI. Thomas ; VII. Ebenezer ; VIII. Sarah ; IX. Mercy. (See p. 140, and Cothren's Woodbury, p. 505.)

5. **MOSES**, son of John, (3.) had ch. : I. Eunice, b. Dec. 23, 1714, m. Eliakim Welton ; II. Sarah, b. Sept. 2, 1717, m. John Warner ; III. Nathan, b. Sept. 5, 1719, m. — Williams, went to Alford ; IV. Martha, b. June 14, 1721, m. — Hill ; V. Elnathan, b. Oct. 2, 1723, m. Rachel Hill ; VI. Charity, and VII. Commfort, twins, b. Mar. 29, 1726. Comfort, m. — Martin ; VIII. Esther, b. Feb. 6, 1728, m. — Peck ; IX. Jerusha, b. Feb. 9, 1730, m. Thomas Williams ; X. Jemima, b. May 25, 1732 ; XI. William, b. May 30, 1734, went to Alford, Mass ; XII. Moses, b. June 19, 1736 ; XIII. Naomi, b. March 28, 1739, m. Jonathan Hughes.

6. **ISAAC**, son of Isaac, (4.) had ch. : I. Jerusha, b. Nov. 8, 1703, m. Paul Welch of New Milford ; II. Isaac, b. Mar. 29, 1707 ; III. Anna, b. Aug. 23, 1709, m. 1st, Daniel How, 2d, Isaac Tuttle ; IV. Josiah, b. June, 1713 ; V. Mary, b. May 29, 1716, m. James Hine of New Milford ; VI. Nathan, b. May, 1719, d. 1722 ; VII. James, b. Oct. 27, 1721, d. 1725 ; VIII. Patience, b. April 14, 1725 ; IX. James, b. Oct. 22, 1727.

7. **Lt. JOHN**, son of Isaac, (4.) had ch. : I. Mary, b. April 9, 1698, m. 1st, Samuel Porter, 2d, John Barnes, and d. 1774 ; II. John, b. April 23, 1701 ; III. Hannah, b. Oct. 13, 1704, m. Nathan Gaylord, lived in New Milford ; IV. Jemima, b. Aug. 27, 1706, m. Stephen Hopkins ; V.

Joseph, b. July 15, 1709; VI. Benjamin, b. Oct. 2, 1711; VII. Tamer, b. March 14, 1730, m. Joseph Nichols; VIII. Ezra, b. April 24, 1732; IX. Phebe, b. March 23, 1734, m. Nathaniel Richardson.

8. Lt. THOMAS, son of Isaac, (4,) had ch.: I. Thomas, b. Jan. 5, 1710-11; II. Stephen, b. Nov. 25, 1712, d. Dec. 30, 1712; III. Elizabeth, b. April 8, 1714, d. 1715; IV. Elizabeth, b. April 24, 1716, m. Ebenezer Warner.

9. EBENEZER, son of Isaac, (4,) had ch.: I. Susanna, b. Ap. 29, 1718, m. William Adams; II. Andrew, b. Nov. 23, 1720; III. Mary, b. Oct. 1723, m. Jonathan Baldwin and d. May 17, 1821; IV. Samuel, b. Mar. 16, 1726, d. 1726; V. Ebenezer, b. Oct. 9, 1730, d. 1730; VI. Thankful, b. Oct. 15, 1733, d. 1750; VII. Ebenezer, b. Feb. 1, 1738.

10. ELNATHAN, son of Moses, (5,) m. wid. Rachel Hill of New Fairfield, Dec. 26, 1744. He had ch.: I. Jesse, b. Sept. 11, 1745; II. Esther, b. Sept. 22, 1747; III. Jerusha, b. Jan. 15, 1749-50; IV. Hannah, b. Feb. 29, 1751-2; V. Joseph, b. Dec. 3, 1753.

11. NATHAN, son of Moses, (5,) m. Obedience, dau. of Thomas Williams, Feb. 22, 1749-50. She d. March 13, 1753, and he m. 2d, wid. Abigail Lewis, June 29, 1769, who d. Nov. 17, 1800. Ch.: I. Reuben, b. Nov. 28, 1750; II. a dau. b. Feb. 17, 1753.

12. ISAAC, son of Isaac, (6,) m. Eunice, dau. of Thomas Richards, July 3, 1734, who d. Sept. 6, 1749, and he m. Abigail, wid. of Caleb Munson, Nov. 22, 1750, and d. Dec. 7, 1799, a. 93. His ch. were, I. Lois, b. Jan. 26, 1735, m. Isaac Prichard of Waterbury, d. 1824; II. Isaac, b. Oct. 2, 1736; III. Hannah, b. Jan. 31, 1738-9, m. Timothy Clark, d. 1815; IV. Lydia, b. June 29, 1741, d. Sept. 1749; V. Eli, b. June 30, 1743; VI. Patience, b. Dec. 12, 1746, d. Sep. 6, 1749; VII. Seth, b. Dec. 7, 1748; VIII. Titus, b. Oct. 15, 1751; IX. Abigail, b. Aug. 12, 1753, m. Ambrose Hickox.

13. Lt. JOSIAH, son of Isaac, (6,) m. Dinah, dau. of John Sutliff, July 23, 1735. She d. Sept. 10, 1736, and he m. Sarah, wid. of David Leavenworth of Woodbury, May 15, 1740, who d. Aug. 28, 1767, and he m. 3d, Rebecca, wid. of Moses Hurlbut of Woodbury, Dec. 23, 1767. She d. June 5, 1797, and he m. 4th, wid. Huldah Williams, June 12, 1798. He was born at Breakneck. Blest by nature with a robust constitution, a cheerful, buoyant spirit and an iron will, he was eminently fitted to grapple with the many difficulties incident to the times in which he lived. He was shrewd, calculating and social; became a lieutenant, secured wealth, and obtained an honorable position in society. With less of the puritan strictness which characterized most men of his day, he was a professor of religion, and died, at a good old

age, Feb. 20, 1804. His ch. were, I. Lucy, b. Sept. 10, 1736, m. James Porter of Middlebury; II. David, b. June 25, 1741; III. Abel, b. May 30, 1743, a physician; IV. Zuba, b. April 28, 1745, m. Abner Munson; V. Ruben, b. June 5, 1747; VI. Thaddeus, b. July 22, 1749; VII. Josiah, b. Feb. 1, 1751-2; VIII. Elijah, b. May 15, 1755.

14. JAMES, son of Isaac, (6,) m. Sarah, dau. of Josiah Brocket of Wallingford, Aug. 22, 1750. Ch.: I. Roswell, b. Sept. 9, 1751; II. Sarah, b. Jan. 5, 1754, m. John Adams; III. Levi, b. June 12, 1757; IV. Asahel, b. Nov. 28, 1759; V. Thankful, b. Mar. 5, 1762, m. Amos Hinman; VI. Jesse, b. July 1, 1763.

15. JOHN, son of John, (7,) m. Comfort, dau. of William Baldwin of Stratford, March 28, 1728. He lived at Jerico, on the Naugatuck, in Northbury, till 1759, when he removed to Nine Partners, N. Y., and became a Baptist deacon. Ch.: I. Rhoda, b. March 30, 1729, m. Joshua Graves; II. Amos, b. Feb. 3, 1730-1; III. Hannah, b. March 6, 1734, m. David Foot; IV. Thankful, b. Sept. 6, 1736, m. Moses Foot of Waterbury, Aug. 12, 1756, d. Sept. 5, 1757; V. Mary, b. Feb. 25, 1738-9, m. Aaron Foot of Harwinton and Sheffield, d. Feb. 10, 1824; VI. John, b. Dec. 22, 1742; VII. Chloe, b. Dec. 29, 1745, m. Col. Barker of Nine Partners, N. Y.

16. JOSEPH, son of John, (7,) m. Anna, dau. of Rev. John Southmayd, June 1, 1732. She d. Aug. 12, 1749, and he m. 2d, Mary, dau. of Lt. Gershom Fulford, May 2, 1750, and d. Sept. 19, 1771. Ch.: I. Meliscent, b. Dec. 24, 1734, d. 1735; II. Eldad, b. July 1, 1736, d. 1749; III. Desire, b. July 9, 1738, m. Jonathan Guernsey; IV. Seba, b. Sept. 23, 1740; V. Anne, b. May 22, 1751, m. Herman Munson; VI. Bela, b. May 7, 1757. I find in addition to the preceding the births of no less than six still born children on record.

17. BENJAMIN, son of John, (7,) m. Lois, dau. of Thomas Richards, March 14, 1728, and d. Nov. 16, 1745. His wid. m. Silas Hotchkiss. Ch.: I. Hannah, b. Nov. 16, 1738, d. same month; II. Ruth, b. Sept. 30, 1739, m. Samuel Scovill; III. Chloe, b. Dec. 2, 1741, d. 1742; IV. Samuel, b. Dec. 10, 1742; V. Benjamin, b. May 8, 1746, d. Dec. 22, 1765.

18. Capt. EZRA, son of John, (7.) He was one of the honored men of his time; was town clerk, town treasurer, a representative to the Assembly, a justice of the peace, and commissary in the Revolution. He m. Susanna, dau. of Thomas Judd, Sep. 6, 1753, and d. Sept. 1, 1795. She d. Oct. 13, 1828, aged 90. Ch.: I. Lt. Michael, b. March 25, 1754; II. Hannah, b. March 26, 1757, m. Wm. Leavenworth; III. Mark, b. Aug. 4, 1762; IV. Susanna, b. March 6, 1766, m. Stephen Welton; V.



Anne, b. Dec. 26, 1770, m. Joseph Cook; VI. Meliscent, b. June 27, 1773, m. William Durand.

19. THOMAS, Esq., son of Lt. Thomas, (8.) m. Susanna, dau. of Rev. John Southmayd, Sept. 25, 1734. She d. Aug. 13, 1741. He then m. Anna, dau. of Stephen Hopkins, Esq., Jan. 9, 1746, and d. June 25, 1759. Ch.: I. Stephen, b. June 30, 1735; II. Susanna, b. Dec. 7, 1736, m. Rev. Elijah Sill; III. Daniel, b. March 8, 1739; IV. Samuel, b. June 21, 1741, d. 1741; V. David, b. Sept. 25, 1748, d. 1750; VI. Thomas, b. March 10, 1751; VII. Anne, b. Sept. 28, 1752, m. Joseph Upson; VIII. Elizabeth, b. Oct. 30, 1755; IX. Ruth, b. Feb. 23, 1759, m. Dr. Jesse Upson.

20. Dea. ANDREW, son of Ebenezer, (9.) m. Mary, dau. of Lt. John Scovill, Feb. 9, 1745-6, and d. Dec. 1799. Ch.: I. Amasa, b. June 8, 1746, d. 1752; II. Esther, b. Jan. 21, 1747-8, m. Daniel Bronson, in 1770; III. Amasa, b. April 1, 1750, d. 1753; IV. Mary, b. April 23, 1752; V. Thankful, b. Aug. 27, 1755; VI. Lucy, b. June 27, 1760, m. Samuel Porter; VII. Samuel, b. Nov. 1, 1762; VIII. Sylvia, b. Nov. 20, 1764; IX. Andrew.

21. EBENEZER, son of Ebenezer, (9.) m. Miriam, dau. of Richard Nichols, April 7, 1763, and d. May 6, 1808. His wife d. July 12, 1812. Ch.: I. Joseph, b. March 1, 1764; II. Amzi, b. April 12, 1765; III. Sarah, b. Nov. 27, 1766, d. 1767; IV. Sarah, b. Dec. 16, 1767; V. Susan, b. May 7, 1769, d. 1782; VI. Ebenezer, b. Nov. 14, 1771, m. and had five or six ch., and d. July, 1840, in the State of New York; VII. Harvey, b. Feb. 21, 1774; VIII. Clarissa, d. Aug. 26, 1778; IX. Clarinda; X. Isaac. The last three were b. April 18, 1778; XI. Susa, b. Feb. 14, 1784.

22. Capt. ISAAC, son of Isaac, (12.) He m. Mary, dau. of Josiah Brocket of Wallingford, Feb. 13, 1755, and d. April 15, 1826, aged 90. His wife d. Aug. 1, 1816. Ch.: I. Eunice, b. Dec. 4, 1755, d. in 1775; II. Mary, b. Sept. 15, 1757, m. Eblem Hill, supposed to be living in Ash-tabula Co., Ohio, at this time; III. Isaac, b. March 10, 1760, (see p. 370;) IV. Laban, b. Feb. 14, 1762, d. 1801; V. Ethel, b. July 22, 1765, (see p. 374;) VI. Chauncey, b. Dec. 31, 1767, d. 1768; VII. Hannah b. May, 1769, m. Eli Hine, Oct. 30, 1792; VIII. Sarah, b. March 21, 1775; IX. Virtue, b. March 22, 1778, m. Nancy Carrington, d. 1815 or 1816, in Ontario Co., N. Y.

23. ELI, son of Isaac, (12.) m. Mehitable, dau. of Capt. Enos At-water of Wallingford, March 4, 1773, and d. Sept. 30, 1816. Ch.: I. Enos, b. March 31, 1774, (see p. 384.) II. Mehitable, b. Nov. 29, 1775, d. 1777; III. Mehitable, b. May 7, 1778, m. Eli Thompson; IV. Diantha,

b. April 11, 1780, m. Amos Curtiss; V. Capt. Philo, b. May 15, 1782, m. Chloe, dau. of Major Samuel Bronson. He was a deacon, a frequent representative to the Legislature, and most excellent man, and d. at Geneva, N. Y., Nov. 29, 1855; VI. A son, b. Oct. 31, 1784, d. young.

24. Dea. SETH, son of Isaac, (12,) m. Chloe, dau. of George Prichard, Nov. 27, 1770, and d. Oct. 11, 1828. His wid. d. Jan. 16, 1805. Ch.: I. Anna, b. Jan. 19, 1773, m. — Kelsey of Jefferson Co., N. Y.; II. Chloe, b. Dec. 28, 1777, m. David Tyler of Middlebury, went to Rutland, N. Y., and still lives; III. Jonas, b. Sept. 25, 1779, m. Melinda Baldwin, is deacon of a Congregational church, and now lives in Rutland, Jefferson Co., N. Y.; IV. Marcus, b. Sept. 8, 1781, m. Rebecca Thompson, and is now living in Middlebury; V. Asa. (†)

25. TRUS, son of Isaac, (12,) m. Hannah, dau. of Moses Cook, Feb. 11, 1779. Ch.: I. Jairus, b. Dec. 9, 1779, m. Irene Mallory of Woodbury, Jan. 11, 1804, is now living in Talmadge, Ohio. Ch.: Charles C., Butler, Zuria, Bennet, Maria, Cornelia and Harriet. II. Horace, b. Feb. 15, 1782, m. Charry Thompson, is now living in Middlebury. Ch.: Alfred H., Horace C., John T., Eliza, Mary, Caroline, Sarah and Joseph. III. Augustus, b. June 24, 1784, m. Nancy Bradley, d. in Ohio, 1838; IV. Esther, b. Oct. 19, 1786, m. John Hine, is a widow, lives in New Haven. Ch.: Harriet and Mary. V. Titus, b. Nov. 27, 1788, m. Sally Richardson, d. in 1853. He was a pioneer settler at Ann Arbor and Kalamazoo, Mich., and Davenport, Iowa, d. Jan. 1853, while on a visit to his native place, Middlebury. VI. Hannah, b. April 18, 1791, d. in 1851. VII. Sally, b. Sept. 13, 1794, m. A. Benham, and is now living in Middlebury; Ch.: William, John, Enos, Sarah and Franklin. VIII. Leonard, b. June 24, 1797, m. Nancy Richardson, wid. of M. Platt. Ch.: Julia Maria, b. Jan. 12, 1820, d. Sept. 1841, Geo. F., b. Jan. 21, 1821, Catharine, d. young, Isaac R., b. May 22, 1826, and Edward L.

26. DAVID, son of Lt. Josiah, (13,) m. Anna, dau. of Daniel Porter, March 1, 1772, and d. July 23, 1799. His wid. d. Nov. 16, 1814. Ch.: I. Hannah, b. Nov. 10, 1774, m. E. Stone; II. David, b. Feb. 3, 1777; III. Anna, b. Nov. 3, 1778, m. Zerah Brown.

27. Doct. ABEL, son of Lt. Josiah, (13,) m. Lydia Benham, Dec. 15, 1768, who d. June 6, 1782. He m. 2d, Esther Hawkins, Oct. 24, 1784, and d. Aug. 2, 1805. Ch.: I. Sarah, b. June 2, 1871, d. young; II. Abel, b. Oct. 1, 1775; III. A son, b. Feb. 2, 1786, d. next day; IV. Lydia, b. March 21, 1787, m. Col. E. Judd; V. Elvira, b. Aug. 1789, m. Joseph Hall; VI. Sarah, b. April 1, 1791, m. Eben Abbott; VII. Joseph Perry, b. Sept. 25, 1794, is living in Watertown; VIII. Homer, b. March 20, 1796, now living in Egremont, Mass.

28. REUBEN, son of Lt. Josiah, (13,) m. Jemima, dau. of Lt. Samuel Porter, Nov. 1, 1770. Ch.: I. Edmund, b. July, 1772, d. 1774; II. Samuel, b. Sept. 1774.

29. THADDEUS, son of Lt. Josiah, (13,) m. Abigail Wilmot, Dec. 10, 1772, who d. May 25, 1793, and he m. 2d, Anne Hitchcock, Jan. 5, 1794, and d. March 2, 1825. Ch.: I. Abigail, b. June 1, 1773, m. D. Prichard; II. Uri, b. May 30, 1778, m. Anna Atwood, Dec. 5, 1799; III. Olive, b. March 17, 1779, m. David Howe; IV. Lucy, b. March 21, 1781, m. Amasa Gaylord; V. Jerusha, b. May 21, 1784, m. Sherman Curtis; VI. Jared, b. June 18, 1791, lives in Middlebury; VII. Ruth, b. May 17, 1793, m. Stephen Atwood of Woodbury.

30. JOSIAH, son of Lt. Josiah, (13,) m. Tabitha, dau. of Ezekiel Tuttle, Jan. 20, 1780. Ch.: I. Truman, b. Jan. 5, 1781, d. in Ohio; II. Alvin, b. May 19, 1783, (see p. 450;) III. Josiah, b. Sep. 19, 1786, lives at Onondaga, N. Y.; IV. Edward, b. Sep. 1, 1789, resides at Cleveland, Ohio; V. Nancy, b. Feb. 27, 1793, lives at Onondaga, N. Y.

31. ELIJAH, son of Lt. Josiah, (13,) m. Lois, dau. of Stephen Bunnell of Wallingford, March 10, 1778. Ch.: I. Giles, b. Feb. 13, 1780, d. leaving one son and two daus.; II. Irene, b. May 28, 1782, m. Roswell Hull of Killingworth, resides there, has four sons, and two daus.; III. Sabra, b. March 9, 1784, m. Jonathan Blake of Winchester, resides there, has one son and two daus.; IV. Selah, b. Feb. 26, 1786, d. at Oswego, N. Y., had one son and one dau.; V. Silas, b. Feb. 15, 1788, resides in the city of New York. His father (a Middlebury farmer) having a large family, it became necessary for the children, at an early age, to look out for their own support. Silas had only a limited common school education, and for four years followed the trade of a carpenter and joiner. Not satisfied with his future prospects, he resolved to try his fortune in the State of Georgia, where he followed the mercantile business for fifteen years. In the year 1830, he removed to the city of New York, and commenced the business of an importing and jobbing dry goods merchant. In 1835, he suffered severely from the memorable fire of that year. But by great energy and perseverance, he soon overcame his losses. As his business increased, his health becoming somewhat impaired, he gave up his dry goods business, and has for the last few years devoted himself to a commission business, which he still continues. He is unmarried. VI. Elijah, b. Jan. 1, 1794, resides in Tenn., has five sons and two daus.; VII. Amos, b. Nov. 23, 1795, resides in Tenn., has one son and one dau.; VIII. Polly, b. Dec. 3, 1797, m. Henry S. Wheeler, lives in Middlebury.

32. ROSWELL, son of James, (14,) m. Susanna, dau. of William

Adams, Nov. 25, 1773. Ch.: I. Benoni, b. Sept. 25, 1774, d. 1777; II. Roswell, b. Jan. 26, 1777, lives in Clinton, N. Y.; III. Mille, b. Feb. 2, 1779, d. Aug. 1826; IV. Nancy, m. Stephen Stone, d. 1828; V. Garry, b. 1791, m. Maria Richardson, d. in 1841.

33. ASAHEL, Esq., son of James, (14,) lived in Middlebury, m. Esther, dau. of Stephen Upson, Feb. 12, 1784, d. April 22, 1850. Ch.: I. Sally, b. Dec. 1, 1784, m. Daniel Tyler of Middlebury; II. William, b. May 27, 1787, m. Almira Tyler, dau. of Roswell, d. Sept. 1856; III. James, d. June, 1816; IV. Doct. Tracy, lives in Newton, Ohio; V. and VI. Almy and Amy; Almy m. Lyman Camp of Middlebury, Amy d. young; VII. and VIII. Asahel and Esther, b. 1800; Asahel d. young, Esther d. 1826.

34. JESSE, son of James, (14,) m. Esther, dau. of Nathan Osborn of Woodbury, Sept. 30, 1784. Ch.: I. Benoni, b. March 1, 1786; II. Marshal, b. Nov. 22, 1787; III. Alvari, (dau.) b. Aug. 30, 1789; IV. Leman, b. Jan. 15, 1792.

35. Capt. AMOS, son of John, (15,) m. Anna, dau. of Jacob Blakeslee, June 3, 1751, and settled on the homestead at Jerico, which was given him by his father in 1759. He was a prominent man in Northbury, now Plymouth, and d. Sept. 2, 1819. Ch.: I. Lucy, b. Nov. 1, 1752, m. Isaac Barnes, d. at Camden, N. Y.; II. Phebe, b. March 30, 1754, m. 1st, — Seymour, 2d, Stephen Sanford, and d. at Medina, Ohio, in 1835; III. Tamer, b. Feb. 1, 1756, d. 1757; IV. Zerah, b. Jan. 22, 1758, m. Aaron Welton, and d. at Medina, Ohio, in 1836; V. Sylvia, b. Feb. 3, 1760, d. April, 1776; VI. Tillotson, b. Jan. 8, 1762, (see p. 376;) VII. Noah, b. Aug. 6, 1764, d. 1766; VIII. Noah M., b. July 15, 1767, m. Betsey Ives of Plymouth, lives at Medina, Ohio, to which place he removed in 1815, and became one of the original settlers and proprietors. He has been a judge of one of the Ohio courts. IX. Amos, b. Sept. 3, 1769, m. Hannah Thomas, d. at Springville, Pa., in 1825; X. Anna, b. Jan. 20, 1773, m. Joseph Chatfield Alcox of Wolcott; XI. Sarah, b. Nov. 3, 1774, m. 1st, Solomon Barker, 2d, Darius Orton, and 3d, Wm. Wiatt, and d. at Medina, Ohio, Sept. 18, 1855; XII. Sylvia, b. Nov. 22, 1776, m. Medad Alcox of Wolcott.

36. SEBA, son of Joseph, (16,) m. Mary, dau. of Abraham Hickox, July 5, 1764. They both d. in Ohio, in 1816. Ch.: I. Levi, b. July 24, 1765, m. Sarah Prindle, May 23, 1783, and had ten ch.; II. Olive, b. July 3, 1766; III. Ager, b. Jan. 1, 1768, m. Clarissa, dau. of Michael Bronson, d. Dec. 11, 1825; IV. Joseph, b. June 3, 1769; V. Anna, b. Feb. 5, 1771; VI. Seba, b. Sept. 26, 1772; VII. Herman, b. Dec. 18, 1774; VIII. Thomas G., b. April 19, 1776; IX. Abraham, b. April

11, 1778; X. Mary, b. March 13, 1780, m. Ard Welton; XI. Bela, b. April 3, 1782; XII.—b. 1784; XIII and XIV. Southmayd and Daniel, b. Sept. 3, 1786. Southmayd d. April 23, 1814.

37. Maj. SAMUEL, son of Benjamin, (17.) m. Temperance Spencer, May 30, 1776, who d. July 31, 1785, and he m. Huldah Williams, Dec. 1786, and d. July 21, 1813. Ch: I. Benjamin, b. March 19, 1777; II. Samuel, b. March 31, 1779; III. Chloe, b. Aug. 5, 1781, m. Philo Bronson; IV. Temperance, b. March 18, 1784; V. Isaac, b. Aug. 18, 1787, d. 1787; VI. Sally, b. Oct. 14, 1791, d. 1798; VII. Isaac, b. Sept. 11, 1793; VIII. William, b. June 27, 1795, d. 1795; IX. John, b. Dec. 29, 1796; X. Ezra R., b. Oct. 19, 1801, d. 1805.

38. Lt. MICHAEL, son of Capt. Ezra, (18.) m. Eunice, dau. of Joseph Nichols, July 5, 1776, and d. July 25, 1822. His widow d. 1841. Ch: I. Clarissa, b. Sept. 30, 1776, m. A. Bronson; II. Horatio Gates, b. Oct. 2, 1777, d. Oct. 23, 1825; III. Hannah, b. Feb. 12, 1780, m. Joel Scott; IV. Ezra, b. Dec. 6, 1783.

39. MARK, son of Capt. Ezra, (18.) m. Esther, dau. of Joseph Hopkins, Sept. 16, 1784, and d. 1797. His widow d. Jan. 19, 1814. Ch: I. Henry, b. Aug. 4, 1787; Nancy, b. June 21, 1789, m. Cyrus Clark, Esq.; III. a dau., b. 1792, d. young; IV. Esther, b. Jan. 28, 1794, d. 1795; V. Edward.

40. Deacon STEPHEN, son of Thomas, Esq., (19.) m. Sarah, dau. of Caleb Hummaston, May 17, 1764, and d. Dec. 15, 1809. His widow Sarah d. July 27, 1822. Ch: I. Mercy, b. Dec. 17, 1764, m. John Kingsbury, Nov. 6, 1794, and d. March 21, 1813; II. Jesse, b. June 9, 1766, d. Feb. 4, 1788, unmarried; III. John, b. Aug. 14, 1768, d. Jan. 22, 1782; IV. Susanna, b. Dec. 26, 1770, d. Oct. 21, 1773; V. Content Hummaston, b. May 14, 1773, d. March 28, 1806, unmarried; VI. Bennet, b. Nov. 14, 1775, d. Dec. 11, 1850. (See p. 379.) VII. Susanna, b. April 6, 1780, m. Joseph Burton, June 23, 1805, d. July 14, 1811.

41. Deacon DANIEL, son of Thomas, Esq., (19.) m. Esther, dau. of Dea. Andrew Bronson, July 19, 1770. She d. June 24, 1719, and he d. Nov. 2, 1824. Ch: I. Leva, b. March 25, 1771, d. 1775; II. Noah, b. Sept. 9, 1773, m. Huldah, dau. of Jacob Sperry, Dec. 28, 1795. She d. 1829. He m. 2d, Chloe, dau. of Ward Peck; III. Asa, b. Nov. 8, 1775, drowned in 1780; IV. Leva, b. April 19, 1778, d. in 1800; V. Balinda, b. May 21, 1780, d. 1798; VI. and VII.—b. Nov. 9, 1782, d. the same day; VIII. Esther, b. April 25, 1784, m. William Comes; IX. Orra, b. June 3, 1786, m. Philander Porter, and d. Jan.

11, 1836; X. Asa, b. Sept. 8, 1788, m. Ruth Prindle; XI. Andrew, b. Dec. 14, 1791, d. 1792.

42. THOMAS, son of Thomas, Esq., (19,) m. Elizabeth, dau. of Capt. Samuel Hickox, Aug. 25, 1774. His wife d. March 15, 1813, and he died the next day. Ch: I. Molly, b. March 18, 1775, m. Daniel Hickox, d. March 24, 1813; II. Sally, b. 1777, d. in 1840; III. Elizabeth, m. Titus Foote of Watertown, March 12, 1804, d. Oct. 8, 1841; IV. Anne, b. 1786, m. Bela Hotchkiss, d. April 18, 1840.

43. JOSEPH, son of Ebenezer, (21,) m. Sarah, dau. of Doct. Preserved Porter, Dec. 23, 1784, and d. 1851. His wife d. Sept. 1839. Ch: I. Sarah G., b. July 21, 1785, d. 1794; II. Nancy F., b. Aug. 13, 1787; III. Lavinia, b. Sept. 9, 1789; IV. Cloe, b. Jan. 28, 1791; V. Preserved P., b. May 1, 1794.

44. AMASA, son of Ebenezer, (21,) m. Sarah, dau. of Samuel Frost, Jr., March 31, 1788. Ch: I. Lucina, b. Dec. 21, 1789; II. Billy, b. Nov. 14, 1791, d. 1794; III. Philomela, b. Jan. 21, 1794; IV. Billy A., b. June 14, 1796; V. Samuel M., b. Jan. 2, 1800; VI. Julius G., b. Dec. 21, 1801; VII. Sarah, b. Feb. 22, 1805.

45. EUGEN, son of Capt. Isaac, (22,) m. Hepzibah, dau. of Joseph Hopkins, Esq., Dec. 30, 1787. (See p. 374.) Ch: I. and II. twins, b. Sept. 11, 1790, d. same day; III. Alfred, b. Oct. 13, 1791, d. 1792; IV. Erastus, b. Feb. 18, 1793; V. Betsey, b. May 6, 1795; VI. Emma, b. Sept. 7, 1797; VII. Isaac, b. Aug. 19, 1800, d. Dec. 31, 1800; VIII. Isaac H. (See p. 375.)

46. BENNET, son of Stephen, (40,) m. Anne, dau. of Richard Smith, of Roxbury, May 11, 1801. She d. March 4, 1819, and he m. 2d, Elizabeth, dau. of Dea. Benjamin Maltby, of Branford, May, 1820. She d. June 12, 1840, and he m. 3d, Nancy, dau. of Jacob Dagget, of New Haven, May 27, 1841. He, Bennet, d. Dec. 11, 1850. (See p. 379.) Ch: I. George, b. Feb. 27, 1802, d. July 21, 1822; II. Henry, b. Jan. 30, 1804, m. June 3, 1831, Sarah Miles, dau. of Samuel Lathrop, and grand-dau. of Joseph Lathrop, D. D., of West Springfield, Mass.; III. Jesse, b. Feb. 8, 1806, d. April 14, 1831, unmarried. He was a physician in North Haven; IV. Thomas, b. June 4, 1808, d. April 20, 1851; V. Elizabeth Anne, b. March 3, 1812, d. April 6, 1845, unmarried; VI. Susanna, b. Feb. 26, 1814, d. Aug. 12, 1814; VII. Harriet Maria, b. Sept. 13, 1815, m. Dec. 8, 1841, Zina K. Murdock, of Madison, now of Meriden; VII. Rebecca Tainter, b. Feb. 10, 1822, m. Douglas F. Maltby, and d. Aug. 8, 1845; VIII. Susan, b. Jan. 19, 1824.

## BROWN.

1. FRANCIS BROWN m. Mary Edwards in England, came to this country, and settled in New Haven. He was one of the company who came to New Haven in advance of the Colony, and spent the winter of 1637 and 1638 in a hut located on what is now the corner of Church and George streets. He signed the Colony Constitution in 1639. Ch.: Lydia, John, Eleazer, Samuel and Ebenezer.

2. SAMUEL, son of Francis, (1,) m. Mercy Tuttle, May 2, 1667. Ch.: I. Abigail, b. March, 11, 1669, d. young; II. Sarai, b. Aug. 8, 1672; III. Rachel, b. April 14, 1677; IV. Francis, b. Oct. 7, 1679; V. Gideon, b. July 12, 1685; VI. Samuel, b. Oct. 29, 1699.

3. FRANCIS, son of Samuel, (2,) m. Hannah Alling, April 11, 1705. Ch.: I. John, b. May 14, 1706; II. Samuel, b. Oct. 6, 1708; III. Mehitabel, b. April 9, 1711; IV. Stephen, b. Aug. 10, 1713; V. Timothy, b. April 10, 1716.

4. STEPHEN, son of Francis, (3,) m. Mabel Bradley, Sept. 27, 1739. Ch.: I. Hannah, b. Feb. 26, 1740-41; II. Mabel, b. May 26, 1743; III. Sybil, b. Dec. 28, 1745; IV. Stephen, b. Jan. 15, 1750-51; V. Olive, b. May 28, 1756; VI. Rebekah, b. May 30, 1757; VII. Phebe, b. July 8, 1759.

5. STEPHEN, son of Stephen, (4,) settled at Windsor, m. Eunice Loomis, Nov. 1775. Ch.: I. James, b. Dec. 2, 1776; II. Stephen, b. April 30, 1778, m. Ruth M. Loomis, d. in Bloomfield, Jan. 27, 1842; III. Bradley, b. Dec. 13, 1679, d. Sept. 16, 1845, in Champion, N. Y.; IV. Eunice, b. Jan. 29, 1781, m. John Robinson, and d. in Rochester, N. Y., Feb. 1846; V. Sarah, b. Jan. 27, 1782, m. N. Parsons of Charlemont, Mass.; VI. Martha, b. Dec. 23, 1784, m. Ichabod Loomis, is living in Cheshire, Mass.; VII. Rebecca, b. Dec. 1786, is living in Bloomfield, Conn.; VIII. A son, b. Feb. 11, 1789, d. in infancy; IX. A son, b. April, 1790, d. in infancy; X. Jesse, b. May 17, 1791, now living in Paulding Co., Ohio; XI. Melinda, b. Feb. 14, 1795, m. Wm. P. Briggs, d. in Richmond, Vt., March 15, 1849; XII. Oliver, b. Dec. 23, 1798, now living in Waterbury; XIII. Mabel P., (by second wife,) b. Feb. 12, 1812, resides in Granby, Mass.

6. Col. JAMES, (see p. 387,) son of Stephen, (5,) settled in Waterbury about 1798, m. Levinia Welton, and d. July 24, 1848. Ch.: I. Philo, b. Jan. 26, 1803; II. William, b. June 16, 1804; III. Mary Ann, d. in infancy; IV. Augustus, b. Aug. 20, 1811; V. James, b. July 2, 1815.

7. OLIVER, son of Stephen, (5,) m. Lucy Hicks of Cheshire, Mass., Oct. 20, 1824, and located in Pittsfield, Mass. In May, 1836, he removed to Waterbury. Ch.: I. Henry, b. Nov. 5, 1825, d. in infancy; II. Oliver J., b. Aug. 9, 1827, m. Emily Latimer of Simsbury; III. Lucy J., b. June 2, 1830.

8. PHILO, son of James, (6,) m. Esther, dau. of Giles Ives. Ch. : I. William Henry, b. April 6, 1827, m. Ellen A. Ives of Hartford; II. Cornelia A., b. April 10, 1834, m. Theodore S. Buel.

9. WILLIAM, son of James, (6,) m. Sarah S., dau. of Judge Kingsbury, who d. May 30, 1840, and he m. 2d, Rachel Vienna, dau. of Asa Fenn of Middlebury, March 25, 1844. Ch. : I. Marcia Bronson, b. July 31, 1832, d. Dec. 14, 1851; II. Robert K., b. Dec. 6, 1833, m. Elizabeth N. Middlebrook of Bridgeport; III. Eliza Jane, b. April 1, 1836; IV. A son and a dau., b. May 1, 1840, d. in infancy; V. Frederick James, b. Sept. 30, 1855.

10. AUGUSTUS, son of James, (6,) m. Frances Elizabeth, dau. of Joseph Burton. She d. April 10, 1851, and he m. Sophia, dau. of Jacob De Groff of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., Jan. 22, 1856. Ch. : I. Charles Augustus, b. Jan. 11, 1845; II. Francis Elizabeth, b. March 23, 1848.

11. JAMES, son of James, (6,) m. Charlotte E., dau. of Oliver Todd, of Plymouth. Ch. : I. Frances Augusta, b. April 1, 1836, d. Jan. 19, 1837; II. Sarah Josephine, b. Sept. 30, 1839; III. Rosa Elizabeth, b. Nov. 25, 1849.

#### BUCKINGHAM.

1. THOMAS BUCKINGHAM came from England to Boston with Davenport, Eaton and Peter Prudden, June 26, 1637. In April, 1638, he went to New Haven, and thence to Milford in Nov. 1639. Hinman says that he, Thomas, was a Welchman, and that he died in Boston, in 1657, while there on business. He. m. first, Hannah, and second, Ann. His children were, I. Hannah, b. 1632, m. — Welch; II. Daniel, b. 1636, m. 1st, Sarah Fowler, 2d, Mrs. Alice Newton. He was a sergeant of militia, also an elder of the church at Milford. He d. May 2, 1711. His ch. were Daniel, Mary, Thomas, John, Gideon, Josiah, and perhaps others; III. Samuel, bap. June 13, 1641, m. Sarah Baldwin, Dec. 14, 1663. (See paragraph 2, and onward, for his descendants.) IV. Mary, bap. March 27, 1643; V. Rev. Thomas, bap. in 1646. Where he was educated, is not known. He was at Wethersfield and Hartford, as early as 1664, and continued some time at Hartford, where he m. Esther, dau. of Thomas Hosmer, Sept. 20, 1666. He received a call from Saybrook, where he was ordained in 1670, and continued to preach until his death, which occurred April 1, 1709. He was a fellow of Yale College. He held a high rank among the clergy of his time, and the strict Puritans of the Colony, and was one of their leaders.



2. SAMUEL, son of Thomas, (1,) m. Sarah Baldwin, Dec. 14, 1663. He resided at Milford, where he d. April 9, 1700. He had the following ch. : I. Sarah, b. Jan. 8, 1664, m. Barnabas Baldwin ; II. Mary, b. Oct. 3, 1666, d. in childhood ; III. Samuel, b. Oct. 7, 1667, d. Feb. 21, 1668 ; IV. Samuel, b. Nov. 1, 1668 ; V. Hannah, b. March 24, 1670-71 ; VI. Thomas, b. June 25, 1672, m. Mary —, d. about 1703 ; VII. Ann, b. June 17, 1674 ; VIII. Mary, b. March 13, 1676 ; IX. Hester, b. May 4, 1677, m. Richard Platt.

3. SAMUEL, son of Samuel, (2,) m. Sarah —, and d. Oct. 29, 1708. Ch : I. Thomas, b. about 1699, m. Mary Woodruff, Jan. 9, 1723 ; II. Nathaniel, b. about 1701, m. Sarah Smith, May 30, 1728 ; III. Mary, b. about 1703.

4. THOMAS, son of Samuel, (3,) m. Mary Woodruff, Jan. 9, 1723. She came to Westbury, now Watertown, with her son Thomas, and d. 1790. Their ch. were as follows : I. Mary, b. Sept. 16, 1724, m. Gideon Platt, Feb. 28, 1756 ; II. Samuel, b. Jan. 29, 1725-6, d. July 16, 1726 ; III. Thomas, b. May 19, 1727, settled in Waterbury ; IV. Epenetus, bap. Jan. 10, 1731, d. unmarried ; V. Hannah, bap. Aug. 13, 1733, m. Abner Gunn, of New Milford ; VI. Benjamin, bap. Jan. 2, 1736-7, settled in New Milford about 1760.

5. THOMAS, son of Thomas, (4,) m. Sarah Treat, removed in 1772 from Milford to Waterbury, the southwestern part of what is now called Watertown, and d. Jan. 27, 1796. His widow Sarah, d. Jan. 11, 1802. Ch. : I. Sarah, m. Gamaliel Clark ; II. Jean, m. Richard Bryan ; III. Isaac, d. young ; IV. Epenetus, m. Ann Welton ; V. Mary, m. 1st, Eli Hickox, 2d, — Bradley, and d. Sept. 7, 1837 ; VI. David, b. March 14, 1760 ; VII. Dan, m. Philena Garnsey. Mary and David remained in Watertown ; the others removed to the State of New York.

6. DAVID, son of Thomas, (5,) m. Chloe, dau. of John Merril, March 14, 1785, and d. Feb. 6, 1832. She d. Dec. 18, 1841. Ch : I. John, b. Oct. 17, 1786 ; II. Sarah, b. Feb. 16, 1790, m. William H. Merriman, son of Charles Merriman,\* of Watertown ; III. Chloe,

---

\* He, Charles, was son of Amasa and Sarah Merriman, of Wallingford, and was born Aug. 2, 1762. He enlisted into the army of the Revolution as a drummer, in 1776,—became drum-major, and served through the war. He m. May 16, 1784, Anna Punderson, of New Haven, and settled in Watertown, where he commenced the business of tailor, which he was compelled to relinquish in consequence of ill health. After having " ridden post " from New Haven to Suffield, four years, and made a voyage to the West Indies, he commenced the mercantile business in Watertown, in which he continued until 1829. He had a genial nature, and was distinguished for decision of character and stern integrity. His death occurred Aug. 26, 1829. His wife survived him, and d. at Watertown, April 1, 1844, aged 80. Their ch. were : I.

b. Dec. 13, 1798, m. Thomas B. Hickox in 1818, and removed to Ohio in 1837. Ch: Mary, (d. 1852,) Daniel, John B. and Elizabeth. IV. David, b. May 28, 1801, m. Emeline, dau. of Caleb Hickox, in 1823, who d. April 11, 1835. He d. Dec. 18, 1842, leaving a dau. Chloe E., b. Aug. 29, 1827, who m. Moses S. Beach of N. Y., Sept. 2, 1845; V. George, b. Oct. 2, 1807, m. Betsey, dau. of Levi Merriam, May 13, 1834, and removed to Ohio. Ch: George E., Mary and Sarah.

7. JOHN, son of David, (6,) m. Betsey, dau. of James Scovill, Sept. 10, 1809, and resides in Waterbury. His ch. are: I. Scovill M., b. Aug. 10, 1811, m. Charlotte Ann, dau. of Aaron Benedict, May 18, 1835, and has a son, John A., b. April 1, 1839; II. Mary, b. May 17, 1815, m. Abram, son of Doct. Ambrose Ives, Feb. 25, 1839; has a dau. Sarah C., b. March 16, 1840.

## CASTLE.

1. HENRY CASTLE emigrated from Stratford to Woodbury with the early settlers of the last named place, and d. in 1698. His descendants are somewhat numerous at Woodbury, Roxbury, Waterbury and vicinity. The First church records of Woodbury show that he had the following ch.: I. Henry; II. Samuel; III. Isaac; IV. Abigail; V. Mary; VI. Mercy; all bap. at Woodbury by Rev. Zechariah Walker, Sept. 1686; VII. William, bap. 1688.

2. HENRY, son of Henry, (1,) was a leading man in that part of Woodbury (Roxbury soc.) where he resided. He had three sons and three daughters. (See Cothren's Woodbury, p. 528.)

3. SAMUEL, son of Henry, (1,) m. and had a dau. bap. at Woodbury in 1693.

4. ISAAC, son of Henry, (1,) lived in Woodbury, and had: I. Isaac, bap. Aug. 9, 1707, settled in Waterbury; II. Samuel, bap. Aug. 9, 1707; III. Sarah, bap. March, 1708; IV. Daniel, bap. Oct. 1717; V. Israel, b. April 18, 1722.

---

Charles P., d. 1794; II. Betsey, m. Doct. Samuel Elton, a well known physician of Watertown. She is living, aged about 70; III. William H., b. Sept. 26, 1738. He m. Sarah Buckingham, as above, and settled in Watertown—was an enterprising merchant—removed to Waterbury, where he now resides. Ch: Charles B., b. Oct. 9, 1799, m. Margaret, dau. of Doct. Edward Field, and lives in Waterbury; Sarah A., b. Sept. 27, 1811, m. 1st, Thomas C. Morton, and 2d, James M. L. Scovill; Joseph P., b. Sept. 24, 1818, m. Julia, dau. of Hawkins Judd; David, b. 1816, d. 1834; Henry, b. March 25, 1820; IV. Nancy, b. 1792, d. young; V. Nancy, b. Oct. 8, 1796, m. 1st, Edward E. Porter, 2d, Rev. Dr. Holcomb, Oct. 23, 1827; VI. Charles P., b. Aug. 7, 1793,—became a merchant, removed to Savannah, Geo., and d. there, July 10, 1835; VII. Anna, b. July 7, 1801, m. Edward Hickox, and d. Aug. 19, 1842; VIII. Frederick, b. Aug. 7, 1803, also a merchant; removed to Georgia, and d. in Alabama, Nov. 1, 1836; IX. William Punderson, b. Sept. 6, 1805, also a merchant; removed to Augusta, Geo., and d. Sept. 8, 1839; X. George F., b. Aug. 5, 1808, m., has a family and is living in Watertown.

5. WILLIAM, son of Henry, (1,) lived in Woodbury, and his ch. were : I. Ann, bap. Jan. 1, 1721 ; II. Ruth, bap. June 2, 1723 ; III. John, bap. May 29, 1729 ; IV. Mercy, bap. May, 1727 ; V. Seth, bap. June, 1729 ; VI. Phineas, settled in Waterbury ; VII. Tabiatha, bap. Oct. 14, 1733.

6. ISAAC, son of Isaac, (4,) settled in Waterbury and m. Tapher, dau. of John Warner, Jan. 21, 1723. She d. July 20, 1740, and he m. Dec. 21, 1740, Lydia, dau. of Richard Scott of "Sunder Land." His ch. were : I. Asabel, b. Aug. 28, 1725 ; II. Sarah, b. Nov. 5, 1727 ; III. Mary, b. Oct. 25, 1730, m. Wm. Judd in 1752, and d. in 1777 ; IV. Lydia, b. Feb. 25, 1735 ; V. Abisha, b. Jan. 26, 1738 ; VI. Tapher, b. Oct. 3, 1741 ; VII. Elizabeth, b. April 20, 1743 ; VIII. Isaac, b. Feb. 5, 1745, d. 1760 ; IX. Mehitable, b. Sept. 5, 1747 ; X. Richard, b. Dec. 5, 1749 ; XI. Daniel, b. Feb. 16, 1752 ; XII. Amasa, b. April 6, 1755 ; XIII. Jedediah, b. July 2, 1757.

7. Capt. PHINEAS, son of William, (5,) was b. at Woodbury, March 25, 1731, and bap. May 2, 1731. He m. Mary Dickerman of Hamden, who was b. Sept. 2, 1743. He settled in Waterbury, was captain in the French and Indian war, and also served in the Revolution. He d. Sept. 25, 1815, and his wid. Mary, d. Dec. 20, 1817. Ch. : I. Mehitable, b. Jan. 24, 1768, m. Ashbel Upson and settled in Wolcott ; II. Mary, b. Feb. 24, 1770, m. Woodward Hotchkiss and settled in Prospect, (see Hotchkiss family ; ) III. Tabiatha, b. March 19, 1772, m. — Barrett, settled in Berlin, lost her husband and m. Frederick Hotchkiss of Prospect and d. in 1850 ; IV. Rhoda, b. April 3, 1774, m. Eber Smith of Burlington, and d. Sept. 1, 1805 ; V. Phineas, b. April 25, 1776, m. Olivia Deane and settled in Camden, N. Y. ; VI. Esther, b. April 24, 1778, m. James Alcott and settled in Wolcott ; VII. Seth, b. June 12, 1780, m. Olive Stephens, settled in Salina, N. Y. ; VIII. Chloe, b. June 3d, 1782, d. 1807 ; IX. Samuel D., b. Nov. 3, 1784, m. Sarah Brockett, removed to Camden, N. Y. ; X. Sally, b. Aug. 15, 1788, m. — Thompson, and soon after died. All of this family left or have children, except Chloe, and most of them large families. Many of them lived to great age.

8. ASAHEL, son of Isaac, (6,) m. Deborah, dau. of Gideon Allen, May 22, 1745, and had : I. Tapher, b. Feb. 24, 1746 ; II. Levi, b. Oct. 23, 1747 ; III. Joel, b. Dec. 30, 1751 ; IV. Simeon, b. May 18, 1753 ; V. John, b. April 24, 1755.

9. ABISHA, son of Isaac, (6,) m. Miriam, dau. of Ebenezer Bradley, March 14, 1760. Ch. : I. Bradley, b. Dec. 5, 1761, d. 1777 ; II. Asher, b. May 10, 1763 ; III. Sarah, b. April 29, 1765 ; IV. Philo, b. Feb. 16,

1768 ; V. Molly, b. July 16, 1770 ; VI. Rosanna, b. July 17, 1775 ; VII. Samuel, b. April 24, 1777.

## CLARK.

1. THOMAS,\* son of William, of Northampton, Mass., and Lebanon, Conn., m. Sarah, dau. of John Strong of Windsor, June 27, 1717, and settled in Waterbury. Sarah, his wife, d. Sept. 10, 1749, aged about 53, and he m. 2d, Mary, wid. of Benjamin Harrison, July 30, 1760, and d. Nov. 12, 1764. His ch. were, I. Mary, b. Oct. 31, 1718, m. Benjamin Harrison, Jr.; II. Timothy, b. March 22, 1720-1, d. Nov. 22, 1727; III. Sarah, b. Dec. 13, 1723, m. Stephen Upson; IV. Hannah, b. Jan. 31, 1726-7; V. Hepzibah, b. Oct. 17, 1729, m. Joseph Hopkins; VI. Timothy, b. May 19, 1732; VII. Esther, b. June 22, 1735, m. Phineas Porter; VIII. Thomas, b. Jan. 26, 1737-8; IX. David, b. April 25, 1740.

2. TIMOTHY, son of Thomas, (1.) m. Sarah, dau. of Stephen Hopkins, Dec. 4, 1756. She d. Oct. 21, 1757, and he m. 2d, Hannah, dau. of Isaac Bronson, June 13, 1759. She d. Sept. 15, 1783, and he m. 3d, Elizabeth, dau. of Thomas Porter. He d. Sept. 18, 1824. Ch.: I. Sarah, b. Oct. 9, 1757, d. May 6, 1770; II. Asahel, b. July 16, 1760, d. Dec. 16, 1787; III. William, b. June 11, 1763, m. Sarah Carrington of New Haven, April 14, 1785; IV. Eli, b. Oct. 2, 1764; V. Molly, b. Oct. 10, 1766, d. Sept. 14, 1856.

3. THOMAS, son of Thomas, (1.) m. Mary, dau. of Daniel Hine of New Milford, March 20, 1765. Ch.: I. Daniel, b. Dec. 30, 1765, d. in infancy; II. "Rusha," b. July 13, 1767, d. March 7, 1813; III. Sarah, b. June 5, 1770, m. Lemuel Harrison; IV. Daniel, b. April 19, 1772; V. Aurelia, b. Feb. 8, 1779, (the family record says 1780,) now living, unm., 1857.

4. DAVID, son of Thomas, (1.) m. Hannah, dau. of Samuel Nichols of Lebanon, Oct. 27, 1772. He had one child, Hannah, b. June 5, 1774, and m. Reuben Adams.

5. ELI, son of Timothy, (2.) m. Rebecca, dau. of Aaron Benedict, Dec. 20, 1792, and d. Dec. 20, 1843. Ch.: I. Joseph, b. Nov. 3, 1793, d. Sept. 7, 1816; II. Polly, b. July 31, 1796, m. Merlin Mead of South Salem, N. Y., Nov. 10, 1820; III. Maria, b. March 12, 1799, m. 1st, Solomon Smith of N. Y., May 13, 1820, who d. April 10, 1822, and she m. 2d, John T. Baldwin, of New Milford, Oct. 27, 1831; IV.

---

\* See p. 148 of this work.

Harriet, b. Nov. 30, 1802, m. Edward Scovill, Aug. 21, 1823; V. Edward, b. June 4, 1805, m. Caroline Smith, and 2d, Maria Stone; VI. Eli Benedict, b. Feb. 22, 1808, m. Cornelia DeWett; VII. Charles, b. Nov. 20, 1810, m. Harriet Blakeslee, and settled at Cayahoga Falls, Ohio; VIII. Mary Ann, b. July 30, 1813; IX. Timothy B., b. Nov. 10, 1815, m. Elvira Calkin and removed to Iowa; X. James, b. Sept. 18, 1818, m. Sarah Maria Silliman, and settled at Iowa City, Iowa.

6. DANIEL, son of Thomas, (3.) m. Polly, dau. of Isaac Lewis, Feb. 10, 1793. She d. and he m. Polly Hitchcock. Ch.: I. Thomas, b. March 11, 1794; II. Isaac Lewis, b. June 25, 1796; III. Nancy, b. Sept. 19, 1799.

Other families of the name of Clark have resided in Waterbury. The following are some of them.

JOSEPH CLARK's will was proved Feb. 2, 1762, by which it appears he had ch., as follows: I. Joseph, d. Jan. 15, 1749-50; II. Lydia, m. — Wheeler; III. Hannah, m. — Plum; IV. Tabiatha, m. — Allyn; V. Deborah, m. — Sanford of New Haven; VI. Diana, m. — Curtiss; VII. Lucy, m. Benjamin Matthews.

JOSEPH, son of Joseph above, m. Mary, dau. of Abraham Clark, of Southington, Dec. 8, 1741, and d. Jan. 15, 1749-50. Ch.: I. Mary, b. Oct. 3, 1743; II. Abner, b. May 12, 1745; III. Ruth, b. Aug. 28, 1747; IV. Lydia, b. Oct. 5, 1749.

JOHN CLARK, son of Joseph, m. Hannah, dau. of Stephen Brooks of Farmington, Sept. 9, 1747. Ch.: I. John, b. May 11, 1748. Samuel Clark, the son of Joseph, d. Sept. 28, 1749.

CALEB CLARK, of Waterbury, d. July 29, 1768. He had a son, Daniel, who m. April 12, 1759, Elizabeth, dau. of John Dowd, of Middletown. Ch.: I. Daniel, b. April 12, 1760, d. next day; II. Phebe, b. Dec. 6, 1762; III. Truman, b. Nov. 12, 1764.

JOHN CLARK was born at Milford, about 1765. He settled in Waterbury and m. Mille, dau. of Herman Munson, also of Waterbury, April 9, 1788. After the birth of his children, he removed to New Milford, and thence, in 1818, to Medina, Ohio. He d. in 1829. His wid. was living in Ohio, 1855, aged 85. Ch.: I. Sherman, b. Aug. 29, 1789; II. Polly, b. Nov. 19, 1791; III. Hansom, b. April 8, 1794; IV. Bela Bronson, b. Oct. 1, 1796; V. John Lines, b. Aug. 8, 1799; VI. Amos, b. Dec. 3, 1801; VII. Jeremiah, b. Jan. 4, 1804; VIII. Anson, b. Dec. 10, 1806, graduated at Kenyon college, Ohio, became an Episcopal clergyman, has held, successively, the rectorship of the parishes of St. Andrew's, Elyria, St. Paul's, Norwalk, St. Philip's, Circleville, and St. Timothy's, Massillon, all in Ohio. In 1854, he accepted the rectorship

of Emmanuel church, in the city of Rockford, Illinois, where he now lives; IX. Abel, b. July 12, 1812.

## COOK.\*

1. HENRY COOK was at Plymouth, Mass., before 1640. He had sons, Isaac, John, Henry and Samuel. Isaac is supposed to have remained at Plymouth, and John to have settled at Middletown. Henry and Samuel settled at Wallingford, and are the ancestors of most of the name of Cook in Connecticut, and of many in various parts of the country.

2. SAMUEL, son of Henry, (1,) was among the first settlers of Wallingford, and signed the fundamental articles of that town in 1670. He m. 1st, Hope, dau. of Edward Parker of New Haven, May 2, 1667, 2d, Mary Roberts, July 14, 1690. He d. in March, 1702, aged 61. He had a son, Samuel, b. March 3, 1668.

3. HENRY, son of Henry, (1,) was early at Wallingford. He had a son, Henry, who settled in Waterbury.

4. SAMUEL, son of Samuel, (2,) m. 1st, Hannah Merriman, about 1690, who d. May, 1713, and 2d, Elizabeth Bedell of Stratford, and d. Sept. 1725. He had five sons and nine daus. One of his sons, Moses, settled in Waterbury.

5. HENRY, son of Henry, (3,) was admitted an inhabitant of Waterbury in 1728. Ch.: Ebenezer, Samuel, Henry, Thankful and Jonathan.

6. MOSES, eldest son of Samuel, (4,) was b. in Wallingford, Nov. 6, 1716. He m. Sarah —, and settled in Branford, where three of his children were born. He removed thence to Waterbury, where his wife died in Jan. 1760, and he m. Dinah, wid. of Benjamin Harrison, who d. in Oct. 1792. He was struck on the head with a "flat-iron" by an Indian, who mistook him for another person, and d. Dec. 12, 1771, (see p. 368.) Ch.: I. Charles, b. 1741, d. Aug. 11, 1764; II. Moses, b. May 30, 1744; III. Sarah, b. June 13, 1747, d. April 5, 1823, unm.; IV. Esther, b. 1750, m. Joseph Beebe; V. Elizabeth, b. May 15, 1752, m. Benjamin Baldwin; VI. Hannah, b. Jan. 11, 1755, m. Titus Bronson; VII. Lydia, b. May 27, 1765, m. — Hickox.

7. EBENEZER, son of Henry, (5,) settled in Northbury, and m. Phebe, dau. of Moses Blakeslee, May 10, 1744. Ch.: I. Huldah, b. April 26,

---

\* The ancestors from whom most of the Cooks in New England trace their descent, came from Herefordshire and Kent, in England. The ancestral branch from whom those of the name trace their origin, now resident in various parts of this State, came from Kent, and were of the Puritan stock.

1745; II. Joel, b. Aug. 5, 1746; III. Justus, b. May 25, 1748, grad. Yale Coll.; IV. Jonah, b. Aug. 11, 1750; V. Eri, b. Oct. 20, 1752; VI. Rozell, b. May 1, 1755, grad. Yale Coll.; VII. Nise, b. April 17, 1758; VIII. Arbe, b. April 4, 1760; IX. Lurenda, b. Sept. 20, 1764; X. Uri; XI. Ebenezer, became a clergyman and resided at Montville, Conn.

8. HENRY, son of Henry, (5) m. Hannah, dau. of Nathan Benham of Wallingford, Nov. 7, 1745, and settled in Northbury. Ch.: I. Thankful, b. Jan. 12, 1747; II. Mary, b. March 30, 1748, d. June 11, 1760; III. Sarah, b. March, 1750, d. June 15, 1760; IV. Zuba, b. Dec. 24, 1751, d. June 17, 1760; V. Lemuel, b. Dec. 7, 1754, d. June 24, 1760; VI. Selah, b. Dec. 19, 1756; VII. Trueworthy, b. Sept. 29, 1759.

9. Jonathan, son of Henry, (5) m. Ruth, dau. of William Luttington of North Haven, June 15, 1735, and settled in Northbury. Ch.: Jonathan, b. March 29, 1736; II. Jesse, b. Feb. 1, 1739; III. Titus, b. May 2, 1741; IV. Sarah, b. Oct. 31, 1744; V. Abel, b. May 18, 1747.

10. MOSES, son of Moses, (6) m. Jemima, dau. of Joseph Upson, Nov. 4, 1766. She d. March 6, 1821; he d. Dec. 28, 1831. Ch.: I. Joseph, b. Nov. 4, 1767; II. Lucy, b. Sept. 29, 1769, d. Dec. 8, 1835, unm.; III. Daniel, b. Jan. 5, 1773; IV. Hannah, b. March 5, 1775, m. Horatio Upson; V. Anna, b. March 8, 1778, m. Mark Leavenworth; VI. Elias, b. Dec. 26, 1783, m. Hannah, dau. of Daniel Bartholomew of Plymouth, Nov. 16, 1813. She d. and he m. 2d, a Mrs. Bartholomew, and d. March 14, 1847.

11. JOEL, son of Ebenezer, (7) m. Dinah Dunbar, Nov. 17, 1768. He lived in Northbury. Ch.: I. Levi, b. Sept. 17, 1769, d. unm.; II. Chloe, b. June 25, 1771, m. Emblem Barnes; III. Zenas, b. July 7, 1773; IV. Dinah, b. March 26, 1775, m. — Jerome; V. Huldah, b. Dec. 29, 1777, m. Truman Johnson; VI. Uri, b. Dec. 24, 1779; VII. Lucy, m. John Elden; VIII. Sally, d. in early life; IX. Phebe, m. Joel Griggs; X. Joel, m. Polly Russell in Bradford Co., Pa.

12. JOSEPH, son of Moses, (10) m. Anna, dau. of Ezra Bronson, Esq., Aug. 1792. He d. Nov. 26, 1855; his wife ten hours afterwards. Both were buried in one grave. Ch.: I. Edward Bronson, b. March 18, 1793; II. Samuel, b. Dec. 12, 1794; III. Susan Judd, b. Oct. 25, 1797, m. Mark Leavenworth, Nov. 1844, and d. Dec. 16, 1848; IV. Sally Leavenworth, b. Oct. 29, 1799, m. Solomon Curtiss of Southington; V. Nancy, b. Nov. 16, 1801, m. William Scovill of Middletown, in 1828; VI. Nathan, b. Jan. 8, 1804; VII. George, b. April 8, 1806, d. Jan. 19, 1815; VIII. George William, b. Feb. 28, 1811.

13. DAVID, son of Moses, (10) m. Nov. 25, 1799, Sally, dau. of Jacob

Sperry of Cheshire. Ch.: I. Marcus, b. Sept. 12, 1800, d. Feb. 9, 1821; II. Sarah P., b. Aug. 1804, m. Thos. B. Segur, in 1826; III. Moses Stiles, b. 1812, m. Polly S. Tolles in 1844.

14. ZENAS, son of Joel, (11,) m. 1st, Polly Lewis of Plymouth, Feb. 1800, who d. in June, 1809, and he m. 2d, Betsey, dau. of Col. Phineas Porter, May 20, 1810. He d. in Waterbury, April 25, 1851. She d. Oct. 1857. Ch.: I. William, b. April 17, 1802, m. Marilla Plumb, and removed to Michigan; II. Sarah Curtiss, b. Jan. 16, 1807; III. Geo. Lewis, b. June 5, 1809, now deceased; IV. Lucian Porter, b. March 18, 1811, m. Sarah Judd, and removed to Georgia; V. Harriet M., b. Dec. 9, 1812, m. Henry P. Peck of Berlin; VI. Catharine L., b. July 2, 1815, m. Augustus Smith of Plymouth, and removed to New Haven; VII. Mary E., b. March 27, 1818.

15. EDWARD BRONSON, son of Joseph, (12,) m. Sept. 11, 1831, Dolly, dau. of Charles McClallan of Lancaster, Mass., and has a dau. Susan L., b. Aug. 1, 1833. He established the "Waterbury American," a well managed, weekly newspaper, in 1845-6.

16. SAMUEL, son of Joseph, (12,) m. Charity Warner, Nov. 7, 1813, and d. in 1835. His wid. m. Leveret Candee of Watertown. An only dau. Ann Maria, b. Sept. 8, 1815, m. Leveret E. Rice, Dec. 6, 1832.

17. NATHAN, son of Joseph, (12,) m. Clarissa, dau. of Russell Reynolds of Plymouth, May 31, 1826, and has one son, Walter Hart, b. Sept. 26, 1837.

18. GEORGE WILLIAM, son of Joseph, (12,) grad. Yale Coll. in 1837, and m. Sept. 26, the same year, Emily C., dau. of Tho. Johnson of Middletown. Ch.: I. Gertrude E. H., b. Oct. 29, 1838; II. Francis B., b. Sept. 14, 1840, d. June 29, 1841; III. Ella S., b. Oct. 7, 1842.

#### DE FOREST.

1. Three brothers, Hendrick, Isaac and David De Forest, (or De la Forest,) came to this country in the early part of the seventeenth century. Hendrick and Isaac settled in New York. Hendrick soon died, and it is believed without children. The descendants of Isaac are numerous. One or more of his children settled in or near Albany, and intermarried with the Dutch; hence the name became corrupted, and many of his descendants are called De Frees, De Frieze or De Frest. David settled in Stratford, Conn. The following are his descendants in the male line.

2. DAVID, above, who settled in Stratford, d. in 1721, left six sons, as follows: David, b. 1702; Samuel, b. 1704; Isaac, b. 1706,



d. without descendants in the male line ; Edward, b. 1708 ; Henry, b. 1710 ; Benjamin, b. 1716.

3. DAVID, son of David, (2,) had sons : Samuel, no male issue ; David, Hezekiah, Elihu, Ephraim.

4. SAMUEL, son of David, (2,) had sons : Joseph, b. 1731 ; Samuel, b. 1739, no male issue ; Nehemiah, b. 1743 ; David, b. 1745 ; Josiah, b. 1743.

5. EDWARD, son of David, (2,) had, Isaac, b. 1736 ; Elisha, b. 1738 ; Edward, b. 1743 ; John, b. 1745 ; William, b. 1752, no male issue ; Joseph, b. 1758.

6. HENRY, son of David, (2,) had, Henry, b. 1750 ; Timothy, b. 1751 ; David, b. 1755. Neither of them had sons.

7. BENJAMIN, son of David, (2,) had Hezekiah, b. 1745 ; Nehemiah, b. 1748, no issue ; Benjamin, b. 1749 ; Isaac, b. 1758 ; Othniel, b. 1761.

8. DAVID, son of David, (3,) had, Eliud, b. 1769 ; Samuel ; David, no male issue ; Isaac ; Clark, b. 1772.

9. HEZEKIAH, son of David, (3,) had Uriah, no male issue ; Hezekiah, b. 1770.

10. ELIHU, son of David, (3,) had, Joseph, no male issue ; David L., b. 1763 ; Benjamin, no male issue ; Bill Clark, no male issue.

11. EPHRAIM, son of David, (3,) had, Nathan, b. 1765 ; Zalmon, b. 1770 ; Henry, b. 1778 ; Samuel, b. 1784, no sons ; Ephraim B., b. 1787.

12. JOSEPH, son of Samuel, (4,) had, Samuel ; Abel, b. 1761 ; Mills, b. 1763, no male issue ; Elihu, b. 1777 ; Gideon.

13. NEHEMIAH, son of Samuel, (4,) had, William, b. 1773 ; Lockwood, b. 1775 ; Philo, b. 1779 ; Delauzun and Charles.

14. DAVID, son of Samuel, (4,) had, Isaac N. ; David L. ; Samuel ; Joseph. The first three had no sons.

15. ISAAC, son of Edward, (5,) had Benjamin.

16. ELISHA, son of Edward, (5,) had, Isaac, b. 1768, no male issue ; Daniel, b. 1771, had Albert, who d. without male issue.

17. EDWARD, son of Edward, (5,) had James, no male issue.

18. JOHN, son of Edward, (5,) had, Curtis ; Philo, b. 1772 ; John ; Edward ; the two last no male issue ; James had a son James.

19. JOSEPH, son of Edward, (5,) had, I. William, b. 1787, had sons, Charles P. and George ; II. Joseph, b. 1790, had William, Curtis W., Ransford S., John D., and Daniel A. ; III. Mitchell, b. 1797, had sons, Daniel and William ; IV. Curtis, b. 1803, had William, Darwin and Charles.

20. HEZEKIAH, son of Benjamin, (7,) had, Philo, b. 1782, and Samuel A., b. 1784.

21. BENJAMIN, son of Benjamin, (7,) had, David C., b. 1774; John II., b. 1776; Benjamin, b. 1780; Ezra, b. 1782.

22. ISAAC, son of Benjamin, (7,) had, Alonzo, b. 1788? Lemuel, b. 1788; Aaron, b. 1790; Isaac, b. 1794; Grandison, b. 1797. None but the first had male issue.

23. OTHNIEL, son of Benjamin, (7,) had, Linson; Sidney, no male issue; Charles.

24. ELIUD, son of David, (8,) had, I. Hiram, b. 1793, had William J.; II. Charles, b. 1796, had Harvey B.; III. William, no sons; IV. Samuel, b. 1800, no sons; V. David L., b. 1804, had John E. and Cyrus R.; VI. Edward, b. 1806, had Charles E. and Samuel E.

25. SAMUEL, son of David, (8,) had, William, no male issue; Henry, do.; Ira.

26. ISAAC, son of David, (8,) had, I. David, who had Legrand and David L.; II. Harvey, had George and Alanson B.; III. Lewis, no male issue; IV. Isaac J., had Josiah and Samuel J.

27. CLARK, son of David, (8,) had, I. Curtis, b. 1804, who had Samuel C., Ransille B. and William W.; II. Jared, b. 1807, had William H. and Giles A.; III. William C., b. 1811, had John W., Henry W., Daniel W. and Isaac; IV. George, b. 1812, had Sylvester, Charles II. and James.

28. HEZEKIAH, son of Hezekiah, (9,) had, I. Hiram O., b. 1794; II. Legrand, b. 1802, who had George B., Charles E. and Stephen C.

29. DAVID L., son of Elihu, (10,) had, I. Archibald, b. 1787, no male issue; II. Alfred, b. 1791, do.; III. Benjamin, had David L., Benjamin and Alfred A.

30. NATHAN, son of Ephraim, (11,) had, I. Henry, b. 1790, who had Edward, James, Hiram and John; II. Samuel J., b. 1793, had George S.; III. Silas G., b. 1794, had Gilbert; IV. J. Hoyt, b. 1806, had George; V. Charles, b. 1808, had George and Charles.

31. ZALMON, son of Ephraim, (11,) had, I. John W., no male issue; II. William S., b. 1815, had James H.

32. HENRY, son of Ephraim, (11,) had Henry E., b. 1818.

33. EPHRAIM B., son of Ephraim, (11,) had, I. William S., b. 1812, who had Albert; II. Samuel H., b. 1827; III. David C., b. 1822, had Charles H.

34. SAMUEL, son of Joseph, (12,) had, I. Marcus, no male issue; II. Legrand, do.; III. William C., had Joseph and Samuel.

35. ABEL, son of Joseph, (12,) had, I. Henry, who had William H.

and Charles; II. Mills, no male issue; III. William; IV. M. Delauzun, had Samuel M.

36. GIDEON, son of Joseph, (12,) had, I. Lee, who had George and Henry S.; II. Abel B.; III. Cyrus H., had Charles, Heman and James; IV. Charles A., had Charles A., A. Henry, Dewitt C. and Edward; V. Tracy R., had Cyrus II., Lewis G., Charles L. and Albert W.

37. WILLIAM, son of Nehemiah, (13,) had, I. Isaac, who had Thomas and William; II. Lockwood M.; III. William, had Edward; IV. Marcus.

38. LOCKWOOD, son of Nehemiah, (13,) had, I. W. Wheeler, b. 1794; II. George B., b. 1806, and had Benjamin L. and George B.; III. Henry G., b. 1820, had Robert W. and Lockwood; IV. James G., b. 1822; V. Frederick L., b. 1825.

39. PHILO, son of Nehemiah, (13,) had Delauzun, b. 1808, who had George and William.

40. DELAUZUN, son of Nehemiah, (13,) had William B., b. 1811, who had William A.

41. JOSEPH, son of David, (14,) had, I. Isaac N., b. 1809, who had Moulton, Newton, Henry C., Theodore, Joseph and Charles; II. John J., b. 1811; III. James G., b. 1817, and had John and Frank.

42. BENJAMIN, son of Isaac, (15,) had, I. Isaac, b. 1791, who had Benjamin, Andrew and David; II. David b. 1801, had David.

43. PHILO, son of John, (18,) lived in Woodbury, had, I. Marcus, b. 1794, who had John P., George and Marcus; II. George, b. 1804.

44. PHILO, son of Hezekiah, (20,) had, I. Charles, who had Charles; II. David D., had George H. and Frederick C.; III. John; IV. William, had Edward; V. George.

45. SAMUEL A., son of Hezekiah, (20,) had, I. Charles, who had William L. and Francis E.; II. Spencer H.

46. DAVID C., son of Benjamin, (21,) and founder of the "De Forest Fund" of Yale College, had a son, Carlos M., b. 1813.

47. JOHN H., son of Benjamin, (21,) had, I. George S., b. 1812, who had Henry W.; II. Henry A., b. 1814; III. Andrew W., b. 1817, had Edward L. and Charles S.; IV. John W.

48. BENJAMIN, son of Benjamin, (21,) had, I. John, b. 1806, who had Erastus L.; II. Samuel S., b. 1811; III. Benjamin.

49. EZRA, son of Benjamin, (21,) had, I. David W., b. 1809; II. Benjamin C., b. 1814, who had David W., Benjamin D. and Ezra.

50. ALONZO, son of Isaac, (22,) had, I. Benjamin S., b. 1806; II. Ezekiel M., b. 1808; III. Samuel S., b. 1811, had Frank B.; IV. Aaron G., b. 1814.

51. LINSON, son of Othniel, (23,) had, I. Charles II., b. 1821; II. Linson, b. 1822, had William H.

52. CHARLES, son of Othniel, (23,) had, I. Charles B., b. 1819, who had Charles E., Clarence R., Benjamin and William II.; II. Benjamin, b. 1821; III. Alfred, b. 1822; IV. Othniel, b. 1826; V. David, b. 1828; VI. Thomas B., b. 1832; VII. William H., b. 1837; VIII. Linson, b. 1839.

### GUERNSEY, or GARNSEY.

1. Tradition says that John Guernsey emigrated from the Isle of Guernsey, near England, and settled at Milford, Conn., and that he is the progenitor of the following family.

2. JOSEPH, said to be the son of John, (1,) appears at Milford, not as a free planter in 1639, but as an after planter; but John, his reputed father, does not appear on record among either class of planters, or otherwise, that I have been able to discover. Joseph m. Hannah, dau. of Samuel Coley, Sen., April 10, 1673, and had, Joseph, b. Jan. 13, 1674; Hannah, b. March 4, 1678, and probably others.

3. JOSEPH, son of Joseph, (2,) m. Elizabeth Disbrow, of Horseneck, who probably d. at Milford. He m. 2d, Eleanor, and removed to Woodbury, Bethlem society, where his wife d. Sept. 15, 1753, aged 77. His death occurred Sept. 15, 1754, age 80. Ch.: I. Joseph, b. 1700; II. Ebenezer, b. 1702; III. Jonathan, b. 1704; IV. and V. Peter and John, b. April 6, 1709; VI. Betsey, m. Joshua Baldwin, and remained at Milford.

4. JOSEPH, son of Joseph, (3,) m. Rachel —, and settled in Westbury. Ch: I. Mary, m. Solomon Steele, Oct. 16, 1760; II. Joseph, b. 1730; III. Ebenezer, b. 1731; IV. Philena, m. David Brown of Bethlem; V. Anna, m. Daniel Steele; VI. Bethel, d. 1760, aged 22; VII. Abijah, b. about 1743; VIII. Job, b. 1744 or '46, d. unmarried, Feb. 18, 1825; IX. Rachel, d. May, 1751, aged 16.

5. EBENEZER, son of Joseph, (3,) settled early in Durham, Conn. Ch.: Lemuel, Ebenezer, (a clergyman,) Eleanor, Rhoda, Catharine, Mary, Sarah and Anna.

6. Dea. JONATHAN, son of Joseph, (3,) m. Jan. 6, 1724-5, Abigail Northrop of Milford, who d. Oct. 18, 1756, and he m. 2d, Widow Desire Scovil, March 10, 1757, and d. June 14, 1776. His widow d. Jan. 2, 1795, aged 87. He bought land in Waterbury in 1729, and removed thither early in 1730, and settled near the present residence of Doct. Porter, East Main street. He and his brother purchased land in

the northwest section of what is now Watertown, where he built a house and soon removed his family. The location is still known as Guernsey Town. Dea. Jonathan's two first ch. were born at Milford; the others in Waterbury. They were as follows: I. Abigail, b. Oct. 29, 1726, m. Eliphalet Clark, and d. June 17, 1746; II. Jonathan, b. Feb. 28, 1729; III. Amos, b. July 3, 1731; IV. David, b. April 12, 1734; V. Sarah, b. July 7, 1736, m. Timothy Foote, and d. Oct. 22, 1777; VI. Samuel, b. Feb. 8, 1739; VII. Isaac, b. Dec. 11, 1741.

7. PETER, son of Joseph, (3,) m. Anne Gunn of Milford, Dec. 9, 1731, and removed to Bethlem. Ch.: I. Solomon, m. Nov. 15, 1764, Sarah, dau. of James Kasson of Bethlem; II. Richard, m. Eunice Mallory of Washington. She belonged to the family that was murdered by Davenport. He removed to Colebrook—had a son, Milo, who became a physician, also a dau. Polly, who d. in Bethlem, July 9, 1788, aged 18; III. Anna, b. 1734, m. Ebenezer Guernsey, d. Feb. 6, 1804; IV. Elizabeth; V. Abigail; VI. Sarah.

8. JOHN, son of Joseph, (3,) m. Ann, dau. of Dea. Jeremiah Peck, and grand-dau. of Rev. Jeremiah Peck. He settled in Litchfield, Northfield society, removed thence to Amenia, N. Y. Ch.: I. John, b. Oct. 28, 1734, m. March 24, 1757, Azubah Buel; II. Anna, b. Oct. 1736; III. Peter, b. Nov. 13, 1738, went to Stanford, N. Y., where he has descendants; IV. Nathan, b. May 14, 1741, settled in Northfield, and removed thence to Half Moon; V. Dorcas, b. Feb. 23, 1744; VI. Noah, b. Aug. 18, 1746, settled in Northfield, m. June 7, 1770, Hannah Hollister, and d. Sept. 18, 1820; VII. Daniel, b. May 30, 1749, went to Ballston, N. Y., thence to Upper Canada; VIII. Lois, b. June 15, 1751; IX. Eunice, b. Nov. 17, 1754; X. Isaac, b. Jan. 20, 1758.

7. JOSEPH, son of Joseph, (4,) m. Mary Brown, April 3, 1764, lived in Watertown. His wife d. Nov. 6, 1806, aged 71; he d. Nov. 2, 1817. Ch.: I. Mary, b. June 14, 1755, m. Amos Hitchcock; II. Anna, b. Dec. 10, 1757, m. Col. Aner Bradley, and d. July, 1844; III. Bethel Chauncey, b. March 27, 1760, m. Betsey Mallory, and had Joseph, Landon, Chauncey, Bethel, Charlotte and Betsey. Charlotte m. Henry S. Atwood and Betsey m. Harvey Atwood; IV. Moranah, b. March 1, 1762, m. Demas Judd; V. Lucy, b. May 22, 1764, m. Dr. E. Davis, and d. Sept. 1827; VI. Joseph, b. June 18, 1766, m. Rachel, dau. of Samuel Guernsey, and had Joseph, Harriet, Rena, Smedley, Hawkins, Jennette and a ch. that d. young; VII. Philena, b. April 28, 1768, m. Dea. Buckingham; VIII. Theodore, b. April 16, 1770, m. Diodema Beach; IX. Anthony, b. Aug. 18, 1773, m. Melliscent Skilton, who d. May 25, 1839, aged 66, and he m. Martha B. Skilton, June 7, 1841, and d. Dec. 30,

1848. He had no issue by first wife; by second wife, Jarvis and Clementine; X. Friend, b. June 23, 1775, m. Sarah Castle, who d. Oct. 23, 1801, and he m. Mary A. Atwood, and d. Oct. 20, 1835. His ch. were: Denrif, b. Sept. 22, 1796, m. Esther Bryan; Augusta, m. — Hawkins.

10. EBENEZER, son of Joseph, (4,) m. Anna, dau. of Peter Guernsey. He lived in Bethlem, and d. Feb. 6, 1804. Ch.: I. Rachel, m. Titus Hotchkiss of Waterbury; II. Eunice, m. Ebenezer Church; III. Philo, m. Irena Murray, went to Genesee, and d. about 1807; IV. Peter, b. Oct. 20, 1767, m. Lucina Minor of Woodbury, June 4, 1793, and d. Oct. 11, 1824. His ch. were, Lucy, m. O. Cowles; Mary, m. Joel Atwood; Melliscent, b. Oct. 12, 1801, m. Willis Downs, now of Woodbury; Julia, b. Dec. 1805, d. 1828; Harriet, b. 1808, m. Harlow Russell of Watertown; Susan, b. 1814, d. young; V. Anna, m. Moses Wright of Colebrook; VI. Abijah, b. April 1, 1774, m. Anne Hotchkiss of Waterbury, April 16, 1797, and d. Oct. 16, 1846. He had Ebenezer, b. 1798, m. Maria Cowles of Bethlem; Althea, b. 1799, m. Asahel Hotchkiss, and d. in Sharon, Sept. 9, 1836; Hannah, m. Amos Hotchkiss of Sharon; Dotha, b. 1803; Minerva, b. 1805; Henrietta, b. 1808, m. Amos Clark of Watertown.

11. ABIJAH, son of Joseph, (4,) m. Lucy Bellamy, who d. May 28, 1805, aged 60. He m. 2d, Araminta —, and d. May 22, 1819. Ch.: I. Frances, b. March, 1778, m. March 10, 1799, Solomon G. Steele, and d. in 1802; II. Silence, b. July 14, 1781, m. Tola Webster, Feb. 10, 1804; III. William, b. Jan. 25, 1784, m. March 13, 1805, Hannah Parker of Wallingford, and had Nancy Ann, Joshua Sherman, Philena, John J. and Rebecca; IV. A dau., d. young.

12. JONATHAN, son of Dea. Jonathan, (6,) m. Desire, dau. of Joseph Bronson, June 5, 1755, and d. April 10, 1805, in Watertown. She d. Dec., 1796. Ch.: I. Mellicent, b. March 24, 1756, d. Aug., 1756; II. Mellicent, b. May 21, 1757, m. Lieut. Osborne, Dec. 6, 1771, d. in 1803; III. Daniel, b. July 18, 1760, m. Huldah Seymour, of Watertown, removed to Blue Lick, Indiana, and d. April 28, 1840. He had, William, m. Hannah French, and was drowned, May, 1839; Seymour, m. — Blakeslee of Watertown, and resides at Blue Lick, Indiana; Grey; Mellicent, m. Isaac Townsend; Anna, m. — Briggs; Polly, m. Jacob Lane; Bronson, m. — Kelly, and lives in Iowa; IV. Southmayd, b. April 10, 1763, m., Sabra Scott, of Watertown, and had Raphael, who d. in 1837; Laura, m. Nehemiah Clark; Rebecca, m. Asahel Stone, of Michigan; Jonathan, resides in Michigan; Amanda, wife of Jonathan Comer of Ashley, Ohio; V. James, b. March 27,

1767, m. Anner Blakeslee of Plymouth, June 3, 1798, who d. March 14, 1801, and he m. 2d, Deborah, dau. of Deacon David Wilcockson of Huntington, Jan. 12, 1806. He d. Nov. 23, 1853; his widow, Jan. 10, 1854, aged 83. He lived in Watertown. Ch.: Adele, b. Aug. 19, 1799, d. Dec. 1, 1799; Anner, b. July 4, 1807, m. David H. Curtiss of Woodbury, April 26, 1829; Maria, b. Aug. 3, 1809, m. William Bassett of Litchfield, July 25, 1832, and resides in Watertown; David B., d. Sept. 1, 1828, aged 14; VI. Sidney, b. May 7, 1772, m. Abner Hard of Watertown, Nov. 10, 1814.

13. AMOS, son of Dea. Jonathan, (6) m. Esther, dau. of Joseph Blake of Waterbury, Feb. 16, 1756. Ch.: I. Abigail, b. Nov. 9, 1756; II. Amos, b. Oct. 23, 1758, went to the State of N. Y., had two ch.; III. Esther, b. June 9, 1760, d. Sept. 5, 1780; IV. Joel, b. Jan. 11, 1763, m. 1st, — Strickland, 2d, Fanny Judd of Windsor, N. Y., had by his first wife, William and Blake, by 2d, Mary P., Ruth M. and Fanny P.; V. Eldad, b. Sept. 5, 1764, m. — Strickland, and went to the State of N. Y.; VI. Annis, b. 1766, d. same year; VII. Annis, b. 1767, m. — Stowe; VIII. Ruth, b. March 2, 1769, m. S. Atwood, d. in 1801; IX. Parthena, b. March 6, 1771, m. — Osborne; X. Phebe, m. — Whitmore of Harpersfield, N. Y.; XI. Sybil, m. — Wells. Amos, the father of this family, removed to the State of N. Y., where he died.

14. DANIEL, son of Dea. Jonathan, (6) m. Hannah, dau. of Samuel Judd, June 6, 1754. She d. in 1776, and he m. Abigail Turner, and removed to Harpersfield, N. Y. Ch.: I. Hannah, b. April, 1755, m. — Doolittle; II. Irene, b. Sept. 19, 1756, m. Dea. Dayton of Watertown, and d. Feb. 27, 1788; III. David, b. March 3, 1758, m. Mary, dau. of William Judd, removed to Harpersfield, N. Y., and had a child, which d. in 1791, also Hannah, Miranda, Pamela, Sally and Polly; IV. Rebekah, b. March 30, 1760, m. Christopher Merriam, of Watertown; V. Olive, b. May 4, 1762, m. James Merriam, and d. Feb. 16, 1798; VI. Isaac, m. — Judd, and lived at Harpersfield, N. Y.; VII. Sarah, m. — Mattoon, and went to Vt.; VIII. Elizabeth, m. — Harrison, and went to Whitestown, N. Y.; IX. Ezra; X. Esther.

15. SAMUEL, son of Dea. Jonathan, (6) m. Rachel Latimer, of Milford, (?) May 10, 1764, who d. in 1765, and he m. C. Smedley and d. at Naugatuck, in 1819. Ch.: I. Samuel, b. April, 1765, went to Canada, and d. there; II. Rachel, b. Aug. 13, 1767, m. Joseph Guernsey, Jr.; III. Irene, (?) b. May 22, 1770; IV. Currence, b. May 28, 1772, — probably others.

16. ISAAC, son of Dea. Jonathan, (6,) is said to have settled in Northampton, Mass., where he m. — Culliver and d. soon after.

17. JOHN, son of John, (8,) had in Litchfield, Azubah, b. July 6, 1758; Sarah, b. Aug. 30, 1760. He removed to Amenia, N. Y., where he had Isaac, Lois, Rachel, Ebenezer and Rhoda.

18. NOAH, son of John, (8,) lived in Northfield. Ch. : I. Hannah, b. May 10, 1771, m. Thomas Merriam, of Watertown, and had eight ch. ; II. Rachel, b. Sept. 3, 1773, m. Isaac Clark of Watertown, and had seven ch. ; III. Samuel, b. Aug. 31, 1775, m. 1st, Laura Johnson, 2d, Mabel Heaton ; IV. Noah, b. Feb. 5, 1778, d. 1778 ; V. Anna, b. Aug. 12, 1779, m. Levi Heaton, and d. about 1818,—had five ch. ; VI. Clarissa, b. March 18, 1782, m. Elijah Warner, and had four ch. ; VII. Polly, b. May 27, 1785, m. Gervase Blakeslee ; VIII. Noah, b. 1787, d. 1788 ; IX. John, b. March 20, 1789, m. Laura Morse and resides in Northfield ; X. Noah, b. April 16, 1793, m. Amanda Crosby ; XI. Caroline, b. 1797, d. 1801.

#### HARRISON.

1. THOMAS HARRISON, from England, settled in New Haven, in that part now East Haven. He took the oath of fidelity at New Haven, April 4, 1654. He had three brothers who came with him to this country, viz: Richard, Benjamin and Nathaniel. Richard was a few years at Branford, but removed to New Jersey. Nathaniel and Benjamin settled in Virginia. Benjamin, it is said, was grandfather of the late President William H. Harrison. Thomas m. 1st, the wid. of John Thompson of New Haven, and 2d, wid. Elizabeth Stent, March 29, 1666. His ch. were, Thomas, b. March 1, 1657; Nathaniel, b. Dec. 13, 1658; Elizabeth, b. Jan. 1667; John; Samuel; Isaac and Mary.

2. THOMAS, son of Thos. (1,) m. Margaret Stent, dau. of his step-mother. Ch. : I. Lydia, b. 1690; II. Jemima, b. 1692; III. Thomas, b. Oct. 12, 1694, removed to Litchfield; IV. Abigail, b. Nov. 17, 1696; V. Benjamin, b. Aug. 7, 1698, settled in Waterbury; VI. Joseph, b. May 25, 1700; VII. David, b. Feb. 7, 1702; VIII. Aaron, b. March 4, 1704, d. 1708; IX. Jacob, b. Oct. 23, 1708, d. 1748.

3. THOMAS, son of Thos. (2,) m. Elizabeth Sutliff, April 21, 1721, and lived for a time in the east part of North Branford. He purchased 1000 acres of land in Litchfield, in the eastern part of the parish of South Farms, to which he removed in 1639. He gave 100 acres of land to each of his nine sons, reserving only 100 for himself. He was chosen deacon of the First church in Litchfield in 1755. Ch. : Thomas, Ephraim, Gideon, Titus, Abel, Jacob, Lemuel, Elihu and Levi.



4. BENJAMIN, son of Thos. (2.) m. Oct. 19, 1720, Mary —, and settled in Farmingbury parish, Waterbury. He d. in 1760, leaving his wife Mary and ch., viz: Abigail, m. — Warner; Benjamin and Aaron.

5. LEMUEL, son of Thos. (3.) m. "in his 24th year," Lois Barnes, Feb. 18, 1762, and d. Sept. 9, 1807. Ch.: I. Timothy, b. 1763, d. 1800; II. Lemuel, b. 1765, m. Sarah, dau. of Thos. Clark, is living in Waterbury; III. James, b. 1767; IV. Phebe, b. 1769, d. 1797; V. Worster, b. 1772; VI. Onley, b. 1774; VII. Lois, b. 1776; VIII. Andrew, b. 1779, d. 1810; IX. Caroline, b. 1785.

6. BENJAMIN, son of Benj. (4.) m. Dinah, dau. of Benj. Warner, Dec. 24, 1741, and d. March 13, 1760, in his 39th year. Ch.: I. James, b. Oct. 1742, d. 1760; II. Jabez, b. Oct. 1744; III. Lydia, b. Sept. 1747; IV. Samuel, b. Sept. 1750, d. 1750; V. Rozel, b. Dec. 1751; VI. Daniel, b. July, 1754, m. Phebe Blakeslee, 1774.

7. AARON, son of Benj. (4.) m. Jerusha, dau. of Obed Warner, Oct. 26, 1748. He was chosen deacon of the church in Farmingbury, (now Wolcott,) at its organization, Nov. 18, 1773, which office he continued to fill until his death. Ch.: I. Jared, b. 1749; Mark, b. Aug. 1751, m. Rebecca Miles, 1775; III. Samuel, b. March, 1753; IV. David, b. March, 1756; V. John, b. Dec. 1758, d. 1776; VI. Luey, b. March, 1762.

## HICKOX,

HICOX, HIKCOX, HECOCK, HICKCOCK, &c.

1. Sergt. SAMUEL HICKOX, had ch.: Samuel, Hannah, William, Thomas, Joseph, Mary, Elizabeth, Stephen, Benjamin, Mercy, Ebenezer. (See p. 148.)

2. JOSEPH, probably brother of Samuel, (1.) lived in Farmington and Waterbury. From the latter place he went to Woodbury, where he d. in 1687, leaving the following ch.: I. Joseph, m. Ruth Fairchild of Woodbury, in 1697; II. Benjamin, m. Hannah Skeel of Woodbury, in 1697; III. Mary, m. Joseph Gaylord, Jr., of Waterbury, went to Durham; IV. Elizabeth, m. John Gaylord of Waterbury; V. Samuel, m., had a family and lived in Woodbury. (See Cothren's Woodbury, p. 564.)

3. SAMUEL, son of Sergt. Samuel, (1.) had ch. as follows: I. A dau.; II. Ebenezer, went to Danbury; III. Samuel; IV. John; V. Hannah; VI. Elizabeth; VII. A son; VIII. Gideon; IX. Sarah; X. Silence.

4. Capt. WILLIAM, son of Samuel, (1.) had ch.: I. —; II. Wil-





liam; III. Samuel; IV. Abraham; V. John; IV. Rebecca; VII. Rachel; VIII. Hannah.

5. Dea. THOMAS, son of Samuel, (1.) Ch.: I. Thomas, b. Oct. 25, 1701; II. Mary, b. May 28, 1704, d. April 30, 1706; III. Mary, b. March 9, 1706-7, m. Dea. John Warner; IV. Sarah, b. Jan. 2, 1709-10, m. Daniel Benedict; V. Mercy, m. Isaac Hopkins; VI. Amos, b. Aug. 19, 1715; VII. Jonas, b. Oct. 30, 1717; VIII. Samuel, b. Aug. 30, 1720; IX. Susanna, b. March 25, 1723, m. George Nichols, Dec. 15, 1741; X. James, b. June 26, 1726, d. young.

6. EBENEZER, son of Samuel, (1.) m. 1st, Esther Hine, Dec. 1714, 2d, Abigail, dau. of Samuel Stevens of West Haven, Aug. 28, 1729. He removed to Bethel soc. in Danbury. His ch. recorded in Waterbury, were as follows: I. Esther, b. July 10, 1715, m. Stephen Kelsey, son of Stephen of Wethersfield, Aug. 25, 1733; II. Samuel, b. Dec. 20, 1716; III. Ambrose, b. Sept. 2, 1718; IV. Elizabeth, b. Sept. 1720, m. Richard Nichols, Aug. 10, 1744; V. Abigail, b. Aug. 8, 1722; VI. Ebenezer, b. July 21, 1730; VII. David, b. Jan. 30, 1732; VIII. John, b. April, 17, 1734; IX. Seth, b. Dec. 5, 1741.

7. EBENEZER, son of Samuel, (3.) settled in Bethel soc., Danbury, about 1725. He had sons, Ebenezer, Maj. Benjamin and Capt. Samuel.

8. JOHN, son of Samuel, (3.) m. Mary, dau. of Joseph Gaylord of Durham, Nov. 18, 1719, and probably had children.

9. GIDRON, son of Samuel, (3.) m. Mury, dau. of Stephen Upson, Aug. 15, 1734. Ch.: I. James, b. Feb. 11, 1734-5, drowned, Feb. 12, 1744-5; II. Jemima, b. Nov. 24, 1736, m. Ira Beebe, Aug. 1758; III. Samuel, b. Sept. 1, 1739; IV. Sarah, b. June 3, 1744, m. Austin Smith; V. James, b. Nov. 28, 1746; VI. Lucy, b. June 20, 1749; VII. Gideon, b. May 4, 1752; VIII. Elizabeth, b. Nov. 28, 1754.

10. Capt. SAMUEL, son of William, (4.) m. Mary, dau. of John Hopkins, March 8, 1721, and d. May 13, 1765. She d. Aug. 19, 1768. Ch.: I. Mary, b. Oct. 30, 1721, m. Richard Seymour, May 20, 1740, d. July 15, 1744; II. Mehitable, b. Nov. 22, 1723, m. Stephen Seymour, March 18, 1741, d. May 9, 1767; III. William, b. Jan. 14, 1725-6; IV. Abraham, b. Jan. 11, 1727-8; V. John, b. July 26, 1730; VI. Samuel, b. Sept. 8, 1733; VII. Dorcas, b. July 11, 1736, m. John Welton, Jan. 5, 1758.

11. THOMAS, son of Dea. Thomas, (5.) m. Miriam, wid. of Samuel Richards, April 19, 1736, and d. Dec. 28, 1787. His wife d. March 13, 1780. Ch.: I. Thomas, b. April 4, 1737; II. Susanna, b. March 30, 1739; III. Daniel, b. Dec. 16, 1742; IV. James, b. Jan. 19, 1747-8, d. 1749; V. James, b. May 8, 1755.

12. AMOS, son of Dea. Thomas, (5,) m. Mercy, wid. of Benjamin Richards, March 15, 1740. She d. July 19, 1787. He d. March 1, 1805. Ch.: I. Freelove, b. April 28, 1741, m. Stephen Scott, Nov. 30, 1758; II. Amos, b. March 18, 1742-3, d. 1749; III. Elisha, b. March 3, 1744-5; IV. Mercy, b. Jan. 25, 1746-7, d. 1752; V. Amos, b. Nov. 12, 1749; VI. Joseph, b. March 12, 1752.

13. Dea. SAMUEL, son of Dea. Thomas, (5,) was one of the early settlers of Westbury, and contributed much towards the establishment of the good state of society, which has ever prevailed in that town. He was a dea. in the church, capt. of the militia, representative to the General Assembly, &c. He gave freedom to the only slave he ever owned. He m. 1st, Elizabeth, dau. of George Welton, Nov. 26, 1741. She d. June 7, 1809, and his death occurred April 6, 1811. Ch.: I. Jonas, b. Aug. 20, 1742, m. Abigail, dau. of Eliphalet Clark, in 1766, and d. in Sept. 6, 1826; II. Mary, b. Jan. 12, 1744-5, d. same month; III. Mary, b. Sept. 16, 1746, d. 1749; IV. Samuel, b. June 9, 1749; V. Elizabeth, b. April 29, 1752, m. Thomas Bronson, Aug. 25, 1774; VI. Hannah, b. Aug. 24, 1754, m. John Nettleton, Jr. and d. Aug. 8, 1784. He d. Sept. 19, 1808; VII. Eli, b. June 17, 1757, m. Mary Buckingham, and d. April 30, 1788. She d. Sept. 25, 1827; VIII. Josiah, b. Sept. 9, 1760.

14. AMBROSE, son of Ebenezer, (7,) lived in Waterbury, m. Eunice, dau. of Caleb Clark, Dec. 11, 1740, and d. June 1, 1792, a. 74. Ch.: I. Ambrose, b. Aug. 28, 1741, m. Mary, dau. of John Dowd of Middletown, June, 1762, and had Eunice and Gideon; II. Ruth, b. Dec. 18, 1743, m. Abijah Wilmot; III. Gideon, b. April 19, 1746, d. 1763; IV. Margery, b. Oct. 6, 1748; V. Marcy, b. Sept. 26, 1752; VI. Ebenezer, b. May 29, 1754; VII. Benjamin, b. April 19, 1756, d. 1769.

15. JOHN, son of Ebenezer, (6,) m. Lydia Kellogg, March 29, 1757. She was b. April 5, 1740. Ch.: I. John, b. Sept. 24, 1759, d. Sept. 1776; II. Lydia, b. Jan. 2, 1762, m. Jesse Richards; III. Seth, b. Jan. 6, 1764, d. March 5, 1773; IV. Jesse, b. Nov. 4, 1769; V. Rachel B., b. July 3, 1771, m. Stephen Camp; VI. Seth, b. Sept. 22, 1773,—was living in 1856, at New Canaan; VII. Eliaseph, b. May 29, 1776, d. Oct. 7, 1777; VIII. Peninah, (?) b. Feb. 15, 1778, m. Ezra Hoyt; IX. Melliscent, b. Sept. 14, 1780, m. Jonathan B. Benedict.

16. EBENEZER, son of Ebenezer, (7,) had a son Zar, who was father of Rev. Laurens P. Hickok, D. D., formerly pastor of the Congregational churches at Kent and Litchfield, Conn. From Litchfield he went to the Western Reserve College, where he was a professor several years, and thence to the Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y., where he

APPENDIX.

was also a professor. He is at present (1856) in Union Col., Rochester, N. Y.

17. Maj. BENJAMIN, son of Ebenezer, (7,) had a son Eli, who was father of Benjamin Eli Hickox of New York City.

18. Capt. SAMUEL, son of Ebenezer, (7,) had sons, I. Daniel, m. and had Ely, Plinley, Starr, Nathaniel Hoyt and Amos. Plinley is father of Rev. Henry, of Elmira, N. Y., also of George S. and Francis S. of New York City; II. Noah, had John and Harvey of New York City; III. Amos, d. at Fort George, in 1814.

19. SAMUEL, son of Gideon, (9,) m. Eleanor, dau. of Obadiah Warner, June 4, 1761. She d. Nov. 14, 1767, and he m. 2d, Charity Dixon, Nov. 10, 1768. Ch.: I. Asee, b. Aug. 14, 1762; II. Enos, b. April 22, 1764; III. A dau., b. Nov. 24, 1765; IV. A son, b. Sept. 3, 1767; V. Silvia, b. Jan. 20, 1770; VI. Charity, b. July 15, 1773; VII. Samuel Johnson, b. Oct. 31, 1775; VIII. Sophia, b. July 26, 1778.

20. JAMES, son of Gideon, (9,) m. Hannah, dau. of Austin Smith, Nov. 28, 1766. Ch.: I. Olive, b. May 7, 1774.

21. GIDEON, son of Gideon, (9,) m. Phebe, dau. of Austin Smith, Aug. 29, 1771. Ch.: I. David, b. Dec. 8, 1772; II. Sarah, b. April 13, 1774; III. Polly, b. March 4, 1777; IV. Hannah S., b. July 2, 1781.

22. WILLIAM, son of Capt. Samuel, (9,) m. Lydia Seymour, April 4, 1745, who d. June 19, 1762, and he m. 2d, Abigail, dau. of Edmund Scott, Jan. 12, 1763. Ch.: I. William, b. Jan. 14, 1746; II. Consider, b. June 21, 1748; III. Abigail, b. July 28, 1751, m. Thomas Welton; IV. Lydia, b. July 29, 1757; V. Rebecca, b. Oct. 14, 1759; VI. Chloe, b. Feb. 7, 1764; VII. Hannah, b. Oct. 31, 1765; VIII. Asahel, b. Nov. 22, 1767.

23. Capt. ABRAHAM, son of Capt. Samuel, (10,) m. Jemima, dau. of Thomas Foote, April 19, 1748. She d. May 20, 1779. He d. in 1777 or 1778, in the British army. Ch.: I. Mary, b. July 2, 1748, m. Seba Bronson; II. Lucy, b. Feb. 13, 1749-50, m. Simeon Scott; III. Jesse, b. April 12, 1752; IV. Jared, b. Jan. 15, 1756; V. Joel, b. April 8, 1758; VI. Timothy, b. Jan. 5, 1761; VII. Abraham, b. June 2, 1765; VIII. Samuel, b. Jan. 1, 1767; IX. Preserved, b. Nov. 6, 1768.

24. JOHN, son of Capt. Samuel, (10,) m. Aner, dau. of Doct. Benjamin Warner, July 1, 1754. Ch.: I. Asa, b. Jan. 23, 1755; II. Joanna, b. Sept. 7, 1756; III. Sabra, b. Aug. 21, 1759; IV. Aner, b. March 24, 1761; V. Lucinda, b. March 6, 1763; VI. John, b. Jan. 14, 1765; VII. Mary, b. March 16, 1767; VIII. William W., b. Feb. 1, 1769; IX. Sarah Anna, b. Jan. 7, 1771.

25. THOMAS, son of Dea. Thomas, (11,) m. Lois, dau. of Thomas Richards, July 17, 1760. She d. May 11, 1764, and he m. 2d, Thankful, dau. of Stephen Seymour, May 12, 1765. Ch.: I. Sarah, b. May 12, 1762; II. Lois, b. March 29, 1766, d. 1766; III. Thomas, b. Oct. 19, 1776; IV. Lois R., b. Oct. 29, 1769; V. Mark, b. May 23, 1773; VI. Ira, b. March 24, 1775; VII. Isaac, b. July 5, 1778.

26. DANIEL, son of Dea. Thomas, (11,) m. Sibel Bartholomew, or Williams, Jan. 15, 1766, who d. April 2, 1774, and he m. 2d, Phebe Orton, July 5, 1775. Ch.: I. Caleb, b. Oct. 18, 1766, m. — Scovill, and d. March 9, 1813. He was father of Edward Hickox of Watertown. II. Daniel, b. Feb. 11, 1769, m. Polly Brown, and d. Oct. 21, 1823; III. Mary, b. May 5, 1771, d. 1772; IV. Chauncey, b. July 12, 1773; V. Eleazer, b. July 25, 1776; VI. Mary, b. Jan. 23, 1778; VII. Uri, b. Aug. 8, 1779; VIII. Merriam, b. Aug. 1, 1781; IX. Sybbel, b. Oct. 13, 1783.

27. SAMUEL, son of Samuel, (13,) m. Dec. 5, 1771, Sarah Scovill, who d. Oct. 1, 1776. He d. Sept. 9, 1778,—no ch.

28. JOSIAH, son of Samuel, (13,) m. Phebe, dau. of John Stoddard of Woodbury, Dec. 2, 1779, and d. Sept. 20, 1786. Ch.: I. Hannah, b. April 6, 1781, m. Asa Woodward, April 6, 1801. She d. April 14, 1851. Ch.: I. Charles S. Woodward—resides in Northfield. II. Samuel, b. Jan. 17, 1783, m. Huldah Bradley, and d. Oct. 1839. He had a son Samuel Josiah, b. Oct. 20, 1806, and d. Oct. 18, 1832. III. Josiah, b. Feb. 13, 1786, d. Jan. 10, 1787.

29. JESSE, son of John, (15,) m. Betsey Hoyt, Nov. 24, 1791,—resided in New Canaan, until his ch. were born,—removed thence to Saratoga Co., N. Y.—thence to Cayuga Co., and d. near Newark, Wayne Co., N. Y., Oct. 8, 1826. Ch.: I. John H., b. Nov. 27, 1792, d. Jan. 14, 1841; II. Albert, b. July 23, 1797—removed to Michigan about 1820, and lives, (1857,) in Blissfield, Lenawee Co., Mich.; III. Emeline, b. Nov. 13, 1800, m. Doct. George R. Powers, and d. Oct. 24, 1854; IV. Emilia, b. July 23, 1802, m. S. A. Holbrook; V. Elizabeth, b. May 23, 1804, m. Rev. Solomon Stearns, and lives in Somerset, Mich.; VI. Rev. S. —, b. 1809, d. Oct. 7, 1820.

30. SAMUEL J., son of Samuel, (19,) m. Laura, dau. of Amos Culver, Oct. 15, 1800. Ch.: I. Selden, b. Sept. 22, 1801, d. 1803; II. Sally, b. Aug. 3, 1804; IV. Samuel H., b. April 16, 1810—perhaps others.

31. JESSE, son of Capt. Abraham, (23,) m. Hannah Strong, July 27, 1775, who d. Dec. 21, 1778, and he m. 2d, Rhoda Thomas, April 26, 1780. She d. Feb. 20, 1781, and he m. 3d, Hannah, wid. of Nathaniel Tompkins, Aug. 16, 1781. Ch.: I. Zenas, b. June 7, 1776; II. Molly, b. Dec. 17, 1777; III. A son, b. Feb. 14, 1781—perhaps others.

32. JARED, son of Capt. Abraham, (23,) m. Rachel, dau. of Caleb Merrills, Feb. 7, 1777. Ch.: I. Lucy, b. Dec. 6, 1777; II. Nathaniel, b. Feb. 16, 1779; III. Jemima, b. April 25, 1780; IV. Hannah, b. Dec. 12, 1782, d. July 22, 1785; V. Hannah, b. July 22, 1785; VI. Asa, b. Sept. 12, 1787; VII. Eri, b. Feb. 19, 1790; VIII. Esther, b. Sept. 20, 1792; IX. Jared, b. June 8, 1794; X. Rachel, b. Sept. 5, 1797.

33. JOEL, son of Capt. Abraham, (23,) removed in 1814, with his family, to Susquehanna Co., Pa., where he resided until his death in 1817. His sons, Spencer and James W., reside in the same county and have children.

34. TIMOTHY, son of Capt. Abraham, (23,) m. Sarah, dau. of Richard Nichols, May 3, 1781. She d. Jan. 24, 1813. He d. Dec. 8, 1835. Ch.: I. Sarah, b. June 27, 1782; II. Elizabeth, b. Aug. 11, 1783; III. Polly, b. Nov. 13, 1784; IV. Abraham, b. May 23, 1786; V. Huldah, b. Aug. 4, 1787, m. James Chatfield; VI. Leonard, b. Sept. 15, 1788; VII. Laura, b. Oct. 1, 1790; VIII. Palmyra, b. Jan. 1, 1792; IX. Nancy, b. Feb. 23, 1793, d. 1801; X. Lydia, b. Dec. 17, 1794; XI. Chloe, b. June 13, 1797, m. Jacob Tallmadge, d. 1848; XII. Sherman, b. Sept. 29, 1798, m. Sally Camp, April 22, 1824; XIII. Vina, b. June 30, 1800, d. 1822; XIV. Nancy, b. Feb. 8, 1802; XV. William, b. Sept. 12, 1803.

35. ABRAHAM, son of Capt. Abraham, (23,) m. Tamer, dau. of Jabez Tuttle, Feb. 24, 1784. Ch.: I. Ruth, b. Nov. 9, 1785; II. "Oraiena," b. Nov. 11, 1788—probably others.

36. PRESERVED, son of Capt. Abraham, (23,) m. Rachel, dau. of Capt. Hezekiah Brown, Oct. 3, 1786. Ch.: I. Samuel, b. March 8, 1787; II. Sally M., b. May 17, 1789—probably others.

37. JOHN, son of John, (24,) m. Lydia, dau. of Moses Cook, May 1, 1786. Ch.: I. Carlos V., b. Feb. 9, 1787, d. Aug. 4, 1787; II. Alonzo G., b. July 22, 1788; III. Sidney, b. July 17, 1790, d. 1791; IV. Sidney, b. Aug. 3, 1792, d. 1794; V. Asa Wm. Warner, b. April 1, 1795; VI. Carlos V., b. Sept. 30, 1797.

38. JOHN H., son of Jesse, (29,) m. Mary Lockwood, who was b. Sept. 28, 1795. He resided in Western New York. About 1823, he removed to Union Co., Pa., in 1828 to Lewiston, in 1836 to Chambersburg, and in 1839 to Harrisburg. He was run over by cars on the Cumberland Valley Railroad, at Harrisburg, and d. Jan. 14, 1841. His ch. were as follows: I. William O., b. Oct. 6, 1815, m. Caroline L. Hutter of Allentown, Pa., Sept. 10, 1840. She was dau. of Charles L. Hutter, and was b. Dec. 26, 1818. The ch. of William O. are, Alice M., b. June 25, 1841; Edwin H., b. Nov. 14, 1844; William O., b.



Feb. 12, 1849, and Caroline, b. March 29, 1852. II. Henry C., b. April 26, 1818, m. Margaret Parke of Susquehanna Co., Pa., Nov. 17, 1841. His ch. are, Theodore C., b. Aug. 20, 1846, and Josephine C., b. Sept. 19, 1848; III. Charles N., b. May 1, 1821, resides at Bedford, Pa., is a dentist; IV. Elizabeth S., b. June 5, 1825, m. Jacob Mann, and resides in Fulton Co., Pa.

## HOPKINS.

1. JOHN HOPKINS, of Hartford, had ch., Stephen and Bethia. (See p. 151.)

2. STEPHEN, son of John, (1,) had John, Stephen, Ebenezer, Joseph, Dorcas and Mary.

3. JOHN, son of Stephen, (2,) had John, Consider, Stephen, Timothy, Samuel, Mary, Hannah and Dorcas.

4. STEPHEN, son of Stephen, (2,) lived at Hartford. Ch.: Sarah, bap. Aug. 21, 1687; Rachel, b. 1789; Thomas, b. 1792, and others.

5. EBENEZER, son of Stephen, (2,) resided at Hartford. Ch.: I. Ebenezer, bap. Nov. 19, 1693, d. young; II. Jonathan, bap. June 28, 1696; III. Ebenezer, b. June 25, 1700; IV. Mary, b. Jan. 30, 1705; V. Stephen, b. Aug. 8, 1707, settled in Waterbury; VI. Isaac, b. Nov. 28, 1708, settled in Waterbury; VII. Sarah, b. June 25, 1710.

6. JOSEPH, son of Stephen, (2,) had ch.: I. Mary, bap. March 10, 1700; II. Hannah, b. 1702; III. Dorcas, b. March 18, 1704; m. Timothy Bronson; IV. Ruth, b. Nov. 9, 1707; V. Joseph, b. Jan. 14, 1711.

7. STEPHEN, son of John, (3,) settled in Waterbury, m. Susanna, dau. of John Peck of Wallingford, in 1717. She d. Dec. 2, 1755, and he m. 2d, Abigail, wid. of John Webster of Farmington, May 25, 1726, and d. Jan. 4, 1769. Ch.: I. John, b. July 20, 1718; II. Stephen, b. June 28, 1721; III. Anna, b. Sept. 25, 1723, m. Thomas Bronson; IV. Susanna, b. Nov. 10, 1725, d. 1748; V. Mary, b. June 4, 1728, d. 1735; VI. Joseph, b. June 6, 1730; VII. Jesse, b. Feb. 12, 1733, d. 1754; VIII. Mary, b. Nov. 26, 1735, d. 1748; IX. Lois, b. June 22, 1738, m. Isaac Johnson of Derby; X. David, b. Oct. 14, 1741, d. 1748.

8. TIMOTHY, son of John, (3,) m. Mary, dau. of Thos. Judd, June 25, 1719, and d. Feb. 5, 1748-9. Ch.: I. Samuel, b. Sept. 17, 1721, (see p. 399); II. Timothy, b. Sept. 8, 1723, m. Jan. 14, 1741-2, Jemima, dau. of Abraham Scovill of Simsbury; III. Huldah, b. Dec. 22, 1725, m. Abijah Richards; IV. Hannah, b. April 11, 1728, m. Thos. Upson; V. Sarah, b. May 25, 1730, m. Timothy Clark; VI. James, b. June 28, 1732, d. July 4, 1754; VII. Daniel, b. Oct. 16, 1736, (see

p. 408;) VIII. Mary, b. June 27, 1737, m. John Cosset; LX. Mark, b. Sept. 18, 1739. (See p. 410.)

9. STEPHEN, son of Ebenezer, (5,) settled in Waterbury, m. Jemima, dau. of John Bronson, Feb. 26, 1729-30. Ch.: I. Noah, b. Jan. 26, 1730-31; II. Roswell, b. May 18, 1733; III. Micah, b. March 9, 1734-5.

10. ISAAC, son of Ebenezer, (5,) lived in Waterbury, (Wolcott,) m. Mary, dau. of Thomas Hickox, Sept. 21, 1732. She d. May 27, 1790. Mr. Hopkins d. Jan. 13, 1805. Ch.: I. Obedience, b. Sept. 1, 1733, d. 1736; II. Simeon, b. April 30, 1735, d. 1736; III. Leda, b. Nov. 21, 1737, m. Samuel Judd; IV. Simeon, b. Nov. 19, 1740; V. Irene, b. 1742-3; VI. Ruth, b. Dec. 26, 1745, d. 1752; VII. Ore, b. June 18, 1748, d. 1749; VIII. Mittee, b. Dec. 14, 1750, d. Nov. 1806; IX. Mary, b. Dec. 4, 1753; X. Welthe, b. June 2, 1756; XI. Ruth, b. Dec. 10, 1759, m. 1st, Ziba Norton, 2d, Thos. Welton.

11. JOHN, son of Stephen, (7,) lived in Waterbury, m. Sarah, dau. of Benajah Johnson of Derby, Dec. 13, 1749. She d. and he m. 2d, Patience —, who d. July 23, 1802. He d. May 12, 1802. Ch.: I. Sarah, b. Oct. 1, 1750, m. Stephen Culver; II. Susanna, b. Sept. 26, 1752, d. 1776; III. and IV. Mary and Mabel, b. Nov. 25, 1755, Mary m. Eli Curtiss, an attorney, Mabel m. Rev. — Camp; V. Lois, b. Nov. 13, 1757, m. John Hotchkiss; VI. David, b. Aug. 24, 1762, m. Mary, dau. of Jonathan Thompson of West Haven, July 4, 1791. He, David, is father of David Hopkins, Esq., and grandfather of Enos Hopkins, both of Naugatuck. VII. Rhoda, b. Sept. 29, 1767, m. Frederick Hotchkiss of Prospect, and went West; VIII. Patience, b. July 22, 1769, d. 1770; IX. John, b. 1770, d. 1771; X. Patience, b. Dec. 10, 1774, d. unm.; XI. Susanna, b. May 19, 1780, d. Oct. 1780; XII. John, b. Feb. 19, 1782, d. young.

12. STEPHEN, son of Stephen, (7,) lived in Waterbury; m. Patience, dau. of Isaac Bronson, Oct. 11, 1744. She d. June 3, 1746, and he m. Dorothy, dau. of James Talmage of New Haven, Nov. 16, 1747. She d. Oct. 22, 1761. Ch.: I. Anne, b. Oct. 1, 1744; II. Samuel, b. Nov. 21, 1748, m. Molly, dau. of David Miles of Wallingford, June 27, 1771; had a son, Samuel Miles, (see p. 416;) III. ~~Samuel~~, b. June 19, 1750, d. April 14, 1801; IV. Stephen, b. April 22, 1754, d. 1782; V. Hannah, b. Sept. 23, 1757; VI. Esther, b. Aug. 29, 1760, d. Nov. 4, 1761.

13. JOSEPH, son of Stephen, (7,) m. Hepzibah, dau. of Thos. Clark, Nov. 28, 1754. She d. July 29, 1800. He d. 1801, (see p. 411.) Ch.: I. Livia, b. Aug. 27, 1755, m. Benoni Upson, D. D., (see p. 443:) I.

*Samuel  
see  
416*

Asa, b. Sept. 1, 1757; III. Joseph, b. Jan. 9, 1760, removed to Rutland, N. Y.; IV. Daniel, b. April 8, 1762, settled in Hartford; V. Esther, b. Feb. 25, 1764, m. Mark Bronson; VI. Jesse, b. May 20, 1766; VII. Hepzibah, b. May 14, 1768, m. Ethel Bronson; VIII. Hannah, b. May 31, 1770, m. Stiles Thompson of Middlebury; IX. Sally, b. Nov. 17, 1772, d. at Hudson, N. Y., unm.

14. MARK, son of Timothy, (8) m. Electa, dau. of Rev. John Sargeant of Stockbridge, Jan. 31, 1765, (see p. 410.) Ch.: I. Archibald, b. March 25, 1766; II. Henry, b. Dec. 28, 1767, d. in 1788, unm.; III. Sewall, b. July 27, 1769—had one son and five daus.; IV. John Sargeant, b. Aug. 27, 1771—had ch.; V. Louisa, b. July 17, 1774; VI. Effingham, b. 1776, d. early.

15. SIMEON, son of Isaac, (10) lived in Waterbury, m. Lois, dau. of Obadiah Richards, Nov. 15, 1764, and d. May 4, 1793. Ch.: I. Hannah, b. Aug. 5, 1765; II. Sarah, b. June 2, 1767; III. Electa, b. July 8, 1770; IV. Isaac, b. Jan. 11, 1773; V. Lois, b. July 21, 1775; VI. Richards Obadiah, b. Jan. 11, 1778; VII. Polly, b. Sept. 19, 1779; VIII. Harvey, b. June 9, 1782.

16. ASA, son of Joseph, (13,) removed from Waterbury to Hartford. He m. Rebecca, dau. of Benjamin Payne, Dec. 1, 1784. She d. Sept. 17, 1791, and he m. Abigail, dau. of Peter Benham of Wethersfield, Oct. 16, 1793, and d. Dec. 4, 1805. Ch.: I. Catharine Payne, b. Oct. 24, 1785; II. Amelia, b. Jan. 4, 1787; III. Maria, b. Oct. 16, 1790; IV. Henry, b. Sept. 3, 1794; V. Rev. Asa T. Hopkins, D. D., first settled at Pawtucket, R. I., afterwards pastor of the Bleeker st. Church, Utica, N. Y., and still later, of the First Presbyterian church, Buffalo, N. Y., where he d. Nov. 27, 1847.

17. JOSEPH, son of Joseph, (13,) m. Ruth, dau. of Abijah Gilbert of Salem, N. Y., Jan. 22, 1784. He settled in Waterbury, removed thence to Rutland, Jefferson Co., N. Y. Ch.: I. Anna, b. March 9, 1786; II. Gilbert, b. Dec. 1787; III. Rebecca, b. March 21, 1790; IV. Sophia, b. Dec. 26, 1791; V. Jesse, b. Feb. 23, 1794, d. 1818; VI. Joseph, b. Oct. 26, 1796; VII. Eliza, b. Dec. 2, 1798 VIII. Henry, b. Feb. 10, 1803 (?) IX. Mary Ann, b. March, 1806 (?) X. Emily, b. April, 1808.

18. JESSE, son of Joseph, (13,) m. Betsey Goodwin of Hartford, Dec. 3, 1794. She d. Feb. 14, 1799. Ch.: I. Betsey, b. Dec. 8, 1795; II. Sally G., Sept. 13, 1798, (see p. 412.)

19. ANNE, dau. of Joseph, (17,) m. Josiah Tyler of Rutland, N. Y. Ch.: Jessie Hopkins and Josiah Bennet.

20. GILBERT, son of Joseph, (17,) m. Betsey Sherman of Rutland, N. Y. Ch.: Ann, Gustavus, Maria, Samuel, George, Morris and Jane.

21. REBECCA, dau. of Joseph, (17,) m. Abel Doolittle. Ch.: William, Eliza, Henry and Justus.
22. SOPHIA, dau. of Joseph, (17,) m. William Sill of Rodman, N. Y. Ch.: Mary, John Sterling, Edward and Elizabeth.
23. JOSEPH, son of Joseph, (17,) m. Pamela Picket of Gouverneur, N. Y. Ch.: Bower, Sara, Emily, Brayton and others.
24. ELIZA, dau. of Joseph, (17,) m. Rev. — Banks, and afterwards, Mr. Holgate of Utica, N. Y. Ch.: Jane, Frances, Asa Hopkins and Arbella Eliza.
25. HENRY, son of Joseph, (17,) m. Celestia, dau. of Dea. David Tyler of Rutland, N. Y., in 1829. Ch.: Charles, Catharine, Martha, Mary Ann and Henry Tyler.
26. MARY ANN, dau. of Joseph, (17,) m. George M. Foster, Esq. of Ogdensburg, N. Y. Ch.: none.
27. EMILY, dau. of Joseph, (17,) m. Israel Lamb, Esq. of Ogdensburg, N. Y. Ch.: Frances, George and two others.

## HOTCHKISS.

1. Samuel Hotchkiss, (probably from Essex, England, and traditional brother of John of Guilford, Conn., whose name was written Hodgke, Hodgkin, Hotchkin, &c.,) was at New Haven as early as 1641. In Aug. 1642, he m. Elizabeth Cleverly, and d. Dec. 28, 1663, leaving children as follows: I. John, b. 1643, remained at New Haven, and m. Elizabeth, dau. of Henry Peck, Dec. 4, 1672. His descendants are numerous, and found in many parts of the country. He had a son, Capt. John, who m. Mary Chatterton at New Haven, in 1694, and settled early at Cheshire, who had a son John, b. in 1694. The last named John had Jason, b. in 1719, who was father of Sarah, who m. William Law, and became the mother of Jonathan Law, Esq., now of Cheshire; II. Samuel, b. 1645, m. Sarah Tallmage, in 1678, settled at East Haven, and d. in 1705. He had, Mary, Sarah, Samuel, James and Abigail. III. James, b. 1647, probably d. without issue; IV. Joshua, b. Sept. 16, 1751, lived at New Haven; V. Thomas, b. Dec. 1654, m. Sarah Wilmot, Nov. 28, 1677, and d. 1711. He had ch., among whom were, Samuel, Anna and Sarah; VI. Daniel, b. June 8, 1657, m. Esther Sperry, June 20, 1683, and d. in 1712. He had, Eliza, Daniel, Obadiah, Rebecca and others.
2. Ens. JOSHUA, son of Samuel, (1,) was married twice or oftener. He was a leading man at New Haven. Ch.: I. Mary, b. April 30, 1679; II. Dea. Stephen, b. Aug. 12, 1681, settled at Cheshire; III. Martha, b. Dec. 14, 1683, m. Thomas Brooks of New Haven, in 1702, who settled at Cheshire, and is the progenitor of most of the name now residing in

the last mentioned place; IV. Priscilla, d. 1688; V. Abraham, settled at Bethany, had three daughters; VI. Desire, d. in 1702; VII. Isaac, b. June, 1701, settled at Bethany, and had a large family, among whom were, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; VIII. Jacob, b. Feb. 7, 1704, settled on the old homestead, at New Haven, but afterwards removed to Hamden, and had ch. Some of his sons remained at Hamden. One of them removed to Derby.

3. Dea. Stephen, son of Ens. Joshua, (2,) m. Elizabeth, dau. of John Sperry, at New Haven, Dec. 12, 1704. He bought lands at Cheshire, in 1706, and removed thither the next year. His ch. were, I. Joshua, b. Aug. 26, 1705; II. Elizabeth, b. 1706, d. young; III. Mary, b. Jan. 1, 1708, m. Nathan Barnes; IV. Hannah, b. Jan. 10, 1710, m. Stephen Atwater; V. Elizabeth, b. Feb. 18, 1712; VI. Dea. Gideon, b. Dec. 5, 1716, and settled in Waterbury; VII. Stephen, b. Dec. 1, 1718, m. Thankful Cook, and had, Esther, Thankful, Susanna and Stephen; VIII. Silas, b. Nov. 22, 1719, m. wid. Olcott; IX. Hannah, b. Feb. 23, 1722; X. Bathshua, b. Sept. 1, 1726, m. Ralph Lines; XI. Benjamin, b. Feb. 1, 1728, m. Elizabeth Roberts; XII. Noah, b. Nov. 24, 1736, d. Jan. 13. 1760.

4. Dea. GIDEON, son of Stephen, (3,) m. Anna Brocket, June 18, 1737, who d. and he m. 2d, Mabel, dau. of Isaac Stiles of Southbury. He settled in the southeast part of Waterbury, about 1736, and when the society of Salem was organized he was made a deacon of the church. He was one of the founders and active supporters of the church and society of Columbia, (now Prospect,) was a leading man in the town, and served in both the French and Revolutionary wars. He d. Sept. 3, 1807, having lived to see 105 grand ch., 155 great grand ch., and four of the fifth generation. Ch.: I., Jesse, b. 1738; II. David, b. April 5, 1740, m. — Williams; III. Abraham, d. 1742; IV. Abraham, b. 1743, d. Oct. 29, 1806; V. Gideon, b. Dec. 1744, m. and had ch., among whom was Jesse, who m. Elizabeth King. Both he and his wife d. in 1833, of the cholera. They had a son, Geo. A., who now resides in Indiana. VI. Hudlah, b. June 27, 1747, m. Josiah Paine; VII. Anna, b. Oct. 22, 1749, m. Reuben Williams; VIII. Amos, b. Nov. 24, 1751; IX. Submit, b. June 2, 1753, m. David Paine; X. Titus, b. June 26, 1755, m. Rachel Guernsey; XI. Eben, b. Dec. 13, 1757, m. Mary, dau. of Gideon Sanford of Cheshire, Feb. 15, 1781, and had ch., among whom was Gideon Mills, now living in Prospect, on or near the old homestead; XII. Asahel, b. Feb. 15, 1760; XIII. Benoni, "died before born, July 27, 1762;" XIV. Mabel, b. May 23, 1764, m. Chauncey Judd, and d. May 5, 1797; XV. Phebe, b. Aug. 3, 1765, m. Reuben Williams, and d. 1789; XVI. Stiles, b. Jan. 31, 1768, m. Polly

Horton, and had Amanda, Sherman, Demas, Marshall, and a dau. who d. young. He lived in Prospect; XVII. Olive, b. Nov. 21, 1769, m. William Jones; XVIII. Melliscent, b. May 16, 1771, m. David Sanford; XIX. Amzi, b. July 3, 1774, resides in Meriden.

5. JESSE, son of Dea. Gideon, (4,) m. a dau. of Peter Mallory of Stratford, Oct. 2, 1759, and d. in the army, Sept. 29, 1776. He had, I. Asahel, b. 1760; II. Charity, b. 1761; III. Bulah, b. 1762; IV. Gabril, b. 1763; V. Rebecca, b. 1765; VI. Temperance, b. 1767; VII. — b. 1768; VIII. Chloe, b. 1771; IX. Anna, b. 1772; X. Huldah, b. 1774; XI. Jesse, b. 1776.

6. DAVID, son of Dea. Gideon, (4,) m. Abigail Douglas of Meriden, Nov. 21, 1763, who d. April 5, 1775, and he m. 2d, — Todd, July 5, 1775; Ch.: I. Aseneth, b. 1764; II. Sarah, b. 1766; III. Frederick, b. 1768; IV. Levina, b. 1770; V. Amraphel, b. 1772; VI. Cyrus, b. 1774; VII. Charles Todd, b. 1776; VIII. Abigail, b. 1778; IX. Gillard, b. 1780; X. Peninah, b. 1783.

7. ABRAHAM, son of Dea. Gideon, (4,) lived in Watertown, m. Sarah, dau. of John Weed, Dec. 28, 1767, and d. Oct. 29, 1806. Ch.: I. John, b. 1768; II. Ezra, b. 1772; III. Lois, b. 1773; IV. Hannah, b. 1775; V. Joel, b. 1781; VI. Benjamin, b. 1786.

8. AMOS, son of Dea. Gideon, (4,) m. Abigail, dau. of Ephraim Scott, Dec. 24, 1772. Ch.: I. Woodward, b. Oct. 19, 1773; II. Sabra, b. July 19, 1777; III. Avera, b. April 5, 1779; IV. Molly, b. Feb. 9, 1783; V. Orel, b. April 11, 1785, d. 1789; VI. Amos H., b. Feb. 18, 1788; VII. Orren, b. April 1, 1792, settled in Naugatuck; VIII. Abigail O., b. Sept. 10, 1779, d. 1804.

9. ASAHEL, son of Dea. Gideon, (4,) m. Sarah Williams, March 22, 1781, who d. in 1794, and he m. 2d, Phebe Merriam of Cheshire, June 7, 1794; Ch.: I. Sally, b. 1781; II. Curtiss, b. 1783; III. Dyer, b. 1785, has a family, lives in Naugatuck; IV. Esther, b. 1788; V. Temperance, b. 1797, m. — Andrews, resides in Sharon, Conn.; VI. Asahel A., b. 1799, resides in Sharon, has a family; VII. Marcus, b. 1801, lives in Naugatuck, has a family; VIII. Phebe Maria, b. 1805.

10. WOODWARD, son of Amos, (8,) m. Polly, dau. of Capt. Phineas Castle, April 2, 1797. They are both living and reside in Prospect. Ch.: I. Castle, b. May 10, 1798, m. Artemesia Stillman of Burlington, Conn., and removed to Ohio; II. Wm., b. Aug. 1800, m. Elizabeth Thorndike of Va.—settled in Ohio, and d. in March, 1842; III. Rhoda, b. Jan. 25, 1803, m. F. M. Benham and removed to Ohio; IV. Polly, b. July 3, 1805, m. Hervey Norton and settled in Western N. Y.; V. Julius, b. July 11, 1810, m. Melissa, dau. of Enoch Perkins of Oxford,

Conn., April 29, 1832, and at present resides in Middletown. He was the first mayor of the city of Waterbury; VI. Albert, b. April 10, 1813, m. Abbey Benio of Middletown, and d. Jan. 22, 1844; VII. Sarah C., b. Sept. 8, 1818, and d. Nov. 1848.

## JUDD.

1. Dea. THOMAS JUDD\* of Farmington had ch., Elizabeth, William, Thomas, John, Benjamin, Mary, Ruth, Philip and Samuel.

2. WILLIAM, son of Dea. Thomas, (1,) had, Mary, Thomas, John, Rachel, Samuel, Daniel and Elizabeth.

3. Lieut. THOMAS, son of Dea. Thomas, (1,) had, Thomas, John and Sarah.

3. Dea. THOMAS, son of William, (2) had, William, Martha, Rachel, Sarah, Hannah, Mary, Elizabeth, Ruth and Stephen.

5. THOMAS, son of Lieut. Thomas, (3,) had, Thomas, Joseph, Sarah, Elizabeth, Joannah, Joseph, Ebenezer, Mary, Rachel and Abigail.

6. JOHN, son of Lieut. Thomas, (3,) m. Hannah, dau. of Serg. Samuel Hickox, April 16, 1696, and d. in 1717. His wid. d. July 17, 1750. Ch.: I. Hannah, b. Feb. 2, 1697, d. March 12, 1713; II. John, b. June 28, 1699; III. Samuel, b. Nov. 6, 1703; IV. Thomas, b. Jan. 10, 1705, d. 1706; V. Thomas, b. July 10, 1707; VI. Benjamin, b. Aug. 28, 1710; VII. Ebenezer, b. 1713.

7. Capt. WILLIAM, son of Dea. Thomas, (4,) m. Mary Root, and d. Jan. 29, 1772. Ch.: I. Timothy, b. Dec. 28, 1713; II. Stephen, b. Aug. 17, 1715; III. Hannah, b. Sept. 12, 1717, d. unm.; V. Jonathan, b. Oct. 4, 1719, (see p. 421; ) V. A dau., d. without a name; VI. Elnathan, b. Aug. 7, 1724; VI. Mary, b. Nov. 22, 1727, m. 1st, Thomas Richards, 2d, — Hurlbut; VIII. William, b. Jan. 12, 1729-30; IX. Sarah, b. Nov. 30, 1732, m. Benjamin Richards.

8. JOSEPH, son of Thomas, (5,) returned from Kensington and settled in present Naugatuck. He m. Elizabeth, dau. of Robert Royce of Wallingford, Nov. 10, 1726, and d. Feb. 16, 1750. His wid. d. May 14, 1770. Ch.: I. Isaac, b. Nov. 18, 1727; II. Phebe, b. May 10, 1729; III. Elizabeth, b. April 7, 1732, m. Abner Lewis, and lived in Sandersfield, Mass.; IV. Lois, b. Jan. 9, 1735, d. 1750; V. Ebenezer, b. Nov. 23, 1737; VI. Ruth, b. May 23, 1740, m. Abraham Lewis; VII. Abigail, b. June 23, 1742-3, d. 1750.

9. Lieut. JOHN, son of John, (6,) m. Mercy, dau. of Samuel Bronson

---

\* For a full account of the three first generations of this family, see p. 153 of this work. The reader is also referred to an extended genealogy by Sylvester Judd, Esq., of Northampton, Mass.

of Kensington, Jan. 6, 1731-2. She d. 1737. He d. May 11, 1797, Ch.: I. Jemima, b. Nov. 12, 1732, m. David Taylor, 1760, d. 1761; II. Samuel, b. Dec. 26, 1734; III. Noah, b. Oct. 13, 1737.

10. SAMUEL, son of John, (6.) m. Elizabeth, dau. of David Scott, Jan. 13, 1730-31; lived in Watertown—d. Jan. 30, 1793. Ch.: I. Asa, b. Sept. 29, 1726; II. Esther, b. Aug. 11, 1728, m. Cyrus Stowe; III. Hannah, b. Nov. 8, 1731, m. David Garnsey; IV. John, b. Aug. 4, 1733.

11. THOMAS, son of John, (6.) m. Ann, dau. of Daniel Porter, May 11, 1732, and d. 1739. His wid. m. James Nichols. Ch.: I. Michael, b. Sept. 7, 1733, d. Oct. 8, 1734; II. Michael, b. Aug. 24, 1735; III. Susanna, b. Jan. 23, 1737-8, m. Ezra Bronson, Esq., Sept. 6, 1753.

12. BENJAMIN, son of John, (6.) m. Abigail, dau. of Gilbert Adams of Simsbury, Jan. 8, 1738. She d. Nov. 7, 1755. He removed from Waterbury to Harwinton—was a physician. Ch.: I. A dau., b. April 30, 1739; II. Benjamin, b. June 6, 1740, d. young; III. Thomas, b. April 12, 1743; IV. Annis, b. Nov. 25, 1744, m. an Alford; V. Joel, b. July 15, 1748, m. Mercy Hickox; ch., 1, Uri; 2, Benjamin H., who now lives in Watertown; 3, Randall; 4, Uri; 5, Lucy; VI. Benjamin, b. Jan. 8, 1755.

13. EBENEZER, son of John, (6.) m. Mary, dau. of Joseph Hawkins of Derby, Nov. 17, 1742, and removed to Claremont, N. H. Ch.: I. Brewster, b. Jan. 12, 1744, was in the Revolutionary war, removed to New Hampshire; II. Enoch, b. July 21, 1745, m. Iphenia Warner, no ch.; III. Ebenezer, b. May 28, 1747, went to New Hampshire; IV. Sarah, b. Jan. 2, 1749, d. 1755; V. David, b. Oct. 11, 1750, d. unm.; VI. Benajah, b. Sept. 15, 1752, d. in the Revolutionary service; VII. Amos, b. Sept. 11, 1755, no ch.; VIII. Hawkins, m. Annis Butler; IX. Sarah, m. Ephraim Page; X. Mary, m. Benjamin Alden; XI. Hannah.

14. TIMOTHY, Esq., son of William, (7.) graduated at Yale College in 1737, lived in Westbury, was a magistrate, &c. He m. March 29, 1744, Mary, dau. of Thomas Clark. She d. Nov. 8, 1744, and he m. Melliscent, wid. of John Southmayd, Oct. 9, 1749, who d. March 26, 1763, and he m. 3d, Ann, wid. of Benjamin Sedgwick, and mother of Judge Theodore Sedgwick. He m. 4th, Mary, wid. of Samuel Foote. She d. Oct. 1782. Ch.: I. Mary, b. Nov. 11, 1751, m. an Andruss, and lived in Binghampton, N. Y.; II. Parthenia, b. Aug. 6, 1754, m. Avery Skilton, March 26, 1771. He was a son of Dr. Henry Skilton from England, and lived in Bethlem and Watertown. She d. March 30, 1829. III. Allen S., b. Oct. 5, 1756, lived in Northfield—removed to Windsor, N. Y.—had eleven ch.; IV. Giles, b. Oct. 30, 1758, d. Sept. 3,



1759; V. Melliscent, b. Aug. 21, 1760, d. Aug. 30, 1762; VI. Timothy, b. Jan. 21, 1763, d. May 26, 1763.

15. STEPHEN, son of William, (7.) m. Margary, dau. of Caleb Clark, May 31, 1743. She d. Feb. 11, 1746-7, and he m. 2d, Mary, dau. of Thomas Wheeler of Woodbury, April 28, 1748, who d. Aug. 11, 1749. He then m. Lydia, dau. of Dr. Ebenezer Warner of Woodbury, March 13, 1751. She d. June 2, 1763, and he m. 4th, Else, wid. of Phineas Matthews, Nov. 10, 1768, and d. Oct. 12, 1771. His fourth wife d. with her son Erastus at Jefferson, N. Y., Aug. 1799. Ch.: I. Thomas, b. Feb. 9, 1743-4, removed to Harpersfield, N. Y.—had eight ch.; II. Lydia, b. Sept. 18, 1745, m. Justus Daily; III. Daniel, b. May 9, 1749, d. Aug. 1749; IV. Daniel, b. Jan. 17, 1751-52—was a soldier in the expedition to Quebec, where he d. Feb. 2, 1776, of small-pox; V. Hannah, b. Oct. 31, 1753, m. Abijah Baird, lived at Harpersfield; VI. Freeman, b. Aug. 10, 1755—was in the expedition to Quebec. He d. at Lockport, N. Y., March 5, 1840—had thirteen ch.; VII. Stephen, b. May 1, 1757, settled in Harpersfield, N. Y.—no ch.—d. Jan. 8, 1821; VIII. "Margret," b. Jan. 23, 1759, m. Noble Atwood; IX. Eben Warner, b. April 12, 1761, removed to Middlebury, Vt., and d. there, Sept. 18, 1837—had four ch.; X. Erastus, b. June 29, 1771, m. Ruth Hickox, and went to Jefferson, N. Y., where he d. May 22, 1837. He had nine ch.

16. ELNATHAN, son of William, (7.) m. Miriam, dau. of Samuel Richards, Nov. 28, 1752. He lived in Westbury, and d. there Jan. 3, 1777. His wid. d. at Paris, N. Y., Jan. 12, 1806. Ch.: I. Richard Samuel, b. Oct. 16, 1753, d. in Clinton, N. Y., April 6, 1821—left no ch.; II. Clarinda, b. May 16, 1755, d. unm. Nov. 29, 1804; III. Sarah, b. Sept. 14, 1757, d. unm., March, 1790; IV. Dotha, b. Feb. 26, 1760, m. Maj. Joseph Cutler—had 11 ch. and d. at Buffalo, N. Y., Sept. 6, 1833; V. Consider, b. June 13, 1762, d. next day; VI. Melliscent, b. July 7, 1763, m. Samuel Prentice—went West, had 5 ch., and d. Feb. 23, 1828; VII. Miriam, b. April 12, 1766, m. Smith Arnold. He became a Methodist minister and lived in various places in N. Y.; VIII. Elnathan, b. Dec. 7, 1773, removed to Paris, N. Y., thence to Troy, Mich., was a physician, and d. Sept. 4, 1845.

17. WILLIAM, son of William, (7.) m. Mary, dau. of Isaac Castle, Nov. 2, 1752, who d. March 12, 1777, and he m. 2d, wid. Sarah Green of Stamford, Oct. 1778. He removed to Harpersfield, N. Y., and thence to Jefferson, where he d. Nov. 22, 1815. Ch.: I. Demas, b. Sept. 10, 1753, m. Maranah Garnsey, removed to Jefferson, N. Y., and d. Sept. 22, 1840—had 14 ch.; II. Balmarine, b. Sept. 20, 1755, m. Ahigail

Thompson, lived in Huntington, Conn., and d. May 19, 1840—had 10 ch.; III. William, b. April 1, 1758—went to Jefferson, N. Y., d. Aug. 24, 1839—was a Revolutionary pensioner; IV. Mary Root, b. Dec. 21, 1759, m. Daniel Garnsey and went to Harpersfield, N. Y.; V. "Luce," b. July 2, 1764, m. Isaac Garnsey—went to Harpersfield; VI. Shelden, b. July 10, 1767, d. 1768; VII. Shelden, b. Oct. 17, 1768, lived at Scipio, N. Y., and d. May 12, 1806—had 4 ch.; VIII. "Perthena," b. Dec. 3, 1771, unm. IX. Marvin, b. May 16, 1775, settled in Jefferson, N. Y.—had 1 son.

18. ISAAC, son of Joseph, (8.) m. Anna, dau. of Daniel Williams, June 23, 1751-2. He lived at Judd's Meadow, and d. June 10, 1808. His wid. d. July 1, 1822. Ch.: I. Roswell, b. Nov. 6, 1752, m. Lois Scott, June 17, 1777. He lived in Salem and had 9 ch.; II. Rosanna, b. Oct. 6, 1754. m. 1st, Edward Perkins, 2d, James Brown; III. Isaac, b. Nov. 19, 1756, m. Patience Hammond, and settled in Woodbridge, Conn.—had 7 ch.; IV. Walter, b. Nov. 11, 1758, m. Margaret Terril, May 3, 1782, lived in Salem so., and d. April 2, 1833—had 6 ch.; V. Apaline, b. Jan. 25, 1761, m. Elias Lounsbury of Bethany; VI. Chauncey, b. July 8, 1764, lived in Salem, was in the Revolutionary war, m. 1st, Mabel, dau. of Gideon Hotchkiss, 2d, Eunice French—had 10 ch.; VII. and VIII. Anna and Ruth, b. July 6, 1767; Anna d. in 1773—Ruth m. Andrew Smith, and had 5 ch.; IX. Milla, b. Oct. 1769, m. Isaac Perkins of Bethany; X. Reuben, b. May 28, 1772, m. Dorcas Smith, had 2 ch. and d. at Bethany, July 4, 1840; XI. Asel, b. June 23, 1776, m. Polly Johnson, and d. at Bethany, Oct. 13, 1834—had 4 ch.; XII. Harvey, b. Dec. 3, 1778, lived in Salem, m. 1st, Jemima Hickox, Dec. 25, 1800, who d. Nov. 1, 1803, and he m. 2d, Mrs. Lucy Twitchel, formerly a Hinman, Aug. 12, 1810—had 7 ch.

19. EBENEZER, son of Joseph, (8.) m. Anna Charles, Feb. 7, 1765, who d. Aug. 10, 1782, and he m. Betsey, dau. of Nathan Hill of Cheshire, Oct. 8, 1782. He was then residing in Goshen. She d. Nov. 23, 1807, and he m. 3d, Mary Hurlbut, Jan. 28, 1808, and removed to Cornwall, Vt., and thence to Onondaga, N. Y. His wife d. June 25, 1821. He d. Sept. 27, 1823. Ch.: I. Charles, b. March 2, 1766, d. 1779; II. Abigail, b. March 31, 1768, m. David Landon; lived and d. in Solon, N. Y.; III. Allin, b. March 19, 1770, d. 1772; IV. Allin, b. March 9, 1772, m. Clarissa Palmer; lived in Orwell, Vt., and thence removed to the State of N. Y.—was drowned about 1817—left 6 ch.; V. Amzi, b. Dec. 21, 1774, unm.; VI. Anna, b. March 16, 1777, m. Reuben Dibble, and lived in German, Chenango Co., N. Y.—both dead; VII. Asa, b. Feb. 11, 1780, m. Sarah Burdick, lived in German, left 2

daus.; VIII. Ambrose, b. Aug. 23, 1783, m. Nancy Johnson of Southbury, Conn., Dec. 16, 1806; resides at Marcellus, N. Y.—a deacon—has 5 ch.; IX. Ruth, b. Oct. 19, 1785, m. Constant Fenn, resides in Onondaga, N. Y.; X. Esther, b. April 19, 1789, d. when 12 years old.

20. Capt. SAMUEL, son of Lieut. John, (9.) m. Bede, dau. of Isaac Hopkins, March 31, 1763. She d. March 20, 1810. He kept a public house on the north side of West Main street 52 years, and d. Sept. 11, 1825. Ch.: I. Mary, b. Feb. 20, 1764, m. Timon Miles of Waterbury, April 5, 1785, d. June 2, 1845; II. Olive, b. July 21, 1767, unm., d. Nov. 3, 1849; III. John, b. April 11, 1769, d. 1769; IV. Sarah, b. Nov. 18, 1771, m. Israel Holmes from Greenwich, Sept. 9, 1773, lived in Waterbury and d. March 19, 1821; V. Hannah, b. June 7, 1774, unm., resides on the old homestead; VI. Samuel, b. June 5, 1777.

21. Noah, son of Lieut. John, (9.) m. Rebecca, dau. of Jonathan Prindle, July 10, 1760. He lived in Watertown and d. Sept. 3, 1822. His widow d. March 19, 1838, aged 99. Ch.: I. Jenima, b. Aug. 10, 1761, m. Samuel Woodward; II. Harvey, b. May 5, 1763, went to Coventry, N. Y.—had four ch.; III. Michael, b. Feb. 19, 1765, went to the State of New York,—had 6 ch.; IV. Eleazar, b. Aug. 22, 1769, lived in Watertown—had ch.; V. Susannah, m. Ebenezer French, d. Oct. 31, 1832; VI. Leverett, b. about 1774, m. Olive C. Steel and resided in Bethlem, Conn. He d. Dec. 11, 1841. His wid. d. Feb. 20, 1848. Ch.: Garwood, has ch.—resides in the State of New York; 2. Auna, m. Titus Pierce and resides in South Britain; 3. Daniel, resides in the State of New York; 4. Erasmus, lives in Ohio; 5. Leverett P., resides in Bethlem, has ch.; VII. Bethel, graduated at Yale College in 1797—long a minister of the Episcopal Church. He received the degree of D. D. from Washington College in 1831; VIII. Hannah, m.—Demming; IX. Jonathan,—was an Episcopal minister at Cambridge, Md.; X. Elijah, d. Dec. 24, 1794, a. 10; XI. Hannah, d. Nov. 13, 1833.

22. JOHN, son of Samuel, (10.) m. Elizabeth, dau. of Ebenezer Richards, April 10, 1755, and lived in Watertown. She d. March 22, 1779, and he d. Dec. 23, 1793. Ch.: I. Levi, b. March 16, 1756, d. July 21, 1756; II. Levi, b. Oct., 1757, m. Eunice Hubbard and had 10 ch. He lived in Watertown and d. Nov. 30, 1810; III. Abigail, b. July 3, 1760, d. 1760; IV. John, b. June 27, 1661, went West; V. Chandler, b. April 3, 1763; VI. Abigail, b. April 7, 1765; VII. Susanna, b. March 19, 1769; VII. Annah, b. Sept. 26, 1772; IX. Esther, b. Feb. 11, 1775.

23. ASA, son of Samuel, (10.) m. Melliscent, dau. of Samuel Silkrigs,

June 27, 1761. Ch.: I. Mercy, b. Nov. 29, 1761; II. Samuel, b. Feb. 28, 1763; III. Melliscent, b. March 29, 1765; IV. Asa; V. Elkanah; VI. Alpheus.

24. **ROSWELL**, son of Isaac, (18,) m. Lois Scott, June 17, 1777. Ch.: I. Esther, b. June 17, 1778, m. Samuel Peck; II. Leava, b. Feb. 7, 1780, m. Rev. Samuel Potter; III. Anna, b. Oct. 1, 1782, m. Russel Chamberlain of Kent; IV. Tamer, b. Sept. 22, 1784, m. Ira Pond of Camden, N. Y.; V. Chloe, b. Sept. 1, 1786, m. Russel Chamberlain after the death of Anna; VI. Roswell C., b. May 20, 1789—went to Illinois; VII. Lois A., b. June 12, 1791, m. Baird Candee of Naugatuck; VIII. Laura, b. July 30, 1794, unm.; IX. Asahel, b. Aug. 15, 1797, m. Polly Platt of Waterbury.

25. **SAMUEL**, son of Capt. Samuel, (20,) m. Cleora, dau. of Benjamin Baldwin, Aug. 30, 1798. She d. Dec. 9, 1809. He m. 2d, Polly, dau. of Jesse Beecher of Woodbridge, April 5, 1812, and d. March 19, 1813, aged 36. His widow d. Aug. 30, 1815, in her 33d year. Ch.: I. Elizabeth Cook, b. Aug. 23, 1800, m. James Morriss of Cussewaga, Pa.; II. Sophia Hopkins, b. Aug. 6, 1805, d. Aug. 25, 1815.

26. **CHANDLER**, son of John, (22,) m. — Scott, and d. Dec. 21, 1791. Ch.: I. Harvey, b. 1787, left home while young and was never heard of more; II. Sarah, b. Oct. 3, 1789, m. Ephraim Nettleton of Waterbury and had 2 ch.; III. Chandler, (posthumous,) b. July 20, 1792, m. Grace Lum of Southbury, Aug., 1819, and had 3 sons and 2 daughters—resides in Watertown.

**STEPHEN JUDD** of Waterbury, was in West Hartford, Aug., 1751; parentage unknown. He m. Sarah Russel of Wallingford, Jan. 18, 1776, and d. July 10, 1820. Ch.: I. Thomas, b. Oct. 28, 1776, m. Betsey Clark of Wallingford, Oct., 1800—had 8 ch.—lived in Southington; II. Stephen, b. Jan. 29, 1780, m. Pamela Stilwell of Cairo, Green Co., N. Y., and removed to Ohio; III. Elizabeth, b. 1782, m. John Tuttle, d. at Waterbury in 1848; IV. Hepzibah, b. May 23, 1784, m. Joseph Root of Waterbury; V. Jesse, b. Oct. 11, 1786,—lives in Greenwood, Steuben Co., N. Y., where he m. Mary Stotenburg; VI. Nabby Curtis, b. April 10, 1791, m. Amasa Roberts of Middletown; VII. Sally Russell, b. Nov. 1, 1793, d. 1794; VIII. Sarah Ann, b. Aug. 18, 1795, m. Jesse Lambert of Waterbury; IX. Harvey, b. Aug. 25, 1798, m. Sally Brown, Dec. 31, 1821, and had Samuel C. and Harvey. He d. in Ohio in 1833; X. William Russell, b. May 9, 1802, married and had ch.—lives in Waterbury.

## KENDRICK.

JOHN, the grandfather of Green Kendrick, was a Virginian, supposed to be of the second or third generation from the original ancestor from Massachusetts. He was a tobacco planter, and had four sons,—John, William, James and Benjamin, and four or five daughters. He was born about the year 1735, and died in 1810. John, his eldest son, the father of Green, removed to North Carolina about the year 1786, and was a tobacco planter, until the invention of the cotton gin, by Whitney, when he became a cotton planter. He was a man of ability, integrity, and eminent usefulness in all matters pertaining to the church, the State and society. He was a deacon of the Baptist church, was born in 1764, and d. 1823.

The wife of the above John Kendrick was Martha Dinkins, dau. of John Dinkins, a wealthy planter, believed to have been of Welch descent. She was b. in 1765, and d. in 1825; was a woman of many virtues, fulfilling the duties of life with a scrupulous regard to the precepts of the Bible. She was the mother of eleven children, nine of whom became heads of families. There were eight sons, and three daus. Green was the seventh child, and is the only survivor.

GREEN KENDRICK was born in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, April 1, 1798. From seven to ten years of age, he attended a common country school, to and from which he walked more than three miles, night and morning. From ten to nineteen, he labored on the plantation, attending school at such brief intervals as his duties on the plantation would allow. For two years during the latter part of the time, he enjoyed somewhat better educational advantages than was common for the sons of planters at that time. He was very ambitious, both in his labors in the field and in his studies, and thus accomplished more than most others with whom he was associated. His father taught him industry and necessity made him frugal. At the age of nineteen, after teaching a common school nine months, he obtained a place in a country store, where he remained about a year, when he procured a more desirable position as salesman in a store in Charlotte, the County town. In a little more than a year he purchased the stock of goods of his employer on a credit, and commenced business on his own account. In 1823, he married Anna Maria, dau. of Mark Leavenworth of Waterbury. The death of his father, which occurred about this time, put him in possession of additional means. He continued the mercantile business at Charlotte until the spring of 1829, when he closed it and

removed to Waterbury, where he engaged in the manufacture of clocks, under the name of Mark Leavenworth & Co., and in that of gilt buttons, under the name of Leavenworth & Kendrick. Since then he has continued to be interested to some extent in the manufacture of the various articles for which Waterbury is somewhat distinguished.

In 1845, 1847 and 1848, Mr. Kendrick was a member of the House of Representatives of Connecticut. In 1846, he was elected to the Senate, and was chosen Lieut. Governor in 1851. In 1854, he was again a member of the House, and speaker after the resignation of L. F. S. Foster, who was elected to the United States Senate. Throughout the session of 1856, he was the speaker of the House of Representatives.

#### LEAVENWORTH.\*

1. THOMAS LEAVENWORTH settled in Woodbury, prior to 1682. Whence he came, I am not informed. He died Aug. 3, 1683, at which date the inventory of his estate was exhibited to the Court of Probate, of Fairfield Co., and his estate was ordered to be distributed to his widow, one third to his eldest son, a double portion to his second child, a daughter, and to his third child, a son, a single portion—names not given. In the settlement of John Leavenworth's estate, the names of the two sons are found to have been, Thomas and John. Thomas settled in Stratford and is the progenitor of the Waterbury and Woodbury Leavenworths. Of John, I have no definite information, but am led to believe he had no male issue.

2. JOHN, brother of Thomas, (1,) also settled in Woodbury, and d. previous to Nov. 7, 1702, when Thomas Leavenworth of Stratford was appointed administrator of his estate, Feb. 28, 1704. The court ordered the estate to be distributed to Thomas, the administrator, and to John, brother of the latter.

3. THOMAS, son of Thomas, (1,) settled in Stratford, Ripton parish, where he had land recorded, Jan. 1702, "near Mill River." He d. in 1748; his widow, Mary, in 1758. The following are mentioned as his children, May 5, 1734. (In his will, dated July 6, 1748, and in the will of Mary his widow, dated May 11, 1758, Edmund and Ebenezer are

---

\* I am aware that my account of the genealogy of this family will not agree with the genealogical tree belonging to the family, which was published a few years since; neither will it correspond with the sketch found in Woodbury His., p. 614, especially the first paragraph in that work, as the first part of that sketch was taken from that tree by the special request of members of the family. The genealogy here given, has been drawn from various records, with the utmost care, and may be relied upon as fact. The investigations I have given the public records, convince me that the tree was drawn from that untruthful story-teller, *tradition*.

omitted.) Ch.: I. Edmund, remained at Stratford, and d. between July 12 and Aug. 15, 1783, leaving a wife, Abigail, and ch. In the distribution of his estate, Gideon and Edmund are named as his sons; II. James, remained at Stratford; III. Ebenezer, of Ripton parish, Stratford, d. in 1734, gave his estate to his father, and to his brothers and sisters, (as here named;) IV. John settled in Woodbury and d. in 1783, aged 77;\* V. David of Woodbury, d. April 10, 1735; VI. Zebulon, settled in Woodbury, and d. in 1793; VII. Mark, b. 1711; VIII. Thomas, settled in Woodbury; IX. Mary, m. Joseph Perry; X. Hannah, m. Nicholas Moss; XI. Sarah, b. Nov. 6, 1721, m. Abner Perry.

4. JAMES, son of Thomas, (3,) remained at Stratford, m. Hester Trowbridge, Aug. 23, 1720, and d. 1759. Ch.: I. Mahitable, b. July 28, 1721, m. — Waterman; II. Tamer, b. May 28, 1727, m. — Hurd; III. Samuel, b. Feb. 21, 1729; IV. Daniel, b. March 25, 1731; V. Ann, b. April 14, 1733, m. — Lake; VI. Mary, b. Aug. 13, 1735; VII. James, b. July 6, 1737; VIII. Esther, b. Jan. 27, 1739; IX. Ebenezer, b. Sept. 22, 1743, d. before 1759.

5. REV. MARK, (see p. 283,) son of Thos., (3,) settled in Waterbury. He m. Feb. 6, 1739-40, Ruth, dau. of Jeremiah Peck, and grand-dau. of Rev. Jeremiah Peck. She d. Aug. 8, 1750, and he m. Dec. 4, 1750, Sarah, dau. of Jesse Hull, of Derby. He d. Aug. 20, 1797. His wid. Sarah, d. May 7, 1808, aged 82. Ch.: I. Jesse, b. Nov. 22, 1741; II. Mark, b. May 26, 1752, grad. Y. C., m. the wid. of Wm. Sherman, (son of Roger,) went to France with Joel Barlow, and d. in Paris, in 1812; II. Joseph, b. Jan. 19, 1755, d. 1756; IV. Sarah, b. Dec. 11, 1756, m. Doct. Isaac Baldwin, and had three daughters, two of whom, Sarah and Esther, m. Doct. Edward Field; the other, Rebecca, d. unm.; V. William, b. Feb. 23, 1759; VI. Nathan, b. Dec. 11, 1761, d. 1797; VII. Joseph, b. June 15, 1764; VIII. Elisha, b. Oct. 13, 1766, m. 1st, Mrs. Russell, 2d, — Stone of Derby—had one son by first wife.

6. SAMUEL, son of James, (4,) had ch., and among them Joseph, b. in 1778.

7. JESSE, son of Rev. Mark, (5,) grad. Y. C. in 1760, m. July 1, 1761, Catharine, wid. of Capt. Culpeper Frisbie of Branford, and dau. of Mr. John Conkling of Southampton, L. I. She d. June 29, 1824, aged 87. Ch.: I. Melines Conkling, b. Jan. 4, 1762, grad. Y. C. in 1781, and went South. In 1801, he m. Mrs. Ann Lamar, of Augusta, Geo., and continued to reside in that city until his death, which occurred July 20,

---

\* See Woodbury His., p. 614; also for the children of David, Thomas and Zebulon.

1823; II. Ruth, b. Feb. 25, 1764, m. Capt. Moses Elkins of Peacham, Vt., and removed to Canada, where she d. and where several of her ch. now reside; III. Dr. Frederick, b. Sept. 4, 1766; IV. Catharine, b. 1768, m. 1st, — Dennis, 2d, Thos. Peck, and d. June 25, 1815, leaving a son and two daughters; V. Jesse, b. Aug. 1771; VI. Mark, b. Aug. 31, 1774.

8. WILLIAM, son of Rev. Mark, (5) m. Hannah, dau. of Ezra Bronson, Esq., May 1, 1781. Ch.: I. Sarah, b. June 20, 1784, m. Joel Walters of New Haven, and had sons, Rev. William, James, and a dau. Caroline, perhaps others; II. William, b. June 20, 1786, m. Fanny, dau. of Abel Porter, and had a dau. Sarah, who m. B. P. Watrous; is now Mrs. Nash of Akron, Ohio.

9. Doct. FREDERICK, son of Jesse, (7) m. Fanny, dau. of Abner Johnson, May 19, 1796. Ch.: I. Lucia, b. March 24, 1797, m. Rev. Asa M. Train, of Milford; II. Eliza, b. Dec. 7, 1798, m. C. D. Kingsbury;\* III. Frederick A., b. June 13, 1801, and d. about 1809; IV. Abner J., b. July 12, 1803; V. Fanny A., m. Nathaniel Worden, of Bridgeport; VI. Elisha.

10. JESSE, son of Jesse, (7) removed to Danville, Vt., early in life, where he resided until his death, Jan. 1, 1830. He m. 1st, Nancy Pope, 2d, Martha Morrill. Ch.: I. Catharine, m. — Hazelton; II. Doct. Frederick; III. Nancy, d. 1821; IV. Fanny, m. — Hazelton; V. Maria, d. 1824; VI. Melina, d. 1825; VII. Jane, b. 1817; VIII. Mark, b. 1828.

---

\* Joseph Kingsbury, from whom C. D. Kingsbury is descended, is supposed to have emigrated from England to Boston, prior to 1640. He settled at Haverhill, Mass., and had a son Joseph.

2. Joseph, son of Joseph, (1) settled at Norwich Farms, now Franklin, Conn., about 1685. The farm on which he settled is still owned and occupied by members of the family. He had six sons; the youngest was named Nathaniel.

3. Nathaniel, son of Joseph, (2) had 9 ch. who lived to manhood, but all d. in early or middle life, except John and Jacob. The last mentioned was a colonel in the U. S. army, and d. in 1837 or 8, aged 81.

4. John, (see p. 422,) son of Nathaniel, (8) was b. at Norwich, Dec. 30, 1762. He settled in Waterbury, and m. Marcia, dau. of Dea. Stephen Bronson, Nov. 6, 1794. She d. March 21, 1818. He d. Aug. 26, 1844. Ch.: I. Charles D., b. Nov. 7, 1795; II. Julius Jesse Bronson, b. Oct. 18, 1797; III. John Southmayd, b. Nov. 18, 1801; IV. Sarah Susanna, b. Nov. 6, 1807, m. William Brown, and d. May 30, 1840.

5. Charles Denison, son of John, (4) m. Eliza, dau. of Frederick Leavenworth, (9) March 8, 1821. Ch.: I. Frederick John, b. Jan. 1, 1828, m. Althea R., dau. of Wm. H. Scovill, April 29, 1851. Ch.: Wm. Charles and Mary Eunice; II. Sarah Leavenworth, b. April 1, 1840.

6. Maj. Julius J. B., (see p. 423,) son of John, (4) m. Jane C. Stebbins, of N. Y. Ch.: I. Julius H., d. in California; II. Walter; III. Mary Jane, m. Capt. S. B. Buckner, U. S. army; IV. Henry W., now of the U. S. Military Academy at West Point.

7. John Southmayd, son of John, (4) m. Abbey H., dau. of Daniel Hayden, Jan. 25, 1827. Ch.: I. James D., b. Nov. 22, 1827, d. May 7, 1881; II. Geo. B., b. Sept. 6, 1829; III. Marcia A., b. May 1, 1832, m. R. Ware, May 1, 1856; IV. Sylvia E., b. Sept. 7, 1834, m. E. D. Griggs, May 1, 1854; V. James D., b. Sept. 7, 1836, d. Jan. 19, 1887; VI. Harriet A., b. June 15, 1839; VII. Abbey S., b. June 30, 1842; VIII. John J. D., b. July 27, 1845.



11. MARE, (see p. 424,) son of Jesse, (7.) m. Anna, dau. of Moses Cook, who d. April 9, 1842, aged 64, and he m. Susan J., dau. of Joseph Cook, Nov. 1844. She d. Dec. 15, 1848, aged 51. Gh.: I. Doct. Melines Conkling, b. Jan. 15, 1796, has been a surgeon in the U. S. army, and is an eminent botanist; II. Anna Maria, b. Feb. 10, 1798, m. Hon. Green Kendrick; III. Mark M., b. May 13, 1800, d. July, 1825; IV. Benjamin Franklin, b. July 27, 1803, m. Jane Bartholomew, was murdered in California; V. Harriet, b. July 19, 1807, d. May 25, 1808; VI. Harriet H., b. May 19, 1810, d. March 23, 1833; VII. Catharine E., b. Aug. 1, m. Corydon S. Sperry, d. Feb. 9, 1855.

12. JOSEPH, son of Samuel, (6.) m. Tamer, dau. of Benj. Richards, Jan. 12, 1797. Ch.: Harriet, b. Nov. 19, 1798; Hannah, b. Sept. 16, 1800; Joseph S. b. Dec. 2, 1802, d. 1841; Samuel E., b. Aug. 11, 1805, d. 1814; Rebecca, b. Feb. 9, 1811, d. 1838; Mary G., b. Sept. 6, 1814; Sarah Ann, b. Aug. 9, 1817.

#### LEWIS.

1. JOSEPH LEWIS, of Windsor and Simsbury, had sons, Joseph and John.

2. Dea. JOSEPH, (see p. 165,) son of Joseph, (1,) settled in Waterbury, and m. Sarah, dau. of Abraham Andruss, April 7, 1703. He d. Nov. 29, 1749, his wife March 6, 1773. Ch.: A dau., b. Aug. 12, 1704, d. Sept. 1704; II. Joseph, b. July 12, 1705; III. Sarah, b. April 29, 1708, m. Obadiah Warner; IV. John, b. April 14, 1711; V. Mary, b. June 10, 1714, m. Daniel Williams; VI. Rev. Thomas, b. Aug. 6, 1716, grad. at Y. C. in 1741, became a Congregational clergyman; VII. Samuel, b. July 6, 1718; VIII. Abraham, b. Feb. 1721, d. young.

3. JOSEPH, son of Joseph, (2,) m. Mary, dau. of John Slaughter of Simsbury, Nov. 12, 1727. She d. April 4, 1738, and he m. Elizabeth ——. He d. Oct. 22, 1749. Ch.: I. Elisha, b. Jan. 30, 1728-9; II. Samuel, b. Feb. 8, 1730-31; III. Damaras, b. April 22, 1734, m. Samuel Scott; IV. Joseph, b. Oct. 16, 1736; V. Abraham; VI. Rhoda, d. May 2, 1767.

4. JOHN, son of Joseph, (2,) m. Mary, dau. of Samuel Munn of Woodbury, Dec. 4, 1734. She d. Sept. 30, 1749, and he m. Amy, dau. of Capt. Samuel Smith of New Haven, May 29, 1750. Ch.: I. David, b. April, 1736, d. 1754; II. John, b. Dec. 1740; III. Sarah, b. April, 1743; IV. Amy, b. May 24, 1751; V. Samuel Smith, b. Sept. 7, 1753; VI. David, b. April 11, 1756.

5. Dea. SAMUEL, son of Joseph, (2,) m. Hannah, dau. of Hezekiah

Rew, May 19, 1743. She d. in 1759, and he m. Eunice, dau. of Ephraim Beebe of Saybrook, Nov. 7, 1763. He d. April 11, 1788. Ch.: I. Abraham, b. Oct. 21, 1744, d. 1749; II. Rev. Amzi, b. Oct. 9, 1746, was graduated at Y. C. in 1768, and became a clergyman; III. Olive, b. Dec. 10, 1749; IV. Lucy, b. March 18, 1753, m. Simeon Porter; V. Mary b. — 31, 1755, d. 1759; VI. Prue, b. Jan. 16, 1759, m. Nathan Porter; VII. Hester, b. May 3, 1765, m. Lucian Spencer; VIII. Molle, b. March 9, 1768, m. Culpeper Hoadley; IX. Samuel, b. June 4, 1770, d. while a member of Y. C.; X. Asahel, b. Aug 8, 1772, d. aged 37, leaving a large and respectable family; XI. Eunice, b. Dec. 10, 1775, m. 1st, Ebenezer Fairchild, 2d, Elias Scott, both of Oxford.

6. ELISHA, son of Joseph, (3,) m. Tamer, dau. of Samuel Hale of New Haven, June 14, 1750. Ch.: I. Jabez, b. Sept. 10, 1751; II. Tamer, b. Dec. 28, 1752; III. Brazilla, b. March 28, 1754; IV. Naboth, b. June 24, 1756.

7. JOHN, son of John, (4,) was a capt. in the Revolution. He m. Sarah, dau. of James Gordon, Nov. 17, 1763. Ch.: I. Anna, b. Jan. 5, 1765; II. Ezra, b. May 28, 1768; III. Leva, b. July 20, 1770; IV. John, b. July 16, 1772; V. Chauncey; VI. Sarah; VII. Alanson; VIII. ———.

8. ABRAHAM, son of Joseph, (3,) m. Ruth Judd, Nov. 9, 1767, who d. April 20, 1814. Ch.: I. Rhoda, b. June 6, 1769; II. Ansel, b. July 18, 1772, m. Lydia Merrill, and had eleven ch.

9. SAMUEL SMITH, son of John, (4,) m. Abigail Baldwin, Feb. 22, 1776, and d. in 1842. Ch.: I. Rev. Thomas, b. April 13, 1777, grad. Y. C. in 1798, and d. in Georgia, March 3, 1804; II. Sally, b. Aug. 30, 1781; III. Milo, b. Oct. 22, 1789, resides in Naugatuck.

#### PORTER.

1. Doct. DANIEL PORTER of Farmington, had ch.: Daniel, Mary, Nehemiah, Richard, Ann, John and Samuel. (See p. 171.)

2. Doct. DANIEL, son of Daniel, (1,) had, Daniel, James, Thomas, Deborah, Ebenezer and Anne. (See p. 172.)

3. RICHARD, son of Daniel, (1,) had, Daniel, Joshua, Mary, Ruth, Samuel, Hezekiah, John, Timothy, Hezekiah, Joshua and Richard. (See p. 173.)

4. Doct. DANIEL, son of Daniel, (2,) had, I. Preserved, b. Nov. 23, 1729; II. Dr. Daniel, b. March 17, 1731, was a surgeon in the army, and d. at Crown Point in 1759, unm.; III. Hannah, b. June 16, 1733, m. Obadiah Scovill; IV. Timothy, b. June 19, 1735; V. Susanna, b. July 17, 1737, m. 1st, Daniel Killam of New Haven, July 4, 1758, and

2d, John Casset of Simsbury, Sept. 1767; VI. Anna, b. Dec. 6, 1738, m. Daniel, son of Josiah Bronson; VII. Jemima; VIII. Elizabeth.

5. Doct. JAMES, son of Daniel, (2,) had, I. Huldah, b. Dec. 8, 1733, m. 1st, — Fairchild, 2d, David Taylor; II. James, b. Nov. 10, 1737; III. David, Aug. 11, 1746.

6. Capt. THOMAS, son of Daniel, (2,) had, I. Sarah, b. Sept. 24, 1728, m. Enoch Scott; II. Ashbel, b. Feb. 2, 1730; III. Mary, b. Jan. 5, 1732, m. Joel Sanford; IV. Eunice, b. April 19, 1734, d. unm.; V. Thomas, b. May 9, 1736; VI. Phineas, b. Dec. 1, 1739; VII. Elizabeth, b. May 9, 1741, m. Timothy Clark; VIII. Simeon, b. June 18, 1744, m. — Lewis, and went to Ohio; IX. Sybbel, b. Aug. 8, 1747, d. young; X. Dorcas, b. Aug. 2, 1751, m. Erastus Bradley of New Haven.

7. EBENEZER, son of Daniel, (2,) had, I. Lydia, b. April 9, 1741, m. Abel Beecher of New Haven, Aug. 31, 1764; II. Asa, b. Aug. 7, 1743; III. —, b. 1745, d. 1745; IV. Mary, b. June 14, 1749, d. March 22, 1780.

8. SAMUEL, son of Doct. Richard, (3,) m. Mary, dau. of John Bronson, May 9, 1722. Administration was granted on his estate March 22, 1727-8, and only one ch. is mentioned. The wid. m. John Barnes. Ch., as recorded, Samuel, b. Dec. 22, 1723; Lucy, b. Oct. 12, 1725.

9. TIMOTHY, son of Richard, (3,) m. 1st, Mary, dau. of Jonathan Baldwin, Dec. 18, 1735, and 2d, Hannah Winters, in 1767. He removed to Stratford. Ch., recorded in Waterbury; I. Sybbel, b. March 23, 1737; II. John, b. Feb. 22, 1739, m. Phebe Curtiss of Wallingford, Nov. 7, 1770; III. Lois, b. Feb. 6, 1743; IV. Mary, b. May 8, 1745; V. Mark, b. March 27, 1748; VI. Ruth, b. May 17, 1750; VII. and VIII. Timothy and Lucy, b. June 8, 1753.

10. PRESERVED, son of Daniel, (4,) m. Sarah Gould of New Milford, April 8, 1764, who d. in 1780. He m. 2d, Lydia Welton, Dec. 9, 1781, and d. Oct. 23, 1803. Ch.: I. Hannah, b. Nov. 10, 1766, m. Joseph Bronson; II. Levinia, b. July 21, 1767, m. Doct. Joseph, son of Doct. Timothy Porter, and d. Nov. 18, 1848; III. Isaac, b. July 27, 1770, d. June 25, 1772; IV. Isaac, b. March 27, 1774, m. Amarilla, dau. of Joel Hickox, still living, and has a son, Preserved Hickox, in Newark, N. J. V. Jesse, b. Oct. 31, 1777.

11. Doct. TIMOTHY, son of Daniel, (4,) m. Margaret, dau. of Gideon Skinner of Bolton, Conn. She was b. Sept. 27, 1739, and d. April 12, 1813. He d. Jan. 24, 1792. Ch.: I. Daniel, b. Sept. 23, 1768; II. Sylvia C., b. Feb. 24, 1771, m. 1st, John King of Bloomfield, N. Y., 2d, Nathan Rose of Avon, N. Y., and d. Feb. 14, 1813; III. Dr. Joseph, b. Sept.

8, 1772, m. Levinia, dau. of Preserved Porter—no ch.; IV. Olive, b. July 26, 1775, m. Moses Hall and d. May 30, 1845. He d. Jan. 29, 1857; V. Anna, b. April 5, 1777, m. Richard F. Welton, Dec. 16, 1804; VI. Chauncey, b. April 24, 1779; VII. Timothy Hopkins, b. Nov. 28, 1785.

12. JAMES, son of James, (5.) m. Lucy, dau. of Josiah Bronson, Nov. 9, 1762. She d. Oct. 14, 1776, and he m. Mary Gambel, April 23, 1778. He d. Nov. 10, 1822. Ch.: I. Jesse, b. June 25, 1763; II. Dorcas, b. June 11, 1766, m. Ward Peck, Jan. 22, 1784, and d. May 11, 1847; III. A son, b. Nov. 22, 1768, d. same day; IV. James, b. Aug. 3, 1772; V. Mary, b. Aug. 2, 1779; VI. Reuben, b. Oct. 24, 1780; VII. Melinda, b. April 26, 1783; VIII. Clarinda, b. Oct. 15, 1789; IX. Josiah, Aug. 30, 1792; X. Samuel, b. Dec. 28, 1793.

13. DAVID, son of James, (5.) m. Esther, dau. of Dea. Timothy Hopkins, Dec. 7, 1775. He d. April 4, 1826, and his wid. d. Sept. 27, 1831. Ch.: I. Silas, b. Oct. 21, 1776; II. William, b. March 18, 1782; III. David, b. June 22, 1783.

14. ASHBEL, son of Thos. (6.) m. Hannah, dau. of John Morris of Stratford, Nov. 24, 1762. Ch.: I. Sybbel, b. Aug. 21, 1764; II. Ashbel, b. Nov. 16, 1766; III. Elias, (†) b. Jan. 16, 1769; IV. Hannah, (†) b. Jan. 8, 1771.

15. THOMAS, son of Thos. (6.) m. Mehitable, dau. of Daniel Hine of New Milford, Dec. 12, 1758. She d. June 1, 1837, aged 98. Ch.: I. Sybbel, b. Nov. 10, 1759; II. Rebecca, b. June 5, 1761, m. Jared Byington; III. Truman, d. Sept. 8, 1763; IV. Ethel, b. 1765, and d. March 2, 1797.

16. Col. PHINEAS, son of Thos. (6.) m. Esther, dau. of Thos. Clark, July 12, 1770. She d. March 18, 1772, and he m. 2d, wid. Melliscent, Lewis, dau. of Jonathan Baldwin, Dec. 23, 1778. He d. March 9, 1804. Ch.: I. Esther, b. March 13, 1772, m. Levi Beardsley, Jan. 5, 1789, and d. Sept. 5, 1808; II. "Orissana," b. Nov. 1, 1779, d. July 8, 1781; III. Sally, b. Feb. 20, 1782; IV. Ansel, b. Aug. 2, 1784; V. Orlando, b. May 8, 1787; VI. Betsey, b. April 14, 1790, m. Zenas Cook, and d. Oct. 12, 1857.

17. ASA, son of Ebenezer, (7.) m. Deborah Fuller, Oct. 22, 1765. Ch.: I. Asa, b. June 6, 1767; II. Climena, b. Jan. 8, 1770.

18. SAMUEL, son of Samuel, (8.) m. Mary, dau. of Stephen Upson, Dec. 9, 1747, and d. Jan. 8, 1793. His wife d. March 23, 1780. Ch.: I. Ebenezer, b. Jan. 24, 1750; II. Jemima, b. Nov. 13, 1752; III. Samuel, b. Oct. 7, 1755.

19. ISAAC, son of Doct. Preserved, (10.) m. Amarilla, dau. of Joel

Hickox, Nov. 13, 1799. Ch.: I. Sarah Gould, b. April 6, 1800; II. Preserved H., b. Sept. 9, 1803, m. Caroline Keene, and resides at Newark, N. J.—no ch.

20. Doct. JESSE, son of Preserved, (10,) m. Comfort, dau. of Chauncey Camp, June 6, 1808. She was b. March 1, 1786, and d. Aug. 10, 1855. Ch.: I. Denman Camp, b. May 22, 1810; II. Sally Ann, b. May 6, 1812, m. Lewis Hotchkiss, who d.—no ch.; III. Adelia, b. April 15, 1815, m. David S. Law and d. March 13, 1857; IV. Preserved G., b. Jan. 18, 1822.

21. DANIEL, son of Timothy, (11,) m. Ana, dau. of — Ingham, and grand-dau. of Israel Clark of Southington, June 9, 1789. She was b. Oct. 17, 1770, and d. March 26, 1831. Ch.: I. Horace, b. Sept. 30, 1790; II. Timothy, b. Jan. 30, 1792; III. Elias, b. May 14, 1795; IV. Alma Anna, b. April 12, 1800, m. William Orton, Jan. 1822, and d. Feb. 25, 1823, leaving a dau. Caroline; V. Daniel, b. May 20, 1805, —a physician, became insane in 1845; VI. Joseph, b. July 11, 1807, d. Jan. 5, 1812.

22. CHAUNCEY, son of Timothy, (11,) m. Sylvia Brockway, at Scho-dack, near Albany, N. Y. He d. at Pittsford, in that State, May 17, 1836. Ch.: I. Chauncey, d. in childhood; II. Sylvia Rose, b. Jan. 19, 1807, m. Lieut. Richardson, of the U. S. Army; III. Olive Ann, b. March 9, 1809, m. R. S. Williams of Avon, N. Y.; IV. Caroline, b. June 7, 1811, m. George W. Chyler, a lawyer of Palmyra, N. Y.; V. Margaret, b. May 9, 1814, m. Ephraim Goss, a lawyer at Pittsford, N. Y.; VI. Jane Maria, b. Nov. 21, 1816; VII. Chauncey H., b. Aug. 11, 1818; VIII. Mary E., b. May 18, 1821; IX. Sarah L., b. Jan. 25, 1824; X. James H., b. Nov. 5, 1826.

23. Hon. TIMOTHY H., son of Doct. Timothy, (11,) m. Lucy, dau. of Judge Moore of Angelica, N. Y., Nov. 8, 1811, and d. at Olean, N. Y., Dec. 1845. Ch.: I. Willard, b. Aug. 7, 1812, d. July 26, 1819; II. Joseph Hopkins, b. April 11, 1818; III. Olive M., b. July 27, 1820, d. Feb. 26, 1821; IV. Harriet M., b. June 7, 1822; V. John, b. April 25, 1824; VI. Lucy, b. Aug. 6, 1826, d. Feb. 8, 1831; VII. Timothy, b. April 20, 1828, d. April 6, 1829; VIII. Willard, b. June 8, 1830; IX. Edward, b. March 26, 1832; X. George, b. Feb. 25, 1834; XI. James, b. Sept. 16, 1835; XII. Andrew, b. Aug. 11, 1839, d. Oct. 6, 1841.

24. SILAS, son of David, (13,) m. Polly, dau. of Benjamin Strong of Southbury, Dec. 21, 1802. Ch.: I. Edwin, b. Feb. 25, 1804; II. Esther, b. June 8, 1806.

25. TRUMAN, son of Thos., (15,) m. Sarah, dau. of Jonathan Thompson of New Haven, Jan. 1, 1784. Ch.: I. Margaret, b. Nov. 23, 1784;

II. Minerva, b. Oct. 24, 1788; III. Julius, b. Aug. 26, 1790; IV. Thomas, b. Jan. 7, 1793; V. Alma, b. Feb. 9, 1795; VI. Sally, b. Sept. 25, 1801; VII. Myretta, b. June 24, 1803; VIII. Hector, b. Aug. 11, 1805; IX. William, b. Oct. 20, 1807, d. March 30, 1809.

26. ANSEL, son of Phineas, (16,) m. Lucy, dau. of Ward Peck, April, 1806,—was an officer in the war of 1812, and d. Oct. 9, 1814. Ch.: Phineas, d. aged 10 months; II. Melliscent, d. aged about 7; III. Ansel Charles, b. Nov. 16, 1811, m. Ruth Ann, dau. of Cyrus Sherman of Woodbury,—has had two ch.

27. ORLANDO, son of Phineas, (16,) m. Olive, dau. of Samuel Frost, and went to Pa., and d. at Harrisburg, Jan. 1, 1836. Ch.: I. Eliza M., d. young; II. Mary M., b. July 2, 1816, m. 1st, — Bartis, 2d, Doct. Bradford,—is living near Wilksbarre, Pa.; III. George Phineas, m. Julia Worthing, of Kingston, is a Methodist preacher.

28. EBENEZER, son of Samuel, (18,) m. Sarah, dau. of Ephraim Beebe, Aug. 31, 1774. Ch.: I. Daniel, b. Aug. 26, 1775; II. Asa, b. Jan. 26, 1778; III. Samuel E., b. July 20, 1782; IV. Ezra, b. May 27, 1785; V. Olive, b. Feb. 23, 1787, d. March 13, 1787; VI. Aaron, b. Feb. 23, 1790, d. same day.

29. SAMUEL, son of Samuel, (18,) m. Sybbel, dau. of Obadiah Monson, Jan. 28, 1778. She d. Feb. 5, 1794, and he m. Lucy, dau. of Dea. Andrew Bronson, Nov. 22, 1795. Ch.: I. Lucy, b. Nov. 14, 1778; II. Eunice, b. March 23, 1780, d. May 1, 1780; III. Stephen, b. Sept. 22, 1781; IV. Obadiah, b. July 24, 1783; V. Azubah, b. July 6, 1785; VI. Marshal, b. June 4, 1788; VII. Samuel M., b. May, 1790; VIII. Shelden, b. March 31, 1792; IX. L. Bronson, b. Sept. 8, 1799; X. Leonard, b. July 23, 1802.

30. Horace, son of Daniel, (21,) m. Hannah, dau. of Ebenezer Frisbie, May 20, 1811. She d. April 11, 1844, and he m. Esther M. W. Hull, Nov. 23, 1845. Ch.: I. Horace Clark, b. March 9, 1812, d. Aug. 11, 1831; II. Hannah C., b. Sept. 1, 1813, m. Christopher L. Ward, of Towanda, Pa., has a son Henry; III. Hamlet C., b. July 11, 1815, d. Aug. 9, 1834; IV. Hobart C., b. Feb. 2, 1819, m. Jerusha, dau. of Benj. Bronson, has two ch.; V. Henry C., b. April 20, 1825, m. Eliza E., dau. of Nathan N. Betts, of Towanda, Pa., is a physician; VI. Margaret A., b. Timothy, 1846; VII. Sarah E., b. Aug. 19, 1849.

31. TIMOTHY, son of Daniel, (21,) m. Clara, dau. of Ebenezer Frisbie. She d. Nov. 18, 1821, and he m. Polly Ann Todd, Dec. 20, 1824. Ch.: I. Joseph, b. June 5, 1812; II. Mary Ann, b. Aug. 21, 1815; III. Jane E., b. Feb. 1818; IV. Timothy H., b. Feb. 16, 1826; V. Nathan

T., b. Dec. 9, 1828; VI. Thomas, b. Feb. 7, 1831; VII. David G., b. March 8, 1833; VIII. Samuel M., b. May 17, 1835.

32. Elias, son of Daniel, (21.) m. Alma Tyler, Jan. 22, 1817,—has one child, James, b. March 26, 1818.

### PRICHARD.

1. ROGER PRICHARD came from Springfield, Mass., to Milford, Conn., previous to Dec. 18, 1653, at which date he married Elizabeth Slough of Milford. He had sons, Joseph and Benjamin. Joseph was b. Oct. 2, 1654, Benjamin Jan. 31, 1657. The last m. ———, Nov. 14, 1683.

2. BENJAMIN and James Prichard removed from Milford to Waterbury about 1733. Roger Prichard, also from Milford, settled at Waterbury in 1738. They were all married and had children previous to their settlement in Waterbury.

3. BENJAMIN, (2.) m. 1st, Mary Andrews of Milford, Jan. 20, 1712-13, and 2d, Hannah Marks, July 4, 1733. He d. in 1760, leaving ch.: I. John; II. Benjamin; III. Nathaniel; IV. Elnathan; V. Desire, b. July 7, 1734; VI. Jonathan, b. Oct. 19, 1739; VII. Esther.

4. JAMES, (2.) m. Elizabeth Johnson of Stratford, Dec. 25, 1721, and d. 1749. Ch.: I. James, b. Jan. 31, 1722-3; II. George, b. Oct. 5, 1724; III. Elizabeth, b. March 12, 1726; IV. Isaac, b. Sept. 20, 1729; V. John, b. July 25, 1734, d. 1749; VI. David, b. April 7, 1737; VII. Anna, b. April 4, 1740.

5. ROGER, (2.) m. 1st, Hannah Northrup of Milford, March 8, 1715-16, and 2d, Sarah ———, and d. May 18, 1760. Ch.: I. Roger; II. Sarah, m. Joseph Fenn, Jr.; III. Ann, m. Stephen Bradley; IV. Phebe, b. April 16, 1731, m. ——— Warner; V. Abigail, b. March 15, 1733, d. before 1760; VI. Sibella, b. June, 1736, d. young; VII. Abraham, b. Oct. 12, 1737; VIII. Ainos, b. Aug. 27, 1739; IX. Elihu, b. Oct. 27, 1741.

6. JAMES, son of James, (4.) m. Abigail, dau. of Ebenezer Hickox, Aug. 7, 1740, and had, I. Jabez, b. Feb. 18, 1741; II. Jerabiah, b. April 13, 1743; III. Elisha, b. Oct. 1, 1745, d. 1749; IV. "James the Less," b. April, 1748, d. 1749; V. James, b. June 4, 1750; VI. Abigail, b. May 14, 1752.

7. GEORGE, son of James, (4.) m. Elizabeth, dau. of Abraham Hotchkiss of New Haven, Feb. 8, 1744-5, and d. Oct. 21, 1820. His wife d. Feb. 17, 1802. Ch.: I. Chloe, b. Sept. 30, 1745; II. George, b. April 4, 1747; III. Patience, b. Dec. 10, 1748, d. 1749; IV. Patience, b. May 8, 1751; V. John, b. April 3, 1753; VI. Isaiah, b. March 30,

1755; VII. Didymus, b. April 27, 1757, d. 1758; VIII. Hannah, b. Dec. 5, 1758; IX. Elizabeth, b. Sept. 7, 1762; X. Rebecca, b. Sept. 16, 1765.

8. ISAAC, son of James, (4.) m. Lois, dau. of Isaac Bronson, Oct. 4, 1758. Ch.: I. Jared, b. May 15, 1760; II. Lidda, b. April 24, 1763, and others.

9. DAVID, son of James, (4.) m. Ruth Smith. Ch.: I. Archibald, b. June 25, 1758; II. Ruth; III. Miriam; IV. Philo; V. Sylvia; VI. Molle, d. 1772; VII. Molle; VIII. David; IX. Damon, b. Nov. 5, 1777; X. Sally, b. June 28, 1780.

10. ROGER, son of Roger, (5.) m. Ann Buggbe of Derby, Feb. 16, 1742-3. Ch.: I. Philenor, b. May 18, 1744; II. Sybel, b. Oct. 25, 1745, d. 1749; III. Elihu, b. Sept. 19, 1747, d. 1749; IV. Elihu, b. July 19, 1749, d. 1751; V. Ann, b. April 24, 1752; VI. Thomas, b. Nov. 29, 1754; VII. Eliphalet, b. Dec. 2, 1756; VIII. Elihu, b. May 23, 1759.

11. ABRAHAM, son of Roger, (5.) m. Abigail, dau. of Thomas Smith of Derby, March 13, 1766, and had, I. Reuben, b. Sept. 30, 1766; II. Abigail, b. Jan. 28, 1768; III. Sybel, b. Oct. 21, 1769, d. Nov. 1769; IV. John Smith, b. Oct. 27, 1770, d. 1773; V. Sarah, b. 1773; VI. —; VI. Phebe, b. March 20, 1778.

12. AMOS, son of Roger, (5.) m. Lydia Blakeslee, May 26, 1768, who d. 1771, and he m. 2d, wid. Mary Adams, Aug. 20, 1777. Ch.: I. Lydia, b. April 12, 1769; II. Amos, b. Oct. 22, 1770; III. Roger, b. May 17, 1777, d. 1779; IV. Sabra, b. Jan. 6, 1780; V. Roger, b. May 7, 1782; VI. Orra, b. Oct. 26, 1783; VII. Elias, b. Jan. 28, 1786; VIII. Aaron, b. Dec. 1, 1788; IX. Ruth, b. Oct. 17, 1791.

13. GEORGE, son of George, (7.) m. Hannah Williams, Dec. 24, 1767. Ch.: I. Didimus, b. May 28, 1769; II. Jane, b. Sept. 23, 1771; III. Chloe, b. Oct. 23, 1773; IV. Ezra, b. Oct. 10, 1775.

14. ARCHIBALD, son of David, (9.) m. Sybil, dau. of John Smith of Canterbury, Oct. 28, 1782. Ch.: I. Julius C., b. June 15, 1784, d. 1788; II. "Soffey," b. Aug. 28, 1786; III. Adelia.

15. PHILO, son of David, (9.) m. Sabra Johnson, Dec. 17, 1783. Ch.: I. "Suky," b. July 26, 1784.

16. DAVID, son of David, (9.) m. Anne, dau. of Benjamin Hitchcock, Nov. 9, 1797. Ch.: I. Minerva, b. June 22, 1798; II. William, b. March 20, 1800; III. Julius Smith, b. Feb. 14, 1802; IV. Elizur E., b. Sept. 19, 1804; V. Anna, b. Sept. 9, 1806; VI. Sally H., b. Aug. 29, 1808; VII. Dr. David, b. Oct. 24, 1810; VIII. Samuel H., b. May 27, 1813; IX. Charlotte L., b. June 27, 1816.

17. JOHN, son of Abraham, (11.) m. Anna, dau. of Eben Hotchkiss,



March 25, 1806. Ch.: I. Eben, b. Nov. 6, 1806; II. Beza, b. April 22, 1808.

I have not found the connection of the following with the preceding.

**JOSEPH PRICHARD**, son of — of Milford, m. Rebecca, dau. of James Smith of Waterbury, Aug. 2, 1761, and d. at Saybrook, Oct. 23, 1775, aged 35. Ch.: I. Sarah, b. Sept. 5, 1763; II. Mary, b. Aug. 19, 1765; III. Thomas Gaius, b. Oct. 3, 1768; IV. William, b. June 4, 1771; V. Elizabeth, b. April 14, 1774.

#### RICHARDSON.

1. **THOMAS RICHARDSON** or **RICHASON** had ch., Thomas, Mary, Sarah, John, Israel, Rebecca, Ruth, Johannah, Nathaniel, Ebenezer. (See p. 179.)

2. **JOHN**, son of Thomas, (1.) had ch., I. Ruth, b. Feb. 10, 1701–2, m. 1st, John Hill, 2d, Moses Doolittle; II. and III. b. Sept. 4, 1703, and d. the same month; IV. Elizabeth, b. Oct. 5, 1704, m. Nathaniel Arnold, Jr.; V. Mary, b. Feb. 14, 1707, m. Nathan Prindle; VI. Sarah, b. April 28, 1710, m. Samuel Weed; VII. John, b. March 5, 1713, d. before Nov. 28, 1749. His estate was distributed to his four sisters or their children.

3. **ISRAEL**, son of Thomas, (1.) had ch.: I. Mary, b. April 16, 1699, d. Dec. 5, 1712; II. Hannah, b. April 2, 1705, m. John Scott; III. Joseph, b. June 11, 1708; IV. Israel, b. Aug. 28, 1711, lived in Sunderland, Mass.

4. **EBENEZER**, son of Thomas, (1.) had ch.: I. Phebe, b. April 22, 1716, d. Jan. 9, 1717; II. Phebe, b. Dec. 15, 1717; III. Thomas, b. Dec. 7, 1720; IV. Joseph, b. Sept. 24, 1725, d. young; V. Nathaniel, b. April 8, 1729; VI. Sarah, b. Dec. 23, 1731.

5. **THOMAS**, son of Ebenezer, (4.) m. Abigail Way, April 8, 1756, who d. Jan. 21, 1775, and he m. 2d, Eunice, wid. of John Hickox, April 15, 1776. Ch.: I. Sarah, b. June 8, 1757, d. Jan. 13, 1772; II. Irene, b. March 15, 1759, d. July 6, 1774; III. Chloe, b. July 26, 1761, d. Feb. 25, 1776; IV. Israel, b. Sept. 25, 1764, d. March 29, 1772; V. Abigail, b. May 24, 1769, d. April 8, 1772; VI. Anner, b. March 13, 1771, d. April 20, 1772; VII. Thomas, b. June 12, 1777; VIII. Margaret, b. Aug. 14, 1779, m. John Beecher; IX. Eunice, b. Dec. 21, 1781, m. Samuel Porter.

6. **NATHANIEL**, son of Ebenezer, (4.) m. Phebe, dau. of John Bronson, April 1, 1752, and d. Oct. 31, 1792. His wife d. April 6, 1811, Ch.: I. Joseph, b. March 28, 1754, d. June 16, 1773; II. Tamer, b.

Sept. 13, 1758, m. Stephen Hotchkiss; III. Ruth, b. Dec. 15, 1761, m. Ashbel Osborne, June 9, 1785; IV. Phebe, b. June 17, 1765, m. Joseph Bartholomew, d. Oct. 1800; V. Ebenezer, b. Sept. 3, 1769, m. Mehitable Clark, lived in Middlebury, had 14 ch. and d. Feb. 1826; VI. Hannah, b. May 22, 1772, d. July 20, 1773; VII. Nathaniel, b. Oct. 28, 1774; VIII. Hannah, b. Oct. 18, 1779, m. Reuben Upson.

7. NATHANIEL, son of Nathaniel, (6,) m. Comfort Stone, April, 1794. She d. March 29, 1756. Ch.: I. Maria, b. Jan. 6, 1795, m. Garry Bronson; II. Nancy, b. March 8, 1797, m. Merritt Platt, May, 1815. He d. Sept. 1815, and she m. Leonard Bronson, April 14, 1819; III. Julia, b. 1799, d. 1800; IV. John Bronson, b. Nov. 1804, graduated at Dartmouth College, is a clergyman at Pittsford, N. Y. He m. Maria, dau. of Philo Bronson, in 1832, who d. in 1834, and he m. in 1836, Susan A., sister of his first wife, who d. April, 1856; V. Nathaniel S., b. 1810, graduated at Y. C., is an Episcopal clergyman, has been settled at Watertown and Derby, and is now editor of the Church Review. He m. Lydia, dau. of James Murdock, D. D., of New Haven; VI. Merritt P., b. 1816, d. the same year; VII. Samuel S., b. Dec. 1817, d. at Harrisburg, Pa., Sept. 4, 1842, while a member of Union College.

## SCOTT.

1. EDMUND SCOTT, of Farmington and Waterbury, had ch., Joseph, Edmund, Samuel, Jonathan, George, David, Robert, Elizabeth and Hannah. (See p. 181.)

2. EDMUND, son of Edmund, (1,) had Sarah, Samuel, Elizabeth, Hannah, Edmund, John, Jonathan. (See p. 183.)

3. JONATHAN, son of Edmund, (1,) had Jonathan, John, Martha, Gershom, Eleazer, Daniel. (See p. 184.)

4. GEORGE, son of Edmund, (1,) had, I. Obadiah, b. April 5, 1692; II. George, b. March 20, 1694, d. May 9, 1725, unm.; III. William, b. March 3, 1696; IV. Elizabeth, b. April 4, 1698, m. Gamaliel Terrel and went to New Milford; V. Zebulon, b. Jan. 10, 1700, d. 1701; VI. Samuel, b. April 26, 1702; VII. Edmund, b. Sept. 4, 1704; VIII. Benjamin, b. April 30, 1707, d. Dec. 1725; IX. Ephraim, b. June 16, 1710, d. Feb. 27, 1744-5.

5. DAVID, son of Edmund, (1,) had, I. Hannah, b. March 21, 1698-9; II. Hester, b. Aug. 1700; III. David, b. May 12, 1701; IV. Ruth, b. Sept. 29, 1704, m. Jonathan Kelsey; V. and VI. Martha and Mary, b. Jan. 1707; Martha, d. April, 1707; VII. Elizabeth, b. May 7, 1709, m. Samuel Judd; VIII. Stephen, b. March 12, 1711; IX. Obadiah, b. Dec. 4, 1714.

6. SAMUEL, son of Edmund, (2,) m. Mary, dau. of John Richards, Jan. 13, 1725, and d. April 3, 1768. Ch.: I. Gideon, b. Sept. 22, 1725; II. Lois, b. March 20, 1727; III. Abraham, b. April 26, 1729, d. Jan. 8, 1730-1; IV. Isaac, b. April 26, 1729; V. Abraham, b. Oct. 18, 1731, d. Nov. 8, 1732; VI. Mary, b. Sept. 7, 1733; VII. Sarah, b. April 4, 1735, m. Edmund Scott; VIII. Samuel, b. Feb. 14, 1738, m. Damaras Lewis; IX. Jemima, b. Nov. 23, 1740, m. Jeremiah Peck, Jr.

7. EDMUND, son of Edmund, (2,) m. Martha, dau. of John Andruss, Aug. 12, 1730, and d. March 23, 1733. His wid. m. Ebenezer Warner, April 18, 1734. Ch.: I. Jemima, b. May 2, 1731, d. May 16, 1735; II. Comfort, b. July 22, 1733, m. Obadiah Scott.

8. JOHN, son of Edmund, (2,) m. Eunice, dau. of Thos. Griffin of Simsbury, Oct. 29, 1730. He d. March 14, 1756. Ch.: I. Amos, b. Feb. 19, 1732; II. John, b. Jan. 30, 1734, d. in 1766, no issue; III. Edmund, b. Jan. 9, 1736, m. Sarah Scott, and d. about 1760, no issue; IV. Abraham, b. March 18, 1739, "killed with thunder," April 7, 1750; V. Eunice, b. Jan. 4, 1741, d. Aug. 12, 1759; VI. Abigail, b. Oct. 5, 1743, m. ——— Moses; VII. Jonathan, b. Oct. 1745, d. 1749; VIII. Reuben, b. Aug. 15, 1747; IX. Abraham, b. May 11, 1750, d. March, 1753; X. Abel, b. Nov. 19, 1756, m. Anne Perkins of New Haven, Jan. 30, 1776 —had ch.

9. JONATHAN, son of Jonathan, (3,) m. Mary, dau. of Joseph Hurlbut of Woodbury, July 14, 1725. She d. May, 1727, and he m. 2d, Rebecca, dau. of Samuel Frost of Branford, July 29, 1729. He d. May 16, 1745. Ch.: I. John, b. May 6, 1726; II. Abel, b. Aug. 3, 1730; III. Thankful, b. May 10, 1732; IV. Phebe, b. May 24, 1734; V. Rebecca, b. Oct. 3, 1736; VI. Rachel, b. Nov. 3, 1739; VII. Eben, b. July, 1747.

10. GERSHOM, son of Jonathan, (3,) m. Mary, dau. of Jonathan Fenton of Fairfield, Nov. 17, 1728, and d. June 24, 1780. Ch.: I. Wait, b. Aug. 17, 1729; II. Hannah, b. Sept. 9, 1731, m. E. Scott; III. Sarah, b. Sept. 1735; IV. Mary, b. May 17, 1739; V. and VI. Gershom and Ann, b. June 9, 1744. Gershom d. June 29, 1778. Ann m. Amos Hotchkiss.

11. DOCT. DANIEL, son of Jonathan, (3,) m. Hannah, dau. of David Way, and d. April 2, 1762. Ch.: I. Esther, b. May 23, 1750; II. Jonathan, b. Sept. 29, 1751; III. John, b. April 30, 1753; IV. Martha, b. Jan. 19, 1755, d. Aug. 31, 1759; V. Eleazer, b. May 24, 1756; VI. Elizabeth, b. Sept. 21, 1757, d. Sept. 15, 1759; VII. Hannah, b. Jan. 16, 1759; VIII. Daniel, b. Oct. 1, 1760.

12. OBADIAH, son of George, (4,) m. Hannah, dau. of Ezekiel Buck of





Wethersfield, Oct. 10, 1716, and d. in 1735. His wife d. June 12, 1749. Ch.: I. —, b. June 20, 1717; II. Zebulon, b. June 16, 1718; III. Mary, b. 1720, d. Sept. 1722; IV. Enoch, b. Oct. 1722; V. Comfort, b. Jan. 31, 1723; VI. George, b. Nov. 10, 1725; VII. Obadiah, b. Jan. 6, 1727; VIII. Ezekiel, b. Sept. 20, 1730.

13. William, son of George, (4.) m. Johannah, dau. of Thos. Judd of Hartford, Nov. 30, 1727. She d. Jan. 25, 1771. Ch.: I. Benjamin, b. Sept. 6, 1728; II. Timothy, b. April 21, 1731; III. Anne, b. Jan. 11, 1734, d. Oct. 30, 1749; IV. Rachel, b. Sept. 27, 1736, d. April 2, 1766; V. Patience, b. Nov. 1748, 1740.

14. SAMUEL, son of George, (4.) m. Presilla, dau. of John Hull of Derby, Sept. 26, 1727. She d. Sept. 23, 1735, and he m. 2d, wid. Lois Striclin, May 4, 1756, who d. Nov. 29, 1762. He m. 3d, Eunice Ashley of Hartford, March 17, 1763, and d. Sept. 15, 1790. Ch.: I. Sybel, b. July 6, 1730, d. March 1, 1798, unm.; II. Elizabeth, b. Feb. 27, 1732, d. Sept. 1, 1814, unm.; III. Ebenezer, b. April 18, 1735, m. Mary Weed; IV. Eunice, b. June 11, 1738; V. Samuel, b. April 10, 1744, d. Sept. 20, 1749; VI. Ashley, b. June 17, 1764.

15. EDMUND, son of George, (4.) m. Martha, dau. of Robert Royce of Wallingford, March 26, 1730. Ch.: I. Mary, b. March 23, 1731; II. Robert, b. Aug. 3, 1733, m. Elizabeth, dau. of Gamaliel Terrel, Dec. 29, 1762; III. Noah, b. Jan. 24, 1736, d. May 9, 1737; IV. Ebenezer, b. March 23, 1738, d. same day; V. Martha, b. May 2, 1739; VI. Abigail, b. July 3, 1742; VII. Comfort, b. April 24, 1745; VIII. Noah, b. April 4, 1748; IX. Lydia, b. March 23, 1751.

16. DAVID, son of David, (5.) m. Hannah, dau. of William Hickox, Jan. 25, 1735. Ch.: I. Zadock, b. Oct. 15, 1733, d. 1746; II. Nathan, b. Aug. 23, 1735, d. 1748; III. David, b. June 22, 1738; IV. Patience, d. May 9, 1747; V. Hannah, d. June 29, 1754; VI. Submit, b. Dec. 22, 1746; VII. Sarah, b. June 8, 1749, m. Wait Smith.

17. STEPHEN, son of David, (5.) m. Rebecca, dau. of John Wolsey of Jamaica, L. I., April 9, 1734, and d. March 25, 1744. Ch.: I. Sarah, b. Feb. 14, 1736, d. Sept. 11, 1749; II. Stephen, b. Sept. 14, 1738; III. Wolsey, b. April 13, 1741, d. in Watertown, Dec. 12, 1794.

18. OBADIAH, son of David, (5.) m. Mary, dau. of John Andruss, May 20, 1733. Ch.: I. and II. twins, d. young; III. Eliphaz, b. Jan. 3, 1735; IV. Obadiah, b. April 12, 1737; V. Jesse, b. May 30, 1739; VI. Barnabas, b. March 7, 1741; VII. Abigail, b. July 3, 1746; VIII. Margaret, b. July 30, 1748; IX. Mary, b. Sept. 14, 1750; X. Elizabeth, b. Feb. 15, 1753; XI. Ruth, b. Nov. 1756.

19. GIDEON, son of Samuel, (6.) m. Phebe Barnes, April 15, 1755.

She d. April 25, 1760, and he m. Hannah, wid. of James Brown, Oct. 4, 1762. She d. Sept. 12, 1766. Ch. : I. Lois, b. Oct. 17, 1756 ; II. Caleb, b. July 11, 1758 ; III. Mary, b. June 25, 1763 ; IV. Alatheia, b. March 18, 1765.

20. ISAAC, son of Samuel, (6.) m. Anne, dau. of Ebenezer Frisbie of Sharon, Oct. 31, 1753. She d. Dec. 3, 1766, and he m. Sarah Smith, March 4, 1767, who d. Feb. 12, 1783. Ch. : I. David, b. Jan. 25, 1755,—drowned, May 10, 1773 ; II. Moses, b. Feb. 16, 1756, d. Dec. 21, 1773 ; III. Thaddeus, b. April 25, 1757 ; IV. Leva, b. Sept. 27, 1758, d. Jan. 15, 1775 ; V. Mesibah, b. Aug. 10, 1760, d. Sept. 23, 1782 ; VI. Abner, b. May 10, 1762 ; VII. Wealthy, b. July 22, 1764 ; VIII. Abraham, b. Aug. 2, 1766.

21. AMOS, son of John, (8.) m. Dorcas, dau. of Ebenezer Warner, April 4, 1759. She d. May 14, 1763, and he m. 2d, Lois, wid. of Ezekiel Scott, Sept. 12, 1763. Ch. : I. Eunice, b. Feb. 23, 1760 ; II. Diana, b. March 14, 1762, d. March 12, 1763 ; III. Amos, b. May 3, 1764 ; IV. John, b. April 4, 1766 ; V. Edmund, b. June 7, 1768 ; VI. Lois, b. Dec. 31, 1770 ; VII. Dorcas, b. Nov. 1, 1773, d. 1774 ; VIII. Levi, b. July 3, 1775.

22. ZEBULON, son of Obadiah, (12.) m. Elizabeth, dau. of Samuel Warner, April 18, 1748, and d. May 12, 1798. His wife d. June 21, 1798, aged 72. Ch. : I. Simeon, b. March 1, 1750 ; II. Huldah, b. Nov. 7, 1753, m. John Powers ; III. Daniel, b. May 4, 1757, d. June 10, 1762 ; IV. Justus, went to Wallingford, Vt., and had a large family.

23. ENOCH, son of Obadiah, (12.) m. Sarah, dau. of Lieut. Thos. Porter, May 14, 1750. Ch. : I. Hannah, b. May 19, 1751 ; II. Eunice, b. Oct. 15, 1752 ; III. Enoch, b. Oct. 6, 1754 ; IV. Sarah, b. Sept. 2, 1757 ; V. Uri, b. Aug. 2, 1759 ; VI. Prue, b. April 6, 1761 ; VII. Esther, b. Sept. 22, 1763 ; VIII. Mille, b. March 21, 1766 ; IX. Mark, b. 1758.

24. EZEKIEL, son of Obadiah, (12.) m. Lois, dau. of John Fenn, April 13, 1758, and d. Jan. 20, 1759. Ch. : I. Ezekiel, b. Jan. 3, 1759.

25. OBADIAH, son of Obadiah, (12.) m. Comfort, dau. of Edmund Scott, April 8, 1751. She d. April, 1798. He d. Sept. 1810. Ch. : I. Annis, b. April 2, 1753 ; II. Mercy, b. July 2, 1755 ; III. Lydia, b. Nov. 28, 1757 ; IV. Martha, b. Jan. 29, 1761 ; V. Sarah, b. Sept. 23, 1763, d. Oct. 30, 1765 ; VI. Patience, b. June 21, 1766 ; VII. Edmund Andrus, b. Oct. 17, 1771.

26. BENJAMIN, son of William, (13.) m. Mary, dau. of Obadiah Richards, Jan. 13, 1757. Ch. : I. Hannah, b. May 12, 1758 ; II. Mary, b. Jan. 12, 1762 ; III. Chloe, b. Feb. 18, 1767, m. Elijah Terrel.

27. **ASHLEY**, son of Samuel, (14.) m. Martha, dau. of Benjamin Judson of Stratford, April 25, 1787, and d. May 15, 1842. His wid. d. Dec. 1848, aged 83. Ch.: I. Betsey, b. Dec. 29, 1787, m. James Street; II. "Catey," b. Jan. 15, 1793, m. Miles Morris, and d. July 8, 1837; III. Lewis, b. Dec. 14, 1796, d. 1827; IV. Edmund, b. April 13, 1799; V. Emma, b. June 28, 1801.

28. **STEPHEN**, son of Stephen, (17.) m. Freelove, dau. of Amos Hickox, Nov. 30, 1758. Ch.: I. Freelove, b. May 9, 1759; II. Rebecca, b. Aug. 20, 1761; III. Stephen, b. April 23, 1763; IV. Uri, b. May 13, 1765.

29. **ELIPHAS**, son of Obadiah, (18.) m. Hannah, dau. of Gershom Scott, Feb. 14, 1757. Ch.: I. Nancy, b. Dec. 4, 1759; II. Jesse, b. Sept. 6, 1762; III. Irene, b. Nov. 16, 1767; IV. Jared, b. March 22, 1771.

30. **OBADIAH**, son of Obadiah, (18.) m. Hannah, dau. of John How, March 10, 1755. Ch.: I. Hannah, b. Sept. 28, 1755; II. Olive, b. Sept. 23, 1757; III. Lucy, b. July 26, 1760; IV. Jesse, b. May 2, 1763; V. David, b. June 22, 1765; VI. Rose, b. Nov. 6, 1768.

31. **BARNABAS**, son of Obadiah, (18.) m. Rebecca, dau. of Doct. Ephraim Warner, Nov. 15, 1764. She d. Sept. 22, 1773. Ch.: I. Sabra, b. Jan. 14, 1766; II. Orpha, b. Nov. 10, 1767; III. Margaret, b. Dec. 5, 1769, d. in infancy; IV. Margaret, b. Nov. 5, 1772.

32. **THADDEUS**, son of Isaac, (20.) m. Orange, dau. of Thos. Hammond, May 23, 1782. She d. March 21, 1826. Ch.: I. Levi, b. Oct. 27, 1782; II. Moses, b. Feb. 28, 1785; III. Jacob, b. Feb. 20, 1786; IV. Anna, b. Feb. 1, 1788, d. June 22, 1802; V. Philo, b. Oct. 6, 1790; VI. Mabel, b. July 8, 1792, d. Oct. 24, 1803; VII. Moses, b. April 14, 1795; VIII. Thaddens, b. Oct. 19, 1797, d. Oct. 29, 1797; IX. Truman, b. Nov. 4, 1798, d. Oct. 19, 1803; X. Isaac, b. May 8, 1801; XI. Bazaleel, b. May 1, 1803.

33. **ABNER**, son of Isaac, (20.) m. Aleathea, dau. of John Bradley of New Haven, Feb. 5, 1783, and d. March 13, 1812. Ch.: I. Lucy, b. Aug. 29, 1785; II. Clary, b. Feb. 14, 1788; III. Eldad, b. April 25, 1791; IV. Deborah, b. Nov. 1, 1793; V. Alathea, b. April 2, 1796; VI. Wealthy, b. Oct. 7, 1798; VII. Phebe, b. April 6, 1801, d. Oct. 4, 1805; VIII. Phebe Elmira, b. Aug. 15, 1805; IX. Marcus, b. June 18, 1807.

34. **SIMEON**, son of Zebulon, (22.) m. Lucy, dau. of Capt. Abraham Hickox, March 9, 1775, and d. Aug. 28, 1828. His wid. d. Feb. 19, 1829. Ch.: I. Jemima, b. Nov. 21, 1775, m. David Hungerford, April 2, 1804; II. Joel, b. May 15, 1777, m. Hannah, dau. of Michael Bronson, Feb. 15, 1796; III. Prue, b. Oct. 4, 1778, d. Sept. 12, 1780; IV.



Elizabeth, b. March 19, 1780; V. Daniel, b. March 7, 1782; VI. Mark, b. Sept. 30, 1783; VII. Titus, b. Sept. 7, 1785, m. Rhoda, dau. of Nathaniel Hall, Dec. 1808; VIII. Jesse, b. June 10, 1787, m. Susan, dau. of David Downs, Aug. 7, 1811; IX. Prudence, b. March 7, 1789; X. Linus W., b. March 27, 1791, m. Minerva, dau. of James Nichols, Feb. 8, 1818.

35. URI, son of Enoch, (23,) m. Esther, dau. of Abiel Roberts, Dec. 26, 1780. Ch.: I. Silas, b. July 22, 1781; II. Rusha, b. Aug. 7, 1783; III. Alpheus, b. Sept. 30, 1785.

36. MARK, TITUS and JESSE, sons of Simeon, (34,) went to Springfield; Pa. Mark has one son and one dau., Titus two sons and a dau., and Jesse six sons.

### SCOVILL.

1. Serg. John Scovill, son of John of Waterbury and Haddam, had ch., John, b. Jan. 1, 1694; Obadiah, b. April 23, 1697; Sarah, b. Oct. 24, 1700; William, b. Sept. 7, 1703; Hannah, b. March 19, 1706-7; Edward, b. Feb. 10, 1710-11.

2. Lieut. JOHN, son of John, Jr., (1,) had ch.: I. Obadiah, b. Oct. 9, 1725; II. Mary, b. March 31, 1727, m. Andrew Bronson; III. John, b. Nov. 24, 1729, d. young; IV. Asa, b. April 4, 1732; V. Hannah, b. Jan. 20, 1734-5, m. Jabez Tuttle; VI. John, b. Oct. 27, 1738; VII. Stephen, b. Aug. 19, 1740; VIII. Timothy, b. June 27, 1742; IX. Annis, b. May 23, 1744; X. Annis, m. Nathaniel Selkrigg.

3. Lieut. WILLIAM, son of John, Jr., (1,) had, I. Anna, b. March 25, 1731, m. Rev. Eleazer Prindle and d. in 1789; II. Rev. James, b. Jan. 27, 1732-3; III. Samuel, b. Nov. 4, 1735; IV. Abijah, b. Dec. 27, 1738; V. William, b. Feb. 9, 1744-5; VI. Darius, b. May 15, 1746, m., had ch. and removed to the State of N. Y. with his family. His son Selah remained in Watertown and m. Sabrina Foote—had a son Hubert, who resides in Watertown and has ch.

4. EDWARD, son of John, Jr., (1,) had ch., I. Sarah, b. Feb. 25, 1740-1; II. Edward, b. Feb. 5, 1744-5, m. Ruth Norton, Nov. 26, 1770, and d. March 21, 1778.

5. OBADIAH, son of John, (2,) m. 1st, Hannah Hull of Norwalk, July 14, 1752, who d. Aug. 22, 1756, and he m. 2d, Hannah, dau. of Danl. Porter, June 11, 1760. She d. June, 1766 and he d. March 19, 1768. Ch.: I. Sarah, b. Nov. 9, 1752; II. David, b. Jan. 26, 1755; III. Anna, b. Feb. 4, 1761, d. April 9, 1781; IV. David, b. June 5, 1762, d. March 19, 1768.

6. ASA, son of John, (2,) m. Lois Warner, Dec. 10, 1755. Ch.: I. Selah, b. June 20, 1757; II. Amasa, b. Dec. 22, 1758; III. Selden, b. July 6, 1760; IV. Sarah, b. Nov. 1, 1766; V. Daniel; VI. Obadiah, m. Mille Nichols, Dec. 6, 1790.

7. JOHN, son of John, (2,) m. Anna Barnes, Sept. 14, 1763, and d. Sept. 15, 1807. Ch.: I. Truman, b. Feb. 24, 1764; II. Reuben, b. Oct. 2, 1765; III. John, b. Feb. 17, 1768, d. same year; IV. John, b. Aug. 12, 1770, d. Oct. 10, 1830; V. Anne, b. Dec. 27, 1772; VI. Clarissa, b. Feb. 24, 1776.

8. ТИМОТНУ, son of John, (2,) m. Jemima, dau. of Doct. Danl. Porter, April 7, 1762, and d. June 22, 1824. Ch.: I. Timothy, b. Nov. 28, 1762; II. Noah, b. Jan. 27, 1765; III. Daniel, b. Dec. 12, 1766, d. 1767; IV. Jemima, b. Jan. 3, 1768, d. 1783; V. Hannah, b. Dec. 23, 1770; VI. Sylvia, b. Aug. 28, 1773; VII. Daniel, b. Nov. 6, 1775; VIII. David, b. Jan. 4, 1780.

9. Rev. JAMES, son of William, (3,) m. Amy, dau. of Capt. George Nichols, Nov. 7, 1762. Ch.: I. James, b. March 19, 1764, settled in Waterbury; II. William, b. 1766, m. Ann Davidson, d. in 1851; III. Hannah, b. 1768, m. Daniel Michean? and d. 1846; IV. Rev. Elias, b. 1771, m. Elizabeth, dau. of William Scovill, and d. in 1841; V. Samuel, b. 1773, m. 1st, Deborah Gilbert, 2d, Mary Smith; VI. Daniel, b. 1776; VII. Sarah, b. 1777, m. Doct. C. Hathaway, d. in 1846; VIII. Edward, b. 1779, m. Polly Bates, d. 1840; IX. Henry, b. 1781, m. Mary Cunningham.

10. SAMUEL, son of William, (3,) m. Ruth, dau. of Benjamin Bronson, Dec. 19, 1756. She d. Aug. 18, 1761, and he m. 2d, — Harts-horn, May 3, 1765. Ch.: I. Anna, b. May 13, 1759; II. Ruth, b. Aug. 12, 1761; III. Uri, b. 1765, m. Melliscent, dau. of Samuel Southmayd, Oct. 17, 1784, who d. Oct. 1796. Ch.: 1. —, b. Aug. 15, 1785; 2. Chester, b. 1787; 3. Southmayd, b. 1789; 4. Sarah, b. 1791; 5. Ruth Ann, b. 1793; 6. Geo. Chester, b. 1795.

11. WILLIAM, son of William, (3,) m. Sarah, dau. of Samuel Brown, Dec. 24, 1767, and d. Aug. 13, 1827. Ch.: I. Bethel, b. June 6, 1769, d. 1775; II. Elizabeth, b. July 31, 1771, d. 1774; III. William, b. Sept. 29, 1773; IV. Elizabeth, m. Rev. Elias Scovill; V. Samuel, m. Ruthy Langdon—lives in Watertown, has Sarah, Mary and William.

12. JAMES, son of Rev. James, (9,) m. Alathea, dau. of Mitchel Lamson of Woodbury, Nov. 16, 1788, and d. Nov. 26, 1825. Ch.: I. James Mitchel Lamson, b. Sept. 4, 1789, m. Sarah, dau. of William H. Merriman, Oct. 9, 1849; ch., James Mitchel Lamson, b. Sept. 3,

1850; Sarah Alatheia, b. Feb. 14, 1852; Henry William, b. Nov. 11, 1853; II. Betsey, b. May 12, 1792, m. Sept. 10, 1809, John Buckingham; III. Sarah H., b. March 25, 1794, m. Aaron Hitchcock, in 1821; IV. William H., b. July 27, 1796, m. 1st, Eunice Davies of Ogdensburg, N. Y., July 2, 1827, who d. Nov. 25, 1839, and he m. 2d, Rebecca H. Smith of New Haven, March 23, 1841, and d. March 27, 1854. His wid. d. Aug. 4, 1854. Ch., Alatheia Ruth, b. March 21, 1828, m. Frederick J. Kingsbury; Mary Ann, b. May 3, 1831; Thomas John, b. June 9, 1833, d. May 22, 1839; Sarah H., b. July 13, 1839, d. Nov. 4, 1839; William Henry, b. Jan. 1, 1842; James Mitchel Lamson, b. June 15, 1843, d. Feb. 8, 1846; Nathan Smith, b. April 3, 1847, d. May 22, 1849. V. Edward, b. Dec. 31, 1798, m. Harriet Clark, Aug. 21, 1823; VI. Amy M., b. Feb. 9, 1801, d. April 30, 1804; VII. Caroline, b. July 4, 1803, m. Rev. William Preston, Oct. 1, 1842; VIII. Maria A., b. Aug. 14, 1805, m. Hon. Joel Hinman, 1825; IX. Mary, b. July 23, 1808, m. Rev. Jacob L. Clark, April 28, 1829, and d. May 2, 1842; X. Stella Ann, b. May 19, 1811, d. Sept. 12, 1815.

13. SELAH, son of Asa, (6.) m. Mary, dau. of Abial Roberts, Nov. 6, 1784. Ch.: I. David, b. Sept. 6, 1787; II. Mark, b. July 24, 1789; III. Ebenezer, b. Nov. 25, 1791.

#### UPSON.

1. THOMAS UPSON, of Hartford and Farmington, had ch., Thomas, Stephen, Mary, Hannah and Elizabeth.

2. Serg. STEPHEN, son of Thos., (1.) had, Mary, Stephen, Elizabeth, Thomas, Hannah, Tabiatha, John and Thankful. (See p. 193.)

3. STEPHEN, son of Stephen, (2.) had ch.: I. Sarah, b. March 8, 1714, d. 1714; II. Sarah, b. July 26, 1715, m. Gideon Hickox, Aug. 15, 1734; III. Stephen, b. Dec. 9, 1717; IV. and V. Joseph and Benjamin, b. Aug. 14, 1720; VI. Mary, b. May 2, 1724, m. Samuel Porter, Dec. 9, 1747; VII. and VIII. Ebenezer and Thankful, b. Sept. 29, 1727, Ebenezer d. in 1749; Thankful m. Ebenezer Johnson, Oct. 15, 1756; IX. Jemima, b. April 8, 1730, d. in 1736; X. Hannah, b. Sept. 29, 1735, m. Jesse Sperry, May 8, 1759.

4. THOMAS, son of Stephen, (2.) had ch.: I. Thomas, b. Dec. 20, 1719; II. and III. Mary and John, b. Jan. 21, 1721,—John d. 1741; IV. Josiah, b. Jan. 28, 1724–25; V. Asa, b. Nov. 30, 1728; VI. Timothy, b. Oct. 8, 1731; VII. Amos, b. March 17, 1734; VIII. Samuel, b. March 8, 1737; IX. Freeman, b. July 24, 1739, d. 1750.

5. JOHN, son of Stephen, (2.) had ch.: I. Daniel, b. March 19, 1726; II. Elijah, b. Feb. 11, 1727–28, d. young; III. Elijah, b. Feb. 5, 1730–

31, d. 1732-33; IV. Hannah, b. Nov. 17, 1733, m. Silas Merriman; V. Martha, b. May 1, 1736, m. William Barnes; VI. John, b. March 31, 1739; VII. James, b. Nov. 4, 1742; VIII. Elijah, b. May 6, 1745.

6. STEPHEN, Esq., son of Stephen, (3.) m. Sarah, dau. of Thomas Clark, Jan. 14, 1749-50, and d. March 27, 1769. His wid. d. Sept. 29, 1813, a. 90. Ch.: I. Mary, b. Nov. 21, 1750, d. Sept. 25, 1757; II. Olive, b. Feb. 18, 1753, m. Isaiah Prichard; III. Ebenezer, b. Aug. 11, 1755, d. Sept. 20, 1757; IV. Stephen, b. Sept. 12, 1758, was shot in N. Y. in 1776; V. Esther, b. Sept. 21, 1760, m. Asahel Bronson, Feb. 12, 1784; VI. Sarah, b. July 15, 1763, m. Stephen Gilbert of South Salem, N. Y.; VII. Mark, b. Feb. 21, 1766, m. Susanna Allen, and d. July 19, 1820; VIII. Daniel, b. March 7, 1769.

7. JOSEPH, son of Stephen, (3.) m. Comfort, dau. of Obadiah Scott, Feb. 13, 1744-45, and d. Aug. 7, 1749. His wid. d. Nov. 28, 1814, a. 91. Ch.: I. Jemima, b. July 14, 1746, m. Moses Cook, Nov. 4, 1766; II. Ezekiel, b. Oct. 7, 1748, m. Mary, dau. of Andrew Bronson.

8. BENJAMIN, son of Stephen, (3.) m. Mary, dau. of Dea. Moses Blakeslee, Nov. 17, 1743. He lived in Northbury. Ch.: I. Ruel, b. June 12, 1744, m. Deborah, dau. of Samuel Peck, April 23, 1766; II. Susanna, b. Jan. 12, 1746, m. Benj. Gaylord, and d. in 1818; III. Lois, b. May 12, 1748, m. Israel Terrel; IV. Joseph, b. May 5, 1750, m. Anna, dau. of Thos. Bronson, Feb. 13, 1771; V. Benjamin, b. July 3, 1752; VI. Jesse, b. Nov. 28, 1754, d. 1755; VII. Jesse, b. May 25, 1756; VIII. Noah, b. Sept. 26, 1758; IX. Asahel, b. April 25, 1762, m. Mehitable, dau. of Capt. Thos. Castle, and settled in Wolcott; X. Mary, b. June 22, 1765; XI. Sarah, b. July 23, 1768.

9. SAMUEL, son of Thomas, (4.) m. Ruth ———. Ch.: I. Mary, b. Feb. 1759, m. Joseph Minor; II. Archibald, b. April 26, 1761, d. 1782; III. Isaac, b. Dec. 22, 1763; IV. Obed, b. Jan. 2, 1767; V. Harvey, b. Nov. 11, 1769; VI. and VII. Samuel and Ruth, b. Aug. 16, 1772; VIII. Jerusha, b. June 27, 1775, d. 1775; IX. Manly, b. March 12, 1777; X. Betsey, b. Aug. 10, 1779.

10. MARK, son of Stephen, (6.) had ch.: I. Olive, m. Joseph Blakeslee, II. Esther; III. Sarah, d. unm.; IV. Lucena, m. William Stowe; V. Lucius, d. aged about 62; VI. Rosetta, d. unm.; VII. Jesse, m. Esther L. Hotchkiss, resides in Waterbury; VIII. Sarah Ann; IX. Davis, d. aged 22.

11. DANIEL, son of Stephen, (6.) m. Mary, dau. of Samuel Adams. She d. June 29, 1830, and he m. wid. Phebe Kirtland of Woodbury, Sept. 4, 1831, who d. May 4, 1845. He d. Oct. 1, 1854. Ch.: I. Stephen, b. May 8, 1797, d. Dec. 6, 1822; II. Alvin, b. Dec. 4, 1798.

m. Mary Sperry, and lives in Mich.; III. Daniel, b. May 16, 1801, m. Nancy Hotchkiss—no ch., lives in Watertown; IV. Minerva, b. March 10, 1803, d. June 6, 1822; V. Polly Maria, b. Dec. 29, 1805, d. Jan. 19, 1807; VI. William, Nov. 1, 1807, lives in Middlebury, unm.; VII. Merlin, b. Feb. 28, 1810, m. Emily Beecher of Naugatuck,—residence, Woodbury; VIII. Sarah Maria, b. Nov. 19, 1813, m. David Summers, lives in Woodbury; IX. Thomas Clark, b. Dec. 20, 1819, m. 1st, Harriet Morris of Woodbury, who d. July 12, 1853, and m. 2d, Cornelia Pease of Vt., lives in Waterbury.

12. BENJAMIN, son of Benjamin, (8,) m. Mary, wid. of Thomes Clark, Jan. 24, 1780, and d. July, 1824. His wife d. June 13, 1816. Ch.: I. Stephen, b. June 12, 1783. (See p. 443.)

13. THOMAS, son of Thomas of Farmington, (4,) m. Hannah, dau. of Capt. Timothy Hopkins, May 28, 1749. She d. June 6, 1757. He d. Sept. 5, 1764. Ch.: I. Benoni, (see p. 443,) b. Feb. 14, 1750, m. Leva Hopkins; II. Charles, b. March 8, 1752; III. Sylvia, b. June 7, 1756, d. 1764.

14. CHARLES, son of Thomas, (13,) m. Wealthy Hopkins, May 26, 1773, and d. April 29, 1809. His wid. d. Dec. 28, 1783. Ch.: I. Washington, b. Sept. 2, 1775, d. April 15, 1813; II. Lee, b. May 7, 1778; III. Gates, b. July 18, 1780.

15. REUBEN UPSON, son of John, and grandson of John? (5,) m. Hannah, dau. of Nathaniel Richardson, Dec. 25, 1798. Ch.: I. Reuben, b. Aug. 28, 1799, d. May 12, 1802; II. Phebe, Oct. 13, 1801, and probably others.

#### WARNER.

1. JOHN WARNER, of Hartford and Farmington, had ch.: John Daniel, Thomas and Sarah.

2. JOHN, son of John (1,) (see p. 195.) had Ephraim, John, Robert, (see Cothren's Woodbury, p. 752,) Ebenezer and Lydia.

3. DANIEL, son of John, (1,) had Daniel, John, Abigail, Samuel and Thomas. (See p. 198.)

4. THOMAS, (see p. 198,) son of John, (1,) had, Benjamin, John, Mary, Martha, Thomas, Samuel and Margaret.

5. Doct. EPHRAIM, (see p. 196,) son of John, (2,) had, I. Margaret, b. Feb. 16, 1693, d. March, 1693; II. Ephraim, b. Oct. 29, 1695, d. Dec. 28, 1704; III. Benjamin, b. Sept. 30, 1698; IV. John, b. June 24, 1700; V. Obadiah, b. Feb. 24, 1702-3; VI. Esther; VII. Ephraim; VIII. Ebenezer.

6. Doct. JOHN, (see p. 196,) son of John, (2,) had, I. A dau., b. July

22, 1699; II. Rebecca, b. Nov. 24, 1703, m. Samuel Thomas of Woodbury; III. Ebenezer, b. June 24, 1705; IV. Lydia, b. Feb. 23, 1706-7; V. John, b. in Stratford, March 31, 1717.

7. DANIEL, son of Daniel, (3,) had, I. A son, d. young; II. A son, b. and d. March, 1795-6; III. Samuel, b. April 16, 1798; IV. Sarah, b. Jan. 3, 1704-5, m. — Huff; V. Ebenezer, b. April 11, 1706; VI. Abraham, b. Nov. 16, 1708; VII. Abigail, b. Feb. 10, 1710-11; VIII. Mary, b. July 16, 1712, m. Isaac Tuttle of Woodbury, April 15, 1731.

8. SAMUEL, son of Thomas, (4,) had, I. and II. twins, d. young; III. Mary, b. July 5, 1718, m. Robert Drakely of Woodbury, July 14, 1751; IV. Sarah, b. Sept. 1720, m. Timothy Warner; V. Thomas, b. June 22, 1722, m. Huldah Warner, and d. without issue; VI. Benjamin, b. Oct. 22, 1724, d. April 22, 1760; VII. and VIII. Thankful and Patience, b. March 10, 1727; Thankful m. Thomas Hammond; IX. Hannah, b. Aug. 20, 1729, m. Abraham Adams; X. Stephen, b. Sept. 30, 1731, m. Phebe Baldwin; XI. Phebe, b. Feb. 6, 1735-6, m. Wait Wooster; XII. Martha, b. July 21, 1738 or 1739, m. Charles Warner.

9. Doct. BENJAMIN, son of Ephraim, (5,) m. Hannah, dau. of Josiah Strong of Colchester, March 17, 1720, and d. April, 1772; his wife d. April, 1785, aged 85. Ch.: I. Josiah, b. April 10, 1721, m. Rebecca Brown; II. Dinah, b. Feb. 11, 1723, m. Benj. Harrison; III. Reuben, b. Oct. 12, 1725, d. March 28, 1727; IV. Margaret, b. Nov. 9, 1727, m. Oliver Welton; V. Reuben, b. Sept. 21, 1729; VI. David, b. Nov. 27, 1731, m. Abigail Harrison; VII. Benjamin, b. Jan. 26, 1734; VIII. Anna, b. Jan. 31, 1736, m. John Hickox, Jr.; IX. Ephraim, b. June 26, 1738, m. Lydia, dau. of Samuel Brown, March 30, 1760, and d. May 20, 1808,—wife d. July 20, 1815—no issue; X. Eunice, b. Aug. 2, 1740, m. John Hickox 3d; XI. Ard, b. Nov. 1, 1742, m. Elizabeth Porter.

10. Dea. JOHN, son of Ephraim, (5,) m. Esther, dau. of David Scott, Dec. 17, 1724. She d. Feb. 18, 1726, and he m. Mary, dau. of Thomas Hickox, Oct. 3, 1728, who d. in 1784. He d. Sept. 7, 1794. Ch.: I. Esther, b. Sept. 11, 1729, d. Sept. 4, 1730; II. Phebe, b. Jan. 8, 1732; III. Annis, b. Jan. 3, 1735; IV. James, b. Dec. 11, 1739, m. Eunice Dutton; V. Mary, b. Oct. 9, 1742, d. April 21, 1745; VI. Elijah, b. March 21, 1746; VII. John, b. Oct. 14, 1749, m. Anne Sutliff.

11. OBADIAH, son of Ephraim, (5,) m. Sarah, dau. of Joseph Lewis, Feb. 1, 1726-7. Ch.: I. Jerusha, b. Oct. 13, 1727, m. Aaron Harrison; II. Lydia, b. June 6, 1729; III. Obadiah, b. June 20, 1731, d. June 25, 1750; IV. Esther, b. Nov. 9, 1733, d. Feb. 1746; V. Joseph, b. Oct. 23, 1735; VI. Lois, b. March 30, 1733, m. Asa Scovil; VII.

Enos, b. Aug. 11, 1740, d. Sept. 1, 1749; VIII. Sarah, b. Feb. 21, 1742-3, m. Aaron Terrel; IX. Eleanor, b. Jan. 13, 1743-4, m. Samuel Hickox; X. Agnis, b. Feb. 24, 1747; XI. Irena, b. July, 1749, m. Abijah Warner; XII. Mary, b. Aug. 6, 1751.

12. EBENEZER, son of Ephraim, (5.) m. Elizabeth, dau. of Thos. Bronson, April 2, 1740, and d. Oct. 5, 1805, aged 94. Ch.: I. Noah, b. Nov. 21, 1740, d. April 6, 1759; II. Ebenezer, b. Sept. 17, 1742, d. Dec. 21, 1746; III. Margaret, b. Oct. 6, 1744, m. Richard Welton; IV. Ebenezer, b. Jan. 16, 1748, d. Aug. 13, 1750; V. Jemima, b. Nov. 5, 1749, d. Nov. 7, 1751; VI. Annis, b. March 21, 1752; VII. Elizabeth, b. March 17, 1754, m. Ard Welton, d. 1827; VIII. Justus, b. March 27, 1756, m. Rena Warner, went to Ohio and d. in Liverpool, O., April 16, 1856; IX. Mark, b. Dec. 22, 1757, m. — Foote, d. in 1815; X. Jemima, b. May 17, 1761.

13. EPHRAIM, son of Ephraim, (5.) m. Eleanor, dau. of Wm. Smith, of Farmington, Feb. 14, 1739, and d. Nov. 5, 1768. Ch.: I. William, b. Sept. 13, 1740, m. Mary Chambers; II. Abijah, b. Jan. 5, 1743, m. Rena Warner; III. Rebecca, b. June 15, 1745, m. Barnabas Scott; IV. Ephra, b. April 29, 1748, m. Elizabeth Perkins of New Haven; V. Seth, b. Oct. 4, 1750, d. Oct. 23, 1751; VI. Seth, b. Jan. 5, 1753; VII. Eleanor, b. Sept. 28, 1757; VIII. Esther, b. May 30, 1760.

14. EBENEZER, son of John, (6.) m. Mary, dau. of Richard Welton, Jan. 22, 1729, and d. Feb. 16, 1750. She d. April 7, 1747. Ch.: I. Stephen, b. June 25, 1730, d. Feb. 24, 1750; II. Dorcas, b. July 1, 1732, m. Amos Scott; III. Phebe, b. Aug. 1, 1735; IV. John, b. March 10, 1739, d. Nov. 8, 1750.

15. JOHN, son of John, (6.) m. Sarah, dau. of Moses Bronson, Oct. 26, 1743. He d. before Dec. 2, 1760. Ch.: I. Ellen, b. Sept. 2, 1744, d. Sept. 20, 1746; II. Ellen, b. Oct. 23, 1746; III. Bela, b. Sept. 20, 1748; IV. Ebenezer, b. Aug. 15, 1750.

16. SAMUEL, son of Daniel, (7.) m. Elizabeth, dau. of Edmund Scott, Dec. 21, 1719. Ch.: I. Daniel, b. Aug. 27, 1720, d. at Cape Breton; II. Timothy, b. July 26, 1722; III. Nathan, b. July 6, 1724; IV. Elizabeth, b. March 26, 1726, m. Zebulon Scott; V. Thomas; VI. Nathan, b. Dec. 25, 1729; VII. Abigail, b. Nov. 15, 1732, m. George Scott; VIII. Huldah, b. May 17, 1734, m. 1st, Thos. Warner, 2d, Saml. Williams; IX. Enos, b. June 14, 1736; X. Susanna, b. Aug. 3, 1738, m. Ephraim Bissel, Nov. 5, 1756; XI. Samuel, b. Jan. 10, 1742, m. Anne Camp.

17. EBENEZER, son of Daniel, (7.) m. Martha, wid. of Edmund Scott and dau. of John Andruss, April 18, 1734. Ch.: Jemima, b. July 2,

1735; II. Benajah, b. Jan. 17, 1738, d. 1741; III. Benajah, b. Jan. 8, 1742.

18. ABRAHAM, son of Daniel, (7.) m. Keziah, dau. of Richard Welton, Dec. 12, 1734, and d. Nov. 23, 1749. Ch.: I. Charles, b. Jan. 18, 1736, m. Martha Warner; II. Levi, b. March 16, 1738; III. Zubah, b. July 12, 1740; IV. Keziah, b. Oct. 6, 1742; V. Sylvia, b. May 18, 1745; VI. Daniel, b. April 18, 1748.

19. STEPHEN, son of Samuel, (8.) m. Phebe, dau. of James Baldwin of Derby, Nov. 13, 1754. Ch.: I. Melliscent, b. Oct. 27, 1755; II. Roxanna, b. April 13, 1757; III. Bede, b. July 6, 1761; IV. Diana, b. Jan. 4, 1764; V. Anna, b. Nov. 11, 1765; VI. Arba, b. April 13, 1768; VII. Reuben, b. Oct. 11, 1773.

20. JOSIAH, son of Doct. Benjamin, (9.) m. Rebecca, dau. of James Bronson, May 26, 1748, and d. Aug. 26, 1750. His wid. d. Jan. 5, 1756. Ch.: I. Ozias, b. Aug. 21, 1749, m. Tamer Nichols.

21. DAVID, son of Doct. Benjamin, (9.) m. Abigail, dau. of Benj. Harrison, Dec. 11, 1753. Ch: I. Josiah, b. Oct. 6, 1754, m. Anne Prichard; II. Aaron, b. Nov. 24, 1756, m. Lydia Welton; III. Urania, b. Oct. 1, 1758; IV. James H., b. Dec. 18, 1760; V. Benjamin, b. Nov. 17, 1762.

22. ARD, son of Doct. Benjamin, (9.) m. Elizabeth, dau. of Doct. Daniel Porter, Jan. 12, 1764, and d. April 30, 1824. His wid. d. Aug. 21, 1835, aged 90. Ch.: I. Joanna, b. 1764, m. Samuel Gunn, had several ch. and d. in Ohio; II. Lydia, b. 1766, m. Samuel Alcox, lived in Wolcott; III. Ephraim, b. 1768, was drowned 1786; IV. Elizabeth, b. 1769, m. — Osborn, went to Black River; V. Prudence, b. 1772, removed to Camden, N. Y.; VI. David, b. 1774; VII. Irena, b. 1775, m. twice, is living in Pa.; VIII. Ard, b. 1777; IX. Hannah, b. 1780, m. Anson, son of Ozias Warner; X. Asahel, b. 1782; XI. Chauncey, b. 1785, resides in Fulton, Ohio, has ch.; XII. Susan, b. 1789, m. Levi, son of Ozias Warner.

23. JAMES, son of Dea. John, (10.) m. Eunice, dau. of David Dutton, Jan. 1, 1761, and d. May 27, 1819. His wife d. May 7, 1815. Ch.: I. Sarah, b. Oct. 2, 1761; II. Noah, b. Aug. 1763, d. Sept. 18, 1820; III. Lucinda, b. Sept. 20, 1765, m. Elijah Hotchkiss; IV. Eunice, b. April 3, 1769, d. Aug. 20, 1769; V. James, b. Jan. 25, 1771, d. Jan. 15, 1773; VI. Eunice, b. May 31, 1773, m. Eli Terry; VII. James, b. Nov. 1, 1775.

24. ELIJAH, son of Dea. John, (10.) m. Esther, dau. of Thos. Fenn, Nov. 19, 1767. Ch.: I. Lyman, b. May 22, 1768; II. Chauncey, b. June



11, 1770, m. A. Tallmage; III. Rosetta, b. Feb. 25, 1773; IV. Elijah; V. Apollos, m. Chloe Wilcox of Simsbury.

25. JOHN, son of Dea. John, (10,) m. Anne, dau. of Dea. John Sutliff, Sept. 22, 1773. Ch.: I. Chloe, m. Enos Dutton; II. Martha, b. Jan. 24, 1775, m. Victory Tomlinson; III. Eliel, b. Oct. 1776, m. Amanda Osborn; IV. Aaron, b. 1780, m. Polly Camp, d. 1839; V. Abijah, b. 1784, m. Betsey Fenn; VI. David, b. 1786, m. Anne Atwater; VII. John S., b. 1789, m. Emily Lord; VIII. Anne, b. July 20, 1792, m. A. G. Welton.

26. JOSEPH, son of Obadiah, (11,) m. Elizabeth, dau. of Ebenezer Wakely, Jan. 13, 1763, who d. in 1767, and he m. Huldah Nichols. Ch.: I. Sarah, b. Nov. 6, 1763, d. young; II. Joseph, b. May 12, 1765, d. Sept. 14, 1845; III. Sarah, b. April, 1767; IV. Obadiah, b. 1770, d. Sept. 14, 1845.

27. ABIJAH, son of Ephraim, (13,) m. Rene, dau. of Obadiah Warner, Dec. 13, 1764. Ch.: I. Garmon, b. Aug. 2, 1765; II. Lucy, b. Oct. 23, 1766; III. Agnis, b. Dec. 25, 1769; IV. Rene, b. Oct. 10, 1771; V. Rebecca, b. Feb. 24, 1773.

28. WILLIAM, son of Ephraim, (13,) m. Mary, dau. of Thos. Chambers, Dec. 8, 1762; Ch.: I. Austin, b. Dec. 18, 1764; II. Loretta, b. Jan. 30, 1767; probably others.

29. TIMOTHY, son of Samuel, (16,) m. Sarah, dau. of Samuel Warner, Feb. 25, 1745; Ch.: I. Naomi, b. Jan. 4, 1746, m. Samuel Webb; II. Mindwell, b. Aug. 14, 1749; III. Rosanna, b. Aug. 1, 1753; IV. Lucy, b. Nov. 9, 1655; V. Jesse, b. Nov. 12, 1757; VI. Rene, b. Nov. 1, 1759; VII. Consider, b. May 9, 1762.

30. SAMUEL, son of Samuel, (16,) m. Anne, dau. of Abel Camp, May 6, 1760. Ch.: I. Levinia, b. Sept. 16, 1761; II. Antha, b. Sept. 25, 1764; III. Bede, b. July 5, 1766; IV. Thankful, b. July 8, 1768.

31. CHARLES, son of Abraham, (18,) m. Martha, dau. of Samuel Warner, April 2, 1759. Ch.: I. Orpha, b. June 11, 1760, d. June 25, 1760; II. Orrin, b. May 1, 1762; III. Lucena, b. April 12, 1764; IV. Levi, b. Nov. 22, 1766; V. Asa, b. July 15, 1769.

32. OZIAS, son of Josiah, (20,) m. Tamer, dau. of Richard Nichols, Oct. 9, 1770. Ch.: I. Rena, b. April 16, 1771; II. Eunice, b. April 2, 1773; III. James, b. Oct. 18, 1774; IV. Anson, b. Aug. 9, 1778; V. Tamer, b. Aug. 13, 1780; VI. Lydia, b. March 14, 1782; VII. David, b. Feb. 20, 1784; VIII. Levi, b. Feb. 14, 1786, m. Susan, dau. of Ard Warner, removed to Springville, Penn., has a large family.

33. JOSIAH, son of David, (21,) m. Anna, dau. of Roger Prichard, Jan. 6, 1774. Ch.: I. David, b. Aug. 17, 1774; II. Anne, b. Sept. 1, 1776; III. Polly, b. Oct. 5, 1779; IV. Anna, b. June 1, 1781,—perhaps others.

34. DAVID, son of Ard, (22,) m. Louis Sutliff wid. of Ira Tompkins. Ch.: I. Amanda, b. 1810, m. John B. Terry, of Bristol; II. Vienna, b. 1815, m. and resides in East Haddam; III. Betsey, b. 1718, m. Reuben Tyler.

35. ARD, son of Ard, (22,) m. Mary, dau. of Seba Bronson. Ch.: I. Maria, m. lives in Ohio; II. Mary, m. Gen. David B. Hurd; ch., Mary M., Elizabeth J., Margaret L., Hellen N., and Caroline; III. Elizabeth, m. Danl. Barheller, resided in Ill., d. Nov. 1855; IV. Nancy, m., lived in Illinois,—is deceased; V. Sherman B., m. Lydia Hall of Southbury, has one ch., Arthur O.; VI. Charles A., m. Mary Ann Thomas of Bethany—has ch.; VII. Maria, m. Col. Levi Bolster of Maine; ch., Edwin S., Juliett M., Horatio A., Mary H., Jane E., M. Harriet; VIII. Abram J., graduated at Trinity Coll., Hartford,—is an Episcopal clergyman in Ill.

36. ASABEL, son of Ard, (22,) m. Lowly Andruss. Ch.: I. Anna, m. C. Case, went to Syracuse, N. Y.—has ch.; II. Chauncey, resides in Syracuse, has been married twice; III. Sarah Jane, m. Sumner Vanhosen of Chicopee, Mass.—has ch.; IV. Wolcott, enlisted, went to Mexico and has not been heard of since the taking of Vera Cruz.

37. ANSON, son of Ozias, (32,) m. Hannah, dau. of Ard Warner, (22,) Ch.: I. Ephraim, m. Mary Whitney—both dead—left a dau.; II. Charity, m. Chauncey Royce of Bristol—has four ch.; III. G. Porter, m. Eunice Terrell and had 3 ch.; IV. Emeline J., m. Charles Ball of Southington, has ch.; V. Charlotte H., m. 1st, Wm. Thompson, 2d, H. Bronson, of Prospect.

#### WELTON.

1. JOHN WELTON (see p. 200) had ch.: John, Stephen, Abigail, Mary, Elizabeth, Else, Richard, Hannah, Thomas, George and Esther. Stephen had no sons, Thomas but one, who d. young. In the following, the descendants of John, Richard and George are given separately.

#### FIRST FAMILY, OR JOHN'S POSTERITY.

2. JOHN, son of John, (1,) had, I. John, b. June 28, 1707; II. Ezekiel, b. March 4, 1709, went to Nova Scotia; III. George, b. Aug. 16, 1711; IV. Ebenezer, b. Aug. 31, 1713; V. Mary, b. Jan. 26, 1716, d. young; VI. Thomas, b. Feb. 23, 1718; VII. Mary, b. Oct. 10, 1722; VIII. Oliver, b. Dec. 14, 1724; IX. Silence, b. Dec. 24, 1727.

3. JOHN, son of John, (2,) m. Elizabeth Hendrick of Fairfield, Feb. 12, 1739. Ch.: I. Lois, b. May 9, 1744; II. Luff, b. March 9, 1748, d. 1749.

4. EBENEZER, son of John, (2,) had, I. Nathaniel, b. April 4, 1742, d. April 23, 1777; II. Sarah, b. Dec. 5, 1744; III. Mercy, b. Sept. 15, 1747; IV. Ebenezer, b. July 14, 1750; V. David, b. July 27, 1752, d. 1757; VI. Phebe, b. April 11, 1755; VII. David, b. June 5, 1760.

5. NATHANIEL, son of Ebenezer, (4,) m. Martha, dau. of Thomas Tuttle of New Haven, Feb. 6, 1764. Ch.: I. Sarah, b. March 10, 1765; II. Hezekiah, b. Nov. 30, 1766; III. Uri, b. June 30, 1768; IV. Nathaniel, b. March 10, 1770; V. Jarvis, b. Feb. 26, 1772; VI. Allen, b. March 11, 1774; VII. Elias, b. July 18, 1776.

6. HEZEKIAH, son of Nathaniel, (5,) m. Hannah, dau. of Levi Welton, had ch.,—went West.

7. NATHANIEL, son of Nathaniel, (5,) had, Horace; Laura, m. John Hotchkiss; Charry; Maria, m. Freeman Sanford; Garry.

8. HORACE, son of Nathaniel, (7,) m. 1st, Julia, dau. of Asahel Finch, 2d, Susan Hitchcock. Ch.: I. Edwin, b. June 26, 1824; II. Augustus, b. March 16, 1826; III. James, b. March 16, 1829; IV. Julia, b. Dec. 23, 1733; V. David, b. Dec. 26, 1835; VI. Stella, b. March 9, 1837; VII. Nelson, b. Oct. 17, 1841; VIII. Mary, b. Dec. 14, 1844; IX. William, b. Sept. 28, 1849; X. Ellen, b. March 22, 1852.

9. JAMES, son of Horace, (8,) m. Augusta Boyd of Simsbury. Ch.: Georgiana and Adella.

10. GARRY, son of Nathaniel, (7,) had Eliza and Nelson.

11. DAVID, son of Ebenezer, (4,) m. Sarah, dau. of Jabez Tuttle, June 20, 1781. Ch.: I. Daniel, b. Nov. 19, 1781; II. Jabez, b. May 30, 1783; III. David, b. June 27, 1785; IV. Hannah, b. Sept. 18, 1789; V. Lucina, m. — Osborn.

12. DANIEL, son of David, (11,) m. Susanna Selkriggs, and had William, George, Annia, Sarah and Mary.

13. GEORGE, son of Daniel, (12,) m. Charlotte Smith, and had Sarah, George and Daniel.

14. JABEZ, son of David, (11,) m. Betsey Moore of New Haven. Ch.: I. Ebenezer, b. Nov. 22, 1805; II. Rebecca, b. Jan. 27, 1809, m. 1st, Tyler Bronson, 2d, Lucius Beach; III. David, b. Aug. 26, 1812; IV. Polly, b. Sept. 1814, m. 1st, Cornelius Munson, 2d, Marvin Minor; V. Francis, b. Jan. 26, 1717.

15. EBENEZER, son of Jabez, (14,) m. Mary Rice, and had Charles.

16. DAVID, son of Jabez, (14,) m. Huldah Bronson. Ch.: Frances E., David F. and Albert B.

17. FRANCIS, son of Jabez, (14,) m. Lucretia, dau. of Ozias Hubbard of Guilford. Ch.: Isidora L., b. Jan. 4, 1848; Ann C., b. Oct. 14, 1853.

18. THOMAS, son of John, (2,) m. Mary, dau. of R. Cossett of Simsbury,

Sept. 15, 1742. Ch.: I. Ezekiel, b. Aug. 29, 1743; II. Reuben, b. Feb. 19, 1746; III. Alling, b. July 14, 1748, d. 1749; IV. Alling, b. May 15, 1750, d. 1750; V. Bethel, b. Aug. 9, 1751, d. 1763; VI. Lucretia, b. Jan. 20, 1754; VII. Rosetta, b. Feb. 10, 1757, d. 1757; VIII. Levina, b. April 20, 1759; IX. Shubel, b. July 29, 1761; X. Bethel, b. July 18, 1767.

19. REUBEN, son of Thomas, (18.) m. Rhoda Hull of Wallingford. Ch.: I. Johnson F.; II. Eri; III. Polly, m. Obadiah Warner; IV. Ezekiel; V. Lucretia, m. William Pendleton; VI. Rosetta, m. David Edwards; VII. Phila, m. William Smith; VIII. Lovisa.

20. ERI, son of Reuben, (19.) m. Alma Baxter. Ch.: Orrin, Julia Ann, Lucius B., Mary, Ransom W., Edward, Charles, Sarah, Eri.

21. EZEKIEL, son of Reuben, (19.) had, Lovisa, Alma, Harriet, Jennet, Merritt, Miranda, Sarah, Mary and Hiram.

22. MERRITT, son of Ezekiel, (21.) m. Clarissa, dau. of Elias Prichard, and had Henrietta.

23. EZEKIEL, son of Thomas, (18.) m. Mercy, dau. of Ebenezer Welton, Oct. 1765. Ch.: I. Eri, b. Feb. 8, 1768; II. Cephas, b. April 25, 1771; III. Gracina, b. March 7, 1774.

24. OLIVER, son of John, (2.) m. Margaret, dau. of Benjamin Warner, Dec. 14, 1749, and d. Nov. 10, 1809. She d. Jan. 17, 1823. Ch.: I. Anne, b. Dec. 14, 1749, d. 1753; II. Ard, b. Aug. 19, 1752; III. Benjamin, b. Sept. 27, 1754; IV. Arad, b. Feb. 26, 1758, went to Virginia, m. and had daughters; V. Margaret, b. Oct. 27, 1763.

25. ARD, son of Oliver, (24.) m. Sept. 13, 1773, Elizabeth, dau. of Ebenezer Warner, and d. July 9, 1803. She d. April 15, 1827. Ch.: I. Annis, b. Sept. 13, 1774, m. Lyman Warner of Northfield, and d. July, 1844; II. Erastus, b. Aug. 6, 1776, d. Aug. 1849; III. Margaret A., b. Feb. 25, 1779, m. Lemuel Porter, went to Ohio, and d. in 1806; IV. Isaac, b. Oct. 2, 1785, d. Feb. 17, 1806, while a member of Y. C.

26. ERASTUS, son of Ard, (25.) m. Abigail Church, who d. Feb. 23, 1846. Ch.: I. Polly, b. July 24, 1797, m. Jared S. Hall, July, 1834; II. Shelden, b. Nov. 7, 1799; III. Ard, b. Feb. 24, 1805,—resides in Charleston, S. C.; IV. Isaac, b. Aug. 25, 1806; V. Elizabeth, b. March 27, 1809, m. Joseph Hine, July 20, 1836.

27. SHELDEN, son of Erastus, (26.) m. Betsey Jordan, Sept. 12, 1825, who was b. Sept. 17, 1803. Ch.: Adaline E., b. Nov. 11, 1826; Birdsey S., b. Aug. 17, 1831; Hiram E., b. Oct. 14, 1734.

28. ARD, son of Erastus, (26.) m. Caroline, dau. of Richard F. Welton, who d. Oct. 1, 1831, aged 26. Ch.: I. Margaret A., b. Jan. 4, 1827; Ellen E., b. Oct. 18, 1829, m. Horace Johnson, Sept. 7, 1852.

29. ISAAC, son of Erastus, (26.) m. Feb. 22, 1841, Eunice P. Òviatt of Ohio, where he resides. She was b. Aug. 28, 1809. Ch.: Emily, b. May 3, 1843; Lucretia, b. May 16, 1845; Luthera, b. May 16, 1845.

30. BENJAMIN, son of Oliver, (24.) m. Agnes, dau. of Enos Gunn. Ch.: Anne, b. May 10, 1780; Willard, b. Jan. 14, 1782; Abel G., b. Feb. 15, 1785; Benjamin S., b. March 5, 1791; Arad W., b. May 1, 1794.

31. ABEL G., son of Benjamin, (30.) m. Anna, dau. of John Warner. Ch.: I. George, was drowned when a young man; II. Jane, m. Luther Hoadley; III. Abijah, m. Elizabeth Upson, has a dau.; IV. William, m. Elvira Atkins, ch., Jane and Harriet; V. John; VI. Henry, m. Mrs. White—one child.

32. BENJAMIN S., son of Benjamin, (30.) m. — Gray. Ch.: Peter, deceased; Caroline, m. — Chidsey; Grey, d. young.

33. ARAD W., son of Benjamin, (30.) m. Sally Smith. Ch.: I. Ellen, b. April 17, 1817, m. Chas. Wooster, d. July 16, 1843; II. Oliver, b. Aug. 24, 1820, d. Jan. 26, 1842; III. Andrew A., b. Aug. 27, 1823, d. Dec. 3, 1841. The two last d. while members of Trinity Coll. IV. Noah B., b. March 21, 1829, m. Eliza Baldwin of New Haven; ch., Oliver, b. July 8, 1853.

#### SECOND FAMILY, OR RICHARD'S POSTERITY.

34. RICHARD, son of John, (1.) had, I. Richard, b. 1701; II. John, b. July 13, 1703; III. Stephen, b. March 12, 1706; IV. Mary, b. June 1, 1708; V. Thomas, b. Oct. 25, 1710, d. Dec. 1, 1780; VI. Keziah, b. Dec. 1, 1713, m. Abraham Warner; VII. Eliakim, b. Jan. 21, 1715, d. Nov. 20, 1794; VIII. Tabitha, b. Feb. 17, 1720, m. Edward Neal—lived in Southington; IX. Ede, b. April 24, 1729, m. — Lewis, d. aged 21.

35. RICHARD, son of Richard, (34.) m. Anna Fenton. Ch.: I. John; II. Anna; III. Titus, d. unm.; IV. Abi, m. — Fenn of Watertown.

36. JOHN, son of Richard, (35.) m. Dorcas, dau. of Capt. Samuel Hickox, Jan. 5, 1758, who d. June 13, 1815. He d. Jan. 22, 1816. Ch.: I. Abi, b. Nov. 2, 1758, d. 1828, unm.; II. Mary, b. June 10, 1760, m. — Phelps, d. 1811; III. Anna, b. Feb. 11, 1762, d. 1803, unm.; IV. Titus, b. July 3, 1764; V. Richard F., b. April 17, 1763, d. May 9, 1829; VI. John, b. Oct. 28, 1769; VII. Dorcas, b. Oct. 29, 1771, d. 1793; VIII. Adrian, b. Feb. 15, 1775, d. Oct. 20, 1804; IX. John, b. Jan. 13, 1778, d. April 2, 1813.

37. TITUS, son of John, (36.) m. Polly Hickox. Ch.: I. Julia A., m. Selden Shelton of Plymouth, went to Western N. Y.; II. Alanson W.;

III. Carlos, b. 1792, d. 1799; IV. Dorcas, m. Reuben Hickox; V. and VI. Carlos and Titus, b. April 10, 1801, both d. young; VII. Sarah, b. 1803, d. 1809; VIII. Wm. Samuel, b. 1806, d. 1817; IX. Mary.

38. RICHARD F., son of John, (36.) m. 1st, Sarah Annah Hickox, 2d, Anna, dau. of Dr. Timothy Porter. Ch.: I. Ephraim W., II. Richard F., m. — Loveland; III. Lydia A., m. Anson Lane; IV. George W.; V. Joseph; VI. Caroline, b. Nov. 6, 1805, m. Ard Welton.

39. ADRIAN, son of John, (36.) m. Sally Clark. Ch.: I. Mary Ann, m. Reuben Judd, d. Dec. 21, 1837, aged 40; II. Sabrina, b. 1799, d. 1852; III. Horace Clark, b. 1801, d. 1854.

40. JOHN, son of John, (36.) m. Abiah Hull. Ch.: I. Manvil; II. Leonard; III. Adrian; IV. Charles, m. Sally, dau. of Thos. Judd.

41. REV. ALANSON, son of Titus, (37.) m. Eleanor Tuttle, d. at Detroit. Ch.: Samuel, Mary and John.

42. EPHRAIM W., son of Richard F., (38.) m. Polly, dau. of Lemuel Nichols. Ch.: Sarah Ann, m. William Hoadley; John; George; Ephraim; Henry and William.

43. GEORGE W., son of Richard F., (38.) m. Harriet Minor, who d. May 26, 1839, and he m. Mary Ann Graham. Ch.: Harriet Minor, Mary, Emily J., Ellen C. and George Richard. The last d. Aug. 5, 1855.

44. JOSEPH C., son of Richard F., (38.) m. Jane, dau. of Timothy Porter. Ch.: Caroline.

45. HORACE C., son of Adrian, (39.) m. Sophia, dau. of Daniel Bradley. Ch.: I. William A.; II. Frederick A., m. and has a son, Byron.

46. GEORGE, son of Ephraim W., (42.) m. Mary Nichols, who d. in 1855. Ch.: Sarah, Ellen and Charles.

47. WILLIAM A., son of Horace C., (45.) m. Eliza, dau. of Leonard Prichard. Ch.: Lewis F., d. 1849; Frederick L. and William P.

48. STEPHEN, son of Richard, (34.) m. Dec. 13, 1731, Deborah, dau. of John Sutliff, and d. April 30, 1759. Ch.: I. Martha, b. Nov. 19, 1732, d. 1735; II. Levi, b. Nov. 10, 1734, d. 1736; III. Martha, b. March 1, 1736, m. J. Grilley; IV. Dinah, b. May 2, 1738; V. Levi, b. March 6, 1741; VI. Stephen, b. Jan. 7, 1744; VII. Thomas, b. Dec. 22, 1749, d. 1751; VIII. Thomas, b. Nov. 22, 1751.

49. LEVI, son of Stephen, (48.) m. Mary, dau. of Richard Seymour, who d. in 1768, and he m. 2d, Molly Hull. Ch.: I. Deborah, b. March 28, 1762; II. Lydia, b. Oct. 28, 1763; III. Stephen, b. Oct. 1, 1765; IV. Molly, m. Jesse Silkrigg of Wolcott; V. Hannah, m. Hezekiah Welton; VI. Cynthia Rosanna, m. Michael Harrison; VII. Lavinia, m.

James Brown; VIII. Disa; IX. Betsey, m. — Camp; X. Philo, m. — Blakesly, removed to N. Y. State.

50. STEPHEN, son of Stephen, (48,) m. Lucy Thomas. Ch.: Lemuel, Levi, Dinah, Lucy, Zilpah, Elihu, Asher, Alfred, Betsey and Irene.

51. THOMAS, son of Stephen, (48,) m. Abigail, dau. of Lieut. Wm. Hickox, June 22, 1772, who d. Jan. 13, 1791. He m. 2d, Ruth Thomas, 3d. Hannah, dau. of Lt. Jared Hill, and d. April, 1835. Ch.: I. Seymour, b. July 2, 1772; II. Sarah, b. Dec. 18, 1773, d. 1774; III. Jared, b. July 15, 1774; IV. Elias, b. July 18, 1776, m. Rhoda Prindle of Watertown; V. Sarah, b. Dec. 12, 1778, m. Levi Hall of Wolcott; VI. Chloe, b. Nov. 2, 1780, m. John Barnes; VII. Lydia, b. July 21, 1783; VIII. Fanny, b. April 1, 1785; IX. Laura, b. Feb. 1787; X. Ransom, b. July 18, 1789, went to Canada; XI. Thomas II.; XII. Ruth N., m. Street Todd; XIII. Herschel, b. 1797, d. 1842.

52. SEYMOUR, son of Thomas, (51,) m. Olive Harrison. Ch.: Harrison, Sophronia and John P.

53. JARED, son of Thomas, (51.) m. Philomela Norton. Ch.: Abbe; Ziba; Emily; Orestes; Leonard; Fanny; Delia A., m. Daniel, son of Elias Clark, is the only living dau. of this family; Almira; Mayrett.

54. HERSCHEL, son of Thomas, (51.) m. Eunice dau. of David Prindle of Watertown. Ch.: David T.; Chauncey P., m. Jennet Cleveland, and had, Dwight, Caroline and Ella; Sherman E.; Hannah A.; Ranslin N.; Hector E.; Herschel O.

55. DAVID T., son of Herschel, (54) m. 1st, Polly Nichols, 2d, Caroline Turner. Ch.: Everet and two daughters.

56. SHERMAN E., son of Herschel, (54,) m. Caroline Cleveland, who d. June 15, 1856. Ch.: Hattie.

57. RANSLIN N., son of Herschel, (54,) m. Mary, dau. of Edward Scott. Ch.: Mary and another dau.

58. THOMAS, son of Richard, (34.) m. Lydia Utter, 2d, Lydia Warner. He lived on Bucks hill—had no ch.—adopted his nephew, Richard Welton. His wife survived him, m. Dr. Preserved Porter, and d. Oct. 1821, aged 92.

59. ELIAKIM, son of Richard, (34) m. April 28, 1736, Eunice, dau. of Moses Bronson. Ch.: I. Eliakim, b. Sept. 22, 1736, d. June 8, 1821; II. Eunice, b. Oct. 19, 1738, m. David Roberts; III. Avis, b. Aug. 13, 1740, m. Thaddeus Barnes; IV. Richard, b. Oct. 10, 1743, d. Feb. 26, 1822; V. Eli, b. Oct. 10, 1746; VI. Moses, b. June 25, 1749; VII. Aaron, b. Feb. 19, 1752; VIII. and IX. Benoni and Benjamin, b. Feb. 18, 1756. Benoni d. unm., Benjamin d. young.

60. ELIAKIM, son of Eliakim, (59,) m. Amy, dau. of Ebenezer Bald-

win, who d. Jan. 3, 1829, aged 87. Ch.: I. Eben, b. June 24, 1764; II. Eliakim, b. Dec. 13, 1766; III. Amy, b. Sept. 25, 1770, d. 1770; IV. Joseph, b. Sept. 6, 1771, d. 1774; V. Mark, b. April 27, 1773; VI. Amy, b. April 4, 1776; VII. Avice, b. March 12, 1779, d. 1779; VIII. Joseph, b. March 29, 1780; IX. Moses, b. March 16, 1783, d. Sept. 14, 1829; X. Micoock, b. March 9, 1787, d. 1788.

61. RICHARD, son of Eliakim, (59.) m. Margaret, dau. of Ebenezer Warner, April 27, 1766. She d. Oct. 19, 1768, and he m. 2d, Hannah Davis, Aug. 7, 1770, who d. Dec. 11, 1839. Ch.: I. Noah, b. Feb. 15, 1767, d. Jan. 26, 1847; II. Richard Warner, b. Oct. 10, 1768, d. Dec. 1768; III. Richard, b. May 10, 1771, d. Sept. 26, 1807; IV. Margaret, b. July 2, 1772, m. Daniel Steele;\* V. Thomas, b. Dec. 8, 1774, d. April 18, 1856; VI. Lydia, b. April 1, 1777, m. David Roberts of Burlington, and d. Aug. 31, 1828; VII. Hannah, b. Oct. 10, 1779, m. David Warner—went to Geneseo, N. Y.; VIII. Joseph Davis, b. April 15, 1783, d. Jan. 16, 1825; IX. Bela, b. Sept. 9, 1787, d. Oct. 16, 1822.

62. ELI, son of Eliakim, (59.) m. Anna Baldwin, July 1, 1771. Ch.: Eli, b. Aug. 10, 1772; Asa, b. Nov. 24, 1773; Phebe, b. Sept. 29, 1775, d. 1777; Eunice, b. Aug. 12, 1777; Benoni, b. April 19, 1780; Anna; Printha.

63. ELI, son of Eli, (62.) had, Joel, Bennet, Eli and Asa.

64. ELI, son of Eli, (63.) m. Rhoda Wilson. Ch.: I. Elmore, m. Sarah Ann Cleveland; ch., I. Homer; II. Jane; III. Ruth.

65. ASA, son of Eli, (62.) m. — Fenn. Ch.: I. Selden; II. Hiram, m. Harriet, dau. of Timothy Ball, d. leaving no ch.; III. Lyman; IV. Emily, m. Simeon Philips; V. Heman.

66. HEMAN, son of ASA, (65.) m. 1st, Adaline Blakeslee, 2d, A. Carter. Ch.: Oliver Blakeslee and another son.

67. MOSES, son of Eliakim, (59.) m. Betta Wooster. Ch.: Andrew and E'izur.

68. AARON, son of Eliakim, (59.) m. Zera Bronson, Jan. 13, 1777. Ch.: Tamar, b. Feb. 28, 1778; Junia, b. Dec. 1779; Harvey, b. Oct. 28, 1780, d. 1782; Harvey, b. Nov. 2, 1782.

69. EBEN, son of Eliakim, (60.) m. Sarah, dau. of Titus Barnes, and moved to Ohio with his family. Ch.: Avice, Sarah, Selden, Jacob, Elisha, Caroline, Eben and Polly.

---

\* Rev. ASHAKL BREWSTER, a son of Daniel by a first wife, was born in Waterbury, Jan. 31, 1796. He now resides in Washington City, and is the author of a recent work evincing laborious research, entitled "Chief of the Pilgrims, or the Life and Times of William Brewster." He married a descendant of Elder Brewster.—H. B.



70. ELIAKIM, son of Eliakim, (60,) m. Loly, dau. of Titus Barnes. Jan. 3, 1788, and went to Ohio with his family. Ch.: I. Orasena, b. March 10, 1790, m. Thos. Worden; II. Micha B., b. Aug. 13, 1792, m. Wealthy Upson; III. Sherman P., b. Oct. 24, 1796, d. 1797; IV. Sherman P., b. Oct. '8, 1798, m. Ruth Upson; V. Sally M., b. July 7, 1801, m. in Ohio.

71. MARK, son of Eliakim, (60.) m. Sally Davis, and removed to the State of N. Y. Ch.: Samuel, Truman, Amy, Hiram, Harriet, Alnira and Dorcas.

72. JOSEPH, son of Eliakim, (60.) m. Ellen, dau. of John Warner of Plymouth, and went to the State of N. Y. Ch.: Norman, Charlotte, Warner, Emeline and Eliakim.

73. MOSES, son of Eliakim, (60.) m. Huldah, dau. of Titus Hotchkiss of Wolcott, Aug. 20, 1810. Ch.: I. Milo, b. 1811, d. young; II. Julia, b. Nov. 22, 1813, m. Andrew Hough; III. Sarah, b. Feb. 20, 1820, m. Franklin Hall; IV. Huldah, b. Sept. 12, 1823, m. Edward Pratt; V. Hester, b. April 6, 1825, m. Hiram Curtiss; VI. Mary, b. April 25, 1827, m. Joel Hungerford.

74. NOAH, son of Richard. (61.) m. Nabby Chidsey of East Haven, in 1791, 2d, Ellen Cowles, Dec. 1804, who d. Nov. 26, 1848. He lived in Harwinton. Ch.: I. Miles, b. June 15, 1793; II. Margaret A., b. March 28, 1800, d. 1803; III. Aaline, b. June 15, 1803, m. Willard Hitchcock of Burlington, April 3, 1822, and went to Vt.; IV. Nabby, b. Nov. 17, 1805, m. Charles Judson, May, 1826; V. Margaret A., b. Jan. 2, 1808, m. Enoch Marks, May, 1826; VI. Noah E., b. Aug. 12, 1811, d. Oct. 1848; VII. John J., b. Feb. 2, 1814; VIII. Lester C., b. April 20, 1817; IX. Elvira, b. April 25, 1821, m. Rev. Collis Potter, of Plymouth, in 1851; X. Bela A., b. Dec. 25, 1823; XI. Jane, b. July 12, 1827, m. Jared Smith of Harwinton in 1854.

75. MILES, son of Noah, (74.) m. Jan. 1815, Nancy, dau. of Stephen Graves of E. Plymouth. Ch.: I. Street C., b. Sept. 8, 1816; II. Ximnus, b. Dec. 16, 1817, d. Aug. 9, 1822; III. Albert, b. May 7, 1820; IV. Carlos, b. April 3, 1822; V. X. Alanson, b. March 17, 1824; VI. Ruth Adaline, b. July 14, 1826, m. Eben Coll of Plymouth, April, 1845; VII. Nancy Ann, b. Jan. 25, 1830, m. Ralph Humphrey of Ansonia, Nov. 1853; VIII. Major G., b. June 21, 1832; IX. Marvin B., b. June 21, 1832; X. Emily W., b. April 17, 1836.

76. NOAH E., son of Noah, (74.) m. Mahitabel Bulkley in 1832, and 2d, Lydia J. Chidsey in 1836. Ch.: Charlotte A., Noah J., Ellen J. and Seymour H.

77. JOHN J., son of Noah, (74,) m. Maria Wilcox, April, 1840, who d. Sept. 1847. Ch.: Charles, b. 1841; Ellen M., b. 1846.

78. LESTER C., son of Noah, (74,) m. Corra Mathews of Bristol, Sept. 1845,—is now living in Henry Co., Ill. Ch.: James M., Ellen A. and Merritt Hobert.

79. Bela A., son of Noah, (74,) resides in Ill., m. Jane Merritt, has a son.

80. STREET C., son of Miles, (75,) m. Aaline Smith of Orange, N. J., Sept. 1841. Ch.: John S. and Alanson.

81. ALBERT, son of Miles, (75,) m. Susan A. Bidwell of Northfield, Jan. 1842. Ch.: Francis G., Mary E. and George W.

82. CARLOS, son of Miles, (75,) m. Maria E. Peck of Farmington, Nov. 1846, who d. Feb. 1850, leaving a son, Henry A.

83. X. ALANSON, son of Miles, (75,) is an Episcopal clergyman, and rector of St. Matthew's church, Cambridge, Henry Co., Ill. He m. Harriet F. Root of Guilford, Vt., Sept. 4, 1853, and had a dau., Ellen E.

84. RICHARD, son of Richard, (61,) m. Sarah, daughter of Nathaniel Gunn, March, 1797. She d. July 20, 1851. Ch.: I. Artemesia, b. April 15, 1798, m. Lauren Frisbie, Nov. 28, 1821; II. Edward, b. Jan. 19, 1800; III. Merritt, b. April 5, 1802; IV. Amy, b. April 18, 1804, m. Mortimer Jordon of Ala.; V. Hannah M., b. July 10, 1807, m. Nathaniel Hawkins of Ala.

85. EDWARD, son of Richard, (84,) m. Laura Brown. Ch.: Richard, Noah A., Caroline A. and Martha A.

86. MERRITT, son of Richard, (84,) m. went South, is now in California with his family. Ch.: Lamson, Amy and Lydia E,—probably others.

87. THOMAS, son of Richard, (61,) m. Sybil Cook of Wallingford, Jan. 3, 1797. She was b. Oct. 10, 1778. Ch.: I. Lyman, b. June 15, 1798; II. Evelina, b. Jan. 23, 1800, m. Anson Downs, Oct. 26, 1823; III. Minerva, b. March 19, 1802, m. Burton Payne, Feb. 3, 1828; IV. Sally D., b. Sept. 5, 1807, d. 1808; V. Sally D., b. June 14, 1810, m. Henry Bronson, Oct. 4, 1832; VI. Nancy, b. April 12, 1812, m. Frederic A. Bradley, May 22, 1836.

88. LYMAN, son of Thos. (87,) m. Minerva, dau. of Benjamin Judd, Dec. 24, 1822. Ch.: Henry A., b. Dec. 2, 1823; Franklin L., b. Dec. 11, 1827; Nelson J., b. Feb. 15, 1825. Henry A. is m. and has one ch., Thos. H.—Franklin L. is also m., has had three ch., one only is living.

89. Rev. JOSEPH D., son of Richard, (61,) m. Eunice, dau. of Victory Tomlinson. She d. Feb. 20, 1832. Ch.: I. Julia M., b. July, 1809, m. Geo.

Warner; II. Hobert V., b. Oct. 28, 1811, m. Adaline, dau. of Luther Richards of Vt., and his ch. are, Edwin D., b. 1836, Sarah C., b. 1839, Harriet A., b. 1850; III. Joseph, b. May 15, 1814, m. Mary, dau. of Searbury Pierpont. Ch., Heber H., b. 1837, Eunice C., b. 1839, Lucy A., b. 1841; IV. Henry, b. Sept. 27, 1824, m. Lucy Baird of Buffalo, N. Y.

90. BELA, son of Richard, (61.) m. April 16, 1817, Polly, dau. of Benjamin Morehouse of Washington, Conn. She was b. Nov. 27, 1792. Ch.: I. Richard, b. Jan. 7, 1820, m. Abby Mitchel, May 10, 1853, has two children, Nelly M. and Richard; II. Hawley Seymour, b. Oct. 13, 1821, m. Eliza Merriam, Dec. 19, 1844. Ch.: Bela and Richard.

### THIRD FAMILY, OR GEORGE'S POSTERITY.

91. GEORGE, son of John, (1.) had ch.: I. Stephen, b. Oct. 27, 1713; II. Samuel, b. Oct. 20, 1715, d. 1738; III. Peter, b. Sept. 28, 1718; IV. Elizabeth, b. May 23, 1721; V. Hannah, b. June 11, 1723; VI. James, b. Oct. 9, 1725; VII. Josiah, b. June 10, 1728, m. Martha, dau. of Jonathan Kelly of Woodbury, d. in 1758, no ch.; VIII. Dan, b. May 19, 1731.

92. JAMES, son of George, (91.) was the first male child\* b. (Oct. 9, 1725) in that part of Waterbury, now Watertown. He m. Mary, wid. of Joseph Prichard of Milford, in 1763.

93. СТЕФАН, son of George, (91.) m. Aug. 27, 1741, Abigail, dau. of Jonathan Welton. She d. Nov. 1, 1776. Ch.: I. Elijah, b. Aug. 13, 1742; II. Samuel, b. Nov. 2, 1744; III. Jesse, b. Nov. 23, 1746; IV. Amasa, b. April 26, 1749; V. Daniel, b. April 1, 1752, d. 1753; VI. "Achshah," b. Sept. 15, 1754; VII. Josiah, b. Feb. 17, 1759.

94. ELIJAH, son of Stephen, (93.) m. Feb. 23, 1769, Hannah, dau. of Isaac Tyler of Wallingford. Ch.: Daniel M., b. Aug. 14, 1770; Isaac, b. Jan. 11, 1775; Hannah, b. Jan. 3, 1778; Stephen.

95. SAMUEL, son of Stephen, (93.) m. Jerusha Hill, Nov. 23, 1770, and d. May 9, 1777. Ch.: I. Anna, b. Dec. 23, 1770; II. Jonathan, b. Feb. 14, 1774; ch., George, Samuel, Edward and Stephen; III. Lydia, b. Oct. 18, 1776.

96. JESSE, son of Stephen, (93.) m. Sarah, dau. of Isaac Tyler of

---

\* The first permanent settlers of Westbury, so far as my inquiries have extended, were Jonathan Scott, Sen. and Dr. (afterwards Deacon) John Warner. These had no children after their removal thither. Isaac Castle from Woodbury settled there about 175, and had born (and recorded in Waterbury) a son, Asahel, August 24, 1725, (as I read the figures.) Samuel Thomas, another settler, had a daughter, Mabel, also recorded in Waterbury, b. Aug. 14, 1733. (See p. 258, of this work.)—H. B.

Wallingford, Dec. 13, 1770. Ch.: Parthenia, b. July 4, 1772; Abigail, b. March 5, 1774; Enos, b. Sept. 29, 1776; Jesse.

97. AMASA, son of Stephen. (93.) m. Mary, dau. of Benjamin Nichols, Sept. 6, 1770. Ch.: Achsah, b. May 20, 1773; Orpha, b. June 3, 1776.

98. JOSIAH, son of Stephen, (93.) had ch., Samuel and Uri.

99. PETER, son of George, (91.) m. Abigail, dau. of Nathaniel Porter, Nov. 22, 1739. Ch.: I. Samuel, b. Sept. 26, 1740, d. 1740; II. Ruth, b. Sept. 26, 1741; III. Peter, b. Feb. 28, 1744; IV. Job, b. March 15, 1746, d. at Ticonderoga, Oct. 11, 1776; V. Abigail, b. Aug. 4, 1748, d. 1751; VI. George, b. Aug. 26, 1750, d. 1751; VII. Abigail, b. Oct. 27, 1752; VIII. Elizabeth, b. May 18, 1756; IX. Dinah, b. June 1, 1759; X. George, b. Nov. 12, 1761; XI. Mary, b. May 15, 1765.

100. PETER, son of Peter, (99.) m. Desire Cooper, April 10, 1766. Ch.: I. Desire, b. Dec. 15, 1766; II. A son, b. July 1, 1769; III. Sarah, b. May 19, 1771; IV. Peter, b. Dec. 1773; V. Josiah, b. Aug. 6, 1776.

101. DAN, son of George, (91.) m. and had Gaal and James. The last had a dau. Irena.

#### WOODWARD.

1. HENRY WOODWARD,\* from England, settled in Dorchester, Mass., about 1636, and united with the church there previous to 1639. In 1659, he removed to Northampton, to which place he followed Rev. Eleazer Mather, and was one of the seven pillars when the church was organized, June 18, 1661. He built a mill there, (not the first mill,) and "was killed in his grist mill," (by lightning it is said,) April 7, 1685. His wife, Elizabeth, d. in Northampton, Aug. 13, 1690. Ch.: I. Experience, m. Medad Pomery, Nov. 21, 1661; II. Freedom, bap. at Dorchester, in 1642, m. Jedediah Strong, Nov. 18, 1662; III. Thankful, m. John Taylor, Dec. 18, 1662; IV. John, an only son.

2. JOHN, son of Henry, (1.) lived in Northampton till after the death of his father. He removed first to Westfield, and then to Lebanon, Conn. He m. Anna Dewey, of Westfield, dau. of the emigrant, Thos. Dewey of Windsor, May 18, 1671. Ch. recorded in Northampton: I.

---

\* I am informed that he had a brother John, who came with him to Mass.,—became a Quaker, was banished, went to R. I., was again banished and his estate confiscated. He is supposed to have gone to Virginia, as the numerous families of that name, now found at the South, originated in that State.

Elizabeth, b. March 17, 1672, m. Stephen Lee of Westfield, in 1691; II. John, bap. April 2, 1674; III. Samuel, b. March 20, 1676, d. Oct. 20, 1676; IV. Henry, b. March 18, 1680; V. Thomas, b. April 22, 1682; VI. Israel, b. Feb. 6, 1685.

3. Capt. ISRAEL, son of John, (2.) m. Abigail Beard of Huntington, and removed to that part of Waterbury, now Watertown, about 1750. They lived together in the married state 69 years, and d. at the advanced ages of 93 and 96. Ch.: I. Nathan; II. Abel, b. April 1, 1736-7; III. Israel; IV. John; V. Asa, m. Esther Roberts, no iss.; VI. Elijah; VII. Anna, m. Asa Curtiss; VIII. Eunice, m. Wait Scott; IX. Abigail, d. in infancy; X. Samuel, b. Oct. 25, 1750.

4. NATHAN, son of Israel, (3.) m. 1st, Sarah Hickox, 2d, Eunice Painter, July 1, 1731, Ch.: Moses, Hawkins, Antepas, John, Nathan, Sarah, Lois, Polly and Laura.

5. ABEL, son of Israel, (3.) m. Lucy Atwood, March 20, 1765. Ch.: I. Rebun S., b. Jan. 9, 1766; II. Eunice, b. March 18, 1767; III. Lucy, b. March, 1769, d. 1770; IV. Abel, b. Oct. 13, 1770; V. James, b. Sept. 25, 1772; VI. David, b. Oct. 26, 1774; VII. Lucy, b. July 23, 1776; VIII. John, b. Aug. 12, 1778; IX. Jerusha, b. April 2, 1781; X. Kussel, b. 1783.

6. ISRAEL, son of Israel, (3.) m. Abigail, dau. of Eliakim Stoddard, Oct. 28, 1765. Ch.: Israel B., b. 1767; Pamela, b. 1770; Abigail, b. 1772; Anna, b. 1774; Asa, b. 1779.

7. JOHN, son of Israel, (3.) m. Lydia Trowbridge, July 13, 1786. Ch.: William, b. May 3, 1787; Rebecca, b. July 9, 1789; Abigail, b. June 30, 1791; Lucius.

8. ELIJAH, son of Israel, (3.) m. Margary Richards. Ch.: Truman, Sally, Minerva and Doha.

9. Dr. SAMUEL, son of Israel, (3.) m. Mary Griswold. Ch.: Mary, Laura, Samuel Bayard, Elijah, Griswold, Rufus, Henry and Charles. Samuel B. was a distinguished physician, first of Wethersfield then of Worcester, and afterwards of Northampton, Mass., where he died in 1850. He had charge of the Hospital for the Insane in Worcester. Rufus graduated at Y. C. in 1816, became a tutor and d. in 1824. Henry was a physician in Middletown of great promise, and died in 1832. Charles is now a well known practitioner of medicine in Middletown. They were all born in Tarringford, to which place the father removed in early life.

*X He has the father of Mrs. Wm. P. (name) wife of Dr. Wm. B. who was a distinguished physician, first of Wethersfield then of Worcester, and afterwards of Northampton, Mass., where he died in 1850. He had charge of the Hospital for the Insane in Worcester. Rufus graduated at Y. C. in 1816, became a tutor and d. in 1824. Henry was a physician in Middletown of great promise, and died in 1832. Charles is now a well known practitioner of medicine in Middletown. They were all born in Tarringford, to which place the father removed in early life.*

### III. LATER ECCLESIASTICAL SOCIETIES: MANUFACTURING: STATISTICS.

---

AFTER the matter of the preceding pages had been arranged, and the book far advanced in the printing, there were put into my hands certain documents relating to the more recently organized churches of Waterbury, and the manufacturing interests of the place. I insert them here, in some instances giving only summaries. The sketch of the Baptist church which immediately follows has been already printed.

#### THE BAPTIST CHURCH IN WATERBURY.

In preparing a sketch of the History of the Baptist Church in Waterbury, great difficulty has been experienced from the imperfection of its records during the earlier years of its existence. Indeed the history of the church, as here presented, from the time of its organization to the year 1836, a period of 33 years, has been mainly taken from Association minutes, the records of neighboring churches, and the personal recollections of those who still survive.

In the year 1791, November 7th, a number of the members of the ancient church of Wallingford, (now Meriden,) were organized into a distinct body, known for a time as the Second Baptist church in Wallingford. Among this number were Zenas Brockett, David Frost and Isaac Terrell, the first Baptists in the town of Waterbury.\* For several years it was their custom, and the custom of those afterwards associated with them, to visit the church of their adoption at least once every month, and this journey, a distance of twelve miles, they usually performed on foot. By these brethren, meetings were established and conducted in the town of Waterbury, and in 1808, November 10th, a church was organized of those previously connected with the Second Baptist church in Wallingford. Preëminent in this movement were the brethren whose names are above recorded; men who deserve a cherished and honored memory as leaders of the infant church, and as Christians of tried integrity of character and purity of life. Poor in the riches of this world, but rich in those graces that find favor with God, this little band maintained for twelve years, with most unwavering fidelity, their regular meetings without a settled pastor. And their humble labors were blessed in a gradual but uninterrupted growth. During this period they were favored from time to time with the administration of the ordinances by elders Samuel Miller and Daniel Wildman, and occasionally by elders Dethick and Fuller.

---

\* There were Baptists in Waterbury 1st Society who bore lists, as early as 1767, as appears by papers of that date relating to Farmingbury's petition to the Assembly for society privileges.—H. B.

In the autumn of 1815, brethren Samuel Potter and Jesse Frost were ordained co-pastors of the church. During this joint pastorate the church enjoyed an unusual degree of peace and harmony, and many a season occurred which made the place of worship verily the house of God and gate of heaven.

In 1817, Nov. 13th, the church, which had attained a membership of nearly one hundred, was divided by the formation of the Woodbridge and Salem church. For this purpose 60 members were dismissed, embracing those residing in the southern part of Waterbury, (now Naugatuck,) and the adjoining towns of Woodbridge (Bethany) and Hamden, leaving but about thirty with the original church, and these in temporal prosperity by no means the most favored. Elder Samuel Potter took charge of the new church, while Elder Jesse Frost remained with the old.\*

Soon after the constitution of the Woodbridge and Salem church, the church in Waterbury erected a house of worship in the northeastern section of the town, which they continued to occupy until the completion of their present house in 1835.

In the year 1827, Elder Jesse Frost, their pastor, was removed by death. The duty of leading the church then devolved upon Dea. Timothy Porter, who had been called by them to accept licensure about a year previous, and who, from this time till 1835, a period of about eight years, gratuitously ministered unto them and performed the various duties of the pastorate.

During this period, the prosperity of the church was constant and marked. Each year witnessed accessions to the number of converts by baptism. In 1828, a special refreshing was enjoyed, when twenty-three were baptized; and another in 1831, when thirteen were in like manner added to the church. So marked at this time was their spiritual prosperity, as evinced by union and fellowship, as well as in their assemblies where they were wont to meet, that many of the old disciples still look back with earnest longing for a return of the former days. The ordinances were administered during this period by Elder I. Atkins and Elder Samuel Miller, and after his death by Elder William Bentley.

The church now began to suffer much from the inconveniences and inadequacy of their house of worship. This, though located two and a half miles from the centre of population, with benches only for seats, and no means of warming in winter, had yet become too straitened for their numbers, so that their meetings were not unfrequently held in the neighboring groves. Finally, after anxious and mature deliberation, they decided to erect a new house of worship in the center of the town. This was known to be a great undertaking, but they felt that the interests of the cause demanded the effort, and they determined cheerfully to incur the burden. They entered into a written compact to subject themselves to a voluntary assess-

---

\* The Woodbridge and Salem church, now extinct, seems to deserve in this connection a passing notice. After the separation, for six years it enjoyed a continual manifestation of the Divine Presence, so that from sixty it increased to one hundred and fifteen members. In 1826, its number was reduced to eighty-eight. In 1828-9, God's presence was again manifest, and forty-five were added by baptism, making about one hundred and thirty actual members. From this period the number gradually declined, till in 1848 the church ceased to be recognized as a member of the Association. Their pastor, Elder Samuel Potter, was removed by death in 1831, Dec. 2. They were then for a time led by Elder David Bradley, and finally, after an interval of some years, by Elder Jacob Sloper, their last pastor. Some of the members afterwards united with the church in Waterbury, and some still remain scattered over the mountains and through the valleys.

ment, the basis of which should be the grand list of the town, apportioned by a committee appointed from their own number. In case any member should feel aggrieved, he might appeal to another committee taken from the church, and finally to one selected from a neighboring church. Upon this basis, they went forward and erected their present house of worship, at a cost of about \$6,500, completing it in the year 1835. Rev. Russell Jennings was then chosen their pastor, whose acceptable labors were blessed in a largely increased congregation, and by two special outpourings of the Spirit in the years 1836 and 1838, in which forty were baptized. He resigned in 1838, and the church was supplied during the year following by Rev. E. Savage and Rev. W. Russell.

In 1839, Rev. A. D. Watrous succeeded to the pastorate, during whose ministration eighty-one were baptized. He was succeeded by Rev. W. S. Smith in 1840, who remained only a few months. From 1840 to 1844, the church was without a pastor. The congregation, however, was regularly supplied with the preaching of the Word by Rev. G. Allen and Rev. I. Atkins. It was during this period that occurred those dark days of their history which so severely tried their hearts and faith. A large debt had remained upon their house at the time of its completion. Still the debt was not unexpected. But soon after the church was finished, occurred the great financial crisis of 1837, from whose disastrous influence no section of the country was exempt, and whose shock was especially felt by the brethren of Waterbury who had struck hands for building the house of God. Still they struggled on as best they could under the heavy burden, until the years 1843 and '44. And it was only when they had voluntarily submitted to three assessments, each of 170 cents upon the dollar of the grand list of the town, (so that the assessments had amounted to more than \$250 upon every \$1000 listed, and over \$100 for every person whose head alone stood in the list;) it was only when they had seen trusted ones prove false and the faithful well nigh crushed, their house of worship attached by fraudulent claims, and closed for an entire year except from sun to sun on the Sabbath, to save it from passing legally from their hands; it was only when they had been driven to the Legislature for a "Confirming Act," and to the Courts of Chancery for the vindication of their rights; it was only after a series of struggles and sacrifices of this character, by which their resources had become exhausted and their strength and numbers wasted, that they resolved to appeal to neighboring churches for assistance, as their only remaining hope. That assistance was cheerfully and liberally granted. About \$700 were thus received, by which, in addition to a fourth subscription in the church, nearly equal to each of the preceding three, they became in 1847 entirely free from pecuniary embarrassment.

In 1844, Rev. A. Darrow was called to the pastorate, who continued to fulfill its duties till 1847. In 1845 the church was revived, and nineteen added by baptism through his labors. In October, 1847, Rev. N. M. Perkins became pastor of the church, and continued to labor with great acceptance for six years. During his labors, the means and influence of the church were greatly extended, and forty-one were added to it by baptism. He resigned in April, 1855, and was succeeded by Rev. Joseph A. Bailey, with whose labors the church is still favored. In him the church is now most happily united, and through him has been greatly prospered, both in a large increase to the congregation and the addition by baptism of forty-seven to the number of its members. The present number of members is two hundred and thirty-one.



## THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN WATERBURY.

Of the early history of Methodism in Waterbury, but little is now known. It is remembered, however, by some now living, that as early as the year 1796 there were a few of this then despised persuasion residing in different parts of the town, mostly near what is now its easterly boundary. Bishop Asbury, in his Journal, under date of Sept. 23d, 1796, mentions passing on his way from East Hartford to Stratford, through Waterbury, Salem and Oxford, and of preaching at Waterbury in the "Separate meeting house." The location of this meeting house the writer has not been able to ascertain.

Again, the Bishop, recording his attendance at a quarterly meeting at Litchfield, Sunday, Aug. 3d, 1800, says: "On Sunday morning we had a living love feast. Some from Waterbury were fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." The names of these fervent Christians so worthy of special notice are not handed down to us. A "class" was formed of those residing in the east part of the town, but such of its members as were not scattered by removal or death afterward united with a little society organized in Prospect.

The present Society was organized in the summer of 1815, at the house of James Wheeler, about half a mile above Waterville, by the Rev. Samuel Cochran, then preacher in charge of the Litchfield Circuit. It consisted of only five persons, viz: James Wheeler and wife, Samuel R. Hickox and wife, and Azuba Tuttle. The little band held their meetings during the first year at the same house, having preaching once in two weeks on Tuesday evenings. Reverends Billy Hibbard and Smith Dayton were colleagues with Rev. Samuel Cochran at that time, and Rev. Nathan Bangs was presiding elder of the Rhinebeck District, to which Litchfield Circuit then belonged. They afterward held meetings at the house of David Wheeler, a little east of Waterville at "Pine Hole," and in the east center school house which stood near what is now the northerly point of Union Square. Being "voted out" of the school house, their ark found for several years a welcome resting place in the dwelling of Widow Mary Peck, a "mother in Israel," whose memory will long be gratefully cherished in the church she loved. Her dwelling was the low red house still standing on East Main street, near the Pin Factory.

Meetings were also held occasionally at the residences of Widow David Wheeler at Pine Hole, Mr. Timothy Ball at Bucks Hill, &c. Still later a room was obtained for a time in the Franklin House, and for a year or two preceding the erection of their first house of worship, meetings were held in the academy, and occasionally in the old school house, the doors of which were again opened. During the whole of this period there was no Sabbath preaching, except occasionally, when a local preacher could be obtained. The circuit preachers came around once in two weeks preaching on week day evenings.

Thus for sixteen years the little society struggled on, unpopular with men, but enjoying the favor of God; poor in this world's goods, but rich in faith; at no time numbering more than twenty or thirty members, and without a convenient place of worship; yet claiming the promise of our Lord, (and often realizing its fulfillment,) that "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."

But the summer and fall of the year 1831 will long be remembered by this

and other churches of Waterbury as a season of gracious revival. Among the Methodists the work commenced under the preaching of Rev. Heman Bangs, then preacher in charge of Derby Circuit, (to which Waterbury belonged from 1829 to 1832,) and continued with great power under his ministry and that of his colleague, Rev. Daniel Smith, they visiting Waterbury often during the revival. Many were added unto the Lord, and the society was increased from less than thirty in number to about one hundred. Such an accession rendered a more commodious place of worship necessary, and in January, 1832, it was decided to build a meeting house fifty feet long and thirty-six feet wide. This building still stands on the corner of Union square and Scovill street. It was completed at a cost of about \$2,700, and was dedicated April 27th, 1833, Dr. Wilbur Fiske preaching the dedication sermon. From this date the church was favored with regularly stationed preachers, and though burdened with a heavy debt and increased expenses, and often weakened by the removal of its members, continued, under the blessing of God, to increase in numbers and prosperity. Its membership had increased in 1840 to 145, in 1845 to 185, and in 1852 to 245.

During the year last mentioned, finding enlarged accommodations again necessary, it was resolved to erect the present tasteful and commodious edifice. It is eligibly located on East Main street, a few rods from Center square. It is 75 feet deep by 55 feet in width, is built of brick, and cost with the lot on which it stands about \$20,000. It was dedicated March 1st, 1854. Much credit is due Rev. N. Mead, preacher in charge at the time the building was commenced, for the good judgment and taste with which it was located and planned, and for the financial ability displayed in securing the funds for its erection.

The church now numbers about 260 members, has a well organized Sunday school, comprising 35 officers and teachers and over 200 scholars, and although still unburdened with wealth has reason to anticipate an increasingly prosperous future. It is under the pastoral care of Rev. J. H. Perry, D. D., one of the ablest ministers of the New York East Conference.

#### NAMES OF PREACHERS SINCE 1833.

1833,	Rev. Davis Stocking,	preachers, (once a month,) and Rev.
1834,	“ W. S. Smith,	Joseph Smith and Rev. Larmon W.
1835,	“ Sanford Washburn,	Abbott, local preachers, (the balance
1836,	“ H. D. Gossling,	of the time.)
1837,	“ Wm. McKendree Bangs,	1847, Same as 1846, excepting Rev. F.
1838,	“ Lorin Clark,	W. Sizer, in place of Rev. E. O.
1839-40,	“ Chas. Chittenden,	Beers,
1841-42,	“ Wm. C. Hoyt,	1848, Rev. Seneca Howland,
1843,	“ Aaron S. Hill,	1849-50, “ Ira Abbott,
1844,	“ Wm. Gay,	1851-2, “ Nathaniel Mead,
1845,	“ Moses Blydenburgh,	1853-54, “ Benj. Pilsbury,
1846,	“ Ebenezer O. Beers and	1855-6, “ Thomas G. Osborn,
	“ Elias Gilbert, circuit	1857, “ James H. Perry, D. D.

## CATHOLIC CHURCH OF WATERBURY.

Previous to 1835, there were but few Catholics in Waterbury, who were visited occasionally from New Haven by Rev. James McDermod, Catholic pastor in that city. In 1837, Rev. James Smith, also of New Haven, succeeded Father McDermod in the visitation of the district. The latter continued to superintend the affairs of the Catholics till the year 1846, when he was replaced by Rev. Charles O'Reilly, who, however, remained but three months. As yet there had been no Catholic clergyman permanently located in Waterbury. The congregation was too small to support a regular pastor, but having increased in 1847 to about one hundred, the Rev. Michael O'Neill was permanently settled there by Dr. Tyler, the bishop of the diocese.

The services of the Catholic church were celebrated for the first time in Waterbury in a small house in the east part of the city, owned and occupied by Mr. Michael Nevil, who was the first Catholic who settled in the city. This was in 1835. In this small house, service was held for eight years, when it being necessary to obtain a larger apartment, the school-house in the Gaylord Plain district was kindly and gratuitously offered by the then committee. Here the Catholics continued to worship for more than a year, when, becoming too numerous to be accommodated there, they rented "Washington Hall" for the purpose of divine service. In 1847, they purchased the old Episcopal church. From this date to the present time, they have continued to increase in numbers, being at present a congregation of nearly four thousand, including children.

A beautiful church is now in course of erection for the use of the Catholics. The style is the early Christian Gothic architecture of the twelfth century. It is of brick, and will be richly ornamented in the interior. The probable cost is \$30,000.

The present and second pastor of Waterbury is the Rev. T. F. Hendriken. It is strange that all those who visited Waterbury for missionary purposes are still living.

The rapid increase of the Catholics of Waterbury is attributed by the Catholics themselves, as much to the known kindness and urbanity of the native citizens towards the stranger, as to the extensive manufacturing establishments which require their labor.

## THE SECOND CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH.

It was organized in April, 1852, with fifty members. Its organization at that time resulted from the conviction, which for two years had been entertained by the members of the First Congregational church, that the rapidly increasing population of the place demanded for that portion of it which might be of Congregational sentiments more extensive accommodations for public worship than were afforded by the house of worship of the First society.

In April, 1855, a new and commodious house of worship, built by the Second society, was consecrated to the name and service of God. Said house affords sittings for one thousand persons.

The number of names enrolled on the catalogue of the church in April, 1857, was one hundred and seventy, to seven of which had been appended the sad

mark which indicates deace, and to twenty-six that which indicates removal to other churches. The Rev. S. W. Magill was installed pastor of the church in May, 1852, and still occupies the pastoral office.

### MANUFACTURING IN WATERBURY.

The manufacturing business of Waterbury was, it may perhaps be said, commenced by Lieut. Ard Welton. He made guns, using hand power alone, on Bucks Hill, during the Revolutionary war or soon after, and furnished some, it is stated, for the government. A few brass muskets were manufactured by him, but perhaps only as curiosities. At length, he removed his works to the place on Mad River, recently occupied by Sherman Bronson.

About 1790, James Harrison, a brother of Capt. Lemuel Harrison, began to make wooden clocks, by hand, in the lower room of the academy or school house\* on the green. He also made shoe heels, reels, flyers and spools for spinning wheels, window sashes and chests of drawers, and carried on the joinery business generally. David Hoadley and Lemuel Porter were in his employment. The first clock which I find charged on his books is one to Major Morris, Jan. 1, 1791, at £3 12s. The second is one charged to Rev. Mark Leavenworth, Feb. 2,

---

\* The academy referred to stood upon the south margin of the present enclosed green, in front of Capt. Harrison's. It was erected to meet a want then felt of accommodations for a higher grade of schools. In the winter of 1794-5, Joseph Badger opened a school for young ladies. Till then, no other than the common district schools had been taught in the town. It flourished for a time, but did not survive long. It served, however, to awaken an interest in favor of education. An attempt was made to put up a building for an academy, by subscription. The frame was raised and the outside covered, but here the means provided were exhausted. When the enterprise was about to be abandoned, Stephen Bronson, Benjamin Upton, Dr Isaac Baldwin and John Curtis proposed to finish the house on condition they should have the control of it till the money they should advance was refunded. Thus the building was got in readiness for occupation in the fall of 1785. Two schools were then opened, one for each sex. That for girls was under the care of Mr. Badger above mentioned. David Hale, a brother of Capt. Nathan Hale of Revolutionary memory, had charge of the boys in the second story. Jeremiah Day, late president of Yale College, and Bennet Bronson were among his pupils. The schools were for a time very prosperous, the scholars the first winter numbering about one hundred and fifty.

After a time the schools ran down, and the academy, a two story wood building, standing in the midst of what appeared to be a flag swamp, with a "gambrel roof" and a bell (the first in the town) on the summit, was removed. It was removed (before the new meeting house was built) to make way for military parades, and placed on the line of the road just west of William R. Hitchcock's. Here the upper room was used for schools and the lower for religious and town meetings. Afterwards, the building was cut down one story, and the bell hung inside under the roof. Two rooms were made on the ground floor separated by a swing partition. In the west room, a private school was occasionally kept; in the east, a district school. Here, more than forty years ago, the town juveniles learned their A B C's. Here, as in other places, the ferule, the birch rod, the dunce block and the closet were the penalties for cutting the benches, making up wry faces and putting crooked pins in the master's chair.

Twenty years ago, the school house was removed back into the middle of the lot and fitted up for dwellings, where it now stands. The bell was removed to the new stone academy which was erected about 1836, on the ground next east of Capt. Harrison's house. It now hangs high in the belfry of the "high school" building, where, once more, at stated intervals, it gives out its unwelcome warning to reluctant boys and giddy girls.

1791, at £4. Capt. Samuel Judd stands debtor for the third, Feb. 19, 1791, £4. The last, a taverner, is credited with one gin sling, 7d., and one load of wood, 2s. 6d.

A little after 1800, Harrison commenced work in a little shop on the south side of North Main street, on the Little Brook. He constructed a water wheel, bringing the water to it in logs laid across the road. This is said to have been the first water wheel for driving manufacturing machinery erected in Waterbury. (See Waterbury American.) It furnished the power for making the pinions and wheel teeth and other parts of the clock. The lease of the land (about 86 rods) on which the shop, water wheel and logs already existed, bears the date of April 15, 1802. It was given by Stephen Bronson, and expired in seven years.

After a few years, the business passed into new hands, and was transferred to the site of the lower grist mill, on Mad River, where a better and more uniform supply of water could be had. Subsequently, Harrison removed to New York, where he died in reduced circumstances. In its new location, the clock business was carried on, somewhat extensively, by Col. William Leavenworth. After the war of 1812, however, he became embarrassed and fled the State. He subsequently lived in Albany, and died in November, 1838. His factory and the water privilege, after a long interval, were purchased, in 1830, by the Beecher Manufacturing Co., and converted into a broadcloth mill. This company failed, and the property is now owned by the American Suspender Co.

About 1810, the late Mark Leavenworth, in company with Wm. K. Lamson and Anson Sperry, 1st, commenced the manufacture of wooden clocks near the beginning of the Bucks Hill road, where he afterwards had his boarding house. Subsequently, Mr. L. occupied a shop upon the brook farther to the east, and extended his business.

Except some silver buttons that were made by Joseph Hopkins at an early date, (see p. 411,) the first metal buttons manufactured in Waterbury are understood to have been made before 1800, of block tin or pewter, by Henry, Samuel and Silas Grilley, brothers, on Bunker Hill. The buttons were cast in moulds, the eyes being at first of the same material; but soon an improvement was introduced and wire eyes were employed.

The manufacture of gilt buttons (which laid the foundation of the brass and copper business) was begun in 1802 by Abel Porter, Daniel Clark, Silas Grilley and Levi Porter, under the partnership name of Abel Porter & Co. (The manufacturing had been previously carried on, to a limited extent and with only partial success, in Attleborough, Mass.) The company commenced operations in a building still standing on the east side of South Main, near the junction of Meadow street. It took about eighteen months to get the business started. Levi Porter soon sold out his interest to the other partners. They employed eight or nine hands, all Yankees, and made buttons of various forms, convex, concave, and oval, the face only being gilded. Gold was employed liberally, sometimes \$3 worth being applied to a gross, for which they obtained as much as ten or twelve dollars. Their brass ingots they carried into the west part of Litchfield, to a place called Bradleyville, where it was rolled in an iron mill. The metal was brought back in strips in a very rough state, and passed between steel rolls two inches in diameter moved by horse power. Thus it was smoothed and finished. All the other work was done by hand. The business proved profitable.



560

1791

The

2a.

o

f .

In Sept. 1808, David Hayden became a partner, and the company bought the old mill place and began to use water power. In August, 1809, Silas Grilley sold out to his partners. Two years later, the latter sold out to Leavenworth, Hayden & Scovill, as mentioned in the biographical notice of Mr. Scovill, p. 429.

For the origin of the brass business, see the notice of Dea. Benedict, p. 448.

I add below some statistical matters relating to the manufacturing interests of Waterbury. Most of the companies mentioned are joint stock companies. The list is not supposed to be entirely complete, but it will give some notion of the magnitude of the manufacturing business of Waterbury.

**BENEDICT & BURNHAM MANUFACTURING COMPANY**; manufacturers of brass in sheets, brass and copper wire, brass tubing, German silver, &c.; successors of others who commenced making brass in 1826, wire about 1831, and German silver in 1834. The present company was organized in 1843. Present capital, \$400,000.\*

**WATERBURY BRASS COMPANY**; manufacturers of brass in sheets, brass and copper wire, brass kettles, German silver, &c. The company was organized in April, 1845, and has a present capital of \$300,000.

**SCOVILL MANUFACTURING COMPANY**; manufacturers of rolled and sheet brass, German silver, plated metal, brass butts, hinges, daguerreotype plates, cases, matings, preservers, &c., and gilt buttons. Present capital, \$300,000.†

**BROWN & BROTHERS**; organized under the joint stock law in 1853; manufacturers of sheet brass and German silver, brass, copper and German silver wire and tubing, brass kettles, copper rivets and burrs. Capital, \$200,000.

**HOLMES, BOOTH & HAYDENS**. The company manufactures brass, German silver, plated metal, daguerreotype plates, mattings and preservers, copper and German silver wire, &c., and was organized Feb. 1853. It has a capital of \$330,000.

The five brass and copper companies named in the preceding list, each owning a first class mill, (the Waterbury Brass Company owns two mills,) have a capital of \$1,530,000; employ on an average 775 hands; pay in wages \$275,000 per annum; consume 3,600 tons of coal per annum, and produce about \$2,550,000 worth of manufactured goods per annum.

**AMERICAN PIN COMPANY**; manufacturers of pins and hooks and eyes; was organized in 1846. Present capital, \$100,000. The making of hooks and eyes was commenced in Waterbury in April, 1836, by Brown & Elton.

**MATTATUCK MANUFACTURING COMPANY**. It was organized in 1847. The company made cloth buttons till 1852. It then began the manufacture of lamp tubes, and afterwards of silver and German silver thimbles, brass ferules, umbrella and parasol furniture, &c. It employs \$40,000 capital.

**WATERBURY HOOK AND EYE COMPANY**; manufacturers of hooks and eyes, gilt brass cornices and curtain bands, brass curtain fixtures, copper rivets, brass nails and other small brass wares. The company was organized in 1849, and has a capital of \$55,000. At present it is doubtful whether curtain cornices can be made with a profit in this country, no attempt hitherto made having succeeded. There is

\* For a more particular account of the origin and history of the business of this company, see the biographical notice of Aaron Benedict, page 448.

† For a more particular account of the origin and history of the business of this company, see the biographical sketch of J. M. L. Scovill, page 429.



reasonable ground to hope, however, that the Waterbury Hook and Eye Company will be successful.

**WATERBURY BUTTON COMPANY**; manufacturers of metal buttons. It was organized in 1849, but the business was commenced in 1824, by A. Benedict and others. It employs \$45,000 capital.

**LANE MANUFACTURING COMPANY**; was organized in January, 1850, and makes buttons. Capital, \$20,000.

**WATERBURY KNITTING COMPANY**; manufacturers of shirts, drawers, and half hose; was organized in 1850. It commenced with a capital of \$100,000, but now employs \$200,000.

**WATERBURY JEWELRY COMPANY**; manufacturers of buttons, plated ware, forks, spoons, butter knives, &c.; also, belt clasps and other brass goods; was organized in 1851. Present capital, \$30,000.

**BLAKE & JOHNSON**; manufacturers of hardened steel rolls, machinery to order, hair pins, rivets, &c.; was organized Feb. 1852. Present capital, \$16,000.

**OAKVILLE COMPANY**; was organized in 1852, and manufactures solid headed pins. Its present capital is \$75,000.

**WILLIAM R. HITCHCOCK & COMPANY**. The company was organized in 1852, and manufactures covered buttons and hooks and eyes. The business (that of making covered buttons) was commenced in 1837, by Wm. R. Hitchcock, J. M. L. Scovill and W. H. Scovill, under the name of W. R. Hitchcock & Co. The present capital is \$35,000.

**AMERICAN RING COMPANY**. The company was organized in 1852; manufactures hollow rings from brass and tin, saddle, harness and carriage hardware, and buttons of all kinds; has a capital of \$16,000.

**E. ROBINSON & SON**. The company was organized in 1852; makes cloth buttons and has a capital of \$4,000.

**WATERBURY BUCKLE COMPANY**; organized 1853; manufactures buckles, belt clasps, steel ornaments, &c. Present capital, \$29,900.

**WATERBURY GAS LIGHT COMPANY**; organized in 1854; furnishes gas from coal. Capital, \$100,000; tons of coal consumed per annum, about 500.

**F. M. PERKINS & COMPANY**; organized in 1854; manufacturers of ivory and steel carriage trimmings, and fine pearl coat and vest buttons. Present capital, \$20,000.

**CHARLES W. JOHNSON**. The company was organized in 1855, and produces machinery of all kinds. Present capital, \$3,000.

**H. A. MATTHEWS**; bought out the Hope Manufacturing Company in 1856, and manufactures carriage and harness trimmings.

**AMERICAN SUSPENDER COMPANY**; present organization in Jan. 1857; manufacturers of suspenders. The business was commenced by the Hotchkiss & Merriam Manufacturing Company, in 1843. Present capital, \$180,000.

**FARREL FOUNDRY AND MACHINE COMPANY**; manufacturers of iron and brass castings, machinery, heavy mill gearing, shafts, &c. The company was organized in 1857, and has a capital of \$40,000. The business was commenced by "The Foundry Company," in 1851.

**WATERBURY CLOCK COMPANY**; manufacturers of clocks and time pieces; organized in 1857; capital, \$60,000.

**AMERICAN FLASK AND CAP COMPANY**; manufacturers of powder flasks, shot belts, shot pouches, gun wads, percussion caps, dram flasks, measuring tapes, &c. The company was organized in April, 1857, and has a capital of \$125,000.

**UNION KNITTING COMPANY**; manufacturers of woolen wrappers, drawers, &c., having a capital of \$50,000.

**CITY MANUFACTURING COMPANY**; manufacturers of patent lamp tops, lamp tubes, &c., having a capital of \$10,000.

**HAYDEN MANUFACTURING COMPANY**; metal button makers, &c., having a capital of \$8,000.

**D. B. HURD**. He manufactures button eyes, button backs, window blinds, staples, &c., and employs a capital of \$10,000.

**B. H. MORSE**. He manufactures pocket cutlery, and employs a capital of \$50,000.

**L. PRITCHARD**. He makes buttons, and employs a capital of \$10,000.

All the companies and business firms above named, have an aggregate capital of about \$2,908,000; employ on an average about 2,730 hands; pay in wages, per annum, about \$760,000; consume annually about 7,600 tons of hard coal, and manufacture goods to the amount of about \$4,300,000 per year.

Waterbury belonged to Hartford County till May, 1728, when it was annexed to New Haven County.

Till Oct. 1719, the probate business of Waterbury was done in the County Court of Hartford. At that time, the Woodbury District was formed and Waterbury annexed to it. In May, 1779, Waterbury was made into a distinct district. The district now comprehends Waterbury, Wolcott, Middlebury and Naugatuck. Plymouth was made a new district in 1833, and Watertown in 1834. Prospect at present belongs to the Cheshire district, and Oxford is a district by itself.

*JUDGES OF PROBATE of the District of Waterbury, and the dates of their Appointment.*

1779, Joseph Hopkins.	1843, Alfred Blackman.
1801, John Kingsbury.	1844, Norton J. Buel.
1830, Joel Hinman.	1846, Willard Spencer.
1840, Norton J. Buel.	1847, Norton J. Buel.
1842, John Peck.	

Since 1849, the Probate judges have been chosen by the people.

*RECORDERS OF TOWN CLERKS of Waterbury, with the dates of their Appointment.*

	John Stanley.	1787, William Leavenworth.
1696,	Thomas Judd, Jr.	1793, John Kingsbury.
1709,	Dea. Thomas Judd.	1804, Abner Johnson.
1712,	John Hopkins.	1806, Ashley Scott.
1713,	John Judd.	1812, John Kingsbury.
1717,	William Judd.	1817, Ashley Scott.
1721,	John Southmayd.	1831, Elisha S. Abernethy.
1755,	Thomas Clark.	1837, Willard Spencer.
1764,	Ezra Bronson.	1839, Charles Scott.
1782,	Michael Bronson.	1840, Norton J. Buel.
1784,	Asahel Clark.	1841, Solomon B. Minor.

## WATERBURY LISTS.

Year.	Persons.	Estate.	Year.	Estate.
1690,	37,	£1,893.	1739,	£ 8,830, 11s.
1691,	43,	1,859.	1740,	9,446, 9.
1692,	43,	1,640.	1741,	9,491, 5.
1693,	46,	1,630.	1742,	10,174, 3.
1694,	43,	1,554.	1743,	10,693, 0, 6d.
1695,	—,	—	1744,	11,209, 6, 9.
1696,	40,	1,562.	1745,	12,492, 7.
1697,	42,	1,640.	1746,	13,380.
1698,	49,	1,742.	1747,	13,790, 18.
1699,	47,	1,700.	1748,	15,277, 1, 6.
1700,	48,	1,871.	1749,	15,674, 2, 5.
1701,	50,	1,994.	1750,	16,910, 3, 3.
1702,	52,	2,050.	1751,	17,762, 10, 6.
1703,	57,	2,145.	1752,	18,632, 14, 10.
1704,	52,	2,261.	1753,	17,635, 18, 7.
1705,	52,	2,047.	1754,	20,953, 15, 3.
1706,	55,	2,165, 10s.	1755,	20,862, 13, 3.
1707,	49,	1,958.	1756,	21,837, 17, 6.
1708,	50,	2,108.	1757,	23,145, 13, 8.
1709,	43,	2,119.	1758,	23,204, 0, 6.
1710,		2,159.	1759,	24,395, 8, 5.
1711,		2,218.	1760,	23,853, 11, 6.
1712,		2,415.	1761,	25,208, 18.
1713,		2,154.	1762,	26,107, 19, 5.
1714,		2,070, 11s.	1763,	25,304, 10, 4.
1715,		2,115, 16.	1764,	25,939, 10, 9.
1716,		2,289, 8.	1765,	28,101, 4, 8.
1717,		2,414, 10.	1766,	27,959, 17, 3.
1718,		2,599, 11.	1767,	30,660, 17, 9.
1719,		2,646.	1768,	32,291, 14, 6.
1720,		2,757, 5.	1769,	33,386, 8, 4.
1721,		2,762, 11.	1770,	35,364, 19, 10.
1722,		3,077, 15.	1771,	35,806, 2, 5.
1723,		3,427, 11.	1772,	35,110, 5, 1.
1724,		3,573, 11.	1773,	36,146, 7, 5.
1725,		3,812, 6.	1774,	39,826, 18.
1726,		4,002, 7, 8d.	1775,	41,243, 2, 9.
1727,		4,234, 11, 6.	1776,	37,756, 3, 6.
1728,		4,534, 18.	1777,	40,455, 5, 3.
1729,		4,879, 15.	1778,	—
1730,		5,024, 15.	1779,	38,504, 18, 9.
1731,		6,392, 15.	1780,	42,499, 6, 6.
1732,		6,742.	1781,	—
1733,		7,146, 19.	1782,	19,784, 12, 8½.
1734,		7,951, 8.	1783,	20,534, 6.
1735,		—	1784,	19,230.
1736,		8,092.	1786,	17,015, 5.
1737,		8,377, 13.	1788,	16,795, 14, 10.
1738,		8,405, 2.		

A LIST OF THE POLLS AND RATABLE ESTATE of *Waterbury* in 1737.

(The polls of persons over 70 years of age were not taxable after May, 1721.)

Gideon Allyn,	£74, 12s.	Isaac Hopkins,	£49, 12s.
John Andruss,	85.	Stephen Hopkins, Jr.,	82.
Nathaniel Arnold,	85, 2.	Daniel How,	30, 6.
Nathaniel Arnold, Jr.,	46.	James Hull,	44.
William Andruss,	22.	Samuel Hickox,	63, 18.
John Alcock,	45, 4.	Timothy Hopkins,	151.
		Wid. Mary Hickox,	151, 8.
Samuel Barnes,	66, 2.	Gideon Hickox,	60, 12.
Ebenezer Bronson,	89, 17.	William Hickox,	97, 18.
Joseph Bronson,	69, 6.		
Ebenezer Baldwin,	34, 8.	Thomas Judd,	6, 14.
Thomas Bronson, Jr.,	54.	Thomas Judd,	45, 10.
Lieut. Thomas Bronson,	105, 14.	Ebenezer Judd,	22, 19.
Moses Bronson,	68.	John Judd,	72.
John Bronson, Jr.,	105.	Silas Johnson,	39, 12.
James Brown,	127.	Robert Johnson,	43, 8.
James Baldwin,	65, 6.	John Johnson,	9.
Thomas Blakeslee,	63, 16.	William Judd,	103, 4.
Lieut. John Bronson,	161.	Joseph Judd,	38, 4.
John Barnes,	65, 2.	Samuel Judd,	30, 18.
Thomas Barnes,	60, 8.		
James Blakeslee,	63, 18.	Stephen Kelsey,	46, 14.
Ephraim Bissell,	26, 10.	Jonathan Kelsey,	80.
Jonathan Baldwin,	59, 9.		
Josiah Bronson,	34, 18.	Joseph Lewis,	153.
Isaac Bronson,	77, 4.	Samuel Lewis,	41.
Isaac Bronson, Jr.,	50, 8.	John Lewis,	42, 4.
Samuel Bronson,	47, 12.		
Nathan Beard,	64.	Amos Matthews,	35.
		Thomas Matthews,	49, 2.
Isaac Castle,	41.	Nathaniel Merrel,	24.
Daniel Curtiss,	33.	Benjamin More,	21.
Henry Cook,	66.	George Nichols,	71, 10.
Thomas Clark,	116.		
Caleb Clark,	47, 10.	Nathan Prindle,	18.
Samuel Camp,	93, 2.	Thomas Porter,	54.
Nathan Coxwell,	21.	Ebenezer Porter,	41.
		Daniel Porter,	52, 6.
Ebenezer Elwell,	74.	John Punderson,	3, 12.
		James Porter,	62, 14.
Jonathan Foot,	62.	Timothy Porter,	30, 6.
Barnabas Ford,	57, 10.	James Prichard,	55, 4.
Thomas Foot,	94.	Jeremiah Peck,	69, 4.
Samuel Frost,	32.	Jonathan Prindle,	95, 10.
Gershom Fulford,	53, 16.		
		Phineas Royce,	31.
Jonathan Garnsey,	78, 12.	Ebenezer Richards,	38, 10.
John Garnsey,	52.	Thomas Richards,	95, 12.
Nathaniel Gunn,	117, 15.	Ebenezer Richason,	92.
		John Richason,	43, 6.
Stephen Hopkins,	181.	Hezekiah Rew,	49, 10.
Thomas Hickox,	77, 14.	Obadiah Richards,	63, 4.
John How,	41, 12.	Mary Richards,	14.
John Humaston,	39.		
Nathan Hubbard,	26, 10.	John Scovill,	80, 6.

Jonathan Scott, } son of Edmund, }	£63, 16s.	John Welton,	£ 6.
Gershom Scott,	58, 8.	John Warner, tailor,	98, 1s.
Eleazer Scott,	59.	Dr. John Warner,	63, 2.
Samuel Scott, Sen.,	83, 6.	Richard Welton, Jr.,	50, 17.
John Sutliff,	91, 4.	Daniel Williams,	42, 12.
John Sutliff, Jr.,	22, 18.	Eliakim Welton,	25, 6.
Jonathan Scott,	36, 12.	Richard Welton,	63.
Jonathan Scott, Jr.,	64.	Thomas Welton,	25.
Daniel Scott,	23, 12.	George Welton,	65.
Joseph Smith,	22.	Ebenezer Warner, }	
John Smith,	97, 4.	son of John, }	26, 4.
James Smith,	29.	Stephen Welton, Jr.,	32.
Edward Scovill,	40, 10.	James Williams,	22.
John Scott,	23, 18.	Benjamin Warner,	56, 18.
Stephen Scott,	38.	Samuel Warner, }	
Obadiah Scott,	37, 18.	son of Daniel, }	55, 8.
William Scovill,	72, 10.	Samuel Warner,	18, 4.
David Scott	65, 18.	Ebenezer Warner, 3d,	35.
Samuel Scott, }		Joseph Weed,	40.
son of George, }	42, 18.	Ebenezer Welton,	26.
William Scott,	39.	Ebenezer Warner, }	
Samuel Thomas,	34, 4.	son of Daniel, }	39, 12.
Samuel Towner,	88.	Stephen Welton, Sen.,	55, 4.
Josiah Terrill,	66, 17.	Abraham Warner,	41.
Caleb Thomson,	40, 12.	Jonas Weed,	35.
Stephen Upson,	114.	Obadiah Warner,	47.
		John Weed,	40, 7.
		Ephraim Warner,	28, 12.

## POPULATION OF WATERBURY.

1688,	about	180.	1790,	2,937.
1694,	"	165.*	1800,	3,256.
1713,	"	180.	1810,	2,874.
1727,	"	350.	1820,	2,822.
1734,	"	450.	1830,	3,070.
1737,	"	900.	1840,	3,668.
1749,	"	1,500.	1845,	3,395.
1756,		1,829.	1850,	5,137.
1774,		3,536.		

## POPULATION OF WATERTOWN, (incorporated 1780.)

1790,	3,170.	1820,	1,439.	1840,	1,442.
1800,	1,615.	1830,	1,500.	1850,	1,533.
1810,	1,714.				

## POPULATION OF PLYMOUTH, (incorporated 1795.)

1800,	1,791.	1820,	1,758.	1840,	2,205.
1810,	1,882.	1830,	2,064.	1850,	2,568.

## POPULATION OF WOLCOTT, (incorporated 1796.)

1800,	948.	1820,	943.	1840,	633.
1810,	952.	1830,	844.	1850,	603.

\* The Wadsworth manuscript says that in 1694, "Waterbury was a small town, though very compact. It contained twenty-five families."—[Barber's Historical Collections of Connecticut, p. 265.]

POPULATION OF OXFORD, (incorporated 1798.)					
1800,	1,400.	1820,	1,683.	1840,	1,626.
1810,	1,453.	1830,	1,762.	1850,	1,562.

POPULATION OF MIDDLEBURY, (incorporated 1807.)					
1810,	847.	1830,	816.	1850,	763.
1820,	838.	1840,	761.		

POPULATION OF PROSPECT, (incorporated 1827.)					
1830,	651.	1840,	548.	1850,	674.

POPULATION OF NAUGATUCK, (incorporated 1844.)					
		1850,	1720.		

COMMISSIONERS FOR WATERBURY.

May.					
1690,	Ens. Thomas Judd.		1694,	Ens. Thomas Judd.	
91,	Ens. Thomas Judd.		95,	Ens. Thomas Judd.	
92,	Ens. Thomas Judd.		96,	Ens. Thomas Judd.	
93,	Ens. Thomas Judd.		97,	Mr. Thomas Judd.	

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

1701,	Lt. Thomas Judd.	1737	Thomas Clark.
2,	Lt. Thomas Judd.	38,	Timothy Hopkins,
3,	Lt. Thomas Judd.		Thomas Clark.
4,	[Ens. Timothy Stanley ?]	39,	Timothy Hopkins,
5,	Ens. [or Dea.] Thomas Judd.		Thomas Clark.
7,	Thomas Judd, Esq.	40,	Timothy Hopkins,
8,	Mr. Thomas Judd.		Thomas Clark,
9,	Mr. Thomas Judd.		John Southmayd.
10,	Dea. Thomas Judd.	41,	Timothy Hopkins,
14,	Mr. Thomas Judd.		Thomas Clark,
15,	Mr. Thomas Judd.		John Southmayd.
16,	Capt. Thomas Judd.	42,	Timothy Hopkins,
17,	Capt. Thomas Judd.		Thomas Clark,
18,	Capt. Thomas Judd.		Samuel Hickox.
19,	Capt. Thomas Judd.	43,	Samuel Hickox.
20,	Capt. Thomas Judd.	44,	Samuel Hickox.
21,	Capt. Thomas Judd.	45,	Samuel Hickox.
22,	Capt. Thomas Judd.	46,	Thomas Clark.
23,	Capt. Thomas Judd.	47,	John Southmayd,
24,	Capt. Thomas Judd.		Thomas Clark,
25,	Capt. Thomas Judd,		Thomas Matthews.
	John Hopkins.	48,	John Southmayd,
26,	Capt. Thomas Judd,		Thomas Clark,
	Mr. John Hopkins.		Thomas Matthews.
27,	Capt. Thomas Judd,	49,	John Southmayd,
	Mr. John Hopkins.		Thomas Clark,
28,	Capt. Thomas Judd,		Thomas Matthews.
	Mr. John Hopkins.	50,	John Southmayd,
29,	Capt. Thomas Judd,		Thomas Clark,
	Mr. John Hopkins.		Thomas Matthews.
30,	[Record worn.]	51,	John Southmayd,
31,	Mr. Thomas Judd.		Thomas Clark,
32,	Mr. Thomas Judd.		Thomas Matthews.
33,	Mr. Thomas Judd.	52,	John Southmayd,
34,	Capt. Timothy Hopkins.		Thomas Clark,
35,	Mr. Timothy Hopkins.		Thomas Matthews,
36,	Timothy Hopkins,		Daniel Southmayd.
	Thomas Clark.	53,	John Southmayd,
37,	Timothy Hopkins,		Thomas Clark,

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1753, Thomas Matthews,<br/>Daniel Southmayd.</p> <p>54, John Southmayd,<br/>Thomas Clark,<br/>Thomas Matthews.</p> <p>55, Thomas Clark,<br/>John Southmayd,<br/>Thomas Matthews,<br/>Thomas Bronson, Jr.</p> <p>56, Thomas Clark,<br/>Thomas Matthews,<br/>Thomas Bronson.</p> <p>57, Thomas Matthews,<br/>Thomas Clark,<br/>Thomas Bronson, Jr.</p> <p>58, Thomas Clark,<br/>Thomas Bronson,<br/>Thomas Matthews.</p> <p>59, Thomas Clark,<br/>Thomas Matthews,<br/>Thomas Bronson.</p> <p>60, Thomas Clark,<br/>Thomas Matthews,<br/>William Hoadley.</p> <p>61, Thomas Clark,<br/>Thomas Matthews,<br/>John Hopkins.</p> <p>62, Thomas Clark,<br/>Thomas Matthews,<br/>Joseph Hopkins,<br/>Caleb Humaston.</p> <p>63, Thomas Clark,<br/>Thomas Matthews,<br/>Joseph Hopkins,<br/>Caleb Humaston.</p> <p>64, Thomas Clark,<br/>Thomas Matthews,<br/>Joseph Hopkins,<br/>Caleb Humaston.</p> <p>65, Thomas Matthews,<br/>Joseph Hopkins,<br/>Caleb Humaston,<br/>Timothy Judd.</p> <p>66, Thomas Matthews,<br/>Joseph Hopkins,<br/>Caleb Humaston,<br/>Timothy Judd.</p> <p>67, Thomas Matthews,<br/>Joseph Hopkins,<br/>Caleb Humaston,<br/>Timothy Judd,<br/>Stephen Upson.</p> <p>68, Thomas Matthews,<br/>Joseph Hopkins,<br/>Caleb Humaston,<br/>Timothy Judd,<br/>Stephen Upson.</p> <p>69, Thomas Matthews,<br/>Joseph Hopkins,<br/>Caleb Humaston,</p> | <p>1769, Timothy Judd.</p> <p>70, Thomas Matthews,<br/>Joseph Hopkins,<br/>Caleb Humaston,<br/>Timothy Judd,<br/>Jonathan Baldwin.</p> <p>71, Thomas Matthews,<br/>Joseph Hopkins,<br/>Timothy Judd,<br/>Caleb Humaston,<br/>Jonathan Baldwin,<br/>Samuel Lewis.</p> <p>72, Thomas Matthews,<br/>Joseph Hopkins,<br/>Timothy Judd,<br/>Jonathan Baldwin,<br/>Samuel Lewis.</p> <p>73, Thomas Matthews,<br/>Joseph Hopkins,<br/>Timothy Judd,<br/>Jonathan Baldwin,<br/>Samuel Lewis.</p> <p>74, Thomas Matthews,<br/>Joseph Hopkins,<br/>Jonathan Baldwin,<br/>Timothy Judd,<br/>Samuel Lewis.</p> <p>75, Thomas Matthews,<br/>Joseph Hopkins,<br/>Jonathan Baldwin,<br/>Timothy Judd,<br/>Samuel Lewis.</p> <p>76, _____</p> <p>77, Thomas Clark,<br/>Thomas Matthews,<br/>Timothy Judd,<br/>Jonathan Baldwin,<br/>Samuel Lewis.</p> <p>78, Thomas Clark,<br/>Thomas Matthews,<br/>Timothy Judd,<br/>Jonathan Baldwin,<br/>Samuel Lewis.</p> <p>79, Thomas Clark,<br/>Thomas Matthews,<br/>Timothy Judd,<br/>Jonathan Baldwin,<br/>Samuel Lewis,<br/>Phineas Royce.</p> <p>80, Thomas Clark,<br/>Samuel Lewis,<br/>Jonathan Baldwin,<br/>Ezra Bronson.</p> <p>81, Thomas Clark,<br/>Jonathan Baldwin,<br/>Samuel Lewis,<br/>Ezra Bronson.</p> <p>82, Thomas Clark,<br/>Samuel Lewis,<br/>Jonathan Baldwin,</p> |
|--|---|

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>1782 Ezra Bronson.<br/>83, Thomas Clark,<br/>Jonathan Baldwin,<br/>Samuel Lewis,<br/>Ezra Bronson,<br/>84, Thomas Clark,<br/>Jonathan Baldwin,<br/>Samuel Lewis,<br/>Ezra Bronson.<br/>85, Thomas Clark,<br/>Jonathan Baldwin,</p> | <p>1785, Samuel Lewis,<br/>Ezra Bronson.<br/>86, Thomas Clark,<br/>Jonathan Baldwin,<br/>Samuel Lewis,<br/>Ezra Bronson.<br/>87, Thomas Clark,<br/>Samuel Lewis,<br/>Ezra Bronson,<br/>John Welton.</p> |
|---|---|

## DEPUTIES TO THE GENERAL COURT.

- | May Session.                                     | October Session.                                 |
|--|--|
| 1689, Ens. Thomas Judd.                          | Ens. Thomas Judd.                                |
| 90, Lt. John Stanley,                            | Ens. Thomas Judd.                                |
| 91, Ens. Thomas Judd,                            | Ens. Thomas Judd.                                |
| 92, Ens. Thomas Judd,                            | Ens. Thomas Judd.                                |
| 93, Lieut. John Stanley,                         | Ens. Thomas Judd.                                |
| 94, Ens. Thomas Judd.                            | Timothy Stanley.                                 |
| 95, Sergt. Timothy Stanley.                      |  |
| 96, Lieut. Thomas Judd,<br>Ens. Timothy Stanley, | Lieut. Thomas Judd,<br>Dea. Thomas Judd.         |
| 97, Lieut. Thomas Judd,<br>Sergt. Isaac Bronson, | Lieut. Thomas Judd,<br>Dea. Thomas Judd.         |
| 98, Lieut. Thomas Judd,                          | Lieut. Thomas Judd.                              |
| 99, Ens. Timothy Stanley,                        | Mr. Thomas Judd.                                 |
| 1700, Lieut. Thomas Judd,                        | Lieut. Thomas Judd.                              |
| 1, Lieut. Thomas Judd,<br>Dea. Thomas Judd,      | Lieut. Thomas Judd,<br>Sergt. Isaac Bronson.     |
| 2, Lieut. Thomas Judd,<br>Dea. Judd,             | Lieut. Thomas Judd,<br>Dea. Thomas Judd.         |
| 3, Dea. Thomas Judd,<br>Mr. Benjamin Barnes,     | Ens. [or Dea.] Thomas Judd,<br>Thomas Judd.      |
| 4, Mr. John Hopkins,                             | Mr. Thomas Judd,<br>Mr. Thomas Judd, Jr.         |
| 5, Ens. Thomas Judd,<br>Mr. Stephen Upson,       | Mr. Thomas Judd,<br>Thomas Judd.                 |
| 6, Mr. Thomas Judd,                              | Mr. Thomas Judd, Senr.<br>Mr. Thomas Judd, Junr. |
| 7, —————   | Mr. Thomas Judd,<br>Mr. Thomas Judd, Junr.       |
| 8, Mr. Timothy Stanley,<br>Mr. Thomas Judd,      | Mr. Timothy Stanley,<br>Mr. John Hopkins.        |
| 9, Mr. Timothy Stanley,<br>Mr. Thomas Judd,      | Mr. Timothy Stanley,<br>Mr. John Hopkins.        |
| 10, Mr. John Hopkins,<br>Mr. Stephen Upson,      | Mr. John Hopkins,<br>Mr. Thomas Judd.            |
| 11, Mr. Timothy Stanley,<br>Mr. John Hopkins,    | Mr. Timothy Stanley,<br>Mr. Thomas Judd.         |
| 12, Mr. John Hopkins,<br>Mr. Abraham Andrews,    | Mr. Thomas Judd,<br>Mr. Stephen Upson.           |
| 13, Mr. Thomas Judd,<br>Mr. John Hopkins,        | Mr. John Hopkins,<br>Mr. Joseph Lewis.           |
| 14, Mr. John Hopkins,<br>Mr. John Scovill,       | Mr. Thomas Judd,<br>Mr. Ephraim Warner.          |
| 15, Mr. Thomas Judd,<br>Mr. John Hopkins,        | Mr. Thomas Judd,<br>Mr. John Hopkins.            |



## May Session.

- 1716, Capt. Thomas Judd,  
Lieut. John Hopkins.  
17, Capt. Thomas Judd,  
Mr. Ephraim Warner,  
18, Capt. Thomas Judd,  
Mr. John Hopkins,  
19, Capt. Thomas Judd,  
Mr. Ephraim Warner,  
20, Capt. Thomas Judd,  
Mr. Ephraim Warner,  
21, Mr. Jeremiah Peck,  
Mr. Joseph Lewis,  
22, Mr. Ephraim Warner,  
Mr. Richard Welton,  
23, Mr. John Richards,  
Mr. Isaac Bronson,  
24, Capt. Thomas Judd,  
Mr. Thomas Hickox,  
25, Capt. Thomas Judd,  
Mr. John Hopkins,  
26, Mr. John Hopkins,  
Mr. Thomas Hickox,  
27, Capt. Thomas Judd,  
  
28, Capt. William Hickox,  
Mr. Timothy Hopkins,  
29, Mr. William Judd,  
Mr. Timothy Hopkins,  
30, Mr. William Judd,  
Capt. William Hickox,  
31, Mr. Joseph Lewis,  
Capt. William Judd,  
32, Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
Mr. Joseph Lewis,  
33, Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
Mr. Thomas Judd,  
34, Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
Mr. Joseph Lewis,  
35, Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
Mr. Joseph Lewis,  
36, Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
Mr. William Judd,  
37, Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
Mr. Joseph Lewis,  
38, Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
  
39, Capt. William Judd,  
Mr. Timothy Hopkins,  
40, Mr. John Southmayd,  
Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
41, Mr. John Southmayd,  
Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
42, Mr. John Southmayd,  
Capt. Samuel Hickox,  
43, Mr. John Southmayd,  
Capt. Samuel Hickox,  
44, Mr. John Southmayd,  
Capt. Samuel Hickox,  
45, Mr. Thomas Matthews,  
Mr. John Scovill,

## October Session.

- Capt. Thomas Judd,  
Mr. John Hopkins.  
Capt. Thomas Judd,  
Mr. Timothy Stanley.  
Capt. Thomas Judd,  
Mr. John Hopkins.  
Mr. Jeremiah Peck,  
Mr. Ephraim Warner.  
Mr. John Hopkins,  
Mr. William Hickox.  
Mr. Thomas Hickox.  
  
Mr. John Bronson,  
Mr. Thomas Hickox.  
Mr. Thomas Hickox.  
  
Mr. Joseph Lewis,  
Mr. Thomas Hickox.  
Mr. John Hopkins,  
Mr. Joseph Lewis.  
Mr. Timothy Hopkins,  
Mr. Thomas Clark.  
Mr. Thomas Clark.  
  
Mr. William Judd,  
Mr. Stephen Upton.  
Mr. William Judd,  
Mr. Timothy Hopkins.  
Joseph Lewis,  
Stephen Hopkins.  
Mr. Joseph Lewis,  
Mr. Stephen Hopkins.  
Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
Mr. Isaac Barnes.  
Mr. Timothy Hopkins,  
Mr. Samuel Brown.  
Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
Mr. Joseph Lewis.  
Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
Mr. Thomas Clark.  
Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
Mr. Joseph Lewis.  
Capt. Samuel Hickox,  
Mr. Joseph Lewis.  
Capt. William Judd,  
Mr. Timothy Hopkins.  
Mr. John Southmayd,  
Mr. Stephen Hopkins.  
Mr. John Southmayd,  
Mr. Joseph Lewis.  
Mr. John Southmayd,  
Capt. Samuel Hickox.  
Mr. John Southmayd,  
Capt. Stephen Upton.  
Mr. John Southmayd.  
  
Mr. Thomas Matthews.

## May Session.

- 1746, Mr. Joseph Bronson,  
Mr. Timothy Judd,  
47, Capt Timothy Hopkins,  
48, Capt. Timothy Hopkins,  
Mr. James Baldwin,  
49, Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
Mr. Timothy Judd,  
50, Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
Capt. Samuel Hickox,  
51, Mr. Timothy Judd,  
Capt. Daniel Southmayd,  
52, Capt. Daniel Southmayd,  
Mr. Jonathan Garnsey,  
53, Capt. Daniel Southmayd,  
Mr. Timothy Judd,  
54, Mr. John Southmayd,  
Mr. Thomas Matthews,  
55, Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
Mr. Thomas Matthews,  
56, Mr. Ephraim Warner,  
57, Mr. Thomas Matthews,  
Mr. Gideon Hotchkiss,  
58, Capt. Timothy Judd,  
Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
59, Capt. Timothy Judd,  
Mr. Gideon Hotchkiss,  
60, Mr. John Lewis,  
Mr. Thomas Matthews,  
61, Mr. Thomas Matthews,  
Mr. John Lewis,  
62, Capt Timothy Judd,  
Mr. John Lewis,  
63, Capt. Timothy Judd,  
Mr. Stephen Upson, Jr.  
64, Capt. Timothy Judd,  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
65, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. Timothy Judd,  
66, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Mr. Stephen Upson,  
67, Mr. Jonathan Baldwin,  
68, Capt. Jonathan Baldwin,  
Mr. Samuel Hickox,  
69, Capt. Jonathan Baldwin,  
Capt. Samuel Hickox,  
70, Mr. Thomas Matthews,  
Capt. Samuel Hickox,  
71, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Mr. Thomas Matthews,  
72, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. Timothy Judd,  
73, Capt. Jonathan Baldwin,  
Capt. Timothy Judd,  
74, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. Jonathan Baldwin,  
75, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. Jonathan Baldwin,

## October Session.

- Capt. Timothy Hopkins.  
Capt. Timothy Hopkins,  
Mr. James Baldwin.  
Capt. Timothy Hopkins,  
Capt. Daniel Southmayd.  
Capt. Daniel Southmayd,  
Mr. Timothy Judd.  
Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
Mr. Timothy Judd.  
Capt. Daniel Southmayd,  
Mr. John Warner.  
Capt. Daniel Southmayd,  
Mr. Ephraim Warner.  
Capt. Daniel Southmayd,  
Mr. Timothy Judd.  
Mr. Stephen Hopkins,  
Mr. Caleb Humaston.  
Mr. Timothy Judd,  
Mr. Thomas Bronson, Jr.  
Mr. Gideon Hotchkiss.  
Mr. Thomas Matthews,  
Mr. Gideon Hotchkiss.  
Capt. Timothy Judd,  
Mr. Stephen Hopkins.  
Capt. Timothy Judd,  
Mr. Thomas Matthews.  
Mr. Thomas Matthews,  
Mr. John Lewis.  
Capt. Timothy Judd,  
Capt. George Nichols.  
Capt. Timothy Judd,  
Mr. John Lewis.  
Mr. Ephraim Warner,  
Mr. Stephen Upson, Jr.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Mr. Ephraim Warner.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. Stephen Upson.  
Mr. Jonathan Baldwin,  
Mr. Samuel Lewis.  
Capt. Jonathan Baldwin,  
Mr. Samuel Hickox.  
Mr. Samuel Hickox,  
Capt. Jonathan Baldwin.  
Capt. Samuel Hickox,  
Capt. Jonathan Baldwin.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Mr. Thomas Matthews.  
Capt. Timothy Judd,  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. Timothy Judd.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. Jonathan Baldwin.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. Jonathan Baldwin.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. Ezra Bronson.

## May Session.

- 1776, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. Ezra Bronson,  
77, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. Ezra Bronson,  
78, Capt. Thomas Fenn,  
Capt. Ezra Bronson,  
79, Capt. Thomas Fenn,  
Capt. Ezra Bronson,  
80, Capt. Thomas Fenn,  
Capt. Jotham Curtiss,  
81, Mr. Abner Johnson,  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
82, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Mr. Abner Johnson.  
83, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Col. Phineas Porter,  
84, Mr. Eli Bronson,  
Capt. John Welton,  
85, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. John Welton,  
86, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. John Welton,  
87, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. John Welton,  
88, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. John Welton,  
89, Capt. Isaac Bronson,  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
90, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. John Welton,  
91, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Mr. John Welton,  
92, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Mr. Isaac Bronson,  
93, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Mr. Isaac Bronson, Jr.  
94, Mr. Isaac Baldwin,  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
95, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Mr. Aaron Benedict,  
96, Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Mr. John Kingsbury,  
97, Mr. John Kingsbury,  
Mr. William Leavenworth,  
98, Mr. John Kingsbury,  
Mr. Jared Byington,  
99, Mr. Richard Welton,  
Mr. Ethel Bronson,  
1800, Mr. Richard Welton,  
Mr. Ethel Bronson,  
1, Mr. John Kingsbury,  
Mr. Ard Welton,  
2, Mr. Ard Welton,  
Mr. Ethel Bronson,  
3, Mr. John Kingsbury,  
Mr. Ethel Bronson,\*

## October Session.

- Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. Ezra Bronson,  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. Ezra Bronson.  
Mr. Thomas Fenn,  
Capt. Ezra Bronson.  
Capt. Jotham Curtiss,  
Thomas Fenn.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Mr. Samuel Lewis.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins.  
  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Mr. Eli Bronson.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. John Welton.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. John Welton.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. John Welton.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. John Welton.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. John Welton.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. John Welton.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. John Welton.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. John Welton.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Capt. John Welton.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Mr. John Welton.  
Mr. Isaac Bronson,  
Mr. Isaac Baldwin.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Mr. John Welton.  
Mr. Isaac Baldwin,  
Mr. John Lewis.  
Mr. Joseph Hopkins,  
Mr. Aaron Benedict.  
Mr. John Kingsbury,  
Mr. William Leavenworth.  
Mr. John Kingsbury,  
Mr. Jared Byington.  
Mr. Jared Byington,  
Mr. Richard Welton.  
Mr. Richard Welton,  
Mr. Ethel Bronson.  
Mr. Ard Welton,  
Mr. James Scovill.  
Mr. John Kingsbury,  
Mr. Ethel Bronson.  
Mr. Ard Welton,  
Mr. Abner Johnson.  
Mr. Abner Johnson,  
Mr. Timothy Gibbard.

\* In the Connecticut Courant of the time, Ethel Bronson and James Scovill are named as the representatives of Waterbury in May, 1800.

## May Session.

- 1804, Mr. Abner Johnson,  
Mr. Timothy Gibbard,  
5, Mr. Eli Bronson,  
Mr. John Kingsbury,  
6, Noah Baldwin,  
Asahel Bronson,  
7, John Kingsbury,  
Eli Bronson,  
8, Thomas M. Culver,  
Nimrod Hull,  
9, Giles Brocket,  
John Kingsbury,  
10, Noah Baldwin,  
John Kingsbury,  
11, Daniel Steele,  
Andrew Adams,  
12, John Kingsbury,  
Truman Porter,  
13, John Kingsbury,  
Truman Porter,  
14, Cyrus Clark,  
Frederick Hotchkiss,  
15, Andrew Adams,  
William K. Lamson,  
16, Andrew Adams,  
James Scovill,  
17, Daniel Steele,  
Timothy Gibbard,  
18, James M. L. Scovill,  
Timothy Gibbard,

## October Session.

- Mr. John Kingsbury,  
Mr. Eli Bronson.  
Mr. Timothy Gibbard,  
Noah Baldwin.  
Asahel Bronson,  
Nimrod Hull.  
Thomas M. Culver,  
Nimrod Hull.  
Giles Brocket,  
Andrew Adams.  
Andrew Adams,  
Giles Brocket.  
Noah Baldwin,  
Andrew Adams.  
Daniel Steele,  
Andrew Adams.  
John Kingsbury,  
Truman Porter.  
John Kingsbury,  
Truman Porter.  
Cyrus Clark,  
Frederick Hotchkiss.  
James Scovill,  
Truman Porter.  
Andrew Adams,  
Daniel Steele.  
James M. L. Scovill,  
Timothy Gibbard.  
Ashley Scott,  
Andrew Adams.

## WATERTOWN REPRESENTATIVES.

## May Session.

- 1780,  
81, Capt. Thomas Fenn,  
Maj. Jesse Curtis,  
82, Capt. Samuel Hickox,  
Capt. Phineas Royce.  
83, Capt. Thomas Fenn,  
Capt. Nathaniel Barnes,  
84, Capt. Samuel Hickox,  
Capt. Nathaniel Barnes,  
85, Capt. Thomas Fenn,  
Maj. David Smith,  
86, Capt. Thomas Fenn,  
Col. David Smith,  
87, Capt. Thomas Fenn,  
Capt. Daniel Potter,  
88, Capt. Thomas Fenn,  
Col. David Smith,  
89, Capt. Thomas Fenn,  
Mr. Wait Smith,  
90, Mr. Thomas Fenn,  
Col. David Smith,  
91, Mr. Thomas Fenn,  
Mr. David Smith,

## October Session

- Capt. Thomas Fenn,  
Mr. Jesse Curtis.  
Capt. Thomas Fenn,  
Capt. Phineas Royce.  
Capt. Thomas Fenn,  
Capt. Nathaniel Barnes.  
Capt. Thomas Fenn,  
Capt. Nathaniel Barnes.  
Capt. Samuel Hickox,  
Maj. David Smith.  
Capt. Thomas Fenn,  
Maj. David Smith.  
Capt. Thomas Fenn,  
Capt. Daniel Potter.  
Capt. Thomas Fenn,  
Capt. Daniel Potter.  
Capt. Thomas Fenn,  
Col. David Smith.  
Col. David Smith,  
Capt. Daniel Potter.  
Mr. Thomas Fenn,  
Mr. David Smith.  
Mr. Elijah Woodward,  
Mr. David Smith.

## May Session.

- 1792, Mr. Elijah Woodward,  
Mr. David Smith,  
93, Mr. Thomas Fenn,  
Mr. Joseph A. Wright,  
94, Mr. Thomas Fenn,  
Mr. Joseph A. Wright,  
95, Mr. Aner Bradley,  
Mr. Joseph A. Wright,  
96, Mr. Thomas Fenn,  
97, Mr. Aner Bradley,  
98, Mr. Thomas Fenn,  
99, Mr. Samuel W. Southmayd,  
1800, Mr. Thomas Fenn,  
1, Mr. Thomas Fenn,  
2, Mr. Thomas Fenn,  
3, Mr. Samuel W. Southmayd,  
4, Mr. Samuel W. Southmayd,  
5, Thomas Fenn,  
6, Samuel W. Southmayd,  
7, Thomas Fenn,  
8, Samuel W. Southmayd,  
9, John H. Deforest,  
10, Garret Smith,  
11, Samuel W. Southmayd,  
12, Samuel W. Southmayd,  
13, Garret Smith,  
14, Garret Smith,  
15, John H. Deforest,  
16, David Baldwin,  
17, Samuel Elton,  
18, Amos Baldwin,

## October Session.

- Mr. Elijah Woodward,  
Mr. Daniel Potter.  
Mr. Thomas Fenn,  
Mr. Joseph A. Wright.  
Mr. Elijah Woodward.  
  
Mr. Thomas Fenn.  
  
Mr. Aner Bradley.  
Mr. Thomas Fenn.  
Mr. Samuel W. Southmayd.  
Mr. Thomas Fenn.  
Mr. Thomas Fenn.  
Mr. Samuel W. Southmayd.  
Mr. Samuel W. Southmayd.  
Mr. Samuel W. Southmayd.  
Mr. Thomas Fenn.  
Mr. Samuel W. Southmayd.  
Samuel W. Southmayd.  
Samuel W. Southmayd.  
Samuel W. Southmayd.  
Samuel W. Southmayd.  
Samuel W. Southmayd.  
John H. Deforest.  
Garret Smith.  
Samuel W. Southmayd.  
Samuel W. Southmayd.  
Garret Smith.  
John H. Deforest.  
John H. Deforest.  
David Baldwin.  
Samuel Elton.  
Amos Baldwin.

## PLYMOUTH REPRESENTATIVES.

## May Session.

- 1795,  
96, Mr. David Smith,  
97, Mr. David Smith,  
98, Mr. David Smith,  
99, Mr. Daniel Potter,  
1800, Mr. Daniel Potter,  
1, Mr. Daniel Potter,  
2, Mr. Lake Potter,  
3, Mr. David Smith,  
4, Mr. David Smith,  
5, Mr. David Smith,  
6, Lake Potter,  
7, Lake Potter,  
8, Lake Potter,  
9, Daniel Potter,  
10, Daniel Potter,  
11, Daniel Potter,  
12, Lake Potter,  
13, Lake Potter,  
14, Calvin Butler,  
15, Jacob Hemingway,  
16, Calvin Butler,  
17, Calvin Butler,  
18, Calvin Butler,

## October Session.

- Mr. David Smith.  
Mr. David Smith.  
Mr. David Smith.  
Mr. Lake Potter.  
Mr. Daniel Potter.  
Mr. Daniel Potter.  
Mr. David Smith.  
Mr. Lake Potter.  
Mr. David Smith.  
Mr. David Smith.  
Mr. David Smith.  
Lake Potter.  
Lake Potter.  
Lake Potter.  
Daniel Potter.  
Daniel Potter.  
David Smith.  
David Smith.  
Lake Potter.  
Calvin Butler.  
Jacob Hemingway.  
Calvin Butler.  
Frederick Stanley.  
Jacob Hemingway

## MIDDLEBURY REPRESENTATIVES

May Session.	October Session.
1808, Isaac Bronson,	Aaron Benedict.
9, Aaron Benedict,	David Thompson.
10, Aaron Benedict,	Aaron Benedict.
11, Eli Bronson,	Eli Bronson.
12, Eli Bronson,	Eli Bronson.
13, Eli Bronson,	Eli Bronson.
14, David Thompson,	Nathaniel Richardson.
15, Nathaniel Richardson,	Philo Bronson.
16, Philo Bronson,	Nathaniel Richardson.
17, Philo Bronson,	Philo Bronson.
18, Philo Bronson,	Philo Bronson.

The members from Waterbury of the Convention of Connecticut, in Jan. 1788, to ratify the Constitution of the United States, were, Joseph Hopkins and John Welton. They both voted in favor of the Constitution.

EPISCOPALIANS OF NORTHBURY IN OCTOBER, 1784, *being the Names of the Persons warned to meet and organize themselves into a Society referred to p. 312.*

Solomon Allen,	Enos Ford,
Abner Blakeslee,	Daniel Ford,
Titus Barnes,	Amos Ford,
Asher Blakeslee,	Cornelius Graves,
Eli Blakeslee,	Benjamin Graves,
Hosea Blin,	Simeon Graves,
Moses Blakeslee,	Zaccheus How,
Samuel Blakeslee,	Eliphalet Hartshorn,
Philo Bradley,	Eliphalet Hartshorn, Jr.,
Amos Bronson,	Jesse Humaston,
Ebenezer Bradley,	David Ludington,
Noah Blakeslee,	Zebulon Mosher,
Jude Blakeslee,	Chauncey Moss,
Ebenezer Bradley, Jr.	Jacob Potter,
John Brown,	Samuel Peck, Jr.,
Thomas Blakeslee,	Samuel Potter,
Wid. Abigail Blakeslee,	Gideon Seymour,
Joab Camp,	David Shelton,
Abishai Castle,	Ezekiel Sanford, Jr.,
Zadoc Curtis,	Abel Sutliff, Jr.,
Amasa Castle,	Samuel Scovill, Jr.,
Ezra Dodge,	Jesse Turner,
Samuel Fenn,	William Tuttle,
Ebenezer Ford,	Thomas Williams,
Jesse Fenn,	Eli Welton,
Lemuel Fancher,	Thomas Way,
Cephas Ford,	Ozias Warner,
Barnabas Ford,	Thomas Williams, Jr.
Isaac Fenn,	Samuel Way.



# INDEX.

---

<b>A.</b>		Bronson, Lt. Josiah,	470
Andruss Family,	131	Capt. Ezra,	471
John,	25	Philo,	473
Joseph,	28	Silas,	474
Abraham, Sen.,	131	Noah M.,	475
Abraham, Jr.,	134	Brown Genealogy,	478
Abraham, 3d,	133	Dea. James,	387
John,	133	James,	244
Thomas,	133	Capt. Hezekiah,	321
Arnold, Nathaniel, Sen.,	244	Beebe, Lt. Ira,	343
Rev. Jonathan,	293	Blakeslee Genealogy,	466
Alcott Genealogy,	459	James,	245
Amos Bronson,	457	Rev. Solomon,	303
Dr. William A.,	447	Dea. Moses,	467
Adams Genealogy,	458	Capt. Thomas,	468
Articles of settlement of Mattatuck,	8	Barnes Family,	135
<b>B.</b>		Benjamin,	135
Bronson Genealogy,	137, 469	John,	136
John of Farmington,	12, 137	Thomas,	136
Abraham,	25	Butler, Calvin,	388
John 1st of Waterbury,	138	Barber, Rev. Horace V.	305
Serj. Isaac,	33, 140	Benedict Genealogy,	463
Rev. Tillotson,	304, 376	Dea. Thomas,	463
Isaac, Jr., 141; fined for		Amos,	370
breaking the Sabbath,		Aaron,	465
318; his petition,	318	Dea. Aaron,	448
Dr. Isaac,	370	Buckingham Genealogy,	479
Ethel,	374	Rev. Mr.,	283
Isaac H.,	375	Burning about the common fence,	57
Bennet,	379	Boundaries, settlement of,	74
Enos,	384	Buckshill settled,	251
William,	139	Break-neck Hill settled,	251
Moses,	139	Bars, common,	58
John 2d,	141	Birth, first on record,	130
Joseph,	142	first male on record,	130
Thomas 1st,	142	first in Westbury,	550
Ebenezer,	142	Bridges,	98
Lt. Michael,	344	Burying yards,	228, 369
Hon. Alvin,	450	Brand, town,	209
		Bills of credit,	284



C.			
Carpenter, David,	29		
Carrington, John,	143		
John, Jr.,	143		
Clark Genealogy,	143, 483		
Thomas,	143		
Rev. Anson,	484		
Castle Genealogy,	481		
Isaac,	245		
Capt. Phineas,	482		
Cook Genealogy,	485		
Calkins, Israel, taken prisoner,	327		
Clerks of town,	563		
Commissioners of town,	567		
Committee, grand,	6		
their last act,	77		
Church, 1st of Waterbury organized, 206; members of, 207; Baptist, 553; Methodist Episcopal, 556; Catholic, 558; 2d Congregational,	558		
Church and State,	315		
Congregationalism, the established religion,	315		
Clocks,	316, 435		
Churchmen of Waterbury,	219, 330		
Clergy, Episcopal,	332		
Constitutional Convention, members of,	575		
Currency, depreciation of,	284		
D.			
Dutton, Rev. Aaron,	388		
Rev. Matthew R.	389		
Henry, LL. D.,	455		
De Forest Genealogy,	487		
Deed, Indian, of 1657, 2; of 1674, 10; deeds of 1684 and 1685, 62, 63; of 1711, 64; of 1674, assigned by committee, 15; of release from General Court,	69		
Deacons of Waterbury, 29, 291; of Westbury, 261; of Northbury,	269		
Deaths of proprietors,	114		
Dayton robbery,	374		
Deputies of Waterbury, 569			
of Watertown, 573; of Plymouth, 574; of Middlebury,	575		
E.			
Ecclesiastical affairs,	202		
Episcopacy in Waterbury, 231, 292; names of churchmen, 294; town votes £12 for a site for a church, 295; church built, 295; petition for parish privileges, and names of petitioners, 296; glebe lands, 297; parish votes, 300; second house			
			of worship built, 306; dedicated, 307; Rev. James Scovill's letter, 328
			Episcopacy in Westbury, 300; names of churchmen, 308; house of worship built, 308; second house of worship, 309; church funds, &c., 309
			Episcopacy in Northbury, 310; names of some of the members, 311; society organized, 312; new church erected, 313; fund, 311, 314
		F.	
		Fulford, Gershom,	243
		Foot, Rev. David,	303
		Foote, Ebenezer,	390
		Samuel A.,	456
		Fenn, Dea. Thomas,	390
		Farrell, Almon,	389
		Farmington church, action of 1677-8,	46
		Fence, common,	47, 62
		Field, common,	47, 62
		owners in,	5
		Forts,	102, 103, 104
		Floods,	111, 112
		Families at Judd's Meadow,	237
		Wooster Swamp,	237
		Buckshill,	237
		Westbury,	257
		Farmingbury petition for winter privileges, 279; not granted, 280; again petitions with success, 280; made a society, 282; a town,	282
		Freemen, list of,	248
		French army passes through Waterbury,	359
		Fulling mills,	91
		G.	
		Gridley, Thomas,	26
		Samuel,	26
		Gaylord Family,	145
		Joseph, Sen.,	145
		Joseph, Jr.,	146
		John,	147
		William,	147
		Griswold, Rev. Alexander V.,	304
		Green, Rev. William,	304
		Guernsey Genealogy,	491
		Dea. Jonathan,	491
		Gates, common,	87
		H.	
		Higason, William,	26
		Hancox, Thomas,	147
		Hickox Genealogy,	148, 496
		Sergt. Samuel,	148
		Joseph 1st,	151
		Samuel 2d,	149



- N.
- Newell Family, 167  
 Thomas and others petition-  
 ers in 1673, 5  
 Thomas, Sen. 28, 167  
 Thomas, Jr. 168  
 John, 168  
 Naugatuck, origin of name, 15  
 New settlers, 243  
 Navigation of the Naugatuck, 101  
 Non-intercourse with Great Britain, 335  
 Northbury settled, 261; names of set-  
 tlers and petition for winter priv-  
 leges, 262; incorporated as a so-  
 ciety, 264; petition to the Legis-  
 lature for a committee to estab-  
 lish boundaries of the society,  
 264; first society meeting in-  
 vites Mr. Todd to settle, he ac-  
 cepts and is ordained, 265; his  
 dismissal, 268; Rev. Andrew  
 Storrs, 269; early deacons, 269;  
 first house of worship, 270; first  
 meeting house, 270; second meet-  
 ing house, 274; seating of the  
 same, 274
- O.
- Olmstead, Lt. Nicholas, 7  
 Oxford parish incorporated, 276
- P.
- Peck, Rev. Jeremiah, 34, 169; in-  
 vited to settle at Waterbury, 204;  
 he accepts, 204; agreement with,  
 204; his death, 210; his resi-  
 dence at New Haven, Guilford,  
 Saybrook, Newark and Green-  
 wich, 210  
 Peck Genealogy, 169  
 Dea. Jeremiah, 170  
 Jeremiah, Jr., 170  
 Caleb, 170  
 Samuel, 170  
 Joshua, 171  
 Porter Genealogy, 171, 519  
 Doct. Daniel, of Farmington, 171  
 Doct. Daniel, of Waterbury, 172  
 Doct. Daniel, Jr., 173  
 James, 173  
 Thomas, 173  
 Richard, 173  
 Doct. Daniel, son of Rich-  
 ard, 174  
 Samuel, 175  
 Timothy, 175  
 Rev. Edward, 290  
 John, 26  
 Robert, 175
- Porter, Thomas, of Farmington, 175  
 Potter, Gen. Daniel, 427  
 Prindle, Jonathan, 245  
 Nathan, 245  
 Rev. Chauncey, 303, 309  
 Prichard Genealogy, 524  
 Petition of inhabitants of Farming-  
 ton for a settlement at Mattatuck,  
 in 1673, 4  
 Petition of Rev. J. Peck and Isaac  
 Bronson for permission to organ-  
 ize a church, 205  
 Petition of Isaac Bronson, Jr., 318  
 Patents of Waterbury, 67, 69  
 Protest of John Stanley against prop-  
 rietors giving away lands, 118  
 Probate Courts, 563; judges of,  
 563  
 Pounds, 61  
 Puritans, character of, 243  
 Population, increase of, 243, 566  
 of Waterbury, 362, 566  
 Physicians of Waterbury, 291  
 Perambulation, 76  
 Proprietors, first meeting of,  
 rights, amount of, 34  
 names of, 9, 24, 31, 40,  
 55, 70,  
 bachelor, 113 to 120;  
 original and bachelor  
 of 1722, 125; vacan-  
 cies of how filled,  
 30; subscribers who  
 secured their rights,  
 31; votes of, of 1697  
 and 1702-3, 116
- R.
- Root, John, 29  
 Samuel, 289  
 Richards Genealogy, 176  
 Obadiah, 176  
 John, 178  
 Hon. Mark, 427  
 Obadiah, Jr., 178  
 Thomas, 178  
 Benjamin, 178  
 Richardson Genealogy, 179, 526  
 Thomas, 179  
 John, 180  
 Thomas, Jr., 180  
 Israel, 180  
 Nathaniel, 181  
 Ebenezer, 181  
 Reed, Rev. John, invited to settle, 212  
 Report of committee to view Matta-  
 tuck, 5; action of the Court on  
 the same, 6  
 Roads, 17, 93, 367  
 Removal of proprietors, 113  
 Revival of 1740, 296

Representatives of Waterbury to Gen. Court, 569; of Watertown, 573; of Plymouth, 574; of Middlebury, 575; to Constitutional Convention in 1788,	575	Sickness of 1712, 118; of 1749,	324
		Slaves,	320
		Slavery abolished in Conn.,	323
		Saw mills,	90
		Scouts,	102
		Subscribers to the articles of settlement,	9
		Subscribers, delinquent, who secured their rights,	24, 45 31
		Streets, original village,	17
		Settlers, first, of Waterbury, personal notices of,	129, 167
		Settlers, new, notices of,	245
		Society, 1st, first meeting of,	283
			T.
		Talcott, Maj. John,	6
		Terry, Eli,	435
		Todd, Rev. Samuel,	266
		Thomas, Samuel,	245
		Trumbull, Rev. John,	258
		John, LL. D.,	441
		house,	260
		Town meetings,	334, 346
		Tax payers of 1760, 277; of 1737, lists, &c.,	565 362
		Town plot, old,	10, 14, 36, 37
		new,	17
		Townsmen and constables first chosen,	76
		Train band,	110
		Tories,	347, 352, 354
		laws against,	352
			U.
		Upson Genealogy,	193
		Sergt. Stephen,	193
		Thomas, of Hartford,	193
		Stephen, Jr.,	194
		Stephen, Esq.,	443
		Benoni, D. D.,	443
		Thomas, of Waterbury,	194
		John,	194
			V.
		Village lots,	252
			W.
		Webster, Lt. Robert,	7
		Wadsworth, Ens. John,	8
		Warner Genealogy,	195
		John of Farmington,	24, 195
		John,	195
		Daniel 1st,	25, 198
		Daniel 2d,	198
		Doct. John,	196
		Samuel,	200
		Thomas,	198
Steele, Ens. Samuel,	7		
Rev. Ashbel,	547		
Stanley Family,	188		
Capt. John,	188		
Lt. John,	13, 41, 118, 189		
John, Jr.,	191		
Samuel,	191		
Timothy 2d,	191		
Lt. Timothy,	191		
Southmayd, Rev. John, 34, 187; invited to settle, 215; ordained, 216; asks the town to procure another minister, 218; offices which he held, 220; inventory of his estate,	221		
Southmayd, John, Jr.,	188, 287		
Capt. Daniel,	188, 434		
Samuel W.,	435		
Seymour, Richard,	26		
Smith, Maj. David,	349		
Scovill Genealogy,	186		
John 1st,	186		
Sergt. John,	187		
Lt. John,	187		
Rev. James,	299, 301		
J. M. Lamson,	429		
William H.	431		
Small pox,	357		
Scott Genealogy,	181, 527		
Jonathan, and his two sons, taken by the Indians,	105, 184		
Thomas,	181		
Edmund, Sen.,	181		
Edmund, Jr.,	183		
Samuel,	32, 184		
George,	182		
John,	184		
Robert,	183		
Joseph,	183		
Jonathan, Jr.,	185		
Eleazer,	185		
Dr. Daniel,	186		
David,	182		
Storrs, Rev. Andrew,	269		
Smith, Junius, LL. D.,	432		
Settlement of Waterbury begun,	16		
Schools, 234; votes of the town respecting them,	235		
School lands, sale of,	239		
house,	238		
moneys,	240		
Sheep,	59		
Sabbath day houses,	228		

Warner, Doct. Ephraim,	196	Wooster Swamp,	252
Benjamin,	199	Westbury settled, 252; petitions	
John, son of Thomas,	199	for winter privileges, 254; peti-	
Ebenezer,	198	tions for a distinct society and is	
Robert,	198	opposed by town, 255; again peti-	
Welton Genealogy,	200	tions with success, 256; location	
John,	200	of its meeting house, 258; its	
John, Jr.	201	early deacons, 261; incorporated	
Stephen,	201	as a town,	275
Richard,	201	War, Indian, 101; King Philip's,	
Thomas,	201	11; French, and names of	
George,	201	soldiers engaged in,	326
Capt. John,	446	War, Revolutionary, 329; officers	
Woodward Genealogy,	551	of alarm companies, 340;	
Weeks, Rev. Holland,	290	names of men who left Wa-	
Waterman, Rev. Simeon,	269	terbury intending to join the	
Wooster, Rev. Benjamin,	446	enemy, 354; La Fayette,	
Washington, Gen.	358	Washington and the French	
Year, old and new,	16	army, 359; clothing furnish-	
Waterbury incorporated,	67	ed, 341; names of soldiers	
origin of name,	67	in the war, 349; provisions	
patents of,	67, 68, 69	furnished by Watertown,	360
petitions Gen. Court, for		Wild horses,	209
abatment of taxes, 203, 325			

*Patron James +18*

Page 138, 15th line from top, *for* 1647, *read* 1747.

Page 138, 17th line from top—Mr. Kilbourn, in his "Kilbourn Family," states that Sarah Bronson m. *John* Kilbourn.

Page 150, 11th and 12th lines from bottom, *for of* Durham previously of Saybrook? *read of* Farmington.

Page 169, 3d line from top, *for* Wrothern *read* Wrotham.

Page 175, 18th line from top, *for* but not *read* and.

Page 181. *Erase* the paragraph next after "Scott." Thomas Scott had an only son, *Thomas*, and 3 daughters, Mary, Sarah, and *Elizabeth*. I know not whose son Edmund Scott, Sen. was.

Page 183, 13th and 14th lines from top, *erase* I suppose he was a literal bachelor.

Page 186. *Erase* the four last lines. The error arose from misunderstanding Mr. Porter's manuscript. John Scovill is not known to have but one child, *John*.

Page 290, 2d line from bottom, *for* where he died, *read* and died in New Haven.

[For other corrections, see the beginning of the volume.]

## CORRECTIONS.

---

- Page 123, 22d line from top, *for* 1622, *read* 1722.  
“ 142, last line, *for* Sept. 28, *read* Sept. 29.  
“ 178, 19th line from top, *for* 1770, *read* 1720.  
“ 371, 4th line from bottom, *erase* traveled in Europe.  
“ 374, 12th line from top, *for* 1798, *read* 1796.  
“ 374, 13th line from bottom, *for* 86th, *read* 85th.  
“ 374, 14th line from bottom, *for* 1839, *read* 1838.  
“ 377, 15th and 16th lines from top, *for* by invitation of the Episcopal Convention, *read* in compliance with the wishes of the Episcopal clergy and laity.  
“ 377, last line but one, *for* Rev. Dr. Noble's, *read* Rev. Mr. Noble's.  
“ 387, 11th line from bottom, *for* the Brown & Elton Co., *read* Brown & Elton. (The sentence is badly constructed.)  
“ 398, 5th line from top, *for* 1852, *read* 1832.  
“ 398, 11th line from bottom, *for* St. Louis, *read* Jefferson Barracks.  
“ 422, 10th line from bottom, *for* Denizen, *read* Denison.  
“ 423, 4th line from bottom, *for* Becker, *read* Bicker.  
“ 423, 6th line from bottom, *erase* the clause in parenthetic marks.  
“ 430, 4th line from bottom, *for* Washington College, *read* Trinity College.  
“ 431, 15th line from top, *for* Lawson, *read* Lamson.  
“ 450, 8th line from top, *for* Alvan, *read* Alvin.  
“ 450, last line, *for* Gilbert, *read* Gillet.  
“ 451, 6th, 8th, 20th and 28th lines from top, *for* Gilbert, *read* Gillet.  
“ 452, 5th and 20th lines from top, *for* port, *read* post.  
“ 459, 12th line from top, *for* John Alcott, *read* John Alcocke.  
“ 495, 4th line from bottom, *for* 1639, *read* 1739?













Sp

974.67

B869

**STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARY**  
**Stanford, California**

--	--	--	--



PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Digitized by Google



