

PROCEEDINGS.

ANNUAL MEETING, OCTOBER 21, 1902, AT THE HALL OF THE
SOCIETY IN WORCESTER.

THE meeting was called to order at 10:30 A. M., by the
President, Hon. STEPHEN SALISBURY.

The records of the previous meeting were approved.

The report of the Council was prepared by WILLIAM B.
WEEDEN, A. M., and the Recording Secretary. In con-
nection with the report, Mr. WEEDEN read a paper on
"Three Commonwealths:—Massachusetts, Connecticut and
Rhode Island, and their early development."

The report of the Treasurer was read by NATHANIEL
PAINE, A.M.

The report of the Librarian was read by Mr. EDMUND
M. BARTON.

Vice-President GEORGE F. HOAR moved that the report
of the Council, with the reports accompanying it, be sub-
mitted to the Committee of Publication, and such parts
of it published as they think best.

Senator HOAR said: "And in making this motion I
wish to express my great satisfaction in listening to Mr.
Weeden's paper. It is inspired by that attachment to his
own State and dwelling-place which is the inspiration and
soul of all patriotism and all public spirit and all good
citizenship. This paper gives the theory of the founders
of the three New England States mentioned, Massachusetts,

Rhode Island and Connecticut, and shows what they deemed the true principles of civil liberty in their application to the question, who shall take part in the government of the State? Perhaps Mr. Weeden on reflection will be willing to pardon a little the effect of a like attachment to their own birthplace and State in the Massachusetts historians, and especially like that noblest of all our examples of civic virtue, Josiah Quincy, in speaking of their own history. Massachusetts people were not perfect in their conception of the doctrines of civil liberty, though for civil liberty as they conceived it, they were willing to encounter exile and privation and death. I do not think Roger Williams, though he be entitled to all admiration and our pride as one of our great lights, so very far ahead of us in his conception of these principles. If I understand it, Roger Williams and his companions admitted to a share in the government of the State only professing Christians and only heads of families. So his conception of a perfect State, in advance as it was of ours, would have excluded Confucius, would have excluded Socrates, would have excluded Plato and Marcus Aurelius, and would have excluded a majority of the human race, including all the Hebrew patriarchs, law-givers and prophets, and inspired oracles of religious faith before Christ. Also, if I understand it, he admitted nobody but heads of families to take part in the government of his State, which would have excluded all bachelors, including three members of the Council of the American Antiquarian Society, one of whom is the President."

The motion of Mr. HOAR was carried.

Mr. WILLIAM E. FOSTER and Mr. EDWARD H. GILBERT, appointed to collect ballots for President, reported thirty-seven ballots cast, all for Hon. STEPHEN SALISBURY.

The President appointed Dr. SAMUEL A. GREEN of Boston, Dr. JOHN GREEN of St. Louis, and Hon. HENRY

S. NOURSE a committee to report a list of the other officers of the Society. The following were nominated and duly elected:—

Vice-Presidents:

HON. GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR, LL.D., of Worcester.
REV. EDWARD EVERETT HALE, D.D., of Roxbury.

Council:

HON. SAMUEL ABBOTT GREEN, LL.D., of Boston.
REV. EGBERT COFFIN SMYTH, D.D., of Andover.
SAMUEL SWETT GREEN, A.M., of Worcester.
HON. EDWARD LIVINGSTON DAVIS, A.M., of Worcester.
JEREMIAH EVARTS GREENE, B.A., of Worcester.
GRANVILLE STANLEY HALL, LL.D., of Worcester.
WILLIAM BABCOCK WEEDEN, A.M., of Providence,
Rhode Island.
HON. JOHN DAVIS WASHBURN, LL.B., of Worcester.
HON. JAMES PHINNEY BAXTER, A.M., of Portland,
Maine.
HON. HENRY STEDMAN NOURSE, A.M., of Lancaster.

Secretary of Foreign Correspondence:

FRANKLIN BOWDITCH DEXTER, M.A., of New Haven,
Connecticut.

Secretary of Domestic Correspondence:

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, LL.D., of Lincoln.

Recording Secretary:

CHARLES AUGUSTUS CHASE, A.M., of Worcester.

Treasurer:

NATHANIEL PAINE, A.M., of Worcester.

Committee of Publication:

REV. EDWARD EVERETT HALE, D.D., of Roxbury.
 NATHANIEL PAINE, A.M., of Worcester.
 CHARLES AUGUSTUS CHASE, A.M., of Worcester.
 CHARLES CARD SMITH, A.M., of Boston.

Auditors:

AUGUSTUS GEORGE BULLOCK, A.M., of Worcester.
 BENJAMIN THOMAS HILL, A.B., of Worcester.

Finance Committee:

HON. STEPHEN SALISBURY, A.M., of Worcester.
 HON. EDWARD LIVINGSTON DAVIS, A.M., of Worcester.
 CHARLES AUGUSTUS CHASE, A.M., of Worcester.

Library Committee:

HON. STEPHEN SALISBURY, A.M., of Worcester.
 NATHANIEL PAINE, A.M., of Worcester.

Librarian:

EDMUND MILLS BARTON, of Worcester.

The Recording Secretary, in behalf of the Council, proposed the names of the following gentlemen for election to membership:—

Roger Bigelow Merriam, Ph.D., of Cambridge.
 Alexander Francis Chamberlain, Ph.D., of Worcester.
 William McDonald, Ph.D., of Providence, R. I.
 Albert Samuel Gatschet, Ph.D., of Washington, D. C.

The above-named gentlemen were duly elected on separate ballots.

The Rev. CALVIN STERRISS, referring to Mr. Weedon's paper, made a few remarks, saying: I have recently been studying the development of democratic ideas in the

Please insert this slip in page 110 of "Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society for October 21, 1902."

For Roger Bigelow Merriam
read Roger Bigelow Merriam.

Puritan Army under Cromwell, and the paper just read has suggested the question whether there was any connection between Thomas Hooker and the leaders of the "New Model." It has been shown that the Puritan warriors began by organizing the regiment into a Church, and that they had the reputation of being greatly given to attending conventicles. But as time went on they turned the prayer meeting into a political meeting and began to discuss questions in politics. While the Presbyterians in Parliament were anxious to reduce the power of the King and make Parliament supreme, the soldiers wished to curtail the power of Parliament as well as that of the King. In 1647, the soldiers after long discussion published a document called "The Declaration of the Army." "In this," says Prof. Gardiner, "for the first time, the modern political doctrine, that the people themselves are the sources of power and that there is no appeal from their decision when expressed through Parliaments recently chosen, was publicly set forth in England." After about two months' discussion the subject was again brought forward in a clearer statement.

Dr. HALE: "What is the date of this?"

Rev. Mr. STUBBINS: The later document was completed on the 27th of July, 1647, and published on the 1st of August. It was called "Heads of Proposals." This document is remarkable on account of what it suggests. It did not state whether there should be a State church or not, or if there was one whether it should be Presbyterian or Episcopal, but it left the whole subject open to be decided by a Parliament to be elected; but it asked for the abolition of all powers of Bishops and Ecclesiastics in criminal cases, that the Book of Common Prayer should not be obligatory, that the taking of the Covenant should be optional, that every man should be protected in whatever form of worship he chose, that the electoral system

be reorganized so that members of Parliament might in reality represent the people, and that biennial Parliaments be held from this time forth and forever. It seems to me, that the development of democratic ideas in America under the lead of Hooker and among the Independents in the "New Model" under Henry Ireton at the same period was very remarkable. Hooker seems to have preached the doctrine before the soldiers began to formulate their ideas, but the soldiers published their "Heads of Proposals" before Hooker's sermon was given to the world.

Mr. JOHN NOBLE, of Boston, read a paper on the Shays Rebellion,—or the side of it as seen in the Courts.

In connection with Mr. Noble's paper, the Recording Secretary, Mr. CHASE, remarked: "The paper just presented has a local as well as national interest. It was only a few feet from where we are now that almost the climax of the rebellion took place. The events here are quite fully described in the "History of Worcester," by William Lincoln. A special grievance of the insurgents was against the courts; one plank in their platform was the abolition of the courts, and the substitution of some simpler mode of dispensing and obtaining justice. The Criminal Court was to be held in Worcester in November, 1786.

The jurisdiction of the session, says Lincoln, was principally over criminal offences, and its powers were exercised for the preservation of social order. No opposition had been anticipated to its session on the 21st of November, and no defensive preparations were made. On that day about sixty armed men under Abraham Gale of Princeton entered the north part of the town. During the evening and on Wednesday morning about one hundred more arrived from Hubbardston, Shrewsbury and some adjacent towns. A committee presented a petition to the court at the United States Arms Tavern, for their adjournment until a new choice of representatives, which was not

received. The insurgents then took possession of the ground around the Court House. When the Justices approached, the armed men made way and they passed through the opening ranks to the steps. There, triple rows of bayonets presented to their breasts, opposed farther advance. The Sheriff, Col. William Greenleaf of Lancaster, addressed the assembled crowd, stating the danger to themselves and the public from their lawless measures. Reasoning and warning were ineffectual, and the proclamation in the riot act was read for their dispersion. Amid the grave solemnity of the scene some incidents were interposed of lighter character. Col. Greenleaf remarked with great severity on the conduct of the armed party around him. One of the leaders replied, they sought relief from grievances: that among the most intolerable of them was the Sheriff himself: and next to his person were his fees, which were exorbitant and excessive, particularly on criminal executions. "If you consider fees for executions oppressive," replied the Sheriff, irritated by the attack, "you need not wait long for redress, for I will hang you all, Gentlemen, for nothing with the greatest pleasure." Some hand among the crowd which pressed close, placed a pine branch on his hat, and the county officer retired, with the Justices, decorated with the evergreen badge of rebellion. The clerk entered on his records that the court was prevented from being held by an armed force, the only notice contained on their pages that our soil has ever been dishonored by resistance of the laws.

Mr. CHASE continued his remarks, saying:

"But there is one matter connected with this subject which I wish would be settled by Mr. Noble, and by the Society, and that is the authority of the spelling of the hero of this rebellion. I am satisfied that it has always been given entirely wrong, and that his real name was "Shea." It is not given so anywhere. Mr. Lincoln writes it "Shays," the most common way.¹

¹ The Secretary is in receipt of the following letter. It settles the question of how the man spelled his name, but perhaps it establishes the fact that he spelled it wrong:

Worcester, 27 Oct., 1902.

DEAR SIR:—*Apròpos* of the question which you raised at the Antiquarian meeting in regard to the spelling of the leader's name in the rebellion in Massachusetts

Dr. HALE. I received some years ago a circular asking us to contribute for the erection of a monument to Daniel Shays in Western New York, where he died.

Dr. S. A. GREEN. I got such a circular, and I think within a very few months I saw something in the paper that steps had been taken toward the erection of a monument of some kind.

At the close of Mr. Noble's paper, Mr. CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS said: I do not propose to take up any unnecessary amount of the time of this meeting. I do, however, want to say a few words in order to secure an opportunity, when the very valuable paper which has just been read is printed, to therein insert what I would say now had I time for preparation. Not only is Mr. Noble's paper interesting, but, historically, I regard it as one of the most important I have ever heard read at the meetings of this Society. It presents a view never before taken to my knowledge of an important episode in our annals,—indeed, an episode second in importance to none; for I believe it is generally conceded that Shays's "Rebellion," so-called, was one of the chief impelling and contributory causes to the framing and adoption of the constitution of 1788. A rude shock, it awakened the whole thirteen States to a realizing sense of the anarchical abyss on the edge of which they were then lingering. In its sequence, it thus revealed a racial difference of far-reaching importance. A similar danger subsequently confronted the several American communities of the Latin race at the regulation point in development. One and all, they plunged into it; they were not equal to the emergency. The Anglo-American community, on the contrary, recoiled

in 1786,—in looking up an entirely different matter, the other day, I had occasion to consult Parmenter's History of Pelham, and was surprised to find there a two-chapter sketch of that man, including several letters by him; one of these letters (p. 393) is given in *facsimile*, and the signature, in excellent chirography, is "Daniel Shays."

Yours very truly,

GEORGE H. HAYNES.

from the abyss, proceeding at once to form a stronger government, as well as "a more perfect union."

In my belief poor old Shays, and his somewhat ragged, helter-skelter and tatterdemalion following have, at the hands of our so-called historians, received rather harsh and inconsiderate treatment. They have been pronounced guilty, unreservedly; my own belief is that, though guilty, there were decidedly extenuating circumstances underlying their action and connected with their case. Undoubtedly law-breakers, they broke the law only under circumstances of almost intolerable hardship, not to say oppression.

My attention was first drawn to Shays's "Rebellion" now some years back. I am glad the subject has passed into the hands of Mr. Noble. I then tried to induce a young student of history, writing one of these theses for his doctorate of philosophy at Harvard College, to go if he could into the underlying causes of the "Rebellion." He had undertaken to write a history of it. He described in the usual way, the Governor's proclamation; how, when, and where the militia mustered; where they marched and in what sort of weather, and what finally took place when they got there, *etc.*, *etc.* I advised him to get in behind all that superficial narrative, to go to the records of the Courts of that day in which writs were filed, to rummage the legal processes, and from them ascertain what the cause of trouble was. The misdirected effort of those engaged in the uprising was to put a stop to the sessions of the Courts of Law, especially in the agricultural counties of the State. They wanted to hinder the rendering of any more judgments, and the issue of executions thereon. Why was this? Those who followed Shays were Massachusetts yeomen,—law-abiding, New England farmers and land-owners. Those men did not without some cause rise in a tumultuous body, and try to suppress the Courts of Justice. Something surely, could we but find it out, was to be

urged in their behalf. That something, I believe, is shadowed forth in Mr. Noble's paper. My young friend of the Ph.D. thesis certainly felt no call, so far as I ever knew or heard, to follow up the trail I indicated to him.

What was the material and economical situation in the States of the Confederation in 1786? I take it to have been somewhat as follows: The thirteen Provinces had emerged from a war of nearly eight years' duration, and they had emerged under conditions of extreme financial and economical distress. There was no commerce; no medium of exchange; no active markets. The old Continental money had depreciated, and so gone out of sight that not to be worth a "continental" was a synonym for no value; it is so still. Here then were the farmers; they lived on the land, getting up early and toiling long hours; industrious and thrifty, they had their farm buildings and implements, and their cattle; for one reason and another, largely because of heavy taxation, they owed money,—for, in those days, taxation was very onerous. They were in debt. They could not well help being so; for the community was then reduced to a system of barter. Ordinary purchase and sale had ceased; for there were many sellers and few buyers. Meanwhile, the laws of Massachusetts as respects the collection of debt were, at the time in question, such as would not now be tolerated in any civilized community. Bancroft, in his "History of the Formation of the Federal Constitution," stigmatizes them as "barbarous." Speaking from memory only, I cannot quote his exact words. Debt was, however, then a crime; and imprisonment at the will of the creditor was the penalty for it no matter what the circumstances might be.¹

¹"Meantime, the sufferings of the debtors in Massachusetts, especially in its central and western counties, embittered by the devices of attorneys to increase their own emoluments, and aggrieved by the barbarous laws of that day which doomed the debtor, however innocent, to imprisonment at the caprice of his creditor, had driven them to interrupt the courts in Worcester. In the three western

The early New Englanders were, moreover, inclined to be litigious. The bar, as a profession, was in 1786, and thereabouts, not thoroughly organized; its tone was distinctly low. During the revolutionary period and immediately subsequent thereto a crop of attorneys, self-taught, and of low antecedents, had developed, country pettifoggers who would now be known as "shyster" lawyers. These men were nothing more nor less than cormorants and blood-suckers; they drew their sustenance from merciless exactions from a suffering community. I cannot myself produce any examples of bills of costs of court such as were run up in those days. Doubtless Mr. Noble could, if he has not already done so. There are, however, in the diary of my grandfather, John Quincy Adams, kept just after the close of his college course, in 1787, and while he was a student in the office of Theophilus Parsons at Newburyport, some curious passages bearing on the public regard in which the legal profession was then held. At the Spring Exhibition before his Commencement, he was assigned a part in a joint conference with two other members of the class, he speaking on behalf of the Law, they on behalf of Physic and Divinity. These extracts will probably be published at an early day in the *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society, to which I propose to communicate the diary in question.¹

In this connection, the extracts from the diary have a

counties measures were taken to close the courts; and once, for a moment, the national armory at Springfield was menaced. The movement assumed the aspect of an insurrection, almost of a rebellion, which received support even from husbandmen otherwise firm supporters of the law."—Bancroft, *History of the Formation of the Constitution of the United States of America*, vol. I., p. 274.

¹ See *Proceedings* of Massachusetts Historical Society for November, 1902. The following is the essential passage in the Exhibition part in question:—"At a time when the profession of the law labours under the heavy weight of popular indignation; when it is upbraided as the original cause of all the evils with which the Commonwealth is distressed; when the legislature have been publicly exhorted by a popular writer to abolish it entirely, and when the mere title of Lawyer is sufficient to deprive a man of the public confidence, it should seem this profession would afford but a poor subject for panegyric; but its real utility is not to be determined by the short-lived frenzy of an inconsiderate multitude, nor by the artful misrepresentations of an invidious writer."

veritable historic interest. Another curious indication of the popular odium which attached to the legal profession at the time of Shays's movement I came across some years ago while serving on a committee to edit the records of the old town of Braintree. J. Q. Adams was at that time a resident of Braintree, the original township not having as yet been divided. At a town meeting held in the Autumn of 1786, immediately preceding the "Rebellion," those who sympathized in that movement evidently had control. A letter of instructions to the town's representative in the General Court was then prepared, and those instructions breathed the full spirit of the subsequent disturbance. I have not the volume here, but, among other things, the representative was instructed to promote, so far as he could, such legislation as would either put a stop to the profession of the law, or, at any rate, subject it to severe restrictions; and also another measure which would provide that land and property should be made a tender in payment of debt.

Even then, however, the demand set forth indicated a fairly moderate spirit, inasmuch as land, *etc.*, was not to be a legal tender unless there had been a default in the payment of interest. Some kind of stay law was demanded.¹

My investigation, so far as I have been able to make one, has been, I confess, merely incidental; but, such as it was, it has led me to believe that there would now be an insurrection in Massachusetts within three months were

¹ The letter of instructions referred to was addressed to Col. Ebenezer Thayer, then the representative of Braintree. It was in several respects characteristic of the time and of the agitators then in control. In its preamble it referred to the "numerous Grievances or intolerable Burthens by some means or other lying on the Good Subjects of this republic." Then, proceeding to an enumeration of grievances, it contained, among other specifications, the following:

"6thly, We humbly request that there may be such Laws compiled as may crush or at least put a proper check or restraint on that order of Gentlemen denominated Lawyers the completion of whos modern conduct appears to us to tend rather to the destruction than the preservation of this Commonwealth."

* * * * *

"8thly, That Real and Personal Estate be a tender for all debts when call'd for provided the Interest be punctually paid."—*Records of the Town of Braintree*, p. 568.

the conditions and laws the same as those existing and in force in 1786. The pettifogging lawyers I have referred to made a business of pressing claims against farmers, and those of the poorer class. They sued them for taxes, or for any debts they had incurred; and then began a process of piling up legal costs. Mr. Noble can, as I have said, undoubtedly give examples from the Court records under his charge. Finally, the parties sued being unable to defend themselves, or having no defence to make, judgment was rendered, and, in due time, execution issued. The executions were then levied mercilessly; there was no homestead, or other exemption law, and whatever property a debtor had was seized and put up for sale at public vendue. There were no buyers at such sales, except the holders of the executions. Accordingly, well-meaning, law-abiding men saw themselves utterly without protection and with no recourse. They were ruined; sold out; rendered not only houseless and homeless, but prisoners for debt. Whatever they had was gone at nominal prices; and, deprived of their liberty as well as their means of livelihood, they saw their all sacrificed. To bear such conditions uncomplainingly would have required a very patient race of men; and the men of Massachusetts of that time were not an uncomplaining race, nor were they conspicuous for meekness.

The subject is one worthy of a careful monograph. A few years ago only,—in the Spring of 1894,—we here in the United States that now is, under a condition of affairs not nearly so intolerable as that existing in 1786, witnessed the "Debs" business, and the labor agitation and movements of that period. The Shays "Rebellion" I take to have been merely a more aggravated instance of the same sort of thing. But, unlike the Debs fiasco, the Shays "Rebellion," as I have already said, was an important historical fact, and, as such, it deserves to be adequately treated.

I have referred to J. Q. Adams's early diary ; but he never forgot the impression made upon him by those early events ; and, fifty years later, speaking of the Federal Constitution, he used the striking expression that it was "extorted from the grinding necessity of a reluctant nation." Shays's "Rebellion" was the extorting agency. I have, therefore, listened to the paper of Mr. Noble, or that portion of it which he read after I came into the room, with especial interest. I have already urged my friend, Mr. Andrew McFarland Davis, who is singularly well qualified for such a work, to prepare an historical monograph on Shays's "Rebellion." For such a study he has been peculiarly prepared by his previous investigations of Massachusetts Currency. If he would undertake it in connection with Mr. Noble, making use of the material which Mr. Noble has unearthed in the Clerk's office of the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth, the result could hardly fail to be a production of a high order, and of permanent historical value.

Meanwhile, until such a monograph appears, Shays and his dragged, shivering rabble will continue to be regarded, as they hitherto have been regarded, as a parcel of lawless insurrectionists, endeavoring without any adequate moving cause to overturn a beneficent government. The historical fact is that the conditions then prevailing were almost unendurable, the laws "barbarous," and the people had shown themselves long-suffering. In the outcome, Shays's insurrection proved a most illuminating reminder and healthy stimulant.

Mr. CHASE: "Mr. Lincoln, giving a biographical sketch of Col. Timothy Bigelow, who was from Worcester, and one of the first to move to the Battle of Lexington with his company, classes him with the vast mass of sufferers from the distressful times. Col. Bigelow, after the war in which he took an active and conspicuous part

as colonel of the 15th Massachusetts Regiment, spent a large part of his declining years in the County jail in Worcester, because he was unable to meet the debts incurred in support of his family during his absence in the field. That was the fate of the colonel of the old 15th Massachusetts Regiment. To the colonel of the 15th Massachusetts Regiment in the War of 1861¹ the people of Worcester County are about erecting an equestrian statue in front of the Court House, near at hand. It is a striking contrast of the times."

Mr. HOAR: "Colonel Bigelow was within the jail 'limits.' There was a distinction. The debtor who could give bonds that he would not go without certain limits, was permitted to dwell outside, and Mr. Bigelow had some place of business at Lincoln Square outside of the actual jail. The jail limits extended for half a mile or a mile from the jail."

Dr. SAMUEL A. GREEN said:—

I wish to give to the library of the Society a copy of a work entitled:—"The Life of Washington, in the form of an Autobiography" (Boston, 1840), in two volumes, by the Rev. Charles W. Upham, a former member. The publication of this work gave rise to some litigation, as it was considered an infringement of the copyright, held by Mr. Sparks, of his "Writings of George Washington," published a short time previously; and the author and publishers were restrained by injunction from making it public. The stereotype plates, however, had been cast,—a few impressions struck off without the knowledge of Mr. Upham,—and afterward sent to England, where an edition of the work was published. Once I showed this copy to him, and on seeing it he expressed great astonishment, as he was then unaware that any copies had ever

¹ Gen. Charles Devens.

been printed here; and at my request he duly recorded the fact on a fly-leaf in one of the volumes, as follows:—

This work was compiled by me. It was never published *by my knowledge*, in this country. It was published in England, *I know not by whom*. I never saw a copy of it, until I procured one by importation from England.

July 22^d. 1869.

CHARLES W. UPHAM.

At the annual meeting of the Society, held on October 21, 1875, it fell to my lot to write the Council's Report, in which appeared a sketch of Mr. Upham, who at that time had recently died; and I then mentioned some of the circumstances here related.

Dr. HALE inquired as to whether any information could be given as to the whereabouts of the missing volume of Washington's diary.

A letter written in 1827, dealing with medical education at that time, was read by Mr. SAMUEL S. GREEN, of Worcester. In connection with the reading of the letter, Mr. GREEN remarked: "The manuscript which I hold in my hand is a copy of a letter written by a gentleman connected with the Medical School of Harvard University to Issacher Cozzens, Jr., of New York, in 1827. Mr. Cozzens was the librarian of the Lyceum of Natural History in New York, and was the author of a volume which many of you know of,—'A Geological History of Manhattan or New York Island.' The volume is of especial value now as it is very hard to study the geology of a city which, like New York, is covered with buildings. Mr. Cozzens had a great many acquaintances among men of science. He was an intimate friend of Audubon. The anecdote is told that Audubon requested the privilege of painting his portrait as a surprise to his wife, and then asked Mrs. Cozzens to have her portrait painted as a surprise to her husband. In the latter part of his life Mr. Cozzens spent a great deal of his time at the well-known hotel of his brother near West

Point. You will remember that Gen. Scott spent his summers at that hotel. There and elsewhere Mr. Cozzens became acquainted with a great many people who were studying in fields different from those trodden by himself.

This letter was given to me by Mr. S. K. Robbins, of Worcester, whose wife was a near relative of Mr. Cozzens. The letter is mainly interesting because it shows that a man who knew all about what was going on in respect to medical education in Massachusetts believed that Boston never would become much of a centre for instruction in medicine. Now that Harvard University is putting up a magnificent group of thoroughly equipped buildings for the study of medicine, it is interesting to see that this notable movement was not foreseen by an especially well informed person seventy-five years ago, and that no such movement was thought possible by him; it is also interesting as showing what facilities there were for medical education in New York in 1827."

CAMBRIDGE, May 26, 1827.

MY DEAR SIR:

There is no one in your city with whom I am acquainted that is *impartial* on the subject on which I now write to you. I will therefore desire you to consider this letter as perfectly *confidential* & request you after reading it to write me as full information as you can, & to give me the result of your own observations & actual knowledge. As it will be impossible for me to visit your city in person to obtain information I must form my opinion on that derived from my friends there.

On the death of Dr. Dana I wrote to Dr. ——— to ask merely what the situation was worth per annum—what were the duties & what the prospects of an increase of the school. At the same time I particularly stated that in so doing *I must not be considered as applying for the office*. I remarked, however, that as I had *no time of my own here*, but lectures & recitations every day throughout the year, I should *not be unwilling* to change my place for one

which should give me an *equal support*, & leave me more *time* at my own disposal.

To this I received in reply that the number of pupils attending Dr. Dana had been comparatively small, & that the number next year would probably be about 80 at \$20 each, that a course of private lectures might be given in the city to ladies & gentlemen with profit each year. My friend also wrote that the Rutgers school would no doubt be *abandoned* as the legislature had passed a law rendering their Diplomas illegal. From the enquiries of another friend I am informed that the new law will not affect the Rutgers school much, but merely give a little more *trouble* to the graduates but their same diplomas will insure their possessors a *license* to practice in New Jersey, & a *license* to practice in N. J. will pass for a license to practice in N. York and the very legislators who wanted this law are beginning to perceive that public opinion is against it, & its *existence* will probably *be short*. My friend also says "while the college of Physicians and Surgeons go altogether upon *hopes* and *suppositions* the *facts* are all in favor of Rutgers—their last Professors will issue a circular to convince the public they are still *alive* and do not think the *law* will kill them." The college of Phys. & Surg. it is said have placed all *their reliance on this law*.

Now I learn that it is reported I have applied for the office, but such is *not* the fact. The President of our College yesterday informed me that Dr. Stevens had written to Dr. Warren in Boston to ask what were my qualifications & whether he thought I would *accept the place if chosen*. No official communication has been made to me directly, but I am desirous of getting at all the facts and prospects of the two schools from the friends of both parties & from disinterested persons. I have thought you would take some pains for aiding me in this, & at the same time *not say I had written you*.

Our medical course in Boston (Dr. Gorham having resigned & I being put in his place) after deducting expenses will not give even more than \$5 or 600 a year—my salary for duties at Cambridge is \$1000 & I pay all expenses, except of fuel. Thus I may estimate the income from *both* at \$12 or most 1300 per annum for which

I must labor *daily*. I can see no prospect of any increase of this as *our* medical school will probably never exceed 80 or 100 pupils. It appears to me that your city is growing so rapidly that a medical school must grow too if well conducted—but not *two* schools. I am told also that N. Y. affords good opportunity to get into Medical Practice.

From some information I am inclined to think that the prospect of the Rutgers School is the *best*, from the known talents of its Professors. I have some reason too to think that their chemical chair is not as well filled as they would *wish*, do you know how this is? & whether the present Prof. is likely to remain permanently? The patronage of the state & the support of the laws are greatly in favor of the permanency & welfare of the College of Phy. & Sur.

Now with so many pros & cons on both sides I cannot make up an opinion, & will esteem it a particular kindness if you will take some pains to send me all the information you can both as to the *present & future prospects* of *both* schools. I repeat again do not *use my name* or let it be supposed I have written you or any one on the subject.

Your friend, etc.

Dr. JOHN GREEN, of St. Louis, Mo., made remarks in connection with the above letter. Dr. GREEN said: "There are two interesting facts suggested by this letter. The College of Physicians and Surgeons is now the great medical department of Columbia University. The medical department of Harvard University, which the writer of this letter seems to have despaired of, is now the best endowed medical institution in America, and its endowment places it, I believe, above any other institution in the world. The letter brings up another interesting point, namely, the way in which the business side of medical teaching was conducted three-quarters of a century ago, when the net income of the school was divided among the professors in proportion to the number of students who took out tickets for the several courses; it shows that the

average income of a professor in the Medical School of Harvard University in 1827 was about \$600. Nowadays, at Harvard, all these things are changed. The professors who are obliged, as this gentleman writes, to devote all their time to the work of daily instruction, now receive good salaries. Men to whom the instruction in the school is secondary to and is supplemented by a remunerative medical practice receive salaries relatively smaller; but all receive good salaries,—a very different state of things from that which existed seventy-five years or even thirty-five years ago. The letter throws light on another point. This professor, who was engaged in giving scientific instruction in Harvard College, in 1827, received a salary of a thousand dollars; but much later, as late as 1855, I recall the case of at least one professor, a man of world-wide recognition in a leading department of natural science, who received but half that amount as salary, and whose fees for special instruction averaged scarcely three hundred dollars in addition. The treasurer's reports of Harvard College, in those days, were very interesting documents, as showing in detail the amounts paid to all persons who received money from the University funds. Perhaps we hardly appreciate how tardy was the recognition given to scientific work by those to whom the conduct of great educational institutions is intrusted; how very recent is the official appreciation of natural science. The late Professor Louis Agassiz once told a small group of students of a visit made by him to Oken, the great German investigator in comparative anatomy. After several hours spent in deep scientific conversation, he accepted an invitation to share the professor's midday meal, which consisted of boiled potatoes and salt. But, said Agassiz, with a lofty enthusiasm which not one of us could ever forget. 'Oken was then the owner of the finest anatomical library in Germany!' I have lived long enough in more or less intimate relations with a few eminent scientific

men in America to know something of the steadfast devotion to the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake that ennobles the lives of such men. The hill of science is even now by no means an easy one ; but how much harder was it in not very distant days within our own recollection !”

Prof. EDWIN A. GROSVENOR, of Amherst College, said :

“The message that I have is entirely informal and verbal, but it is from the Numismatic and Antiquarian Society of Montreal. I had occasion this summer to see a remarkable collection of portraits and miniatures and engravings, a collection that as far as I know is unparalleled in this country, and Mr. McLachlan, the curator, was speaking of the great distinction of the American Antiquarian Society, speaking of it as the foremost on the continent in prominence, said that he would be very glad if I would communicate with the Society, and extend the greetings and best wishes of this senior society of all the kindred societies in the Dominion to the senior society of all similar societies in this country, and I said that it would be a very great pleasure. It was in the summer time, when of course most of the officers of this institution were away, and he said that they would like to pass some vote, and asked me to bring it, which of course was a delight to me. In giving anything so informal, it seems a little difficult without dwelling upon it too much, but it would not be fair to him without in this way presenting the messages of that Society from its most prominent member, to the President and members of this Society.”

President SALISBURY. The Society is very grateful to receive this special communication.

Vice-President HOAR at this point addressed the Society on the Compromises of the Constitution. His paper is given on a subsequent page.

A contribution from Professor WILLIAM D. LYMAN, of Walla Walla, Washington, entitled "Painted Rocks of Lake Chelan," was read by Hon. SOLOMON LINCOLN.

MR. WEEDEN called attention to the work being done by the Colonial Dames of Rhode Island, in publishing documents relating to the history of that State, and suggested that the American Antiquarian Society assist the Rhode Island Society in its work.

On motion of Mr. HOAR, seconded by Dr. HALE, the President was requested to open communication with the Canadian Society, assuring it of this Society's desire for co-operation and further acquaintance.

Dr. HALE said he had received a letter from Bermuda, which gave some curious information respecting the granddaughter of King Philip, who seems to have been born in Bermuda about the year 1720. Dr. HALE will make this the subject of a paper to be presented at another meeting.

It was voted that all the papers and communications be referred to the Committee of Publication.

At the close of the meeting the members enjoyed the hospitality of the President at his residence.

CHARLES A. CHASE,

Recording Secretary.

Copyright of Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society is the property of American Antiquarian Society and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.