

2018

Correspondence from Charlotte E. Hobbs to Fannie Hardy Eckstorm ca. 1935 and 1939

Charlotte E. Hobbs

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/eckstorm_papers



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#), [History Commons](#), and the [Linguistics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hobbs, Charlotte E., "Correspondence from Charlotte E. Hobbs to Fannie Hardy Eckstorm ca. 1935 and 1939" (2018). *Fannie Hardy Eckstorm Papers*. Submission 46.

https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/eckstorm_papers/46

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UMaine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Fannie Hardy Eckstorm Papers by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UMaine. For more information, please contact um.library.technical.services@maine.edu.

Lowell, Maine

Nov. 11, 1935

My dear Mrs. Eckstrom, -

Yesterday I was talking with Mr. Geo. Weston of Fryeburg, whose brother, Mr. Edward Weston, lives on the road from Fryeburg village to Weston's Bridge, the last house on the right before you come to the bridge. Mr. Geo. thinks that one field of his brother's farm is, by tradition, the site of the old Indian village. He also thinks that his brother knows something about the old Indian trail leading from ~~Weston's Bridge~~ the Indian village to Lowell's Pond, - that is he thinks that his brother knows where the trail was, at least in part.

I do not know that this information will be of any help to you. You may already have seen Mr. Weston, or he may not know so much as his brother thinks, or my information may come too late. But I felt that I should pass it on to you as soon as possible. There have been many interruptions to my work

on Sabattus but I am at it in earnest now and before long hope to have something to send to you for your criticism. Undoubtedly your Sabattus and the one at Nyburg were different persons, - with quite different personalities. I believe that yours was, unquestionably, with Arnold, and I am inclined to the opinion that ours was also. That is what I am now working on.

One reference - which you sent me I have been so unfortunate as to lose, - the reference for the statement about the death of the ~~the~~ Sabattus who was taken prisoner by Col. Rogers at St. Francis, - and for the statement of Mrs. Susanna Johnson that she regarded him as her brother. That is, I have the reference you gave me in a letter, from memory, to Farmer and Morse's Historical Monthly Magazine, Concord, 1822-5 but later you sent me the reference, which you had found, on a post-card, and that I was so unfortunate as to lose. You may recall just what it was; if not don't take the trouble to look it up again, as I may be in Concord working sometime, and can undoubtedly hunt it out for myself. It doesn't affect my work

on the Arnold expedition, at all, but later, if ever I should be so lucky as to find the Nathaniel Swan account of our Sabbath and he had anything on the origin of Sabbath which seemed to agree with Willey, I might then want to compare with Mrs. Susanna Johnson. However Nathaniel Swan, if ever I can find him, would be rather an indisputable evidence.

I trust you will excuse this hastily written note, The address for Mr. W - would be just
Mr. Edward Weston,
Fryeburg,
Maine.

Very sincerely yours,

Charlotte E. Hobbs.

Lowell, Maine

Apr. 2, 1939

Mrs. Fannie Hardy Eckstorm

Brewer, Maine

My dear Mrs. Eckstorm,

It seems a long time since I received those letters, which have been a great help to me, and for which I have not ceased to be grateful.

Since receiving them I have done considerable work on the Indians with Arnold, a work not yet complete in all details, since in a few years I hope to be having some time in Boston, and there are books and documents there that I would like personally to examine. I have, however, covered all the principal sources of evidence, Arnold's letters and journal, Henry's narrative, Senter's and Dearborn's journals, and others of lesser importance, and have become convinced that the names Natamis, Enneas, Aeneas, Eneas, Sabatis and Sabathis represent your Indians, two, Natamis and Sabatis, brothers, dwelling in the Dead River region at the time of Arnold's expedition, joined Arnold at Sartigan (first house in Canada) on Nov. 4, took part in the fighting before Quebec, probably served later with Andrew Gilman on the Penobscot, entered in the Revolutionary Rolls as "Penobscots" but may have been of old Norridgewock stock, (your letters make it perfectly clear that this would be possible); and two others, Sabathis* and Enneas (Aeneas, Eneas), probably Penobscots (whether of Norridgewock stock or not I find it impossible to determine), joined Arnold on or before Oct. 13 on which date they were sent with letters to Quebec, returned, probably by Nov. 1, saying that their letters had been taken from them, were present at Sartigan on Nov. 4, and remained with Arnold for some time afterward, but were never able to convince him of the truth of their story. The further identification of these two Indians, ^{I have found it} impossible to establish but it is known that at the outset of Arnold's expedition there were St.

St. Francois Indians whom Washington wished him to use in communicating with Quebec; that there were Indians coming overland whom Arnold was expecting on Sept. 29, to join him on the Kennebec, but who had not yet arrived; that there were St. Francois Indians who had visited Cambridge in August, 1775, four of whom had remained under Washington's direction; and finally that there were ^{six} Penobscot Indians serving at Cape Ann from Aug. 15 to Sept. 15, had come to Cape Ann by a ~~four~~ ^{six} days' journey, their service probably known to Washington, and this service expiring just in time to make it possible that these Indians could be sent, with or without the Cambridge Indians, to join Arnold by an overland route. Moreover two of these Indians at Cape Ann are enrolled as "Sabatis" and "Eneos", and though we have no proof that they were sent to join Arnold, at least here is an "Eneos", a Penobscot, who cannot be the Natamis known to have been at Dead River on Sept. 7 and 8. And these Indians from Cape Ann and from Cambridge entirely aside, I believe all the evidence of the letters and journals goes to show that the letter carriers of Oct. 13 were not the two brothers, Natamis and Sabatis.

As for our Tugheung Sabatis I have not yet found the Swan manuscript, but I have found another written about fifty years ago by a cousin of mine, from the oral dictation of a very old man whose grandfather lived close by Sabatis, on the bank of the Saco. This manuscript states that Sabatis was well known to the earliest settlers who came in the 1760's; ^{that he} was believed by them to be the last male Pequawket remaining when the tribe went to Canada; that he lived at Tugheung with Moll-locket, and afterwards with an earlier "wife" who returned from Canada and drove off Moll-locket; and that he and this "wife" died about 1809 and are buried near the site of their cabin, on the Saco's bank. The manuscript makes no mention of Revolutionary service. But there is evidence from another source that when the Tugheung settlers marched to the

aid of Bittel in 1781 he was their guide. I have talked again with Miss Abbott whose grandfather knew Sabatis but did not say he was with Arnold, and I have made some study of the three local histories which state that he was. These are of late date and two of the authors I have proved unreliable. The third, who is living, is quite sure he has heard the tradition but doesn't remember from whom. My conclusion is that our Sabatis cannot have been the brother of Natanis, and I am reasonably sure that he was a Pequawket instead of a Penobscot. I find no evidence of any Revolutionary service other than that of 1781. From this source the tradition may have been handed down that he was a guide during the Revolutionary war; from this it would be an easy step to the tradition that he was a guide for Arnold. With the evidence as I now have it I am forced to believe that something like this happened, - and that the statement that he was with Arnold is an error.

But I do believe that there were two Indians named Sabatis with Arnold, and as far as I have read the commentators this possibility has never been considered, but always the discussion has been whether Natanis, Aeneas, Eneas, Emnos, Sabatis and Sabatis were two Indians or three, and either way there are unexplained difficulties but with four Indians these difficulties disappear, and all the apparent inconsistencies of the diaries and letters except two, that Senter records as happening at Norridgewock on Oct. 7 an event which seems to have happened at the Great Carrying place on Oct. 13, and that Arnold heads two of his letters of Oct. 13 "Head River" whereas his exact position as shown by the diaries was the second portage of ~~the~~ ^{just mentioned.} Carrying Place. But Senter's diary was evidently not a day by day record, therefore "subject to error", and Arnold appears to have stretched the truth in sending reports to Washington so why not also in writing to Quebec?

For all this I have notes, with references, which I am now getting

into the form of a memorandum, or outline, to try out my arguments, and get my material into as condensed form as possible. It is not, I suppose, a matter of great importance, but before I could decide about our Fuyehqu Sabatis I had to try to determine what did really happen on Arnold's march, and now having put in so much time I feel inclined to finish what I have begun, as soon as the history of Lovell becomes a little less urgent. I might at least make a club paper sometime, and at Augusta they have been interested, and have offered to place on file anything I may dig up.

I do not know whether this interests you or not. If it doesn't I hope you will not hesitate to say so; if it does I shall be glad to let you know as soon as my memorandum is completed, and to send it to you, with return postage, if ever you have a bit of leisure in which to look it over. But I do not wish to take a moment of your time away from more important matters. You have my conclusions, anyway, and perhaps I have made them detailed enough so that you can, from this letter, form an opinion as to whether I am "off the track" or not. Or perhaps I am just covering ground that has already been covered.

I have read with a great deal of interest your article in the New England Quarterly on "Piquaquet and Parris Symmes", and I hope you are doing the story of the fight. Don't let me take any of your time from it even to answer this letter! I can wait.

Most sincerely, and gratefully,

Charlotte E. Hobbs

* In writing on page 1 the name of the Indian with Ennece as Sabatis, I have followed the spelling of Senter who is the only contemporary writer giving him a name. It is of course just one more spelling of Sabatis.

Lovell, Maine

Oct. 10, 1939

My dear Mrs. Ekström,

I was glad to know you enjoyed the card, and I am glad to be able to report that I accept Paugus the prisoner, Paugus, scourge of Dunstable, and Paucanaulemet who was both prisoner and scourge of Dunstable, as one and the same. With the evidence as you have given it I do not see how it could be otherwise, and the more I think over the evidence the stronger becomes my conviction. For, as I understand, there is to be found in the contemporary records no mention of any Piquackets attacking Dunstable, or of any Indian by the name of Paugus, attacking Dunstable, but only mention of Paucanaulemet, ^{and French Montezunks,} and then after Paugus' death no further mention of Paucanaulemet, but Paugus suddenly comes into the limelight as having been the scourge of Dunstable.

One thing I wondered about - the pronunciation of Paucanaulemet's name. Do you think the c was hard? If so it would have been an easy step to Paucus and then to Paugus. But anyway the difference between Paucanaulemet and Paugus doesn't trouble me for I know how people of colonial New England spelled, and the liberties they took with proper names.

Only one statement of yours I felt doubtful about accepting, and that was that Paugus and the two Indians buried with him must have been buried on the battlefield because their bodies when found were too much decomposed to be carried away. Certainly the Indians knew every foot of that ground around the pond and I do not see how they could have had great difficulty in finding all the bodies. Besides if the three bodies had fallen in deep water do you think they would have become decomposed very quickly at that season of the year? The water in our streams and ponds does not warm up so quickly as the land, and in those days when the virgin forests were all uncut

the snow and ice must have remained considerably later than at present. And then, too, Paugus' body was not so badly decomposed but that Col. Lynge's men recognized the marks upon it.

Might it not have been possible that Paugus and the two buried with him were all visiting Scaticooks, who had incited the Piquackets to go on the war-path with them (witness the raid on Scarborough) and were buried as they were because not of the Piquacket tribe? Perhaps the Piquackets felt that Paugus had brought bad luck enough upon them, as he most certainly had, if your thesis is correct, or perhaps they felt that the English might make a special search for Paugus' body, and they didn't wish to draw ~~them~~ ^{the English} to their own secret burying place, — or what I think most probable it was no easy matter to carry away all those bodies, (hardly enough living to bury the dead) and so Paugus and the other two were disposed of in the quickest and easiest manner possible. Do you think there might be anything in this idea? I know almost nothing about Indian customs but somehow I felt that the fact that Paugus' body was left where it was, might be just one more indication that he was not a Piquacket, most certainly not the Piquacket chief.

As for the Paugus-Chamberlain duel it may interest you to know that though people in this vicinity have always accepted May 8 as the ~~proper~~ ^{correct} date, and Paugus as a Piquacket chief, there has always been considerable skepticism regarding the duel. One of my father's cousins once attempted a history of Fryeburg, and my father used to have a bit of fun at his expense saying that he couldn't finish the history because he couldn't determine who killed Paugus. Also here's a newspaper clipping which must date back twenty-five years or more. I think Mr. Lewis was on the staff of some Boston newspaper (The Herald, I believe) but he was born and

brought up in Fryeburg, and his brother, Abouzo Lewis, spent about all his time studying Fryeburg history. You may enjoy looking over the clipping though I think it adds nothing to what you said except the statements regarding Elijah Russell and you may have known about his shortcomings.

^{Also} I notice Mr. Lewis interprets "the Chief Powow" to mean the chief conjurer, and I wondered if that were your interpretation or if you accept Powow as a proper name. And if a proper name where does Wahuwar come in? Some people seem to think he was the Chief but I do not know their authority. Perhaps you will be telling us all that when you write the complete story of the fight.

I was interested to learn about Scaticooks. They were Indians at Cambridge in 1775 whom I thought Washington might have sent with Arnold but the indications are that they came from New York and how New York Indians could possibly be of any help in an expedition up the Kennebec I couldn't see.

I was interested also in your account of the Indian tribes. Some writers seem to think that all ~~the~~ Maine Indians were Abenakis but from your article I understand that the Abenakis were the hunting nomads who lived too far north to get their living by agriculture. They would include, roughly, the Indians of the three large river valleys of central Maine, - the Androscoggin, Kennebec, and Penobscot, - but not the Sarrentines, who lived for a time on the Penobscot; ~~and~~ not, of course, the scattered settlements of Mohicans; and not the Sokokis (who might be of Mohican origin). The Pigwackets, as I understand were a branch of the Sokokis, though I have seen mention of them ^{if there were} as a separate tribe. The relations between the Pigwackets at Fryeburg and the Androscoggin Indians at Bethel appears to have been rather close. The trail led through Lovell, known as the Scoggin Trail, and when the trail left Lake Umbagog and struck across Sebattus Mountain there's a place known to the

early settlers - I found it in their records - as "Ambriscogen".

It seems to me there's no doubt that the word "Ambriscogen" is just one more spelling of Androscoggin. Perhaps the name Ambriscogen was like a sort of sign-post - the trail divided at this point - saying "This way to the Androscoggin River"! But I suppose there's a possibility that the Piquacket and Androscoggin Indians may have visited each other's territory and perhaps there were Androscoggin living at one time at this place.

This is a long letter with a good many questions. Don't think that all the questions must be answered. I'll just be looking out for your next article on "The Fight". But if I haven't a correct idea of Abenakis or if you have any suggestion as to the correct meaning of the word Ambriscogen I'll be very glad to know. And I would be glad to have the clipping some time though it's not really necessary that it be returned.

I did receive the material on Nataniel and Sabatis and of course should have sent you a card but waited hoping to have my outline on the Indians with Arnold completed. You may really get it some day though I no longer dare to say when. This work is difficult, I find, and some times one needs just to stop and let evidence "speak its own language".

I am sorry to have been so slow to answer your last letter. I had two workmen most of the summer, and an elderly friend of mine was trying to do a family history and I felt that I must give her what aid I could. I hope I do not again get involved in any family histories, - at least ^{not} until my other work is finished.

I see Miss Abbott occasionally and we always speak of you!

Most sincerely, and always most gratefully,
Charlotte E. Hobb