

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, &
Professional Papers

Graduate School

1915

Social, religious, and economic status of women in Colonial days as shown in the writings of that period

Sylvia M. Brady
The University of Montana

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Brady, Sylvia M., "Social, religious, and economic status of women in Colonial days as shown in the writings of that period" (1915). *Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers*. 3600. <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/3600>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

THE SOCIAL, RELIGIOUS, AND ECONOMIC STATUS OF WOMAN
IN COLONIAL DAYS
AS SHOWN IN THE WRITINGS OF THAT PERIOD

73

Submitted as a Partial Requirement
for the
Master of Arts Degree
(1915)

SYLVIA M. BRADY.

(Typed from copy of thesis in Montana State University Library)

UMI Number: EP36353

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP36353

Published by ProQuest LLC (2012). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Lib.
1-17-55

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

PRIMARY SOURCES

2449-K

- Adams, Abigail: Letters
- Adams, J. Q.: Writings
- Alsop, George: A Character of the province of Maryland
- Beverley: History and Present State of Virginia
- Bradford: History of Plymouth Plantation
- Bradstreet, Anne: (Old South Leaflets)
- Buckingham: Reminiscences
- Byrd: Westover Manuscripts
- Cable: Strange True Stories of Louisiana
- Cairns: Early American Writings
- Edwards, Jonathan: Sermons
- English Garner
- Firth: Stuart Tracts
- Fiske: Colonial Documents of New York
- Founding of Harvard College: (Old South Leaflets)
- Grant: Memoirs of an American Lady
- Hammond, John: Leah and Rachel
- Hooker: Way of the Churches of New England (Old South Leaflets)
- Jefferson: Writings (Ed. by Ford)
- Lawson: History of Carolina
- Library of Southern Literature
- Masefield: Chronicles of the Pilgrim Fathers

Narratives of Early Maryland.
New England's First Fruits, (Old South Leaflets).
Original Narratives of Early American History.
Pynchon: Diary.
Records of the Virginia Company.
Robertson: Louisiana under Spain, France, and the United States.
Sewall, Samuel: Diary.
Smyth: Writings of Benjamin Franklin.
Stith, William: History of First Settlement in Virginia.
Trent, W. P.: Pioneer Literature, Colonial Literature, and
Revolutionary Literature
Trent, W. P.: Southern Writers.
Winthrop: History of New England.
Williams: Ballads of American Revolution.
Soolman, John: Journal.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Andrews: The Colonial Period.
Allen: Woman's Part in Government.
Anthony, S. B.: Past, Present and Future Status of Woman.
Avery: History of the United States.
Beach: Daughters of the Puritans.
Beard: Readings in American Government.
Bliss: Side Lights from the Colonial Meeting-house.
Brooks: Dames and Daughters of Colonial Days.
Brown: History of Maryland.
Brown: Mercy Warren:

Bruce: Economic Forces in Virginia in the seventeenth Century.
Bruce: Institutional History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century.
Campbell: Puritans in Holland, England, and America.
Cairns: American Literature.
Coffin: Old Times in the Colonies.
Cooke: Virginia.
Crawford: Romantic Days in the Early Republic.
Drake: S. Adams: New England Legends.
Draper: American Education.
Duyckinck: Cyclopaedia of American Literature.
Earle: Child Life in Colonial Days.
Earle: Colonial Days in Old New York.
Earle: Customs and Manners of Colonial Days.
Earle: Home Life in Colonial Days.
Earle: Margaret Winthrop.
Fisher: Men, Women, & Manners in Colonial Times.
Fiske; Dutch and Quaker Colonies.
Fiske: Old Virginia and Her Neighbors.
Freeze: Historic Homes and Spots in Cambridge.
Goodwin: Dolly Madison.
Griswold: Prose Writings of America.
Hart: American Nation Series.
Holliday: Literature of Colonial Virginia.
Holliday: History of Southern Literature.
Holliday: Three Centuries of Southern Poetry.
Holliday: The Wit and Humor of Colonial Days.
Howard: History of Matrimonial Institutions.
Humphreys: Catherine Schuyler.

Johns Hopkins Studies.

Monroe: Cyclopedia of Education.

Nichol: American Literature.

Onderdonck: History of American Verse.

Otis: American Verse.

Pryor: Mother of Washington, and Her Times.

Ravenel: Eliza Pinckney.

Richardson: American Literature.

Sears: American Literature in its Colonial and National Periods.

Schrimacher: Modern Woman's Rights.

Simons: Social Forces in American History.

Stockton: Stories of New Jersey.

Stedman: American Anthology.

Stedman & Hutchinson: Library of American Literature.

Tyler: American Literature in the Colonial Period.

Uurtenbaker: Virginia Under Stuarts.

Vanderdonck: New Netherlands.

Van Rensselaer: Good Vrouw of Man-ha-ta.

Weeden: Social and Economic History of New England:

Wendell: American Literature.

Wharton: Martha Washington, (Women of Colonial Times).

Wharton: Through Colonial Doorways.

Wright: Industrial Evolution in the U. S.

In attempting to give a true picture of the condition of women in Colonial days it has been found necessary to treat the subject not as a whole, but under various divisions; viz., religion, education, the home, dress, social and marriage. Because of the difference in economic conditions, the influence of climate, soil, etc., the attitude toward religion, education, and the state, it is impossible to discuss as a whole, the position of the women in all the colonies. But the above factors developed several forms of government and types of living. Hence, the women of New England and Virginia could not be treated under one division, but must be discussed from entirely different view points. Thus, the women of New York, New England, the Middle Colonies, Virginia, and Louisiana have been considered under the four subjects noted above.

The quotations for the most part have been taken from such writings as letters, diaries, newspapers, books, essays, poems and sermons. In a few instances in discussing the laws controlling marriage, divorce, adultery, etc., the records and statutes have been consulted, but only where it was impossible to secure the desired information from any other source.

An attempt has been made in this work to present a true picture of the life of the Colonial woman. However,

it has not been the intent to portray a complete picture; certain phases have been, perhaps, unduly emphasized, while others, equally important, have been only mentioned. This is due to the difficulty in securing source material, and the nature of the discussion, since, to treat the subject in complete and finished form, would require a much longer discourse.

In this study of the Colonial woman we shall find her not unlike her sister of the present century. The same "eternal feminine" note is here, as would be found in a study of the women of any age or country. And yet, while there are many similarities, there are marked differences.

- - - -

1

For the purpose of securing the adequate view point let us recall that the colonies were planted during the seventeenth century, Georgia being the only founded in the eighteenth, in 1732. This was the century of Milton, Dryden, and Bunyan. The greater number of the colonies were established under the Stuarts. This was the century also of the Protectorate, the rise and fall of the Puritans, the Revolution of 1688 in England, the terrible Thirty Years' War in Germany, and the long reign of the "Grand Monarch" in France.

The seventeenth century was one of adventure. The discovery of the new world and the defeat of the Armada previous to this century had now made England the greatest sea

power. Tales of a wealth like that of Croesus came from the sailors who had seen the new world. The people were open-mouthed with wonder, ready to believe anything. It seemed the place that offered wealth, freedom -- both religious and political -- a home for the poor, the wretched -- in truth a place for any who longed to begin life anew. It was at such a time that the colonies were settled; the century that had seen the wonderful reign of "Good Queen Bess", was just drawing to a close. Shakespeare was at the height of his career in 1607 when Jamestown was settled, and had been dead but four years when the puritans landed at Plymouth. It was amid such influences that puritan and cavalier sought the new world, hoping to find there that which he had been unable to find in the old.

While the Cavalier colony of Jamestown was the oldest from the stand-point of years, it is with the Puritans that we shall begin this discussion. The latter exerted such a tremendous influence on American history and literature that we may expect to find the Puritan woman with considerable power. We have not time to dwell on the hardships of the voyage and the early settlement; they were beyond belief. Sickness and famine was the common happening. This was especially true of the early years of the colonies of Massachusetts and Virginia. Their sufferings were intense, as they were the pioneers; while the others suffered also, yet as the colonies in the middle and later part of the century were established, some of the rawness and newness had worn off, and if the sufferings were as

intense, the emphasis is not placed on them, as in the older colonies. Prince in his "Annals of New England" published in 1736 says of the colony at Plymouth, the following spring after the settlement records:

"March 24. N. B. This month, Thirteen of our number die. And in three months past, die Half our Company. The greatest part in the depth of winter, wanting houses and other comforts; being infected with the scurvy and other diseases, which their long voyage and unaccommodate conditions bring upon them. So as there die, sometimes, two or three a day. Of one hundred persons, scarce fifty remain. The living scarce able to bury the dead; the well not sufficient to tend the sick: there being, in their time of greatest distress, but six or seven; who spare no pains to help them. . . . But the spring advancing, it pleases GOD, the mortality begins to cease; and the sick and lame to recover: which puts new life into the people; though they had borne their sad affliction with as much patience as any could do."¹

When we read of the terrible suffering of the first two years of the Plymouth colony, we wonder that the plan was not abandoned. Bradford in his "History of Plymouth Plantation" has given a hint as to the hardships:

"But that which was most sad, and lamentable, was, that in two or three months' time half of their company died, especially in January and February, being the depth of winter . . . that of one hundred and odd persons scarce fifty remained: and of these in the time of most distress there was but six or seven sound persons; who to their great commendations, be it spoken, spared no pains, night nor day, but with abundance of toil and hazard of their own health, fetched them wood, made them fires, . . . in a word did all the homely, and necessary offices for them."²

The same condition was true at Massachusetts Bay as at Plymouth. Johnson writes in 1631 the next year after the colony had been founded:

"The women once a day, as the tide gave way, resorted to the mussels, and clambanks, which are a fish as big as horse-

¹ English Garner, Vol II, P. 429.
²

mussels, where they daily gathered their families' food with much heavenly discourse of the provisions Christ had formerly made for many thousands of his followers in the wilderness. Quoth one, 'My husband hath travelled as far as Plymouth (which is near forty miles), and hath with great toil brought a little corn home with him, and before that is spent the Lord will assuredly provide.' Quoth the other, 'Our last peck of meal is now in the oven at home a-baking, and many of our godly neighbors have quite spent all, and we owe one loaf of that little we have.' Then spake a third, 'My husband hath ventured himself among the Indians for corn, and can get none, as also our honored Governor hath distributed his so far, that a day or two more will put an end to his store, and all the rest, and yet me thinks our children are as cheerful, fat and lusty with feeding upon these mussels, clam-banks, and other fish, as they were in England with their fill of bread, which makes me cheerful in the Lord's providing for us, being further confirmed by the exhortation of our pastor to trust the Lord with providing for us; whose is the earth and the fulness thereof.'¹

We are pleased to note the comment of the author that such faith was realized, for he adds, "And as they were encouraging one another in Christ's careful providing for them, they lift up their eyes and saw two ships coming in, and presently this news came to their ears, that they were come -- full of victuals After this manner did Christ many times graciously provide for this His people, even at the last cast."²

When we remember that many of these men and women, especially those of Massachusetts Bay colony, were accustomed to the comfortable living of the country people of England, with many luxuries, plenty of material wealth, the contrast in the new world, appears more marked. And certainly the splendid courage of those women, deserves our admiration; those women, reared in plenty, who gave up their comfortable homes in England for the hardships and deprivations of the new land. Johnson tells us the method of establishing new towns. In connection with the building of Concord, Mass., he writes: "After they had thus found out a place of abode they burrow themselves in the earth for their first shelter, under some hillside, casting the earth aloft upon timber; they make a smoky fire against the earth at the highest side and thus these poor servants of Christ provide

¹Wonder-working Providence of Zion's Saviour in N. Eng.,
Trent, Col. Lit., p. 9.

²Ibid.

shelter for themselves, their wives and little ones, keeping off the short showers from their lodgings, but the long rains penetrate through to their great disturbance in the night season. Yet in these poor wigwams they sing psalms, pray and praise their God till they can provide them houses, which ordinarily was not wont to be with many till the earth by the Lord's blessing brought forth bread to feed them, their wives and little ones.... Thus this poor people populate this howling desert, marching men fully on, the Lord assisting, through the greatest difficulties and sorest labors that ever any with such weak means have done."¹

Many quotations could be cited which repeat and intensify those given above. Reading these, after the passing of two and a half centuries, we wonder how the hardships were endured. These seem to us insurmountable, but these were not all the trials of the Puritan woman. To understand in any measure at all, her life, with its terrible burdens and sufferings, we must know something of her religion. Paradoxical, as it may seem, it was both a curse and a blessing; it was as rigid and as unbending as steel. We shudder when we read the sermons of Cotton Mather and Jonathan Edwards, and well we may, for to shudder after the lapse of these hundreds of years, what must it have been to have lived under such conditions: Theirs was a religion based on Judaism and the Mosaic code, "An eye for an eye." Tyler says, "They did not attempt to combine the sacred and the secular; they simply abolished the secular, and left only the sacred. The state became the church; the King a priest; politics, a department of theology; citizenship, the privilege of those only who had received baptism and the Lord's Supper."²

A poem entitled "The Day of Doom" by a New England divine, Wigglesworth by name, published in the latter part of the seventeenth century, describes fully the theology of the Puritans. And when we learn that this was not only very popular, being read by old and young, but had received the sanction of the elders, we

¹ "Wonder-working Providence", Trent: Col. Ed., p. 111.

² Tyler: History of American Literature, p. 101.

know the doctrines given in the poem must have been orthodox. The Puritan believed man to be weak and sinful, a prisoner whom God had placed here in the world, surrounding him with temptation. However He is good in that He has given him an opportunity to overcome the evil.

"But I'm a prisoner,
Under a heavy chain;
Almighty God's afflicting hand,
Doth me by force restrain.

.....

"But why should I complain
That have so good a God,
That doth mine heart with comfort fill.
Ev'n whilst I feel his rod?

.....

"Let God be magnified,
Whose everlasting strength
Upholds me under sufferings
of more than ten years' length;"

This poem is a picture of the author's conception of the Judgment Day, and surely whatever faults are here, it is at least realistic.

One of the most terrible doctrines of the Puritan teaching was the inherent belief in the eternal punishment of infants who died unbaptized. Such a belief as this touched very closely the life of the women. In this poem the writer describes for us, what he conceives will be the scene on that final day when young and old, heathen and Christian are called before the Creator to answer for his conduct while on earth. He gives us the plea of the infants, who dying at birth, before baptism could be administered, ask to be excused from punishment, as they are not

Trent: Colonial Literature, v. 118.

guilty of sin.

"If for our own transgression,
or obedience,
We here did stand at thy left hand,
just were the Recompense:
But Adam's guilt our souls hath spilt,
his fault is charg'd upon us:
And that alone hath overthrown and
utterly undone us."²

Saying that it was Adam who ate of the tree, that they
were innocent, they ask?

"O great Creator, why was our nature
depraved and forlorn?
Why so defil'd, and made so vil'd,
whilest we were yet unborn?
If it be just, and needs we must
transgressors reckon'd be,
Thy mercy, Lord, to us afford,
which sinners hath set free."²

The Creator answers: (*italics mine*)

"Then answered the Judge most dread:
*'God doth such doom forbid,
That men should die eternally
for what they never did.
But what you call old Adam's fall,
and only his trespass,
You call amiss to call it his,
both his and yours it was.'*"³

The Judge then says they would have received the pleasures and
joys that Adam could have given them, the rewards and blessings,
why should they hesitate to share his "treason."

"Since then to share in his welfare,
you could have been content,
You may with reason share in his treason,
and in the punishment,
Hence you were born in state forlorn,
with natures so depraved
Death was your due because that you
had thus yourselves behaved."

.....

"Had you been made in Adam's stead,
you would like things have wrought,
And so into the self-same woe
yourselves and yours have brought."⁴

1-4 Library of Am. Lit. Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. II, p. 9.

Then follows a reprimand upon the part of the Judge that they should presume to question His judgments, and to ask for mercy:

"Will you demand grace at my hand,
and challenge what is mine?
Will you teach me whom to set free,
and thus my grace confine.

"You sinners are, and such a share
as sinners may expect;
Such you shall have, for I do save
None but mine own Elect.
Yet to compare your sin with theirs
who liv'd a longer time,
I do confess yours is much less
though every sin's a crime.

"A crime it is, therefore in bliss
you may not hope to dwell; (hardly!)
But unto you I shall allow
the easiest room in Hell."¹

Can we conceive the anguish of the Puritan mother, living, believing such untruths as this? How much she suffered during the days of anxious waiting we shall never know. But the suspense between the birth and baptism can at least be imagined. Knowing this, it does not seem strange, that the infant was baptized a few days after birth. Judge Sewall, whose diary covers approximately the years from 1686 to 1725, and who records everything of interest from the cutting of his finger to the blowing off of the Governor's hat, has kindly left the record of the baptism of his fourteen children.

"April 8, 1677. Elizabeth Weeden, The Midwife, brought the infant to the third Church when Sermon was about half done in the afternoon. . . . I named him John."² (Five days after birth)

"Sabbath-day, December 13th, 1685. Mr. Willard baptizeth my Son lately born, (four days old) whom I named Henry."³

"February 6, 1686/7. Between 3 and 4 P. M. Mr. Willard baptiseth my Son, whom I named Stephen."⁴

¹ Library of Am. Lit. Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. II, p. 12.

² Mass. Historical Society, Sewall's Diary, Vol I, p. 40.

³⁻⁴ Ibid, p. 11, 167

Since the infant was baptized in the church, and they had no heat, it is little wonder infant mortality was high, especially when the baptismal service took place on a day as cold as this record of Sewall's.

"Sabbath, Janr. 24. . . . This day so cold that the Sacramental Bread is frozen pretty hard, and rattles sadly as broken into the plates."¹

We may know the water in the font was frozen. Small wonder the baby shrinking as the ice water touched his head, gave up the struggle for existence, upon his reception into so cold and forbidding a world. This also from the kindly old judge certainly presents a graphic picture:

"Lord's Day, Jan. 15, 1715-6. An extraordinary Cold Storm of Wind and Snow. . . Bread was frozen at the Lord's Table: Though 'twas so Cold, yet John Tuckerman was baptised. (Poor little John, who was not over five days old). At six a-clock my ink freezes so that I can hardly write ^{by} a good fire in my Wive's Chamber. Yet was very Comfortable at Meeting. Laus Deo."²

However, let us note further this theology under which the Puritan woman lived. The God pictured in the "Day of Doom" was not only cruel and of an angry nature, but revengeful. His wrath fell on sinner and saint. We may well ask, what manner of God was this, or perhaps by what strange mental process could anyone believe this. We can imagine a different existence after death, but regardless of doctrine, creed, or theology, we cannot disassociate this present mental condition from that future state. Our conception of an eternity after this world, is where we, at least, will have the same intelligible mind, and the same ability to understand, perceive, love, and recognize and be with the loved ones. But evidently the Puritan had no trouble in making himself

¹Sewall's Diary, Vol. I, p. 116.

²Ibid, Vol. III, p. 71.

believe the following to be true:

"He that was erst a husband pierc'd
with sense of wife's distress,
Whose tender heart did bear a part
of all her grievances.
Shall mourn no more as heretofore,
because of her ill plight,
Although he see her now to be
a damn'd forsaken wight.

"The tender mother will own no other
of all her num'rous brood
But such as stand at Christ's right hand,
acquitted through his Blood.
The pious father had now much rather
his graceless son should lie
In hell with devils, for all his evils,
burning eternally.¹

However, while Mr. Wigglesworth in his poem has presented a realistic conception of the God of the Puritans, it is in the sermons that we find the harshness, the inflexibility of this Being. In the poem, the wrath of God seems to us rather painful, yet in the thunderings of Cotton Mather and Jonathan Edwards, we can fairly smell the brimstone. Note this from the sermon of Jonathan Edwards on "The Eternity of Hell Torments:"

"Do but consider what it is to suffer extreme torment forever and ever; to suffer it day and night, from one day to another, from one year to another, from one age to another, from one thousand ages to another, and so, adding age to age, and thousands to thousands, in pain, in wailing and lamenting, groaning and shrieking, and gnashing your teeth; with your souls full of dreadful grief and amazement, with your bodies and every member full of racking torture, without any possibility of getting ease; without any possibility of moving God to pity by your cries; without any possibility of hiding yourselves from him. . . . How dismal will it be, when you are under these racking torments, to know assuredly that you never, never shall be delivered from them; to have no hope; when you shall wish that you might but be turned into nothing, but shall have no hope of it; when you shall wish that you might be turned into a toad or a serpent, but shall have no hope of it; when you would rejoice, if you might but have any relief, after you shall have endured these torments millions of ages, but shall have no hope of it; when after you shall have worn out the age of the sun, moon, and stars, in your dolorous groans and lamentations, without any rest day or night, when after

¹Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. II, p. 12-13.

you shall have worn out a thousand more such ages, yet you shall have no hope, but shall know that you are not one whit nearer to the end of your torments; but that still there are the same groans the same shrieks, the same doleful cries, incessantly to be made by you, and that the smoke of your torment shall still ascend up, forever and ever; and that your souls, which shall have been agitated with the wrath of God all this while, yet will still exist to bear more wrath; your bodies, which shall have been burning and roasting all this while in these glowing flames, yet shall not have been consumed, but will remain to roast through an eternity yet, which will not have been at all shortened by what shall have been past."¹

While the above could scarcely be termed scientific, yet it is surely realistic, and no doubt produced the desired effect, and brought the penitent sinner to church, to listen to more along the same line, and thus escape such horrors. But not only did this God of the Puritans condemn sinners to eternal fire and torment, but He enjoyed the tortures of the damned, and gloated in fiendish joy over the punishment of the wicked. The following from Edwards Sermon "Sinners in The Hands of An Angry God", shows this; and also the goodness of God in saving man from the pit;

"The God that holds you over the pit of hell, much as one holds a spider, or some loathsome insect, over the fire, abhors you and is dreadfully provoked; his wrath towards you burns like fire; he looks upon you as worthy of nothing else but to be cast into the fire; he is of purer eyes than to bear to have you in his sight; you are ten thousand times so abominable in his eyes, as the most hateful and venomous serpent is in ours. You have offended him infinitely more than ever a stubborn rebel did his prince; and yet it is nothing but his hand that holds you from falling into the fire every moment; it is ascribed to nothing else that you did not go to hell the last night; that you was suffered to awake again in this world, after you closed your eyes to sleep; and there is no other reason to be given why you have not dropped into hell since you arose in the morning, but that God's hand has held you up; there is no other reason to be given why you have not gone to hell, since you have sat here in the house of God, provoking his pure eyes by your sinful wicked manner of attending his solemn worship: yea, there is nothing else that is to be given as a reason why you do not this very moment drop down into hell."²

No doubt at this point, the miserable sinner looked

¹ Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. II, p. 392.

² Ibid, p. 384.

suddenly at the floor, expecting to see the pit yawning. Is it any wonder that the Puritans believed man to be vile, a loathsome creature, whose only hope of escaping eternal damnation was because this wrathful, tyrannical, merciless God had elected a few to be saved. Their religion was founded on the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination; but just why this Creator was also disposed to save a selected few they never explained.

During the early days of the colony all were expected to go to church, and if a man failed in this he was not allowed to give testimony in Court. But no doubt most of them did attend the service, where the pastor attempted to frighten them into being good. The quotation given on page 12 on the length of the torment, would have the desired effect, no doubt, should one have erred in his church attendance. This would shake the strongest nerves. Then also the sainted few who had escaped the sulphurous pit would sit enthroned rejoicing at the tortures of their fellowmen -- possibly neighbors and friends. The following quotation is taken from another sermon of Jonathan Edwards, "Why Saints in Glory will Rejoice to see the Torments of the Damned:"

"They will rejoice in seeing the justice of God glorified in the sufferings of the damned. The misery of the damned, dreadful as it is, is but what justice requires. They in heaven will see and know it much more clearly than any of us do here. They will see how perfectly just and righteous their punishment is, and therefore how properly inflicted by the supreme Governor of the world. . . . They will rejoice when they see him who is their Father and eternal portion so glorious in his justice. The sight of this strict and immutable justice of God will render him amiable and adorable, in their eyes. It will occasion rejoicing in them, as they will have the greater sense of Their Own happiness, by seeing the contrary misery. It is the nature of pleasure and pain, of happiness and misery, greatly to heighten the sense of each other. . . . When they shall see how miserable others of their fellow-creatures are, who were naturally in the same circumstances

with themselves; when they shall see the smoke of their torment, and the raging of the flames of their burning, and hear their dolorous shrieks and cries, and consider that they in the meantime are in the most blissful state, and shall surely be in it to all eternity; how will they rejoice! . . . When they shall see the dreadful miseries of the damned, and consider that they deserved the same misery, and that it was sovereign grace, and nothing else, which made them so much to differ from the damned, that if it had not been for that, they would have been in the same condition; but that God from all eternity was pleased to set his love upon them, that Christ hath laid down his life for them, and hath made them thus gloriously happy forever, O how will they admire that dying love of Christ, which has redeemed them from so great a misery, and purchased for them so great happiness, and has so distinguished them from others of their fellow-creatures..! ¹

We have only pity and sympathy for the people who believed this, and for a system of theology that made such teaching possible. And when we learn that Jonathan Edwards was a man of singular gentleness of spirit, we know it must have tortured him to preach such sermons, and yet he believed it his duty.

But the religion of the Puritan woman went further than this. It taught the belief in a personal devil. Satan was a real individual with the forked tail and horns; not a mythical weakling such as twentieth century scepticism and science has pictured him. We have as authority for this the statement of Cotton Mather, one of the most eminent divines of New England, who states in his book "Memorable Providences";

There is both a God and a Devil, and Witchcraft: That, There is no out-ward Affliction, but what God may (and sometimes doth) permit Satan to trouble his people withal: That, the Malice of Satan and his instruments, is very great against the Children of God: That, the clearest Gospel-Light shining in a place, will not keep some from entering hellish Contracts with infernal spirits: That, Prayer is a powerful and effectual Remedy against the malicious practises of Devils and those in Covenant with them: . . ."²

¹Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. II, p. 396.

²Original Narratives of Early Am. Histo., Narratives of the Witchcraft Cases, p. 96-97.

Thus not only did God allow Satan to afflict mankind, but Satan had legions of followers, equally insistent on tormenting humanity. In "The Wonders of the Invisible World", published in 1692, Mather proves there is a devil, and also defines this being.

"A devil is a fallen angel, an angel fallen from the fear and love of God, and from all celestial glories; but fallen to all manner of wretchedness and cursedness." We have a definition of the monster, in Eph. vi, 12."¹

Not only is there one devil, but many devils plotting to destroy the church and even the religion of the Puritan as well. "There are multitudes, in the valley of destruction, where the devils are! When we speak of the devil, 'tis a name of multitude: . . . The Devils they swarm about us, like the frogs of Egypt, in the most retired of our chambers. Are we at our boards? There will be devils to tempt us into sensuality. Are we in our beds? There will be devils to tempt us into carnality. Are we in our shops? There will be devils to tempt us into dishonesty. Yea, though we get into the church of God, there will be devils to haunt us in the very temple itself, and there tempt us to manifold misbehaviors. I am verily perswaded that there are very few human affairs whereinto some devils are not insinuated. There is not so much as a journey intended, but Satan will have an hand in hindering or furthering of it."

Further the same author tells us, "'tis to be supposed, that there is a sort of arbitrary, even military government, among the devils. . . These devils have a prince over them, who is King over the children of pride. 'Tis probable that the devil, who was the ringleader of that mutinous and rebellious crew which first shook off the authority of God, is now the general of those hellish armies; our Lord that conquered him has told us the name of him: 'tis Belzebub: 'tis he that is the devil and the rest are his angels, or his soldiers. . . 'Tis to be supposed that some devils are more peculiarly commission'd, and perhaps qualify'd, for some countries, while others are for others. . . . It is not likely that every devil does know every language; or that every devil can do every mischief. 'Tis possible that the experience, or, if I may call it so, the education of all devils is not alike, and that there may be some difference in their abilities. . ."²

It seems impossible for us to conceive of any sane individual believing such a teaching; but let us remember this was a credulous age. Science had not come into its own as it has in the twentieth century. All the people in the world believed in

¹Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. II, p. 117,

²Ibid, p. 118.

evil spirits and witches. So the Puritan in this respect differed not from his fellowmen. Viewed in its larger aspect, theirs was an objective, not a subjective religion. It made them morbid, introspective. They had little time or thought for the beauties of this world; indeed the emphasis of their thinking must be on the world after. They must not allow themselves to become too deeply attached to anything temporal. It was a device of the devil and God would take it from them, whether through anger, or jealousy or through kindness He removed the temptation was not explained. Winthrop gives an example of the loss of the coveted article.

"A godly woman of the church of Boston, dwelling sometimes in London, brought with her a parcel of very fine linen of great value, which she set her heart too much upon, and had been at charge to have it all newly washed, and curiously folded and pressed, and so left it in press in her parlor over night". He then describes how the servant, carelessly set it afire, and all was burned.

"But it pleased God that the loss of this linen did her much good, both in taking off her heart from worldly comforts, and in preparing her for a far greater affliction by the untimely death of her husband. . ."¹

Another teaching of this religion which must have indeed grieved the women was the constant admonition of the pastor that they must exercise constant care in loving their children, for if they loved them too much God would take them from them. Again, we find Winthrop making these comments.

"God will be sanctified in them that come near him. Two others were the children of one of the Church of Boston. While their parents were at the lecture, the boy (being about seven years of age), having a small staff in his hand, ran down upon the ice towards a boat he saw, and the ice breaking, he fell in, but his staff kept him up, till his sister, about fourteen years old, ran down to save her brother (though there were four men at hand, and called to her not to go, being themselves hasting to save him) and so drowned herself and him also, being past recovery ere the

¹Winthrop: History of N. Eng., Vol. II, P. 36.

men could come at them, and could easily reach ground with their feet. The parents had no more sons, and confessed they had been too indulgent towards him, and had set their hearts overmuch upon him."¹

This God of the puritans was also a jealous God, and sometimes punished the parent for his sin, through the loss of the child. So this statement from Winthrop reads:

"This puts me in mind of another child very strangely drowned a little before winter. The parents were also members of the church of Boston. The father had undertaken to maintain the mill-dam, and being at work upon it (with some help he had hired), in the afternoon of the last day of the week, night came upon them before they had finished what they intended, and his conscience began to put him in mind of the Lord's day, and he was troubled, yet went on and wrought an hour within night. The next day, after evening exercise, and after they had supped, the mother put two children to bed in the room where themselves did lie; and they went out to visit a neighbor. When they returned, they continued about an hour in the room, and missed not the child, but then the mother going to the bed, and not finding her youngest child (a daughter about five years of age), after much search she found it drowned in a well in her cellar; which was very observable, as by a special hand of God, that the child should go out of that room into another in the dark, and then fall down at a trap-door, or go down the stairs, and so into the well in the farther end of the cellar, the top of the well and the water being even with the ground. But the father, freely in the open congregation, did acknowledge it the righteous hand of God for his profaning his holy day against the checks of his own conscience."²

However, one does not need to inquire into the teachings of the Puritans to find a belief in such a doctrine. One might possibly find some people of this century, who accept such a faith as this. Under such a teaching as this the people attempted to find an explanation for all events, and that explanation touched always the religious; they did not seek natural causes. Their morbid, sensitive, super-conscious natures imagined far-fetched hypothesis; God was in everything. Apparently all the Creator had to do was to watch the Puritans. The following is again from

¹Winthrop: History of N. Eng., Vol. II, p. 411, 1648.

²Ibid.

winthrop:

"1648. The synod met at Cambridge. Mr. Allen preached. It fell out, about the midst of his sermon, there came a snake into the seat where many elders sat behind the preacher. Divers elders shifted from it, but Mr. Thomson, one of the elders of Braintree, (a man of much faith) trode upon the head of it, until it was killed. This being so remarkable, and nothing falling out but by divine providence, it is out of doubt, the Lord discovered somewhat of his mind in it. The serpent is the devil; the synod, the representative of the churches of Christ in New England. The devil had formerly and lately attempted their disturbance and dissolution; but their faith in the seed of the woman overcame him and crushed his head."¹

The following also is explained by fixing the responsibility on God:

"June, July and August, (1633). It pleases GOD to visit us (at Plymouth) with an infectious fever; of which many fell very sick, and upwards of twenty die; men and women, besides children. . . . For towards winter, it pleased the LORD the sickness ceased. . . ."²

Other illustrations could be cited, but are not needed to convince the reader that a people who could believe this could believe anything. And they did believe God was revengeful, until many curious tales were told, and apparently there was no occasion to doubt them among the puritans. The following quotation, from "An Essay For the Recording of Illustrious Providences", shows to what lengths a belief such as this could be believed:

"The hand of God was very remarkable in that which came to pass in the Narragansett country in New England, not many weeks since; for I have good information, that on August 28, 1683, a man there (viz. Samuel Wilson) having caused his dog to mischief his neighbor's cattle was blamed for his so doing. He denied the fact with imprecations, wishing that he might never stir from that place if he had so done. His neighbor being troubled at his denying the truth, reproved him, and told him he did very ill to deny what his conscience knew to be truth. The atheist thereupon used the name of God in his imprecations, saying, "He wished to God he might never stir out of that place, if he had

¹ Sear: American Literature, p. 38.

² Prince; Annals of N. Eng., English Garner, Vol. II, p. 655.

done that which he was charged with.' The words were scarce out of his mouth before he sunk down dead, and never stirred more; a son-in-law of his standing by and catching him as he fell to the ground."¹

This strange account is also given, from the same source:

A thing not unlike this (the above) happened (though not in New England yet) in America, about a year ago; for in September, 1682, a man at the Isle of Providence, belonging to a vessel, whereof one Wollery was master, being charged with some deceit in a matter that had been committed to him, in order to his own vindication, horridly wished 'that the devil might put out his eyes if he had done as was suspected concerning him.' That very night a rheum fell into his eyes so that within a few days he became stark blind. His company being astonished at the Divine hand which thus conspicuously and signally appeared, put him ashore at Providence, and left him there. A physician being desired to undertake his cure, hearing how he came to lose his sight, refused to meddle with him. This account I lately received from credible persons, who knew and have often seen the man whom the devil (according to his own wicked wish) made blind, through the dreadful and righteous judgment of God."²

Especially did such a teaching as this leave its impress on the sensitive and over-nervous wrought women, and more so upon the children. Timid, little girls, taught such things as children, lived in constant fear, and grew into shrinking, nervous women, who in time, communicated their fears to their children. Timid, Betty Sewall, was troubled all the years of her life by this religion. Her father notes, when she was about five years of age:

"It falls to my daughter Elizabeth's Share to read the 24 of Isaiah which she doth with many Tears not being very well, and the Contents of the Chapter and Symoathy with her draw Tears from me also!"¹

"The terrible verses telling of God's judgment on the land, of fear, of the pit, of the snare, of emptiness and Waste, of destruction and desolation, must have sunk deep into the heart of the sick child, and produced the condition shown by this entry

¹Trent, Colonial Literature, p. 218.

²Ibid.

when she was a few years older:

'When I came in, past 7 at night, my wife met me in the Entry and told me Betty had surprised them. I was surprised with the Abruptness of the Relation. It seems Betty Sewall had given some signs of dejection and sorrow; but a little while after dinner she burst into an amazing cry which caus'd all the family to cry too. Her Mother ask'd the Reason, she gave none; at last said she was afraid she should go to Hell, her Sins were not pardon'd. She was first wounded by my reading a Sermon of Mr. Norton's; Text, Ye shall seek me and shall not find me. And these words in the Sermon, Ye shall seek me and die in your Sins, ran in her Mind and terrified her greatly. And staying at home, she read out of Mr. Cotton Mather -- Why hath Satan filled thy Heart? Which increas'd her Fear. Her Mother asked her whether she pray'd. She answered Yes, but fear'd her prayers were not heard, because her sins were not pardoned.'¹

We shall note later, more of Betty's troubles. Poor, timid, child, her father who had led her into the difficulty by holding before her sinful condition, could offer no help, and even her mother whose life had been gloomy indeed under the shadow of this religion, was not able to give comfort. Surely, this teaching made the lives of the women unhappy, and especially such a nervous, shrinking woman as Betty Sewall. As Mrs. Merle says of her:

"A frightened child, a retiring girl, a vacillating sweetheart, an unwilling bride, she became the mother of eight children; but always suffered from morbid introspection, and overwhelming fear of death and the future life, until at the age of thirty-five her father sadly wrote, 'God has delivered her now from all her fears.'²

Truly, the life the little girls of the Puritans were shadowed from earliest infancy by such a religion. It cast its sinister shadow on them from the cradle through all the life until death. Cotton Mather records this in his diary, when his little daughter was but four years old:

"I took my little daughter Katy into my Study and then I

¹Earle: Child Life in Colonial Days, p. 238.

²Ibid: p. 237.

told my child I am to dye shortly and she must, when I am Dead, remember everything I now said unto her. I set before her the sinful Condition of her Nature, and I charged her to pray in Secret Places every Day. That God for the sake of Jesus Christ would give her a New Heart. I gave her to understand that when I am taken from her she must look to meet with more humbling afflictions than she does now she has a tender Father to provide for her."¹

What infinite pity we have for those stern men and women, who, faithful to what they thought their duty missed so much of the sweetness and joy of life; and how sorrowful we are for the children whose lives should have been full of love and play, and light, and whose thoughts should have been far from death, hell and eternal damnation. And with what irony we read the above, and recall that Cotton Mather survived by thirty years, this little child "that he loved yet blighted with the chill and dread of death."²

Such a religion seems indeed dreadful when we think of men and women living according to its teachings, but surely more so when little children felt its gloom and darkness. And truly it led the good elders into many, not only painful experiences, but absurd as well. But the last straw seems added when we

note "one child two years old was able 'savouringly to understand the mysteries of Redemption'; another of the same age was 'a dear lover of faithful ministers'. . . . Anne Greenwich, who died when five years old, 'discoursed most astonishingly of great mysteries'; Daniel Bradley, who had an 'Impression and Inquisitiveness of the State of Souls after Death,' when three years old; Elizabeth Butcher, who, 'when two and a half years old, as she lay in the Cradle would ask her self the Question What is my Corrupt Nature? and would answer herself it is empty of Grace, bent unto Sin, and only to Sin, and that Continually,' were among the distressing examples".³

¹Earle: Child Life in Colonial Days, p. 236.

²⁻³, Ibid: p. 237, 251.

Possibly, the Puritan woman received one blessing at least from this stern teaching, and that because Sunday, or the Puritan Sabbath was strictly observed. There was no visiting, picnicing, and jolly good times, as at present. Thus, she was spared the task of doing the greatest day's work in the week, cooking and entertaining. But to us, the alternative would seem worse than the visiting -- attendance at church during the greater part of the day. The Sabbath was indeed a day for religious worship. No one must leave the town, likewise no one must come to the town on this day. Mrs. Earle writing of Sunday in the colonies, says "Citizens were forbidden to fish, shoot, sail, row, dance, jump, or ride, save to and from church, or to perform any work on the farm. . . . The use of tobacco was forbidden near the meeting house. These laws were held to extend from sunset on Saturday to sunsent on Sunday; for in the first instructions given to Governor Endicott by the company in England, it was ordered that all in the colony cease work at three o'clock in the afternoon on Saturday...."

"A Sabbath day in the family of Rev. John Cotton was this described by one of his fellow-ministers:

"He began the Sabbath at evening, therefore then performed family duty after supper, being longer than ordinary in exposition. After which he catechized his children and servants, and then returned to his study. The morning following, family worship being ended, he retired into his study until the bell called him away. Upon his return from meeting (where he had preached and prayed some hours), he returned again into his study (the place of his labor and prayer), unto his favorite devotion; where having a small repast carried him up for his dinner, he continued until the tolling of the bell. The public service of the afternoon being over, he withdrew for a space to his pre-mentioned oratory for his sacred addresses to God, as in the forenoon, then came down, repeated the sermon in the family, prayed, after supper sang a Psalm, and toward bedtime betaking himself again to his study he closed the day with prayer."¹

There was no opportunity to enjoy the forests, or the great out-of-doors. Perhaps, though the early colonists did not feel the need of a return to nature every first day of the week, such as the men and women who lead the strenuous life in

¹Earle: Home Life in Colonial Days, p. 379.

the twentieth century.

To us it seems the Puritan woman must have lived indeed a gloomy life. Trained to believe implicitly in the teaching of the church and the power of the clergy, unable to show the extent of her love for her family, with her thoughts fixed on heaven, having been taught she was the weaker vessel, surely her life was narrow. Anything beautiful was the work of Satan, hence the innate love of beauty she must suppress; likewise her emotions must be repressed. This religion even regulated her dress; it must be of the plainest, else Satan was tempting her.

"There were orders of the General Court forbidding 'short sleeves whereby the nakedness of the arms may be discovered'. Women's sleeves were not to be more than half an ell wide. There were to be no 'immoderate great sleeves, immoderate . . . knots of ribbon, broad shoulder bands and ruffles, silk ruses, double ruffles and cuffs.' The women were complained of because of their 'wearing borders of hair and their cutting, curling, and immodest laying out of their hair'".¹

The church interfered in every trivial affair. The Elders weighed the pros and cons of every question connected with the church as though it was vital to their happiness. As Fisher says:

"At every opportunity there raises some question of religion and discussed it threadbare, and the more fine-spun and subtle it was the more it delighted them. Governor Winthrop's Journal is full of such questions as whether there could be an indwelling of the Holy Ghost in a believer without a personal union; whether it was lawful even to associate or have dealings with idolaters like the French; whether women should wear veils. On the question of veils, Roger Williams was in favor of them; but John Cotton one morning argues so powerfully on the other side that in the afternoon the women all came to church without them."²

Note the troubles of John Cotton in the following:

. . . "The second scruple about Singers is 'Whether women may sing as well as men.'" After a long discussion he finally

¹Fisher: Men, Women & Manners in Colonial Times, p. 185.

²Ibid. p. 137.

decides that the Lord allowed the women to go with the men, 'so here, some that were altogether against singing of Psalms at all with a lively voice. yet being convinced that it is a moral worship of God warranted in Scripture, then if there must be a Singing one alone must sing, not all (or if all) the Men only and not the Women . . . Some object, 'Because it is not permitted to a woman to speak in the church (I. Cor. 13, 34) How then shall they sing? . . . A woman is not permitted to speak in the Church in two cases: 1. By way of teaching. . . For this the Apostle accounteth an act of authority which is unlawful for a woman to usurp over the man, II, Tim. 2, 13. And besides the woman is more subject to error than a man. ver. 14, and therefore might soon prove a seducer if she became a teacher.

"It is not permitted to a woman to speak in the Church by way of prebouncing questions though under pretence of desire to learn for her own satisfaction; but rather it is required she should ask her husband at home."¹

And so on for several pages, this good, old Puritan older and pastor, argues the matter, quoting scripture, and giving the matter his most careful consideration. To these good men this was a far more weighty question than the cause of poverty, or the reasons for the high mortality especially among women and children. Noting as Earle says: "the mortality among infants was appalling great; they died singly, and in little groups, and in vast companies. Putrid fevers, epidemic influenzas, malignant sore throats, . . . raging small pox, carried off hundreds of the children who survived baptism,"²

It would seem that such an important a matter as this might have claimed some of their attention. But let us not judge them too harshly. Remembering that freedom of thought and conscience has been given more liberty because of science during the nineteenth century than all the previous span of history it is utterly impossible for us of the twentieth to see the view point of the Puritan. However, since the women of the New England colonies knew no other condition, possible she thought herself not so unhappy. Troubles and trials always seem worse to

¹Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. I. p. 265.

²Earle: Child Life in Colonial Days, p. 4.

the onlooker than to the one who must endure them. And yet the other colonists of the time evidently thought them severe. Byrd, in his "History of The Dividing Line, Run in the Year 1728", has many comments on not only his southern neighbours, but also those of the northern colonists. However, in quoting Byrd, we must bear in mind, that his vein of humor is often exaggerated, and, therefore he is not as dependable as we would wish. He makes this comment:

"Nor would I care, like a certain New England Magistrate, to order a Man to the Whipping Post, for daring to ride for a midwife on the Lord's Day."¹ And yet this same author, evidently realizes the moral worth of the Puritans, though glad he does not live under their rigid theology.

"Tho' these people may be ridiculed for some Pharisaical Particularities in their Worship and Behaviour, yet they were very useful Subjects, as being Frugal and Industrious, giving no Scandal or bad Example, at least by any Open and Public Vices. By which excellent Qualities they had much the advantage of the Southern Colony, who though their being members of the Establish't Church sufficient to Sanctifie very loose and Profligate Morals. For this reason New England improved much faster than Virginia, and in seven or eight years New Plymouth, like Switzerland, seemed too narrow a territory for its inhabitants."²

Is it to be wondered, that living under such repression, amid incredible hardships, as we shall note later that there were cases of insanity, strange and unaccountable happenings in which the women were concerned, and which troubled exceedingly the good fathers? They deemed it the wiles of the devil; but we know aside from the incidents cited, there must have been many, many women, whose minds were unbalanced, and who, unable to endure the monotony and dreariness of life, because of the harshness and

¹Byrd: Writings of Co. W. Byrd., Bassett, p. 25.

²Ibid: p. 11

ungentleness, needed the skilled care of physicians, rather than the petty rule of the elders and the tragical farce of a church trial. One or two of these incidents given by Winthrop is sufficient to make us realize the tragedy of such a religion.

"A cooper's wife of Hingham, having been long in a sad melancholic distemper near to phrensy, and having formerly attempted to drown her child, but prevented by God's gracious providence, did now again take an opportunity. . . .And threw it into the water and mud. . . .But the tide being low, the little child scrambled out. . . .She carried the child again, and threw it in so far as it could not get out; but then it pleased God, that a young man, coming that way, saved it. She would give no other reason for it, but that she did it to save it from misery, and with that she was assured, she had sinned against the Holy Ghost, and that she could not repent of any sin. Thus doth satan work by the advantage of our infirmities, which would stir us up to cleave the more fast to Christ Jesus, and to walk the more humbly and watchfully in all our conversation."¹

"Dorothy Talbye was hanged at Boston for murdering her own daughter, a child of three years old. She had been a member of the church of Salem, and of good esteem for godliness, but, falling at difference with her husband, through melancholy or spiritual delusions, she sometimes attempted to kill him, and her children, and herself, by refusing meat. . . .After much patience, and divers admonitions not prevailing, the church cast her out. Whereupon she grew worse; so as the magistrate caused her to be whipped. Whereupon she was reformed for a time, and carried herself more dutifully to her husband, but soon after she was so possessed with Satan, that he persuaded her (by his delusions, which she listened to as revelations from God) to break the neck of her own child, that she might free it from future misery. This she confessed upon her apprehension; yet, at her arraignment, she stood mute a good space, till the governor told her she should be pressed to death, and then she confessed the indictment. When she was to receive judgment, she would not uncover her face, nor stand up, but as she was forced, nor give any testimony of her repentance, either then or at her execution. The cloth which should have covered her face, she plucked off, and put between the rope and her neck. She desired to have been beheaded, giving this reason, that it was less painful and less shameful. Mr. Peter, her late pastor, and Mr. Wilson, went with her to the place of execution, but could do no good with her."²

Little gentleness and love is found in this religion.

It sounds strangely unlike the precepts of Christ, whose emphasis was on love, but the Puritans did not live in a gentle age. Not long before, men and women had been killed for their

¹Winthrop: History of N. Eng., Vol. II, p. 79.

²Ibid, p. 335

beliefs. The Spanish Inquisition had barely ceased its workings. And perhaps it was as well, if not better to scare men into being good by preaching damnation and hell-fire, as the policy of Henry VIII, who deciding to become a protestant to further his selfish desires, declared the English people protestant, and they had no recourse but obedience. However, we shall note the Puritan colonies were not the only people in America who had a harsh religion, and who believed not in tolerance.

But there was another side to the Puritan religion which served to help the women. If, to us, their doctrines seem rigid and unyielding, and almost childlike in its literalness, the belief in a personal devil, in the wrath and vengeance of God, and the over-importance of trivial events, on the other hand, their faith and trust in God was childlike. Many are the references in the writings to God and his help and comfort, during the early days, when the foundations of American Liberty were being laid, and later also, in fact, throughout the entire colonial period. Note this from a letter of Margaret Winthrop written to her husband:

"Sure I am, that all shall work to the best to them that love God, or rather are loved of him. I know he will bring light out of obscurity, and make his righteousness shine forth as clear as the noonday. Yet I find in myself an adverse spirit, and a trembling heart, not so willing to submit to the will of God as I desire. There is a time to plant, and a time to pull up that which is planted, which I could desire might not be yet. But the Lord knoweth what is best, and his will be done . . ." Boston, 1637¹

Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. I., p. 310.

Women seem to have had very little active part in church matters. They were attendants and hearers, but not active in the administration of the church. Aside from attending, their work seemed entirely that of caring for the sick, visiting the poor, and a general charity work. They were commended for this, but they were not deacons, nor did they hold office. As far as can be determined we have no record of any woman serving in an official capacity. The mention of the seating is carefully given, according to rank, and of their attendance at evening meetings, probably similar to the prayer-meeting of a later time. This mention is made by Cotton Mather in his "Essays to do Good," published in 1710.

"It is proposed, that about twelve families agree to meet (the men and their wives) at each other's houses, in rotation, once in a fortnight or a month, as shall be thought most proper, and spend a suitable time together in religious exercises."¹

Thus Anne Hutchinson held a meeting for women only, and for a long time there was no objection: "Mrs. Hutchinson thought fit to set up a meeting for the sisters, also, where she repeated the sermons preached the Lord's Day before, adding her remarks and expositions. Her lectures made much noise, and fifty or eighty principal women attended them. At first they were generally approved of."²

However, later, when the followers of Anne Hutchinson became so powerful they threatened to control the colony, and she was considered a dangerous woman, these women's meetings were forbidden. In a later discussion of Anne Hutchinson, and her influence, we shall note the reason for this. Winthrop tells us that a meeting of the Assembly in 1637 one resolution of importance adopted was one which tended to restore the

¹Trent Colonial Literature, p. 269.

²Hutchinson, History of Mass Bay, Trent, Revolutionary Lit. p. 17.

peace of the church which had been seriously disturbed by Mistress Hutchinson and her followers:

"That though women might meet (some few together) to pray and edify one another; yet such a set assembly, (as was then in practice at Boston.) Where sixty or more did meet every week, and one woman (in a prophetic way, by resolving questions of doctrine, and expounding scripture) took upon her the whole exercise, was agreed to be disorderly, and without rule."¹

No doubt after this was in affect, the women still continued to meet and "edify one another", and possibly, since they were like all women, to indulge in kindly chit-chat also about their acquaintances.

The only other record found of women's meetings were among the Quakers. In the Journal of George Fox (1672) this statement is given: "We had also a Mens-Meeting, and a Womens-Meeting. . ."

On the first of these days the men and women had their meetings for business, wherein the affairs of the Church of God were taken care of . . ."²

The Quakers, were probably the only sect where the women served at all in an official capacity, but the explanation is found in the fact that the equality of the sexes was one of their teachings. Not only did they attend the business sessions of their own meetings, but also the quarterly business meeting:

"We attended the quarterly meeting with Ann Gaunt and Mercy Redman."³

"After the quarterly meeting of worship ended I felt drawings to go to the women's meeting of business which was very full."⁴

The Quakers also allowed women to preach and speak, and whenever a woman in the meeting felt called upon to talk, she

¹Eade: Margaret Winthrop, p. 275.

²Journal of George Fox, Narratives of Early Maryland.

³Woolman: Diary, p. 95.

⁴Ibid: Chapter IX.

was permitted to do so. Woolmen speaks of women preachers, and we know of Mary Dyer, a follower of Anne Hutchinson, and other Quaker women, who visited Massachusetts for the purpose of exhorting and converting the Puritans to the Quaker faith. (see p.).

No discussion of the religious status of women among the Puritans would be complete without, mentioning, at least, two important circumstances, for the lives of the women were directly concerned: *viz.*, the Rise of the Antinomians, and Salem witchcraft. We shall find in connection with these events, though the women served the church in no official capacity, and apparently seem to have exerted little influence, that it was through the power of the women that Anne Hutchinson earned her fame, disturbing so much the good elders, and that the witchcraft delusion was possible.

While most of the women of the Puritan colonies seem to have been so busy with their household duties they had little time for outside affairs, was one woman who passed into everlasting fame as the creator of the greatest religious and political disturbance in the colony during colonial history -- Anne Hutchinson. Many are the references to this woman and her followers in the writings of the period. The most prominent men in the colony were her disciples, and for a time she seemed to be the real power in the community; great was the excitement. Thomas Hutchinson, in his "History of Massachusetts Bay Colony", (1746-1767) tells of the trial and banishment.

"Countenanced and encouraged by Mr. Vane and Mr. Cotton, she advanced doctrines and opinions which involved the colony in disputes and contentions; and being improved to civil as well as religious purposes, had like to have produced ruin both to church and state."

Anne Hutchinson was the daughter of Francis Marbury, a

prominent clergyman of Lincolnshire, England. Deeply religious as a child, when a young woman she was deeply influenced by the preaching of John Cotton. The latter, not being able to worship as he wished in England, moved to the Puritan colony in the new world, and "Anne Hutchinson, upon her arrival at Boston, frankly confessed that she had crossed the sea solely to be under his preaching in his new home."¹

However, many of the prominent men of the community soon became her followers; Sir Harry Vane, governor of the colony, her brother-in-law, the Rev. John Wheelwright, a prominent clergyman of the colony, William Coddington, a magistrate of Boston, and even Cotton himself, leader of the church, and supposedly orthodox of the orthodox. This was enough to turn the head of any woman, when we remember that she was supposedly the silent and weaker vessel, to find suddenly the learned men, and even the greatest clergymen sitting at her feet, and teaching her doctrines to others. It is difficult to determine the real state of affairs concerning this woman and her teachings. Nothing, unless possibly the witchcraft delusion at Salem, excited the colony as did this disturbance in both church and state. While much has been written, yet feelings were bitter, and so much of partisanship is in all the statements, that we find it is with great difficulty we are able to really judge the facts, aside from the jealousy and bitterness. During the first few months of her stay, she seems to have been commended for her faithful attendance at church, her care of the sick, and her general attitude toward the community. Even her meetings for the good sisters were praised by the pastors. But, not content with holding meetings for her neighbors, she criticised the preachers

¹Brosks - Daughters of Colonial Days.

and their teachings. This was indeed disturbing to the good men, since women was the silent member of the household, and not capable of offering criticism. But even then, the matter would have ended, no doubt if the church and state had not been one, and the pastors, politicians. Hutchinson, a kinsman of the leader of this movement, says:

"It is highly probable that if Mr. Vane had remained in England, or had not craftily made use of the party which maintained these peculiar opinions in religion, to bring him into civil power and authority and draw the affections of the people from those who were their leaders into the wilderness, these, like many other errors, might have prevailed a short time without any disturbance to the state, and as the absurdity of them appeared, silently subsided, and posterity would not have known that such a woman as Mrs. Hutchinson ever existed. . . It is difficult to discover, from Mr. Cotton's own account of his principles published ten years afterwards, in his answer to Bailey, wherein he differed from her. . . . He seems to have been in danger when she was upon trial. The . . . ministers treated him coldly, but Mr. Winthrop, whose influence was now greater than ever protected him."¹

Just what were her doctrines no one has ever been able to determine; even Winthrop, a very able, clear-headed man, who was well versed in Puritan theology, and who was one of her most powerful opponents, said he was unable to define them. "The two capital errors with which she was charged, were these: That the Holy Ghost swells personally in a justified person; and, that nothing of sanctification can help to evidence to believers their justification."²

Her teachings were not unlike those of the Quietists, and that of the "Inner Light" preached by the Quakers -- a doctrine that has always held a charm for people, especially those who enjoy the mystical. But it was not so much the doctrines, probably, as the fact that she and her followers were a disturbing element in a small colony where it was vital and necessary to the life of that colony that harmony prevail. There had been great hardships

¹Hutchinson, Hist. of Mass., Trent: Revolutionary Lit. p. 255.

²Ibid.

and sacrifices: even yet they were merely a handful, surrounded by thousands of hostile enemies. There must be uniformity and con-

formity if they were to live. "When the Pequots threatened Massachusetts colony a few men in Boston refused to serve. There were Antinomians, followers of Anne Hutchinson, who suspected their chaplain of being under a 'Covenant of works', whereas their doctrine was one should live under a 'Covenant of grace'. This is one of the great reasons why they were banished. It was the very life of the colony that they should have conformity, and all of them as one man could scarcely withstand the Indians. Therefore this religious doctrine was working rebellion and sedition, and endangering the very existence of the state."¹

She was given a church trial, and finally after long hours and days of discussion banished. "Her sentence upon record stands thus: 'Mrs. Hutchinson, the wife of Mr. William Hutchinson, being convented for traducing the ministers and their ministry in the country, she declared voluntarily her revelation, and that she should be delivered, and the court ruined with her posterity, and thereupon was banished. . . .'"²

We know she must have been a woman of shrewdness, force and personality, intelligent, endowed with the ability of leadership. At her trial she was the equal of the ministers in her replies. The theological discussion was exciting; many were the fine-spul, hair-splitting doctrines discussed. Even to read it today is enough to weary the brain.

This story of Anne Hutchinson and her remarkable influence is one of the best examples of the power of the Puritan woman. For the growth of her ideas must be attributed to the women. We know she held meetings for the women, and here to these meetings the women, saddened by their hardships, their many house-hold tasks, depressed by their religion, denied all love of beauty, the cultivation of the aesthetic, with no outlet for their emotions, no

¹Fiske: Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America, Vol. I, p. 232.

²Trent, Revolutionary Literature, p. 255.

magazines, books, news-papers, came, eager to hear this woman. Is it strange, we find them anxious and glad to attend? Their souls were hungry, starved. They were not free even to notice the beauty of the sunsets and wonder of the hills. They may not have realized what they craved; they may have been only vaguely aware of their longing. But a few attended her first meetings, probably out of curiosity and as it provided a diversion. In the dullness of their lives it afforded at least, a change. This woman seemed to understand the woman's heart better than did John Cotton or the Rev. Mr. Wilson. Those few who attended the first meetings, told others, and the number increased, until as stated eighty women were in attendance. This inner light, or "covenant of grace" must have been refreshing after the harshness and intolerance of Calvinism. These women talked of the meeting and the speaker to their husbands and fathers, and gradually the men became interested. Hence, gradually the influence of these women spread until as we have noted the movement included the prominent people, and the larger part of the church at Boston. Thus, from the story of this woman, her influence, and power, we may feel assured in believing that the Puritan wife's counsel was heeded, and she was not the silent, unheard member we so often think, but one whose opinions were held in great respect, and listened to, also.

Whether the fate of this woman was typical of that which was in store for all women speakers, and women "outside their place" is not stated by the elders, but they were firm in their belief, that her death was a punishment. She moved to Rhode Island, where after the death of her husband, she and all her family, with the exception of one, were killed by Indians. The explanation of the

Puritan is this:

"I never head that the Indians in those parts did ever before commit the like outrage upon any one family, or families; and therefore God's hand is the more apparently seen herein, to pick out this woful woman, to make her and those belonging to her an unheard of heavy example of their cruelty above others."¹

The other great disturbance occurred not at staid Boston where Anne Hutchinson had marshalled her forces, but at Salem, and later in the dentury. There may seem but little connection between witchcraft and religion, but an examination of the facts shows such to be the case.

Looking back after the passing of two hundred years it seems strange that such enlightened, intelligent people as the Puritans should believe in witches. A people too, remember, who had come to this country for the exercise of religious freedom, people who were descendents of men trained in universities; men who had founded Harvard College, only sixteen years after they had landed at Boston Harbor. However, the people of Salem werent alone in their belief in witches. The belief was common to the entire civilized world. It was as old as man itself. Without science to explain many of the common happenings of life, man had always believed firmly in devils, witches, and spirits. While the death of a witch, as late as this, as not as common as it had been a century earlier, however it still ocured, among so-called enlightened people. As late as 1712, a witch was burned near London, and several pastors were prosecutors.

Winthrop records the death of a witch in 1648 in Massachusetts:

"At this court one Margaret Jones of Charlestown was
¹Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. I, p. 242.

indicted and found guilty of witchcraft, and hanged for it. The evidence against her was, I. that she was found to have such a malignant touch, as many persons, (men, women, and children,) whom she stroked or touched with any affection or displeasure, or etc., were taken with deafness . . . or other violent pains or sickness. . . . some things which she foretold came to pass. . . . Her behaviour at her trial was very intemperate, lying notoriously, and railing upon the jury and witnesses, etc., and in the like distemper she died. The same day and hour she was executed, there was a very great tempest at Connecticut, which blew down many trees, etc.,"¹

We find this mention in 1656 from the "Extracts from Annual Letters of the English Province of the Society of Jesus".

". . . The tempest lasted two months in all, whence the opinion arose, that it was not raised by the violence of the sea or atmosphere, but was occasioned by the Malevolence of witches. Forthwith they seize a little old woman suspected of sorcery; and after examining her with the strictest scrutiny, guilty or not guilty, they slay her, suspected of this very heinous sin. The corpse, and whatever belonged to her, they cast into the sea. But the winds did not thus remit their violence, or the raging sea its threatenings. . ."² This is in connection with a voyage of settlers bound for Maryland. Likewise, in the records of Virginia we find persons fined, who accused others of being witches, but it was at Salem that this belief developed into a mania -- a form of hysteria. Josselyn, an English traveller of New England in 1638 says:

"There are none that beg in the country, but there be witches too many . . . that produce many strange apparitions if you will believe report, of a shallop at sea manned with women; of a ship and a great red horse standing by the main-mast, the ship being in a small cove to the eastward vanished of a sudden. Of a witch that appeared aboard of a ship twenty leagues to sea to a mariner who took up the carpenter's broad axe and cleft her head with it, the witch dying of the wound at home."³

There may have been other reasons why at Salem, witchcraft developed into a craze, but surely the most important reason was because of their peculiar religious belief. We have noted

¹Winthrop: History of New England, Vol. II, p. 397.

²Narratives of Early Maryland, p. 141.

³Trent: Colonial Literature, p. 69.

the belief in a personal devil, (see p. 15); that God allowed him to tempt mankind; that there were myraids of devils present all the time, ever watchful to catch the unwary. Then the belief that God was constantly watching them, and the terrible danger of straying from the narrow way, and, ever before them, the tortures of the after-world, made them as above stated, morbid, introspective, self-conscious. Remember, too, they believed, so Mather said that the devils were plotting to destroy the church; hence the idea that one bewitched was in the power of the devil was easy to believe. The effects of a belief such as this is far-reaching, either to drive one to the extreme of scepticism, or make one a zealous bigot. Then if one believes in a legion of devils. one must invent things for them to do, or they soon cease to exist, for it is only the useful that survive. Thus, the Puritan dwelling constantly on the weakness of man, his utter wickedness, his aptness for sin, watching constantly not only his soul's salvation. but his neighbors as well, actually feared Satan, as one to be abhorred. To the Puritan the devil was a real individual. In an attempt to explain life, sin, wrong doing, and why it is in the world, they conceived God, the creator to be all powerful, and yet in the world which he had created, and over which he had absolute authority, there was this arch-fiend, who was responsible for all the sin which afflicted mankind. He was constantly devising ways and means to tempt them from the true and narrow way. He was sly, cunning, subtle, wary, and man must be ever mindful and watchful, lest Satan should deceive him. He was constantly making

converts, and his methods were so deceiving and treacherous, that even the most godly might fall a victim, with the terrible consequence that when one became bewitched, he knew it not; and when he reached this stage, only his neighbors and friends could help him by attempting to free him from the devil. If he did not confess, it were better than he be killed, than leave his body in the possession of the devil. Mather says:

"If the devils now can strike the minds of men with any noisons of so fine a composition and operation, that scores of innocent people shall unite in confessions of a crime which we see actually committed, it is a thing prodigious, beyond the wonders of the former ages, and it threatens no less than a sort of dissolution upon the world."¹

Satan had divers of followers, devils, whom he sent over the world as a prey on mankind. He could not only assume the form of a man, but had the power to assume any form he choose. To carry on this purpose he not only sent his legions of devils, but he also employed witches to aid him: these might be in human form. Indeed Satan carried a black book, in which under pretext of disguise he induced people to write their names. This mark was made in the blood of the victim, signifying he had given his soul into the keeping of the devil, and thus was his follower. Now this the Puritan believed; in the black book, in the power of Satan, and that one never could tell one's neighbors or even family might belong to this fiendish band. Satan's rendezvous was the forest, generally his hour of meeting his followers was midnight. Here secret meetings were held in which he and his followers plotted the death and destruction of the saints. At the trial of George Burroughs he was accused by eight of the confessing witches, "As being a head actor at some of their hellish

¹Trent: Colonial Literature, p. 233.

renezvoues, and one who had the promise of being a king in Satan's kingdom, now going to be erected. One of them falling into a kind of trance affirmed that G. B. had carried her away into a very high mountain, where he showed her mighty and glorious kingdoms, and said, 'he would give them all to her, if she would write in his book.'¹

Of course this was an age when no attempt was made to explain events in the light of a natural reason. Such simple things as sickness and disease were visitations of God to try the faith of the fathers or the device of Satan to tempt them from the path. Such a thing as nerves were unrecognized; in fact, physicians were nearly as superstitious as laymen. This was the day when insanity was ridiculed; anyone subject to fits, or a nervous disorder was intensely funny. Nervous children were thought to be possessed of devils: if the child was across and irritable no one ever thought of explaining it by the food it ate, or lack of fresh air; it was bewitched. If a good Puritan father ate of mince pie and plum pudding before retiring, and dreamed of unusual, unearthly happenings, God was speaking to him in dreams, or else warning him of certain dangers: there was no connection between the dream and the pie. Note this comment from Increase Mather:

Concerning the case of the children of John Goodwin of Boston:" . . .In the day time they were handled with so many sorts of Ails, that it would require of us almost as much time to relate them all, as it did of them to endure them. Sometimes they would be deaf, sometimes dumb, and sometimes blind, and often, all this at once. . . .Their necks would be broken, so that their neck-bone would seem dissolved unto them that felt after it: and yet on the sudden, it would become again so stiff that there was no stirring of their Heads. . . ." ²

Remember too, they were allowed no natural outlet for their emotions, such as amusements, or social diversions. No theaters, dance, clubs, receptions, nothing in the way of

¹Trent: Colonial Literature, p. 240.

²Narratives of Witchcraft Cases, p. 102.

a social good time, but the occasional visits of friends, and the life of the church, and while this was social, it can scarcely be termed a "good time." Note the following from Sewall, only a few years before the witchcraft craze:

"Thursday, Nov. 12. After the ministers of this town came to the court and complain against a dancing master, who seeks to set up here and hath mixt dances, and his time of meeting is Lecture-Day; and 'tis reported he should say that by one play he could teach more divinity than Mr. Willard or the Old Testament. Mr. Moodey said 'twas not a time for N. E. to dance. Mr. Mather struck at the root, speaking against mixt dances."¹

Also Prince notes the prohibition of card-playing:

"1631. March 22. First court of at Boston. ORDERED that all who have cards, dice, or 'tables,' in their houses, shall make away with them, before the next Court."²

However, despite the awful curse of witchcraft and its terrible results in Salem, Cotton Mather could find a reason for it.

"So horrid and Hellist is the Crime of Witchcraft, that were Gods thoughts as our thoughts, or Gods ways as our ways, it could be no other, but unpardonable. But that Grace of God may be admired, and that the worst of sinners may be encouraged, Behold, Witchcraft also has found a pardon. . . . From the Hell of Witchcraft our merciful Jesus can fetch a guilty Creature to the Glory of Heaven. Our Lord hath sometimes recovered those who have in the most horrid manner given themselves away to the Destroyer of their souls."³

These quotations given will suffice to show that the people were very superstitious and easily led to believe the unnatural, and the unexplainable. The witchcraft delusion had its beginning with an old negress, some half dozen young girls, and the aid of the women of the colony. Coffin in "Old Times" in the Colonies", has told the story briefly:

"The saddest story in the history of our country is that of the witch craze at Salem, Mass. brought about by a negro woman and a company of girls. The negress, tituba, was a slave,

¹Sewall's Diary, Vol. I, p. 103.

²Prince: Annals of N. Eng., English Garner, p. 579.

³Narrative of Witchcraft Cases, p. 135

whom Rev. Samuel Parris, one of the ministers of Salem, had purchased in Barbadoes. We may think of Tituba as seated in the old kitchen of Mr. Parris's house during the long winter evenings, telling witchcraft stories to the minister's niece, Elizabeth nine years old. She draws a circle in the ashes on the hearth, burns a lock of hair, and mutters gibberish. They are incantations to call up the devil and his imps. The girls of the village gather in the old kitchen to hear Tituba's stories, and to mutter words that have no meaning. The girls are Abigail Williams, who is eleven; Anne Putnam, twelve; Mary Walcott and Mary Lewis, seventeen, Elizabeth Hubbard, Elizabeth Booth, and Susannah Sheldon, eighteen; and two servant girls, Mary Warren, and Sarah Churchill. Tituba taught them to bark like dogs, mew like cats, grunt like hogs, to creep through chairs and under tables on their hands and feet, and pretend to have spasms. . . . Mr. Parris had read the books and pamphlets published in England. . . .and he came to the conclusion that they were bewitched. He sent for Doctor Griggs who said that the girls were not sick, and without doubt were bewitched. . . .The town was on fire. Who bewitches you? they were asked. Sarah Good, Sarah Osburn, and Tituba, said the girls. Sarah Good was a poor, old woman, who begged her bread from door to door. Sarah Osburn was old, wrinkled, and sickly. "1

The news soread throughout the village of the actions of the girls; people came to see them. They carried it so far, that they would have been punished if they confessed, so to escape that they accused several old women of bewitching them, having no idea, of course, this delusion would become so firmly entrenched in the minds of the people. However, the people took the matter seriously, and the accused were brought to trial. The craze spread, neighbor accused neighbor, friends their enemies, and those who did not confess were put to death. It is a singular fact, worth noting, that the majority of the witnesses and the greater number of the victims were women. The men, who conducted the trials and passed the verdict of "guilty" should not be excused for their part, but it was the active imagination of the women, who testified at the trials to unbelievable things; and who brought the greatest number of accusations. No doubt, 1Coffin: Old Times in the Colonies, p. 316.

many personal grievances, petty jealousies, spites, and neighborhood quarrels entered into the conflict. Note these incidents, sworn to on the witness stand:

Increase Mather in "Remarkable Providences", tell this of the persecutions of William Morse and wife in Newberry Mass., by the bewitched one:

"On December 8, in the morning, there were five great stones and bricks by an invisible hand thrown in at the west end of the house while the Mans wife was making the bed, the bedstead was lifted up from the floor, and the bedstaff flung out of the window, and a cat was hurled at her. . . .The man's wife going to the cellar. . . .the door shut down upon her, and the table came and lay upon the door, and the man was forced to remove it ere his wife could be released from where she was."¹

Another circumstance that befell Mary Hortado, 1683:

"The said Mary and her husband going in a cannoo over the river they saw like the head of a man new-shorn, and the tail of a white cat about two or three foot distance from each other, swimming over before the cannoo, but nobody appeared to joyn head and tail together."²

Cotton Mather in his "Wonders of the Invisible World," gives us an insight as to the types of witnesses called.

"It cost the Court a wonderful deal of trouble, to hear the Testimonies of the sufferers; for when they were going to give in their depositions, they would for a long time be taken with fitts, that made them uncapable of saying anything. The Chief Judge asked the prisoner who he thought hindered these witnesses from giving their testimonies? and he answered, He supposed it was the devil."³

Surely, it would seem these witnesses were fit subjects for the care of a physician, rather than allowed to testify in a court-room.

The following quotations show that the majority of those executed were women:

In Robert Calef's "More Wonders of the Invisible World"

¹Narratives of Witchcraft Cases,

²Ibid, p. 38.

³Trent: Colonial Literature, p. 217.

we note: "September 9. Six more were tried, and received Sentence of death; viz., Martha Cory of Salem Village, Mary Easty of Topsfield, Alice Parker and Ann Pudeater of Salem, Dorcas Hear of Beverly, and Mary Bradberry of Salisbury. September 1st. Giles Cory was prest to death."¹

Of the cruel manner in which Giles Cory met his death, the editor of Sewall's "Diary" makes this comment:

"At first, apparently, a firm believer in the witchcraft delusion, even to the extent of mistrusting his saintly wife, who was executed three days after his torturous death, his was the most tragic of all the fearful offerings. He had made a will, while confined in Ipswich jail, conveying his property, according to his own preferences, among his heirs; and, in the belief that his will would be invalidated and his estate confiscated if he were condemned by a jury after pleading to the indictment, he resolutely preserved silence, knowing that an acquittance was an impossibility."²

Sewall says: "Monday, Sept. 19, 1692. About noon, at Salem, Giles Corey was press'd to death for standing Mute; much pains was used with him two days, one after another, by the Court and Capt. Gardner of Nantucket who had been of his acquaintance, but all in vain."³

Possibly the community thought this manner in which Cory met his death, like that of Anne Hutchinson, was a judgment of

God, for Sewall records: "Sept. 20. Now I hear from Salem that about 18 years ago, he (Giles Corey) was suspected to have stamped and press'd a man to death, but was cleared. Twas not remembered till Ann Putnam was told of it by said Corey's Spectre the Sabbath day night before the Execution."⁴

The Corey's, Easty's and Putnam's were families very prominent during this entire craze, especially the later: Anne Putnam's name occurs again and again. She seems to have been a woman of force and personality, and many were the revelations she had concerning suspected persons, and also innocent neighbors.

Note this mention of sentences, and that the larger number

¹Trent: Colonial Literature, p. 366.

²Sewall: Diary, Vol. I, p. 364.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

are women: "September 17. Nine more received Sentence of death, viz., Margaret Scot of Rowly, Goodwife Reed of Marblehead, Samuel Wardwell, and Mary Parker of Andover, also Abigail Falkner of Andover. . . .Rebecka Eames of Boxford, Mary Lacy and Ann Forster of Andover, and Abigail Hobbs of Topsfield. Of these Eight were executed."¹

Cotton Mather in a letter to a friend, about this time, makes this comment:

"Our good God is working of miracles. Five witches were lately executed, impudently demanding of God a miraculous vindication of their innocency."²

As seen from the character of the testimony and of the witnesses, much evidence was introduced absolutely absurd, if it had not resulted in such tragedies. This from the trial of Martha Carrier, shows how these people were deluded into believing the most impossible things. One of the witnesses confessed "That the devil carry'd them on a pole to a witch-meeting: but the pole broke, and she hanging about Carrier's neck, they both fell down, and she then received an hurt by the fall whereof she was not at this very time recovered. . . .This rampant hag, Martha Carrier, was the person, of whom the confessions of the witches, and of her own children among the rest, agreed, that the devil had promised her she should be Queen of Hell."³

It was in connection with the witchcraft delusion that the story is told of Lady Phips, wife of the Governor, who by her bravery signed a warrant for the discharge of a prisoner. The jailkeeper obeyed, and lost his place therefor, but he must "have rejoiced afterwards at his costly error."⁴

Even children were imprisoned. In the N. Eng. History and General Register, XXXV, 253, we note, "Dorcas Good, thus sent to prison 'as hale and well as other children, 'lavy there seven or eight months, and 'beint chain'd in the dungeon was so hardly used and terrified' that eighteen years later her father alleged 'that she hath ever since been very chargeable, having little or no reason to govern herself.'"⁵

¹Trent: Colonial Literature, p. 366.

²Narratives of Witchcraft Cases, p. 215.

³Trent: Colonial Literature, p. 247.

⁴Editor's note, Sewall's Diary, p. 359.

⁵Narratives of Witchcraft Cases, p. 159.

Extracts from Robert Calef's "More Wonders of the Invisible World", give us a graphic picture of that time of horror and bloodshed.

"It was the latter end of February, 1691, when divers young persons belonging to Mr. Parris's family, and one or more of the neighbourhood, began to act after a strange and unusual manner, viz., as by getting into holes, and creeping under chairs and stools, and to use sundry odd postures and antick gestures, uttering foolish, ridiculous speeches, . . . The physicians that were called could assign no reason for this; but it seems one of them . . . told them he was afraid they were bewitched. . . . March the 11th, Mr. Parris invited several neighboring ministers to join with him in keeping a solemn day of prayer at his own house. . . . Those ill effected. . . first complained of . . . the said Indian woman, named Tituba; she confessed that the devil urged her to sign a book. . . and also to work mischief to the children, etc."

"A child of Sarah Good's was likewise apprehended, being between 4 and 5 years old. The accusers said this child bit them, and would shew such like marks, as those of a small set of teeth, upon their arms. . . ."

"March 31, 1692, was set apart as a day of solemn humiliation at Salem. . . on which day Abigail Williams said, 'that she saw a great number of persons in the village at the administration of a mock sacrament, where they had bread as red as raw flesh, and red drink.'"

The husband of Mrs. Cary, who afterwards escaped, tells this: "Having been there (in prison) one night, next morning the jailer put irons on her legs (having received such a command): the weight of them was about eight pounds: these with her other afflictions soon brought her into convulsion fits, so that I thought she would have died that night. I sent to entreat that the irons might be taken off; but all entreaties were in vain. . . ."

"John Jacobs being condemned, the sheriff and officers came and seized all he had; his wife and her wedding ring taken from her. . . the neighbors in charity relieved her."

"The family of the Putmans. . . were chief prosecutors in this business."

"And now nineteen persons having been hanged, and one pressed to death, and eight more condemned, in all twenty and eight . . . about fifty having confess. . . above an hundred and fifty in prison, and above two hundred more accused: the special commission of oyer and terminer comes to a period. . . ."

Above from Stedman & Hutchinson, p. 172-183, Vol. II.

We can have but a faint idea of the horror of that time: no one was safe. Any one, regardless of family, his manner of living, or standing in the community might be the next victim. It may have been possible that neighborhood quarrels, and petty spite entered into many of the accusations, although we hesitate to think this. However we may dislike this idea, it was an easy matter to procure witnesses, and from the evidence given, it was not difficult to bring the most unfounded charges. And the only way to escape death, was by confession. Otherwise the witch was still in the possession of the devil, and since Satan was plotting the destruction of the Puritans, anything in the power of Satan must be destroyed. Those who met death were martyrs, who would not confess a lie, and who died knowing they were innocent, as a protest against the denial of liberty of conscience. Their names should be commemorated in marble as a fitting testimony of their heroism.

During the summer of 1692 nearly a reign of terror was evident. Harvests were unharvested: fields neglected: people sold their farms and moved away, and many abandoned their homes, seeking other places of abode. Finally the reaction set in. This thirst for blood could not last. Then the accusers aimed too high; accusations were made against persons of rank, members of the governor's family, the pastors, etc. Naturally this had a tendency to check it.

"The killing time lasted about four months, from the first of June to the end of September, 1692, and then a reaction came because the informers began to strike at important persons, and named the wife of the governor. Twenty persons had been put to

death. . .and if the delusion had lasted much longer, under the rules of evidence that were adopted everybody in the colony except the magistrates and ministers would have been either hung or would have stood charged with witchcraft."¹

The pastors have been severely blamed, and no doubt they were largely responsible as leaders in the movement, but even their power and influence could never have resulted in the wide-spread terror without the aid of the women. They craved excitement, and since their emotions were suppressed, proved easy victims.

And as Fisher says: "As their religion taught them to see in human nature only depravity and corruption, so in the outward nature by which they were surrounded they saw fore-warnings and signs of doom and dread. Where the modern mind now refreshes itself in New England with the beauties of the sea-shore, the forest, and the sunset, the Puritans saw only threatenings of terror."²

We do not doubt their sincerity, and it is only with pity and sorrow that we realize such crimes were committed under the name of religion, and in the name of One who taught the Golden Rule, and the foundation of whose teaching was love.

Confessions were made, and as the people awakened from their error they were deeply penitent. Judge Sewall read publicly before the assembled congregation his petition, asking God for forgiveness. "In a short time all the people recovered from their madness, admitted their error. . .In 1697 the General Court ordered a day of fasting and prayer for what had been done amiss in 'the late tragedy raised among us by Satan.' Satan was the scape goat, and nothing was said about the designs and motives of the ministers."³ Possibly it was as well Satan was blamed, at least it is possible to make either God or Satan responsible for nearly every crime committed by man.

¹Fisher: Men, Women & Manners in Colonial Times, p. 171.

²Ibid: p. 165.

³Ibid: p. 171.

It seems the Puritan woman was the only colonial woman who really suffered from the teachings of her religion. There may have been those who felt restrained and hampered, but hers was the only teaching that made life a dread and a burden. In the south the Established church of England was the uniform religion. The women here attended church regularly, and we have no reason to doubt were reverent and pious. The earliest settlers in Virginia in 1607 observed the forms of the Established Church, and that was the dominant church during the colonial period. John Smith has left the record of the first place of divine worship in Virginia:

"Wee did hang an awning, which is an old sail, to three or four trees to shadow us from the sun; our walls were rails of wood; our seats unhewed trees till we cut planks; our pulpit a bar of wood nailed to two neighboring trees. In poor weather we shifted into an old rotten tent; this came by way of adventure for new. This was our church till we built a homely thing like a barne set upon Cratchets, covered with rafts, sedge, and earth: so also was the walls; the best of our houses were of like curiosity. . . . Yet we had daily Common Prayer morning and evening; every Sunday two sermons; and every three months a holy communion till our minister died: but our prayers daily with an Hemily on Sundays we continued two or three years after, till more Preachers came."¹

The early Virginians were very strict about church attendance, as were the people of New England. "The first General Assembly to meet in Virginia passed a law requiring of every citizen attendance at divine services on Sunday. The penalty imposed was a fine, if one failed to be present. If the delinquent was a freeman, he was to be compelled to pay three shillings for each offence to be devoted to the church, and should he be a slave, he was to be sentenced to be whipped."²

"Sarah Purdy was indicted 1682 for shelling corn on Sunday."³

While we have only the writings of Eliza Pinckney, and one or two others, we can feel justified in feeling that their lives were typical of the women of the upper classes.

¹Earle: Home Life in Colonial Days, p. 381.

² - 3 Bruce: Institutional History of Va. in 17th Cent. p. 22, 35

In the Carolinas and Georgia, especially later in the 18th century there came Wesley and Whitfield, with Methodism; the Scotch Presbyterians and the French Huguenots. Among the Methodists, women took an active part in the meeting, but among the other sects named, they were in the background.

That women such as Eliza Pinckney, were deeply religious we find traces in the letters. When still a young girl, about seventeen years of age she wrote to her brother George a long letter of advice, showing a remarkable insight into life for one so young. We find this passage: "To be conscious we have an Almighty friend to bless our Endeavours, and to assist us in all difficulties, gives rapture beyond all the boasted enjoyments of the world, allowing them their utmost extent & fullness of joy. Let us then, my dear brother, set out right and keep the sacred page always in view. . . .God is truth itself and can't reveal naturally or supernaturally contrarieties."¹

On the whole this religion of the south seems much more sensible and reasonable than that of the Puritan. While, early in the days there was intolerance, yet the constant bickerings and quarrels found in the northern colony were not so often here. Though there were religious quarrels, particularly after the arrival of whitfield, yet they did not seem to leave the bitterness and feelings that such trials left in New England. We have this comment about the middle of the 18th century by the Surveyor, de Brahm, after naming "nine different sects in a town of twelve thousand inhabitants, said, 'Yet are (they) far from being incouraged, or even inclined to that disorder which is so common among men of contrary religious sentiments in other parts of the world. . . .of this city and province, whose inhabitants was from the beginning renound for concord, compleasance, courtousness and tenderness towards each other, and more so towards foreigners, without regard or respect of nature and religion'"²

¹Ravenel: Eliza Pinckney, p. 65.

²Ibid: p. 24.

However, we find this trust in religion, and the acknowledgment of the Divine Providence in the letters of other women. Abigail Adams, whose letters cover the last twenty-five years of the eighteenth century says:

"That we rest under the shadow of the Almighty is the consolation to which I resort, and find that comfort which the world cannot give."¹

In a letter written by Martha Washington to Governor Trumbull, on the death of her husband, she says:

"For myself, I have only to bow with humble submission to the will of that God who giveth and whotaketh away, looking forward with faith and hope to the moment when I shall be again united with the partner of my life."²

Mercy Warren in 1776, writes in a letter to her husband:

". . .I somehow or other feel as if all these things were for the best -- as if good would come out of evil -- we may be brought low that our faith may not be in the wisdom of man but in the protecting providence of God."³

In New York among the Dutch religion, as eating and other common things associated with life was taken as a matter of fact. Seldom indeed did the Dutch man or woman become so roused as to quarrel about doctrines; they were too content with life. Mrs. Grant in her "Memoirs of an American Lady", has left us many intimate touches of life in the Dutch colony. She, with her mother, came to New York in 1758 to join her father, who had preceded them the previous year. She lived at Claverack, Albany, and Oswego, and her knowledge of these people, their customs, social life, amusements, etc., is very interesting, as well as trustworthy. She makes the following comment concerning their religion:

". . .Their religion, then, like their original national

¹Letters of Abigail Adams, p. 106.

²Wharton: Martha Washington, p. 280.

³Brown: Mercy Warren, p. 96?

character, had in it little of fervor of enthusiasm; their manner of performing religious duties was regular and decent, but calm, and to more ardent imaginations might appear mechanical. . . if their piety, however, was without enthusiasm, it was also without bigotry; they wished others to think as they did, without showing rancor or contempt towards those who did not. . . That monster in nature, an impious woman, was never heard of among them."¹

Even the pastor in New York was totally unlike his New England brother, who was an authority on all things, and who gave advice on all subjects, marriage, sickness, politics, etc.

"The Dominies, as these people called their ministers, contented themselves with preaching in a sober and moderate strain to the people: and living quietly in the retirement of their families, were little heard of but in the pulpit; and they seemed to consider a studious privacy as one of their chief duties."²

However, it was only in New England where Church and State were one, and this accounted for the fact that the pastor was such a force. In New York, the church was separate from the government; hence, unless the pastor was a man of exceedingly great personality, his work was in the church alone.

Thus, it seems that only the Quaker women took part in the active and official life of the church. The women of the Episcopal Church in the south, the Catholic Church in Maryland, and the Established Church in New York, were quiet, on-lookers, pious and reverent, freely acknowledging God in their lives; content to be seen and not heard, yet doing some charitable work and caring for the poor and needy. Likewise, the women of the Puritan faith also, but they did exert a marked influence, possibly, what the anti-suffragists term the "silent influence", and yet in the case of Anne Hutchinson and Salem witchcraft, it was

¹Grant: *Memoirs of an American Lady*, p. 29.

²Ibid: p. 155.

far from a "silent" power. On the whole, we may assume that likewise, the women of the other colonies would have exerted an influence in religious affairs had the occasion arose. There seems no doubt that women like Jane Turrel (see page 60). Mercy Warren, Eliza Pinckney, Aunt Schuyler (see page 61). and others, who were prominent in the community, were women whose opinions the pastor considered, and there was no thought of meekness in their silence, no idea of oppression and humility. Thus, because, the women were for the most part silent members of the church, was not that they were not allowed to take part, but this was the custom, and there was little occasion for them to assert themselves. True, the Puritans did talk against women speaking in meeting, saying if they had any questions, they should ask them of their husbands in the privacy of the home, but, nevertheless, the fact remains, that on occasions when they wished to do so, they did speak.

The men at this time were the active members, and the time had not come when the church must be kept alive, largely through the activities of women, after the men had gradually ceased to assume the initiative. The tithing system was still in use, and the finances of the church were not dependent on teas and ice-cream socials, and chicken-pie dinners.

EDUCATION

Unfortunately when we attempt to learn the position of women in regard to education, we are handicapped. The training of the mind, the mental, was of little consequence in the colonial days. The emphasis was placed on the soul, and the acquiring of the social graces, and the knowledge necessary to become a good wife and mother. We have only the barest hints telling us of the learning of the women. It was, of course, a common custom throughout the civilized world for man to be educated -- those who were in a position where it was possible -- but not women. Her place was in the home; there was nothing to call her from this work, no shops, factories, or economic pressure forcing her to earn her own livelihood. Marriage was the only door open to woman. Very few men, even philosophers, before the eighteenth century thought a woman would be a better mother because of education, and the training of the mental. And woman, herself, on the whole was not interested. A few perhaps, who dreamed of a time, when the sister should be taught equally with the brother; but the greater number were content, never questioning the why or wherefore. And the woman's club, the opening in business, the opportunity to learn a trade, acquire knowledge, had not come.

We know from the history of this period that schools were early established in Massachusetts, attended both by boys and

girls. Then, too, there were the Dame schools, taught generally by unmarried women. Sewall has left evidence, showing that his children, both boys and girls attended school.

"Tuesday, Oct. 16, 1688. Little Hannah going to school in the morn. being enter'd a little within the Schoolhouse Land, is rid over by David Lomez, fell on her back, but I hope little hurt, save that her teeth bled a little: was much frightend: but went to school."¹

"Friday, Jan. 7th, 1687. This day Dame Walker is taken so ill that she sends home my daughters, not being able to teach them."²

"Wednesday, Jan. 19th, 1686/7. Mr. Stoughton and Dudley and Capt. Eliot and self, go to Muddy-River to Andrew Gardner's, where 'tis agreed that I'll only in or as Monday, be levved on the people by a rate towards maintaining a school to teach to write and read English."³

Throughout Massachusetts, at least, it seems that girls were taught to read, to knit, and to do the household duties.

"2nd day, Nov. 2. Mary goes to Mrs. Thair's to learn to read and knit." (1696)⁴

The record given by Sewall, would indicate that not only were women taught to read, but the schools were often conducted by women, or else, possible in place of what we know as the public school, one woman had private pupils.

"Arr. 27, 1691 . . . This afternoon had Joseph to school to Capt Townsend's Mother's, his cousin Jane accompanying him, carried his Horn-book."⁵

Mrs. Adams says concerning her education the following, written to a friend, in 1817: (*italics mine*)

"My early education did not partake of the abundant opportunities which the present days offer, and which even our common country schools now afford. I never was sent to any school. I was always sick. Female education, in the best families went no farther than writing and arithmetic: in some

¹Sewall: Diary, p. 231., Vol. I.

²Ibid: p. 164.

³Ibid: p. 165.

⁴Ibid: p. 436.

⁵Ibid: p. 344.

few and rare instances, music and dancing."¹

Again she says: "I never studied."²

The women of New York, famous for their skill as housewives, probably did not attend school. Mrs. Grand speaking of educational advantages for women in 1709, says:

It was at this time very difficult to procure the means of instruction in those inland districts: female education, of consequence, was conducted on a very limited scale: girls learned needlework (in which they were indeed both skillful and ingenious) from their mothers and aunts: they were taught too at that period to read, in Dutch, the Bible, and a few Calvinist tracts of the devotional kind. But in the infancy of the settlement few girls read English: when they did, they were thought accomplished: they generally spoke it, however imperfectly, and a few were taught writing. This confined education precluded elegance; yet, though there was no polish, there was no vulgarity."³

"Meanwhile (about 1710) the girl (Catherine Schuyler) was perfecting herself in the arts of housekeeping, so dear to the Dutch matron. The care of the diary, the poultry, the spinning, the baking, the brewing, the immaculate cleanliness of the Dutch, were not so much duties as sacred household rites."⁴

We know the women of Holland were taught, in addition to household tasks, the keeping of accounts, in preference to reading. And no doubt this custom was followed in the Dutch colony, for the frugality, economy and industry of the Dutch house wives is proverbial.

Benjamin Franklin while in London writes to his daughter:

"The more attentively dutiful and tender you are towards your good mama, the more you will recommend yourself to me. . . . Go constantly to church, whoever preaches. For the rest, I would only recommend to you in my absence, to acquire those useful accomplishments, arithmetic, and book-keeping. This you might do with ease, if you would resolve not to see company on the hours set apart for those studies."⁵

¹Abigail Adams Letters, p. 24.

²Ibid: p. 57.

³Grant: *Memoirs of an American Lady*, p. 27.

⁴Humphreys; Catherine Schuyler, p. 8.

⁵Smyth: Writings of B. Franklin, p. 202.

This advice shows us what Franklin considered an essential education, and is, no doubt, similar to what the average girl received. In a letter to his mother, 1750, he speaks of his daughter thus:

"Sally grows a fine girl, and is extremely industrious with her needle, and delights in her book. She is of a most affectionate temper, and perfectly dutiful and obliging to her parents, and to all. Perhaps I flatter myself too much, but I have hopes that she will prove an ingenious, sensible, notable, and worthy woman, like her aunt Jenny. She goes now to the dancing-school. . . ."¹

In the south the daughters of the "first families" were taught in addition to household tasks, and supervision of servants, those social graces that they might become women of charm and ease in the social life. Thomas Jefferson has given us some idea of the education of the aristocratic women of Virginia, in the following advice to his daughter:

"Dear Patsy: -- With respect to the distribution of your time, the following is what I should approve:

From 8 to 10, practice music.
From 10 to 1, dance one day and draw another.
From 1 to 2, draw on the day you dance, and write a letter next day.
From 3 to 4, read French.
From 4 to 5, exercise yourself in music.
From 5 till bedtime, read English, write, etc.

Inform me what books you read, what tunes you learn. and inclose me your best copy of every lesson in drawing. . . Take care that you never spell a word wrong. . . It produces great praise to a lady to spell well. . ."²

It should be remembered that this letter is written in the 18th century, when the French influence was more felt than it had been earlier. Then, too, Jefferson, had been in France for some time, so that the education of the French women may have influenced him in his desire for the education of his daughter.

¹Smyth: Writings of Benjamin Franklin, Vol. III, p. 4.

²Ford: Writings of T. Jefferson, Vol. III, p. 345.

The established custom throughout the south ordered the sons of the planters sent to England to be educated, and the girls were taught by tutors. We have interesting comments as to the duties of these men in the advice given by Philip Fithian, who had been a tutor in the wealthy families of Virginia, to John Peck, his successor.

"The last direction I shall venture to mention on this hand, is that you abstain totally from women. What I would have you understand from this, is, that by a train of faultless conduct in the whole course of your tutorship, you make every lady within the Sphere of your acquaintance, who is between twelve and forty years of age, so much pleased with your person, & so satisfied as to your ability in the capacity of a teacher: & in short, fully convinced, that, from a principle of Duty, you have both, by night and by day endeavoured to acquit yourself honourably, in the character of a tutor; & that this account, you have their free and hearty consent, without making any manner of demand upon you, either to stay longer in the country with them, which they would choose, or whenever your business calls you away, that they may not have it in their power either by charms or justice to detain you, and when you must leave them have their sincere wishes & constant prayers for Length of days & much prosperity."¹

As we shall note later, dancing was one of the common forms of amusements in the south. All young women were taught to dance. There seems no evidence in regard to the women of the laboring class in the south. Here, unlike any of the other colonies, social lines were more rigid. We have no reason to doubt but that they attended the free schools, for there were such. But unfortunately these women have left no writings, and those who did write were more interested in colonial government than the education of the women of the laboring and indented classes. As Hart says:

"Under the conditions of Virginia society, no developed educational system was possible, but it is wrong to suppose that there was none. The parish institutions introduced from England

¹Trent: Revolutionary Literature, p. 326.

included educational beginnings: every minister had a school, and it was the duty of the vestry to see that all poor children could read and write. The county courts supervised the vestries, and held a yearly 'orphans court,' which looked after the material and educational welfare of all orphans."¹

Bruce in his "Institutional History" says the interest in education during the seventeenth century was general. He cites several cases from the records, showing provisions made by parents in wills, as to the education of their children.

"In 1657, Clement Theesh, of Rappahannock, in his will declared that all his estate should be responsible for the outlay made necessary in providing, during three years, instruction for his step-daughter, who, being then thirteen years, of age, had, no doubt, already been going to school for some length of time. The manner of completing her education (which, it seems was to be prolonged to her sixteenth year) was perhaps the usual one for girls at this period: -- she was to be taught at a Mrs. Peacock's, very probably by Mrs. Peacock herself, who may have been the mistress of a small school; for it was ordered in the will, that, if she died, the step-daughter was to attend the same school as Thomas Goodrich's children."²

"Robert Gascoigne, provided that his wife should. . . keep their daughter Bridget in school, until she could both read and sew with an equal degree of skill."³

"The indentures of Anne Andrewes, who lived in Surry . . . required her master to teach her, not only how to sew and 'such things as were fit for women to know,' but also how to read and apparently also how to write." . . . "In 1690, a girl was bound out to Captain William Crafford, . . . under indentures which required him to teach her how to spin, sew, and read. . ."⁴

The degree of illiteracy among the women has also been estimated by Bruce. It should be remembered this was in the seventeenth century, and, no doubt, through the eighteenth century this was lessened, as the country became more settled, culture became more general.

"There are numerous evidence that illiteracy prevailed to a greater extent among the women than among persons of the opposite sex. . . Among the entire female population of the Colony, without embracing the slaves, only one woman of every three was able to sign her name in full, as compared with at least three of every five persons of the opposite sex."⁵

¹Hart: American Nation Series, Vol IV, p. 114.

²Bruce: Institutional History of Va. in the 17th cent., p. 299.

³Ibid: p. 301.

⁴Ibid: p. 311.

⁵Ibid: p. 454, 457.

In the middle colonies, as in New England, schools were early established for all classes. The first school in Pennsylvania was established in 1683, a year after the founding of Philadelphia. Probably the education of Franklin's daughter was that of the average upper class woman of Pennsylvania.

More emphasis was placed on education in New England than any other colony. A great number of the men who established the colonies here, were University men, naturally interested in education, and the early founding of Harvard College, sixteen years after the landing of Plymouth indicates their interest. As Tyler has said:

"Theirs was a social structure with its corner-stone resting on a book."

However, true this is, I don't know as we are warranted in assuming that the women of Massachusetts were any better educated than those of the other colonies. We do find more of them writing, for here lived the first poet, also Mercy Warren, and others, especially in their letters and diaries, showing some of them took a keen interest in affairs of the public. However, it may have been circumstances which caused Abigail Adams and Mercy Warren to write such extensive letters, due, largely, to the absence of their husbands. Eliza Pinckney's letters rival in interest those of any woman of that period, and if she had been the wife of a man, prominent in the war, like John Adams, her letters, too, would not doubt have been just as interesting as those of Mrs. Adams. True, Martha Washington was in a position to have left many comments, for she was for years close to the

1 Tyler, History of American Literature, p. 87.

very center of the most exciting events, but she was more of a housewife than a woman who enjoyed the discussion of political events. While, these women are only one or two individuals of many, perhaps we should not draw any conclusions, and yet those are all we have to conclude from. It may be with a wider examination of all the writings, the women of the south were as keenly interested in education as those of the colonies farther north, but from my study, I do not believe this to be true. It seems to me the evidence is on the side of the northern woman.

That there were a few women interested in study, and that of unusual subjects, in a day when only reading and writing was the curriculum of women, is shown in letters. We find these comments in the letters of Eliza Pinckney:

"I have got no further than the first volume of Virgil, but was most agreeably disappointed to find myself instructed in agriculture as well as entertained by his charming pen, for I am persuaded 'tho he write for Italy it will in many instances suit Carolina."¹

This, also a little later: "If you will not laugh too immoderately at me, I'll trust you with a secret. I have made two wills already! I know I have done no harm, for I can'd my lesson personal, and never forget in its proper place, him and his heirs forever. . . . But after all what can I do if a poor creature lies a-dying, and their family takes it into their head that I can serve them. I can't refuse: but when they are well, and able to employ a lawyer, I always shall."²

In writing to a friend, after she had been absent from her plantation home, attending some prolonged social function, and speaking of her reluctance to resume her home duties, she says:

"I began to consider what attraction there was in this place that used so agreeably to soothe my pensive humour, and

¹Ravenel: Eliza Pinckney, p. 50.

²Ibid: p. 51.

made me indifferent to everything the gay world could boast: but I found the change not in the place but in myself. . .and I was forced to consult Mr. Locke over and over, to see wherein personal identity consisted, and if I was the very same self!"¹

Surely this was solid material, and one which probably not a great many college women of the twentieth century are familiar with.

One more she notes her wide interest in education: "I am a very Dunce, for I have not acquired the writing short hand yet with any degree of swiftness. . ." ²

Added to these various subjects which she pursued, she spent the larger part of her time studying agriculture, for she conducted the business of three large plantations, and was much interested in experimenting as to the various kinds of crops to cultivate. (See p. 211).

Jane Turell was a resident of Boston in the first half of the eighteenth century, whose interest in various subjects was surely not common to the women of the period.

"Before she had seen eighteen, she had read, and 'in some measure' digested all the English poetry and polite pieces in prose, printed and manuscripts, in her father's well furnished library. . . She had indeed such a thirst after knowledge that the leisure of the day did not suffice, but she spent whole nights in reading. . .

"I find she was sometimes fired with a laudable ambition of raising the honor of her sex, who are therefore under obligations to her; and all will be ready to own she had a fine genius, and is to be placed among those who have excelled.

". . .What greatly contributed to increase her knowledge, in divinity, history, physics, controversy, as well as poetry, was her attentive hearing most that I read upon those heads through the long evenings of the winters as we sat together."³

Mrs. Adams was also interested in subjects foreign to most women of the period. To her husband she writes: "I have taken a great fondness for reading Rollin's Ancient History since you left me. I am determined to go through with it, if possible, in these days of solitude. . ." ⁴

¹Ravenel: "Eliza Pinckney, p. 119.

²Ibid: p. 29.

³Trent: Revolutionary Literature, p. 96.

⁴Letters of Abigail Adams, p. 11.

Also in a letter to Mercy Warren, December 5, 1773, she says: "I send with this the first volume of Moliere and should be glad of your opinion of the plays. I cannot brought to like them. There seems to me to be a general want of spirit. At the close of every one, I have felt disappointed. There are no characters but what appear unfinished; and he seems to have ridiculed vice without engaging us to virtue. . . .There is one negative virtue of which he is possessed, I mean that of decency. . . .I fear I shall incur the charge of vanity by thus criticising an author who has met with so much applause. . . .I should not have done it, if we had not conversed about it before."¹

Mrs. Grant has told us of Aunt Schuyler, a woman of great personality and force of character, the aunt of General Philip Schuyler, a general of the Revolutionary War.

"She was a great manager of her time, and always contrived to create leisure hours for reading; for that kind of conversation which is properly styled gossiping, she had the utmost contempt. . . . Questions in religion and morality, too weighty for table-talk, were leisurely and coolly discussed." (In the garden)²

Like Abigail Adams, she was interested in the vital questions of the hour. "She clearly foresaw that no mode of taxation could be invented to which they would easily submit; and that the defence of the continent from enemies, and keeping the necessary military force to protect the weak and awe the turbulent, would be a perpetual drain of men and money to great Britain, still increasing with the increased population. . . ."³

Several hints are found in the writings of this period, showing what both men and women considered the real education for the latter. Abigail Adams, whose tact, thrift, and womanliness made possible the career of her husband says:

"I consider it as an indispensable requisite, that every American wife should herself know how to order and regulate her family: how to govern her domestics, and train up her children. For this purpose, the all-wise Creator made woman an help-meet for man, and she who fails in these duties does not answer the end of her creation. . . ."⁴

Benjamin Franklin relates the incident of the wife of a

¹Letters of A. Adams, p. 9.

²Grant: Memoirs of an American Lady, p. 136.

³Ibid: p. 267.

⁴Letters of A. Adams, p. 101.

printer, who, after the death of her husband, took charge of his business "With such success, that she not only brought up reputably a family of children, but at the expiration of the term, was able to purchase of me the printing-house, and establish her son in it."¹ He attributes this success largely to that fact, that being of native of Holland she had been taught "the knowledge of accounts."

"I mention this affair chiefly for the sake of recommending that branch of education for our young females, as likely to be of more use to them and their children, in case of widowhood, than either music or dancing, by preserving them from losses by imposition of crafty men, and enabling them to continue, perhaps, a profitable mercantile house, with establish'd correspondence, till a son is grown up fit to undertake and go on with it . . ."²

Mrs. Franklin, like Mrs. Adams, thought a knowledge of household tasks necessary for every woman who married. She writes to her sister-in-law in 1757 in regard to the proposed marriage of her nephew:

"I think Miss Betsey a very agreeable, sweet-tempered, good girl, who has had a housewifely education, and will make, to a good husband, a very good wife. . ."³

However necessary Franklin considered it for a girl to learn accounting, he is anxious that Sally be taught her French and music. Writing to his wife in 1758 we note this:

"I hope Sally applies herself closely to her French and Music and that I shall find she has made great proficiency. Sally's last letter to her brother is the best wrote that of late I have seen of hers. I only wish she was a little more careful of her spelling. I hope she continues to love going to Church, and would have her read over and over again the Whole Duty of Man, and the Lady's Library. . ."⁴

Later in 1772, we find the following in a letter to Sally after her marriage: "I have advis'd him (Mr. Bache) to settle down to business in Philadelphia, where he will always be with you. . . and I think, that in keeping a store, if it be where you dwell, you can be serviceable to him as your mother was to me: For you

1-2Smvth: Writings of B. Franklin, Vol. I, p. 344.

3Ibid: Vol. III, p. 394.

4Ibid: Vol. III, p. 431

are not deficient in capacity, and I hope are not too proud.

"You might easily learn accounts, and you can copy letters, or write them very well upon occasion. By industry & frugality you may get forward in the world, being both of you yet young. . ."¹

Toward the latter part of the eighteenth century Boarding schools for girls were established. One of these well-known was kept by Susanna Rawson, the author of a very popular work, *Charlotte Temple*. Mrs. Earle gives a letter from Eliza Southgate Bowne, who attended this school when fourteen years of age.

"Hon. Father:

"I am again placed at school under the tuition of an amiable lady, so mild, so good, no one can help loving her; she treats all her scholars with such tenderness as would win the affection of the most savage brute. I learn embroidery and geography at present, and wish your permission to learn music. . . .I have described one of the blessings of creation in Mrs. Rawson, and now I will describe Mrs. Lyman as the reverse: she is the worst woman I ever knew of or that I ever saw, nobody knows what I suffered from the treatment of that woman."²

The Moravian schools at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, were very popular schools for girls. The author of the above letter has described one of these schools: "The first was merely a sewing school, little children and a pretty single sister about 30, her white skirt, white short tight waistcoat, nice handkerchief pinned outside, a muslin apron and a close cap, of the most singular form you can imagine. I can't describe it. The hair is all put out of sight, turned back, and no border to the cap, very unbecoming and very singular, tied under the chin with a pink ribbon--blue for the married, white for the widows. Here was a piano forte and another sister teaching a little girl music. We went thro' all the different school rooms, some misses of sixteen, their teachers were very agreeable and easy, and in every room was a piano!"³

Dancing was taught in most of these boarding schools, even in Puritan New England at this time. True, there had been much opposition to it, but even such fiery thunderbolts of Cotton Mather's as the following, had been unable to stay the change of public

¹Smyth: Writings of B. Franklin, Vol. V, p. 345.

²Earle: *Child Life in Colonial Days*, p. 114.

³Ibid: p. 114.

opinion:

"Who were the Inventors of Petulant Dancings? Learned men have well observed that the Devil was the first inventor of the impleaded dances, and the Gentiles who worshipped him the first practitioners of this Art."¹

Some of the daughters sent to school showed a remarkable degree of independence, hardly in keeping with our ideas of the meekness characteristic of girls of that day. Sarah Hall, whose parents lived in Barbadoes, was sent to her grandmother Madam Coleman of Boston, to attend school. She arrived in 1719, accompanied by her maid. But she remained only a short time with her stately grandmother, and left abruptly with her maid, securing board and lodgings at a near-by home. At her brother's command, she returned, but even a brother's authority failed to control this lively little maid. A few months after this episode, we find this letter from Madam Coleman:

"Sally wont go to school nor to church and wants a new muff and a great many other things she don't need. I tell her fine things are cheaper in Barbadoes. She says she will go to Barbados in the Spring. She is well and brisk, says her brother has nothing to do with her as long as her father is alive."²

Four month's instruction in writing (and pens, ink, and paper) was one pound seven shillings and four pence. The entrance fee for dancing lessons was a pound a piece: and the bill for Sally's dancing for four months, two pounds."³

The expense was worth it, no doubt, for Sally learned to "sew, floure, write, and dance, and grew up a dashing belle."⁴

One thing emphasized in the training of the colonial woman was manners -- how to be a charming hostess. Mrs. Earle says: "It is impossible to overestimate the value these laws of etiquette, these conventions of customs had at a time when

¹Earle: Child Life in Colonial Days, p. 111. (110)

²⁻³Ibid: 101-103.

⁴Ibid.

neighborhood life was the whole outside world."¹

Many were the "don'ts" enjoined on the colonial miss. The following are but a few:

"Never sit down at the table till asked, and after the blessing. Ask for nothing: tarry till it be offered thee. Speak not. Bite not thy bread but break it. Take salt only with a clean knife. Dip not the meat in the same. Hold not thy knife upright but sloping, and lay it down at the right hand of plate with blade on plate. Look not earnestly at any other that is eating. When moderately satisfied leave the table. Sing not, hum not, wiggle not. . . . Smell not of thy meat; make not a noise with thy tongue, mouth, lips, or breath in thy eating and drinking. . . . When any speak to thee, stand up. Say not I have heard it before. Never endeavour to help him out if he tell it not right. Snigger not: never question the truth of it."²

Possibly too much emphasis was placed on etiquette, but at least the children of those days were not the sole criterions of authority, as in the present. To see a child now-a-days who is well-mannered, causes comment, as probably one ill-mannered was noticed in this colonial period. Instead of the extremes, how splendid it would be, could the median be found.

Girls were early taught these forms, and in addition much care taken to train them to be erect and dignified, with the correct manner of standing, sitting, etc. "To attain an erect and dignified bearing growing girls were tortured as in English boarding schools by sitting in stocks, wearing harnesses, and being strapped to backboards. The backthread stays and stiffened coats of "little Miss Custis" were made still more unyielding by metal and wood busks: the latter made of close-grained heavy wood. All these constraints and accessories contributed to a certain thin-chested though erect appearance, which is notable in the portraits of girls and women painted in the past century.

"The backboard certainly helped to produce an erect and dignified carriage, and was assisted by the quick, graceful motions used in wool-spinning. The daughter of the Revolutionary patriot General Nathanael Greene stated to her grandchildren that in her girlhood she sat every day with her feet in stocks, strapped to a backboard."³

¹Farle: Child Life in Colonial Days, p. 212.

²Ibid: pp. 215-217.

³Ibid: pp. 105-107.

We have an interesting comment on the schools and the educational advantages of Connecticut in the latter part of the eighteenth century, written by Hannah Adams. She says, in part:

"My health did not even admit of attending school with the children in the neighborhood where I resided. The country schools, at that time, were kept but a few months in the year, and all that was then taught in them was reading, writing and arithmetic. In the summer, the children were instructed by females in reading, sewing, and other kinds of work. The books chiefly made use of were the Bible and Psalter. Those who have had the advantages of receiving the rudiments of their education at the schools of the present day, can scarcely form an adequate idea of the contrast between them, (written in 1832) and those of an earlier age; and of the great improvements which have been made even in the common country schools. The disadvantages of my early education I have experienced during life; and, among various others, the acquiring a very faulty pronunciation: a habit contracted so early, that I cannot wholly rectify it in later years."¹

Samuel Peters, writing in 1781, gives this comment on the education of the women of Connecticut, which seems hardly to conform with the above:

The women of Connecticut are strictly virtuous, and to be compared to the prude rather than the European polite lady. They are not permitted to read plays: cannot converse about whist, quadrille, or operas: but will freely talk upon the subjects of history, geography, and the mathematics. They are great casuists, and polemical divines; and I have known not a few of them so well skilled in Greek and Latin, as often to put to the blush learned gentlemen."²

The Colonial woman excelled in needlework and knitting, and many are the comments about her industry along these lines. An advertisement in a New York newspaper indicates the different forms of decorative work, then popular.

"Martha Gazley, late from Great Britain, now in the city of New York makes and teacheth the following curious works, viz: Artificial Fruit and Flowers and other Wax-works, Nuns-work, Philigree and Pencil Work upon Muslin, all sorts of Needle-Work, and Raising of Paste, as also to paint upon Glass, and Transparent for Sconces, with other works. If any young Gentlewomen, or others are inclined to learn any or all of the above-mentioned curious works, they may be carefully instructed in the same by said Martha Gazley."³

¹Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. IV, p. 68.

²Ibid: Vol. III, p. 213.

³Farle: Child Life in Colonial Days, p. 335.

"While Dutch women must be awarded the palm of comfortable and attractive housekeeping, they did not excel Englishwomen in needlework. . . Crewel-work and silk-embroidery were fashionable, and surprisingly pretty effects were produced. Every little maiden had her sampler which she begun with the alphabet and numerals, following them with a scriptural text or verse of a psalm. Then fancy was let loose on birds, beasts and trees. Most of the old families possessed framed pieces of embroidery, the handiwork of female ancestors."¹

"Knitting was taught to little girls as soon as they could hold the needles. Girls four years of age could knit stockings and mittens. In country households young damsels knit mittens to sell and coarse socks. Many fine and beautiful stitches were taught, and a beautiful pair of long silk stockings of open-work design has initials knit on the instep. They were the wedding hose of a bride of the year 1760; and the silk for them was raised, wound, and spun by the bride's sister, and a girl of fourteen, who also did the exquisite knitting."³

Something more will be said concerning the activities of women in the home in discussing the latter phase.

Some of the women realized their lack of education, and the opportunities to secure such. Abigail Adams writing to her husband says, "If you complain of education in sons what shall I say of daughters who every day experience the want of it. With regard to the education of my own children I feel myself soon out of my death, destitute in every part of education. I most sincerely wish that some more liberal plan might be laid and executed for the benefit of the rising generation and that our new Constitution may be distinguished for encouraging learning and virtue. If we mean to have heroes, statesmen, and philosophers, we should have learned women. The world perhaps would laugh at me, but you, I know, have a mind too enlarged and liberal to disregard sentiment. If as much depends as is allowed upon the early education of youth and the first principles which are instilled take the deepest root great benefit must arise from the literary accomplishments in women."²

Hannah Adams, writes thus: "I was very desirous of learning the rudiments of Latin, Greek, geography, and logic. Some gentlemen who boarded at my father's offered to instruct me in these branches of learning gratis, and I pursued these studies with indescribable pleasure and avidity. I still, however, sensibly felt the want of a more systematic education, and those advantages which females enjoy in the present day. . . My reading was very desultory, and novels engaged too much of my attention."⁴

Aunt Schuyler deplored the fact that there were so few books for the education of women, yet she was very particular to

¹Farle: Child Life in Colonial Days, p. 338-9.

³Brooks: Dames and Daughters of Colonial Days, p. 199.

⁴Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. IV, p. 69.

read only the books she choose, even though reading material was not plentiful: "Shakespeare was a questionable author at the Flatts, where the plays were considered grossly familiar, and by no means to be compared to 'Cato,' which Madame Schuyler greatly admired. The 'Essay on Map' was also in highest esteem with this lady. . . ."¹

This interest of Madame Schuyler's in such books as noted above, is the more singular, as the Dutch women were not as much interested in education as their English sisters. They left very few diaries, letters, or writings compared with the latter. The author of "Catherine Schuyler" comments on this

saying: "The difference between the English and Dutch settlements is not more emphasized than in the status of the women. The Colonial women of New England and the South were inveterate letter writers and diarists. The descendants of the Dutch were estimable mothers and wives, but neither pen-women nor talkers."² It is doubt

Thus, the education of women throughout the colonies consisted, for the most part, in learning how to care for and conduct a home. This was their essential training, for the business of being a home-maker was their work. They were either sent to country or dame schools, taught by tutor, or attended later in the eighteenth century, boarding schools. Reading, writing, and the rudiments of arithmetic were taught them. A few were interested in broader fields, but not the average woman. Especially through the middle colonies and the South, accomplishments such as dancing, music, drawing, and later in the eighteenth century, French were considered important. In New York, among the Dutch, the women were able to read and write.

¹Humphreys: Catherine Schuyler, p. 75.

²Ibid: p. 10.

but, on the whole, were not as interested in education or writing as those women, especially of Massachusetts, Connecticut, or even in the south. That a few women realized their lack of education, and deplored it is shown in their letters. No doubt it was, in part, the spirit among these women, impressed upon their families and friends, that had its influence during the early part of the nineteenth century in bringing about better educational facilities for women, and which has resulted during the later part of the nineteenth century and the early part of this, the twentieth, in creating the most varied educational opportunities for women, who did not write, but yearned for a better training, and hungered for the culture that was denied them, we shall never know. But let us rejoice that there were a few, who interested themselves in what was considered the education of men, and who, possibly by their ability and receptiveness in unknown fields, paved the way for the wonderful advantages now offered to women in school, college and university, and in other lines as well.

JII

THE HOME

Perhaps, it is in the home that we shall find the real colonial woman. In these other phases, religious, social, education, we do not find her at her natural work. For in any age, clime, or among any people, it is in her home, surrounded by her loved ones, that we see woman at her best. This is her inherent place, and regardless of feminism, the clubs, the splendid opportunities now open to her, the fears of the race-sucidists, the home will always be the place where woman is most beautiful. Here she is indeed a reigning queen. We can say with truth, that there never was a time when the home wielded more, or a greater influence than during the colonial period of the history of the United States. The home was the center of society. This was before the days of men's clubs, women's clubs, moving pictures, theatres, suffragist meetings, and the thousand and one activities that now call us from our homes. The colonial home was more than a place where one slept and ate. It was a home in the broadest, deepest sense of the word. I would have had the gift of words to portray the charm, the beauty, simplicity, the love, the influence of the colonial home: but one must read the writings himself. Those colonial women had never received diplomas upon graduating in courses such as domestic science and home economics; they had never heard of balanced diets, they knew aught of how to arrange

the color scheme of a room, but they knew the secret of how to make a home.

In discussing the home life, however, let us remember that all these homes were not ideal. So often in our study of the founders of the colonies, and the men and women who made the history, we are prone to think all were of the stamp of John Winthrop, Governor Bradford, Judge Sewall, John Adams, and George Washington. Unfortunately this is not the case. These men and women were not perfect, but common people who strove hard, finding life not all ease, and often failing. There were only too many who complained, grumbled, and were altogether hardly the material fit to found a new nation. In discussing the social phase we shall note the breaking of laws, harsh sentences, etc. There was an element of what we term "uncouthness" and rudeness in the colonial society. Much of the under strata of society was decidedly unsentle, rough and coarse: such as is always found in a new county, under pioneer conditions. And yet the great majority of the thinking, leading class in New England, the substantial traders and merchants of New York and Pennsylvania, the plantation owners in the south were men and women who were law-abiding, God-fearing people who believed essentially in their homes and cherished them. There was that restful air about the colonial home which the distracted American in the midst of this nerve-racking age does not seem to find.

Here, again, in a discussion of the colonial home we must depend more upon the writings of the men, for little was written by the women. Yet, here and there, in their letters we catch

glimpses of how much it meant to the women, as well as the men. We find in the letters of the men and women, touches of a deep, abiding faith and love; as beautiful love as one would wish.

While, in one sense, we find the life of the Puritan woman narrow because of her religion, denied many of the things which would have made their lot more pleasant, yet we find traces in the writings which brighten the dreary existence. In many of the letters we find a trace of the love which shows us that they were people much like you and me who above all, wanted to be happy. In the letters between husbands and wives, we find the woman held in high respect, her advice asked, and her influence marked. The letters of Governor Winthrop and his wife breathe a devotion, a love, as beautiful as that of Elizabeth Barrett and Robert Browning. Governor Winthrop was one of the leading men of Plymouth and Boston; a man of high ideals, with the best education that England could furnish, a lawyer of the Middle Temple, a man whose devotion to duty has made the pages of the history of Plymouth and Boston live in our memory, and whose love for the colony made possible the development of the towns of Massachusetts. He served many years as governor, accepting no remuneration, and, at last, in his old age, we see him, without material comforts, having lost his private property, in giving so much to the colony he loved. There are beautiful touches in his letters to his beloved wife Margaret, the second of his three wives. Governor Winthrop was in New England for several years, before his wife came, and it is during this time that we find the passages quoted. Writing after reaching England he says: "My Dear Wife: Commend my Love to them all, I kiss & embrace thee, my

deare wife, and all my children, and leave thee in his armes who is able to preserve you all, & to fulfill our joye in our happye meeting in his good time. Amen. Thy faithfull husband."¹

The following letter was written shortly before her husband left England:

"MY MOST SWEET HUSBAND: -- How dearely welcome thy kine letter was to me I am not able to expresse. The sweetnesse of it did much refresh me. What can be more pleasinge to a wife, than to heare of the welfayre of her best beloved, and how he is pleased with hir more endeavours. . . . I wish that I may be all-ways pleasinge to thee, and that those comforts we have in each other may be dayly increased as far as they be pleasing to God. . . . I will doe any service whearein I may please my good Husband. I confess I cannot doe vnoth for the. . . ." ²

Winthrop writes this, just before leaving England: "I must begin now to prepare thee for our long parting which growes very near. I know not how to deal with thee by arguments; for if thou wert as wise and patient as ever woman was, yet it must needs be a great trial to thee, and the greater because I am so dear to thee. That which I must chiefly look at in thee, for thy ground of contentment, is thy godliness."³

Later in New England, he "longs to see the sweet face of his deare wife", and writes many letters to her telling her what will be necessary for the voyage, arranging as best he can for her comfort.

But there are other letters, later in the period, and far removed from this puritan period, in which we find the traces of a deep and reverent love. Sometimes, it is in the letters of the men, longing for him, or those of their wives, longing for their return, or possibly not in letters, but poetry such as we note in Ann Bradstreet's writings, or the beautiful description by Jonathan Edwards of the woman, who afterwards became his wife. The latter was written in 1723, and is as

¹Earle: Margaret Winthrop, p. 148.

²Ibid: p. 38.

³Ibid: p. 129.

I prize thy love more than whole mines of gold,
or all the riches that the East doth hold,
My love is such that rivers cannot quench,
Nor aught but love from thee give recompense.
My love is such I can no way repay;
the heavens reward thee manifold, I pray,
then while we live in love let's persevere
than when we live no more we may live ever."¹

.

The letters of Abigail Adams to her husband show a depth of love and affection, and we can faintly realize what the years of separation must have meant to her. She writes in 1767:

"My dearest Friend:

. . . I hope soon to receive the dearest of friends, and the tenderest of husbands, with that unabated affection which has for years past, and will whilst the vital spark lasts, burn in the bosom of your affectionate

A. Adams."²

"Boston, 25 October, 1777. . . This day, dearest of friends, completes thirteen years since we were solemnly united in wedlock. Three years of this time we have been cruelly separated. I have, patiently as I could, endured it, with the belief that you were serving your country. . ."³

"May 18, 1778. . . Beneath my humble roof, blessed with the society and tenderest affection of my dear partner, I have enjoyed as much felicity and as exquisite happiness, as falls to the share of mortals. . ."⁴

Likewise the letters of James and Mercy Warren, contain the same note. Writing to his wife in 1775 he says: "I long to see you. I long to set with you under our vines & have none to make us afraid. . . I intend to fly home I mean as soon as prudence Duty & Honour will permit."⁵

Again in 1780, he writes:

"MY DEAR MERCY: -- . . . When shall I hear from you. My affection is strong, my anxieties are many about you. You are alone. . . if you are not well and happy how can I be so."⁶

She replies on December 30, 1777, to his anxious inquiries:

. . . "Oh! these painful absences. ten thousand anxieties invade my Bosom on your account and some times hold my lids waking

¹Old South Leaflets, Vol. VII, p. 181.

^{2, 3, 4}Letters of A. Adams., pp. 10, 89, 93.

^{5, 6}Brown: Mercy Warren, pp. 73, 95.

Many hours of the cold and lonely night. . ."¹

In a letter written by George Washington, after accepting the appointment of Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army, to his wife, there is the "home touch". He says in part:

"MY DEAREST: --. . ."You may believe me, my dear Patsy, when I assure you, in the most solemn manner, that, so far from seeking this appointment, I have used every endeavor in my power to avoid it, not only from my unwillingness to part with you and the family, but from a consciousness of its being a trust too great for my capacity, and that I should enjoy more real happiness in one month with you at home than I have the most distant prospect of finding abroad, if my stay were to be seven times seven years. . . .My unhappiness will flow from the uneasiness you will feel from being left alone."²

Eliza Pinckney writing to a friend of her husband, shortly after her marriage, says:

"I am married and the gentleman I have made choice of comes up to my plan in every title. . ."³

After the death of her husband, she writes to her mother:

"I was for more than 14 year the happiest mortal upon earth! Heaven had blessed me beyond the lott of Mortals and left me nothing to wish for. . .I had not a desire beyond him. . ."⁴

Even the material and matter-of-fact, Franklin longs for home. Writing to Miss Ray, March 4, 1755, he says:

"began to think of and wish for home, and, as I drew nearer, I found the attraction stronger and stronger. My diligence and speed increased with my impatience. I drove on violently, and made such long stretches, that a very few days brought me to my own house, and to the arms of my good old wife and children, where I remain, thanks to God, at present well and happy. . ."⁵

The charm of the colonial home is often mentioned. One or two citations will be sufficient to show then, as this phase is discussed more in detail under the social life. William Byrd describes in detail the home of Colonel Spotswood, which he visited in 1732. He says in part: "In the evening the noble Colo. came

¹Brown: Mercy Warren, n. 98.

²Wharton: Martha Washington, n. 85.

³Ravenel: Eliza Pinckney, n. 93.

⁴Ibid: n. 175.

⁵Smyth: Writings of B. Franklin Vol. III, n. 245.

came home from his Mines. who saluted me very civilly. and Mrs. Spotswood's sister. Miss Theky. who had been to meet him enCavalier. was so kind too as to bid me welcome. We talkt over a legend of old Storvs. supp'd about 9. and then prattl'd with the ladys. till twas time for a Travellour to retire. In the mean time I observ'd my old friend to be very uxorious. and exceedingly fond of his children. This was so opposite to the Maxims he us'd to preach up before he was marrv'd. that I cou'd not forbear rubbing up the memory of them. But he gave a very good-natur'd turn to his change of sentiments. by alleging that whoever brings a poor gentlewomen into so silitary a place. from all her friends and acquaintance. wou'd be ungrateful not to use her and all that belongs to her with all possible tenderness.

. . . "At nine we met over a pot of coffee. which was not quite strong enough to give us the palsy. After breakfast the Colo. and I left the ladys to their Domestick Affairs. . . . Dinner was both elegant and plentiful. The afternoon was devoted to the Ladys. who shew'd me one of their most beautiful Walks. They conducted me thro' a Shady Lane to the landing. and by the way made me drink some very fine water that issued from a Marble Fountain. and ran incessantly. Just behind it was a cover'd bench. where Miss Theky often sat and bewail'd her fate as an unmarried woman.

" . . . In the afternoon the Ladys walkt me about amongst all their little animals. with which they amuse themselves. and furnish the table. . . . Our ladys overslept themselves this morning. so that we did not break our fast till ten."¹

The charm of the home life of Mount Vernon is noted in this brief account of a young women of Fredericksburg. in writing to a friend: "I must tell you what a charming day I spent at Mount Vernon with Mama and Sally. The Gen'l and Madame came home on Christmas Eve. and such a racket the Servants made. for they were glad of their coming! Three handsome young officers came with them. All Christmas afternoon people came to pay their respects and duty. Among them were stately Dames and gay young women. The Gen'l seemed very happy. and Mistress Washington was from Daybrake making everything as agreeable as possible for everybody."²

The picture of a beautiful home life is found in the following quotations concerning home of Alexander Hamilton. His reason for resigning his seat in the cabinet in his own words

¹Bassett: Writings of Col. William Byrd., pp. 356-358.

²Wharton: Martha Washington. n. 153.

was "to indulge my domestic happiness more freely. This was the principal motive for relinquishing an office in which it is said I have gained some glory.

There is the picture of Mrs. Hamilton "seated at the table cutting slices of bread and spreading them with butter for the younger boys, who, standing by her side, read in turn a chapter in the Bible or a portion of Goldsmith's 'Rome.' When the lessons were finished the father and the older children were called to breakfast, after which the boys were packed off to school."

He writes to a friend: "You cannot imagine how domestic I am becoming," he writes. "I sigh for nothing but the society of my wife and baby."¹

However, despite the beauty of the home life and the charm it held for both men and women, it was extremely hard on the latter. Possibly, this was more true, in New England than in the south, as in the former there were fewer servants, on the whole, than in the south. And then there were many, many homes where all the work must be done with the aid of only the children, as the family finances would not permit the securing of servants. Then, too, even where it was possible to purchase slaves, or the labor of indented persons, they were extremely difficult to secure, and, when secured, were often more of a trial, than the work. Especially, in the south, as noted under the social life, there was a constant demand on the housewife to entertain great companies of people. But aside from the social phase, the entertainments, dinners, etc., just the routine housework was very difficult, indeed. Books could be written on this phase of the life of the colonial woman. The dreary drudgery and physical labor in the home was indeed terrible. Aside from the distressing conditions of the new country, privation, danger from Indians, the ravages of war, etc., the method of housekeeping had not been devised to ease the woman of burdens. This was the day of polished and sanded floors; no carpets to make the cleaning less. And the neatness of the colonial housewife, north, south,

¹Brooks: Dames and Daughters of Colonial Days, p. 242.

east, west, is proverbial. Often the rooms were large, and there were no modern conveniences for oiling and dusting floors as now. All such work was done on the knees, and one can only surmise how many weary miles the colonial housewife travelled in her dusting and cleaning.

Nearly every household had an abundance of silver or pewter, and this must be polished often and kept in immaculate condition. The wealth of the colonists before the war consisted largely of silver and linen, and the latter was over a source of pride to the good dames. "An old-time stained record contains the inventory of 135 homespun sheets, 9 fine sheets, 12 tow sheets, 13 bolster-cases, 6 pillow-biers, 9 diaper brakefast cloathes, 17 table cloathes, 12 damask napkin, 27 homespun napkins, 31 pillow-cases, 11 dresser cloathes and a damask cupboard cloate."¹

But this was the day before the use of the electric washer, indeed before the washing machine at all: all was hand work. The preparing the food would seem, to the modern woman, like an herculean task. Our good forefathers had never heard of appendicitis and dyspepsia, and they feasted much and often, and apparently enjoyed it. The caterer's bill for the following banquet given by the corporation of New York to Lord Cornbury, indicates that, surely, there was no death of famine in the land:

"Mayor. . . .Dr.
To a piece of beef and cabbage,
To a dish of tripe and cowheel
To a leg of pork and turnips
To 2 puddings
To a surloyn of beef
To a turkey and onions
To a leg mutton and pickles,
To a dish chickens
To minced eyes
To fruit, cheese, bread, etc.
To butter for sauce
To dressing dinner,
To 31 bottles wine
To beer and syder."²

¹Humphreys: Catharine Schuyler, p. 69.

²Fiske, Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America, Vol. I. p. 278.

But while the Dutch may have been heavier eaters than the English, the latter were a close second. We must recall also that practically all the food must be prepared in the home. On the farm and plantation, the meat was killed, cured; the wheat threshed and made into flour, the vegetables laid away for winter, the fruit prepared, and many other tasks performed, before the food was ready for use. Spices, sugar, salt, molasses and rum were imported from the West Indies, but as these were largely the imports all other food products must be produced.

One task that must have taxed the strength of the housewife was the care of the huge beds. Anyone who has seen the picture or even the original colonial bed has, no doubt, wondered just how the sleeper succeeded in climbing in: but if that was difficult, how about the making of the bed? One could ascend a ladder to reach its downy depths, but this would seem a rather perilous way to make it. -- to move slowly about the bed. However, they had to be made, how we do not know, and we can imagine something of the physical energy it must have taken, and how weary were the muscles after the accomplishment.

Aside from the work similar to that done today in the home -- dusting, cleaning, cooking, etc., there were many tasks which today are done in the factory. Indeed, so far removed are we from those times and the manner of industry, that when we read of the tasks, they convey no meaning, for we have lost the understanding of the terms. Early in the history of the colonies, the material for all the clothing was prepared in the home, the carding, preparing the thread for the spinner, the spinning, the weaving, dying, all this before the material could be secured for the making

into garments. The preparing of the flax, wool, and cotton used for clothing was no easy task. Then, when the material was ready for making, all sewing was done by hand, as such a thing as a sewing-machine was unknown until nearly the middle of the nineteenth century. Aside from the members of the family, there were the slaves and servants to clothe. This comment is made con-

cerning one skilled housewife: "Notwithstanding they have so large a family to regulate (from 50 to 60 blacks) Mrs. Schuyler seeth to the Manufacturing of suitable Cloathing for all her family, all of which is the produce of her plantation in which she is helped by her mama and Miss Polly and the whole is done with less combustion and noise than in many families who have not more than four or five persons in the whole family."¹

Mrs. Earle in the "Home Life in Colonial Days", describes in a delightful manner the details of the spinning and weaving, but too detailed to quote. Throughout the eighteenth century much of the material for clothing, silks, satins, brocades, and the finer cloths used was imported from Europe, but during the war the spinning wheel was again revived, and "from Massachusetts to South Carolina the women of the colonies banded together in patriotic societies called Daughters of Liberty, agreeing to wear only garments of homespun manufacture, and to drink no tea. In many New England towns they gathered together to spin, each bringing her own wheel. At one meeting seventy linen-wheels were employed. In Rowley, Massachusetts, the meeting of the Daughters is thus described:

'A number of thirty-three respectable ladies of the town met at sunrise with their wheels to spend the day at the house of the Rev'd Jedediah Jeweel, in the laudable design of a spinning match. At an hour before sunset, the ladies there appearing neatly dressed, principally in homespun, a polite and generous repast of American production was set for their entertainment. . ."²

Washing and cleansing of the wool was a long, wearisome process. The following comment found in an old diary gives a hint of the task. "' A large kettle of varn to attend upon. Lucretia and self rinse, scour through many waters, set out, drv,

¹Humphreys: Catherine Schuyler, p. 108.

²Earle: Home Life in Colonial Days, p. 183.

attend to, bring in, do up and sort 110 score of wearn: this with baking and ironing. Then went to hackling flax." (One day's work)¹

After the spinning and weaving, the cloth was dyed, or bleached, and this was no easy task. Later, silks, and finer materials, imported from Europe lessened the work, but spinning and weaving continued to be a part of the home work until the early part of the nineteenth century. Every good housewife was taught to spin and weave, and though during the latter part of the eighteenth century, not all the clothing was produced in this manner, it did not become a lost art, for as noted, it was revived again with the war. Martha Washington took out the spinning wheels again, as did thousands of other women, and "Mrs. Washington, who would not have the heart to starve her direct foe within her own gates, heartily co-operated with her husband and his colleagues. The spinning wheels and carding and weaving machines were set to work with fresh spirit at Mount Vernon. . . . Some Years later, in New Jersey, Mrs. Washington told a friend that she often kept sixteen spinning wheels in constant operation, and at one time Lund Washington spoke of an even larger number. Two of her own dresses, of cotton striped with silk, Mrs. Washington showed with great pride, explaining that the silk stripes in the fabric were made from the ravellings of brown silk stockings and old crimson damask chair covers. Her coachman, footman and maid were all attired in domestic cloth, excepting the coachman's scarlet cuffs, which she took care to state had been imported before the war."²

In the South the slaves assisted in the household tasks, taking much of the physical work from the women, but the supervision of the slaves, was in itself work that required much time. "The welfare of the slaves, of whom one hundred and fifty had been part of her dower; their clothing much of which was woven and made upon the estate, their comfort, especially when ill; and their instruction in sewing, knitting, and other housewifely arts, engaged much of Mrs. Washington's time and thought."³

When we remember that practically everything needed for the

¹Farle: Home Life in Colonial days, p. 202.

²Wharton: Martha Washington, p. 71.

³Ibid: p. 62.

use of the family was supplied on the farms, especially in New England and the Middle colonies, more than in the south, we can realize a little of the work that fell to the lot of the women.

"In a paper published in the American Museum in 1787, an old farmer says: 'At this time my farm gave me and my whole family, a good living on the produce of it, and left me one year with another one hundred and fifty silver dollars. for I never spent more than ten dollars a year which was for salt, nails, and the like. Nothing to eat, drink or wear, was bought, as my farm provided all.'"¹

Another task, unthought of at the present time, was the preparation of the candles for the use of the family. Mrs.

Farle says: "The making of the winter's stock of candles was the special autumnal household duty, and a hard one too, for the great kettles were tiresome and heavy to handle. An early hour found the work well under way. A good fire was started in the kitchen fireplace under two vast kettles, each two feet, perhaps, in diameter, which were hung on trammels from the lug-hole or crane, and half filled with boiling water and melted tallow, which had had two scaldings and skimmings. . . . Deer suet, moose fat, bear's grease, all were saved in frontier settlements, and carefully tried into tallow for candles. Every particle of grease rescued from pot liquor, or fat from meat, was utilized for candle-making. . . ."²

This also the day before the lamp, was the day before the match, and some form of a flint and steel was used to obtain the spark, which was blown into a flame. Fire was precious in that day, and one means of securing it, which to us, would seem truly primitive, is indicated in the following comment:

"April 21, 1631. The house of JOHN PAGE of Waterton, burnt by carrying a few coals from one house to another. A coal fell by the way, and kindled the leaves."³

Of course, later rude forms of lamps were used, but flint, steel, and timber were used into the nineteenth century, for sulphur matches were very expensive.

¹Farle: Home Life in Colonial Days, p. 158.

²Ibid: pp. 34-38.

³Prince: Annals of New England, English Garner, p. 584.

Soap-making was another source of much worry and hard work for the women. Wood-ashes from the fireplaces, together with the refuse grease from cooking, butchering, etc., with the added lye was used. One old-time recipe gives the following directions:

"The great difficulty in making Soap come is the want of judgment of the Strength of the Lye. If your Lye will bear up an Egg or a Potato so you can see a piece of the Surface as big as a Ninepence it just is strong enough."¹

The making of soap was one of the industries that survived the colonial period.

Every mother was a physician, and considerable time was spent in the fall gathering herbs for the tonics used; in the spring the material was secured for the salves and ointments. Syrups were made, certain plants were dried for use, others pressed, etc. But all this took the time of the housewife.

Added to all this was the cooking and baking, which would indeed seem a gigantic task today. There were no stoves for many years, only the great fireplaces. A woman traveller in New York says: "The chimney-places are very droll-like; they have no jambs nor lintell as we have, but a flate grate, and there projects over it a lum in the form of the cat-and-clay lum, and commonly a muslin or ruffled pawn around it."²

Pots and kettles hung on cranes over the fire-place; and the utensils were long handled and quaint. Great care had to be taken to watch carefully the savory dishes cooked over the fire-place, and especially the baking. "The great brass and copper kettles often held fifteen gallons; the vast iron pot -- desired and beloved of every colonist -- sometimes weighed forty pounds, and lasted in daily use for many years."³ One would think so, and no doubt the pots and kettles lasted longer than the women who used them. These great kettles were used for boiling vegetables and meats.

¹Earle: Home Life in Colonial Days, p. 254.

²Ibid: p. 55.

³Ibid: p. 56.

We have noted (see n. 79) what feasts the Dutch had in their entertaining. A little imagination will serve to give a faint idea of the work done by the women in preparing such quantities and varieties of food over the fireplaces, with the long-handled kettles and pots. The following comments serve to give us an idea, also, of the foods used in Philadelphia:

"This plain Friend, (Miers Fisher, a young Quaker lawyer) with his plain but pretty wife with her Thees and Thous, had provided us a costly entertainment: ducks, hams, chickens, beef, pie, tarts, creams, custards, jellies, fools, trifles, floating islands, beer, porter, punch, wine and a long, etc."

"At the home of Chief Justice Chew. About four o'clock we were called to dinner. Turtle and every other thing, flummery, jellies, sweetmeats of twenty sorts, trifles, whipped sillabubs, floating islands, fools, etc., with a dessert of fruits, raisins, almonds, pears, peaches.

"A most sinful feast again! everything which could delight the eye or allure the taste; curds and creams, jellies, sweetmeats of various sorts, twenty kinds of tarts, fools, trifles, floating islands, whipped sillabubs, etc. Parmesan cheese, punch, wine, porter, beer." [1]

Truly we can understand why Benjamin Franklin was troubled with gout, if this was a fair sample of the eatables of the times.

However, it should be noted that the above is dated late in the eighteenth century, when the fire-place had been replaced by the stove, so possibly the burden was lightened.

There was also the canning and preserving, the pickling, making the sugar from the sap, the preparation of the meat after the killing, and many other forms of labor we might mention.

We are able to have some notion of the skill of a house-keeper during those days, from the following advertisement in the "Pennsylvania Packet of September 23, 1780:

"Wanted at a Seat about half a days journey from Philadelphia, on which are good improvements and domestics, a single

Farle: Home Life in Colonial Days, n. 160.

woman of unsullied Reputation, an affable, cheerful, active and amiable Disposition: cleanly, industrious, perfectly qualified to direct and manage the female concerns of country business, as raising small stock, dairying, marketing, combing, carding, spinning, knitting, sewing, pickling, preserving, etc., and occasionally to instruct two young ladies in those branches of economy, who, with their father, compose the family. Such a person will be treated with respect and esteem and meet with every encouragement due to such a character."¹

In one sense, the very nature of the work provided a portion of the social life, especially in New England. It was a common custom for neighbors to join their efforts in accomplishing many of the more common tasks. The women had quilting bees, sewing, bees, knitting bees, mending bees, and many other "bees", and this served to lighten the labor, and to develop a spirit of neighborliness that has disappeared under modern conditions. However, the law of compensation ever works, and if we have become less neighborly we are more philanthropic, and if we have less love for men, we have more for mankind than did our colonial forefathers.

From the vantage point of two hundred years, forgetting these hardships, and crude methods of labor, the quietness and simplicity of these colonial homes appeal to us. But I imagine the women who made possible those homes were often sick at heart with life's burdens. Confronted with the unsettled conditions of a new country, with society on an insecure foundation, the unbelievable hardships, and above all the terrible strain of the bearing and rearing of many children, possibly tho they loved them, the home may not have been as ideal as it seem to us. And that brings us to the most terrible burden of the colonial women:

1 Earle: Home Life in Colonial Days. p. 252.

The incessant child-bearing. Large families then were an asset, not a liability. Boys and girls meant workers, boys on the farm or in the shop, girls in the house. Since most of the food and clothing was produced directly by those who used it, education not expensive, children were welcomed. And yet, if we could have read the hearts of some of those women, I wonder if all were welcome. No doubt they tried to make themselves believe all were, for their religion taught them any other thought was sinful, and yet there must have been women who had borne many children, who because of the hardships, earlier, surrounded by savages, miles from medical aid, who hesitated, wondering if they could find the necessary courage. Small wonder that many of them gave up, and passed out, willing to do their share, but not able to do the unnecessary. And so much was unnecessary! Women bore many children, and buried many. Families of twelve children were not uncommon. Cotton Mather had fifteen children, married twice; the father of Benjamin Franklin, seventeen children, married twice; Roger Clap of Dorchester fourteen children by one wife; William Phips, a royal governor of Massachusetts, the son of a gunsmith, belonged to a family of twenty-six children all by the same father and mother. The latter was probably unusual, but families of ten and fourteen children were common. Catherine Schuyler was the mother of fourteen children. Judge Sewall piously tell us: "Jan. 6, 1701. 'In a Memorandum on his Children). This is the thirteenth child that I have offered up to God in Baptisme: my wife having born me seven sons and seven daughters.'"¹

Franklin tell us "My mother had likewise an excellent

¹Sewall's Diary, Vol. II, p. 50.

constitution: she nursed all her ten children."¹ He does not add, however, what kind of constitutions the children had, or to what age they lived. Four or five of Judge Sewall's children died in infancy, and only four lived to be over thirty years of age. It seems never to have occurred to the good colonial father that it were better to rear five children to maturity, than to rear five and bury five. We know that the death rate among women and children was exceedingly high. Many, many men were married twice and three times, and a considerable four times. Posterity has paid the debt of the strain upon the colonial woman in weakened constitutions, and there is a bare possibility that some of the nervousness and neurasthenia of the twentieth century is still the interest on that debt. And yet men referred to the women as a "poor, weak, vessel". We wonder how she had the courage to live? why she did not give up? Probably, since she knew no other condition -- her mother before her had lived a similar life.

The following quotation presents a picture of industry in 1775, and conditions then were no doubt, much different, and burdens lighter than earlier in the century, or in the years of the previous century: This is the record of a young girl, whose life was not yet burdened with many children, and the responsibilities of a home:

"Fix'd gown for Prude, -- Mend Mother's Hiding-hood,
spun short thread, -- Fix'd two gowns for Welsh's girls, --
carded two, -- spun linen, -- worked on cheese-basket, --
Hatchel'd flax with Hannah, we did 51 lbs. apiece, -- nleated
and ironed, -- Read a Sermon of Dodridge's, -- spooled a niece --
Milked the Cows, -- spun linen, did 50 knots, -- Made a Broom
of Genuine wheat straw, -- Spun thread to whiten, -- set a red
dye, -- Had two scholars from Mrs. Taylor's. -- I carded two

ounds of whole wool and felt Nationaly, -- Spun harness twine,
-- Scoured the pewter, -- Ague in my face, -- Ellen was snark'd
last night; -- spun thread to whiten -- Went to Mr. Otis's and
made them a swinging visit -- Jsrael said I might ride his jade
(horse) -- Prude stayed at home and learned Eve's Dream by heart."¹

But aside from the hardships connected with the work and
the large families, there were tragedies outside the home and also
difficulties. Incidents here and there than speak more eloquently
than books on the subject. These were, of course, experiences
that occurred when the country was new in the seventeenth century,
for with the more permanent settlement of the country these passed
away. Some of the terrible exposure which the women experienced
in the early days of the colony is shown by the following account:

"1630. December 22, RICHARD GARRETT of Boston, with one
of his daughters, a young maid, and four others, against the advice
of their friends, went towards Plymouth in a shallop: . . .and the
wind blew so much at northwest, as they were put (driven) to sea,
and the boat took in much water, which froze so hard as they could
not free her: so that they gave themselves up for lost: but . . .
by GOD'S special providence, were carried through the rocks to the
shore: where some got on land, but some had their legs frozen in
the ice in the boat, so they were forced to be cut out. . . .They
kindle a fire: but having no hatchet, they can get but little wood:
and are forced to lie in the open air all night: being extremely
cold. . . .Two Indian squaws, . . .bring them back to their wig-
wam, and entertain them kindly: . . .One of the (Indians) goes to
find out their boat and the rest of their company. . . .he builds a
wigwam, covers it, gets the wood for they are so weak and frozen
they could not stir. . . .By this time the Governor of Plymouth
sends three men to them, with provision. . . .and with a fair wind,
get to Plymouth, where another of their company dies. . . .The girl
escaped best. . . ."2

There was constant danger also from the Indians, and the
terrible massacres and raids of the savages kept the colonists in
a continual state of fear. Several incidents are recorded of the
stealing of women, and their treatment from the Indians, which
serve to indicate a little of the terror of that period. It should
be remembered in reading these, that they were not the common lot

¹Fisher: Men, Women and Manners in Colonial days, p. 275.

²Prince: Annals of New England. English Garnet, p. 564.

of women, and yet no doubt, many more women and children were carried into captivity by the Indians than has been recorded, and while but few of the women had such experiences, there was the constant dread and danger to all women. The following experiences, with the exception of the story of Mary Rowlandson, are found in the second volume of Sewall's diary from the pamphlet, "A Memorial of the Present Deplorable State of New England." We do not know the author, nor exactly when it was written. Cotton Mather has often been suggested as the author, and we know it was some one incited against the Governor, Dudley, and it was, no doubt, published in order to injury him. As Mather and Dudley had some trouble, it is thought he was the instigator, but there were other men who disliked the Governor, who were as capable of publishing it as Mather. It appeared early in the eighteenth century, about 1707.

"The Indians came upon the House of one Adams at Wells, and captivated the Man and his Wife, and assassinated the children. . . . The woman had lain in about eight days. They drag'd her out, and tied her to a post, until the house was rifled. They then loosed her, and bid her walk. She could not stir. By the help of a stick she got half a step forward. She look'd up to God. On the sudden a new strength entered into her. She travelled that very Day Twenty Miles a foot; she was up the neck in water five times that very Day in passing of Rivers. At night she fell over head and ears, into a Slough in a swamp, and hardly got out alive. . . . She is come home alive unto us.¹

The following story of Mrs. Bradley of Haverly, Massachusetts, was sworn to as authentic:

"She was not entered into a Second Captivity: but she had the great encumbrance of being big with child, and within six weeks of her time! After about an hours rest, wherein they made her put on snow shoes, which to manage, requires more than ordinary agility, she travelled with her tawny guardians all that night, and the next day until ten a Clock, associated with one woman more who had been brought to bed but just one week before:

¹Sewall's Diary, p. 59.

Here they refereshed themselves a litte, and then travelled on till Night; when they had no Refreshment given them, nor had they any, till after their having Travelled all the Forenoon of the Day Ensuing. . . She underwent incredible hardships and famine: A Moooses Hide, as tough as you may suppose it, was the best and most of her Diet. In one and twenty days they came to their Head-quarters. . . . But then her Snow-Shoes were taken from her; and yet she must go every step above the knee in Snow, with such weariness that her Soul often Pray'd That the Lord would put an end unto her weary life!

". . ." "Here in the Night, she found herself ill." (Her child was born here) . . . "There she lay till the next Night, with none but the Snow under her, and the Heaven over here, in a misty and rainy season. She sent then unto a French Priest, that he would speak unto her Squaw Mistress, who then, without condescending to lock upon her, allow'd her a little birch-rind, to cover her Head from the Injuries of the Weather, and a little bit of dried Moose, which being boiled, she drunk the Broth, and gave it unto the Child.

"In a Fortnight she was called upon to Travel again, with her child in her Arms: Every now and then, a whole day together without the least Morsel of any Food, and then she had any, she fed only on Ground-nuts and wild-onions, and lilly-roots. By the last of May, they arrived at Cowefick, where they planted their corn; wherein she was put into a hard task, so that the child extremely suffered. The Salvages would sometimes also please themselves, with casting hot Embers into the Mouth of the child, which would render the Mouth so sore, that it could not suck for a long while together, so that it starv'd and Dy'd. . . He

"Her mistress, the squaw, kent her a twelve-month with her, in a Squalid Wigwam: Where, in the following winter, she fell sick of a Feavour; but in the very height and heat of her Paroxysms, her Mistress would compel her sometimes to spend a Winters-night, which is there a very bitter one, abroad in all the bitter frost and snow of the climate. She recovered: but Four Indians died of the Feavour, and at length her Mistress also. She took, she might have struck through it if she pleased.

". . . At last, there came to the sight of her a Priest from Quebeck who had known her in her former Captivity at Naridgowock. . . . He made the Indians sell her to a French Family. . . where tho' she wrought hard, she lived more comfortably and contented. . . ." She was finally allowed to return to her husband.¹

Mary Rowlandson has written the account of her captivity and residence among the Indians. The first of the narrative tells

¹Sewall's Diary, p. 59, ff.

of the attack by the Indians, and the killing of her relatives, and her capture, with one child, by the savages.

"There remained nothing to me but one poor, wounded babe, and it seemed at present worse than death, that it was in such a pitiful condition, besneaking compassion, and I had no refreshing for it, not suitable things to revive it. . . . But now (the next morning) I must turn my back upon the town, and travel with them into the vast and desolate wilderness, I know not whither. It is not my tongue or pen can express the sorrows of my heart, and bitterness of my spirit, that I had at this departure: but God was with me in a wonderful manner, carrying me along and bearing up my spirit that it did not quite fail.

"One of the Indians carried my poor wounded babe upon a horse, it went moaning all along: 'I shall die, I shall die.' I went on foot after it, with sorrow that cannot be expressed. At length I took it from the horse, and carried it in my arms, till my strength failed and I fell down with it. Then they set me upon a horse with my wounded child in my lap, and there being no furniture on the horse's back, as we were going down a steep hill, we both fell over the horse's head, at which they, like inhuman creatures, laughed and rejoiced to see it, though I thought we should there have ended our days, overcome with so many difficulties."

They went farther and farther into the wilderness, and a few days after leaving her home, her son Joseph joined her, having been captured by another band of Indians. She tells how, having her Bible with her, she and her son found it a continual help, reading it and praying.

"After this it quickly began to snow, and when night came on they stopped: and now down I must sit in the snow by a little fire, and a few boughs behind me, with my sick child in my lap and calling much for water, (being now) through the wound fallen into a violent fever. My own wound also growing so stiff that I could scarce sit down or rise up, yet so it must be, that I must sit all this cold winter night, upon the cold snowy ground, with my sick child in my arms, looking that every hour would be the last of its life; and having no Christian friend near me, either to comfort or help me.

". . . Fearing the worst, I durst not send to my husband, though there were some thoughts of his coming to redeem and fetch me, not knowing what might follow. . . .

"The Lord preserved us in safety that night, and raised us

up again in the morning, and carried us along, that before noon we came to Concord. Now was I full of joy and yet not without sorrow: joy, to see such a lovely sight, so many Christians together: and some of them my neighbors. There I met with my brother, and brother-in-law, who asked me if I knew where his wife was. Poor heart! he had helped to bury her and knew it not: she, being shot down by the house, was partly burned, so that those who were at Boston, . . . who came back afterward and buried the dead, did not know her. . . . Being recruited with food and raiment, we went to Boston that day, where I met with my dear husband: but the thoughts of our dear children, one being dead, and the other we could not tell where, abated our comfort in each other. . . ."

Mrs. Rowlandson tells of the return of her daughter who was also taken into captivity by the savages: "She was travelling one day with the Indians, with her basket on her back: the company of Indians were got before her and gone out of sight, all except one squaw. She followed the squaw till night, and then both of them lay down, having nothing over them but the heavens, nor under them but the earth. Thus she traveled three days together, having nothing to eat or drink but water and green whortle-berries. At last they came into Providence, where she was kindly entertained by several of that town. . . . The Lord make us a blessing indeed to each other. Thus hath the Lord brought me and mine out of the horrible pit, and hath set us in the midst of tender-hearted and compassionate Christians. 'Tis the desire of my soul that we may walk worthy of the mercies received, and which we are receiving."¹

The Indians often carried white children into captivity, or kidnapped them, and in 1765 after the close of the war with Pontiac, a gathering took place in the orchard of Aunt Schuyler at Albany, where many of these stolen children were returned to their parents and relatives. An eye-witness thus describes the scene:

"Poor women who had traveled one hundred miles from the back settlements of Pennsylvania and New England appeared here with anxious looks and aching hearts not knowing whether their children were alive or dead, or how to identify their children if they should meet them. . . ."

"On a gentle slope near the Fort stood a row of temporary huts built by retainers to the troops: the green before these buildings was the scene of these pathetic recognitions which I did not fail to attend. The joy of the happy mothers was overpowering and found vent in tears: but not the tears of those who after long travel found not what they sought. It was affecting to

¹Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. II, pp. 52-62.

see the deep silent sorrow of the Indian women and of the children, who knew no other mother, and clung fondly to their bosoms from whence they were not torn without bitter shrieks. I shall never forget the grotesque figures and wild looks of these young savages; nor the trembling haste with which their mothers arrayed them in the new clothes they had brought for them, as hoping with the Indian dress they would throw off their habits and attachments. . ."¹

These dangers from Indian raids did not all belong to the seventeenth century. During the entire period of the eighteenth, the settlements on the border were inconstant dread, and it is a fact of known history to all, that the dread and danger was ever present through all the settlement of the Mississippi Valley and the States of the Plains, to the slope of the Pacific, down until very recent years. And the danger did not all pass away even in the old settled communities. During the Revolutionary War, it was ever present in New York, as, especially Burgoyne used the Indians as allies, and when they attacked a village, he could not hold them in check. As late as 1782 an attempt was made by Burgoyne to capture General Schuyler, as the British were very anxious to have this done, since he had so much influence with the Indians, and by capturing him they hoped this would cease. The house was guarded by six men. "Their guns were stacked in the hall, the guards being outside and the relief asleep. Lest the small Philip (grandson of General Schuyler) be tempted to play with the guns his mother had them removed. The guards rushed for their guns, but they were gone. The family fled upstairs, but Margaret, remembering the baby in the cradle below, ran back, seized the baby, and when she was halfway up the flight, an Indian flung him tomahawk at her head, which, missing her, buried itself in the wood, and left its historic mark to the present time."²

The murder of Jane McCrea (see p. 222) is ample evidence that the danger of Indian raids did not die away with even the late eighteenth century.

The charge made today against the twentieth century home

¹Humphreys: Catharine Schuyler, p. 123.

²Ibid: p. 193.

that the training of the children is left almost entirely to the mother, and that consequently the boy is becoming effeminate, seems to have been untrue in the colonial home, or at least in some of them. How true we can make our statement from the few testimonies we have is difficult to determine, but, we can at least draw the conclusion that since we have no more evidence, we may use that which we have, and believe until disproven that this is a real picture. From the statements of the men there seems to have been splendid cooperation on the part of the men and women in training the children, and that the men were much interested.

Kindly Judge Sewall who mixed his weddings, funerals, visits to neighbors, his numerous courtships, his notices of hangings, and his duties as a magistrate: though intensely interested in the salvation of his acquaintances, yet finds time to record:

"Sabbath-day, February 11. 1685/6. Little Hull speaks Apole plainly in the hearing of his Grand-Mother and Eliza Lane; this the first word."¹

Samuel Mather in "The Home Life of Cotton Mather", says this, in regard to his interest in his children:

"He began betimes to entertain them with delightful stories, especially Scriptural ones: and he would ever conclude with some lesson of piety, bidding them to learn that lesson from the story. . .

"And thus every day at the table he used himself to tell some entertaining tale before he rose: and endeavor to make it useful to the olive-plants about the table.

"When his children accidentally at any time came in his way, it was his custom to let fall some sentence or other, that might be monitory or profitable to them. . . .

As soon as possible he would make the children learn to write; and, when they had the use of the pen, he would employ

¹Sewall's Diary, Vol. I. p. 122.

them in writing out the most instructive and profitable things he would invent for them. . . .

"The first chastisement which he would inflict for any ordinary fault, was to let the child see and hear him in an astonishment, and hardly able to believe that the child could do so base a thing: but believing they would never do it again.

"He would never come to give a child a blow, except in case of obstinacy or something very criminal. To be chased for a while out of his presence, he would make to be looked upon as the sorest punishment in his family.

"He would not say much to them of the evil angels: because he would not have them entertain any frightful fancies about the apparitions of devils. But yet he would briefly let them know that there are devils, who tempt them to wickedness. . . ."¹

The following again from Sewall indicates that he, at least, had something to do with the discipline and training of his family:

"November 6, 1692. Joseph threw a knot of brass and hit his sister Betty on the forehead so as to make it bleed and swell, upon which, and for his playing at Prayer-time, and eating when Return Thanks, I whind him prettly smartly. When I first went in (call'd by his grandmother) he sought to shadow and hide himself from me behind the head of the Cradle: which gave me the sorrowful remembrance of Adam's carriage."²

We have noted on pp. 19 and 20, the interest of Judge Sewall in the spiritual condition of his daughter Betty. This is also noted: "Sabbath, May 3, 1696. Betty can hardly read her chapter for weeping; tells me she is afraid she is gon back, does not taste that sweetness in reading the Word which once she did: fears that what was once upon her is worn off. I said what I could to her, and in the evening pray'd with her alone."³

However, though it is said directly in the writings of the men concerning the influence of the women over the children, we know they did have the interest of their little ones at heart, and tried, as best they could, to train them to be good men and women. Eliza Pinckney writes this to a friend: "Shall I give you the

¹Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. II, p. 346.

²Sewall's Diary, p. 369, Vol. I.

³Ibid, p. 423.

trouble my dear Madam to buy my son a new toy (a description of which I inclose) to teach him according to Mr. Locke's method (which I have carefully studied) to play himself into learning. Mr. Pinckney (his father) himself has been contriving a sett of toys to teach him his letters by the time he can speak. You perceive we begin betimes for he is not yet four months old."¹

Her consciousness of her responsibility toward her children, is set forth in this notation, found in some private papers:

"I am resolved to be a good Mother to my children, to pray for them, to set them good examples, to give them good advice, to be careful both of their souls and bodys, to watch over their tender minds, to carefully root out the first appearing and budings of vice, and to instill pietv. . . to spare no paines or trouble to do them good. . . and never omit to encourage every Virtue I may see dawning in them."²

That this endeavour on her part bore fruit, in part, is indicated in the letter to her son, in which she says: "A son who has lived to near twenty-three years of age without once offending me."³

The women of New York, according to Mrs. Grant, had the instruction and teaching of the children largely, since she says:

"Indeed, it was on the females that the task of religious instruction generally devolved; and in all cases where the heart is interested, whoever teaches, at the same time learns. . . .Not only the training of children, but of plants, such as needed peculiar care or skill to rear them, was the female province."⁴

John Adams was intensely interested in his children, and though absent from his home for several years, his thoughts are

"Continually traveling to his 'babes' at home. He tells of how he walked the city streets 'twenty times and gaped at all the store windows like a countryman,' in order to find presents suitable to send to his 'prettv little flock.' His letters to his wife contain many grave injunctions about the children. 'Take care that they don't go astray,' he says. 'Cultivate their minds inspire their little hearts, raise their wishes. Fix their attention upon great and glorious objects. Root out every little thing, weed out every meanness. Let them revere nothing but religion, moralitv, and libertv.'⁵

¹Earle: Child Life in Colonial Days, p. 182.

²Ravenel: Eliza Pinckney, p. 117.

³Ibid: p. 243.

⁴Grant: Memoirs of an American Lady, p. 29.

⁵Brooks: Dames and Daughters of Colonial Days, p. 197.

Mrs. Adams in her letters to her sons indicates her anxiety for him, as he was young, and without guidance, being in Europe with her husband. Writing to him June 1778 she says:

"My Dear Son. . . . Let me enjoin it upon you to attend constantly and steadfastly to the precepts and instructions of your father, as you value the happiness of your mother and your own welfare. His care and attention to you render many things unnecessary for me to write. . . .but the inadvertency and heedlessness of youth require line upon line and precept upon precept, and, when enforced by the joint efforts of both parents, will, I hope, have a due influence upon your conduct: for, dear as you are to me, I would much rather you should have found your grave in the ocean you have crossed, or that an untimely death cross you in your infant years, than see you an immoral, profligate, or graceless child. . . ."¹

"Mrs. Adams's influence on her children was strong, inspiring, vital. Something of the Spartan mother's spirit breathed in her. She taught her sons and daughter to be brave and patient, in spite of danger and privation. She made them feel no terror at the thought of death or hardships suffered for one's country. She read and talked to them of the world's history. . . .Every night, when the Lord's prayer had been repeated, she heard him (John Quincy) say that ode of Collins beginning,

"How sleep the brave who sink to rest
By all their country's wishes blest!"²

These quotations would show that there was at least an effort on the part of both parents to instruct their children, and especially, did the women realize the grave importance of training a little child for citizenship.

There are many comments on the part of the men, paying high tributes to the women. They seem not to have praised them for any one quality, but all those traits which we define as "womanliness" -- as men have ever done, and ever will do, these men of the colonial period admired this more than any other characteristic. They do not call it womanliness, but we can easily understand that is the meaning. Judge Sewall said these words

¹Letters of Abigail Adams, p. 93.

²Brooks: Dames and Daughters of Colonial Days, p. 197.

at the funeral of his mother:

"Janv, 4th, 1700/1. . . . Nathan Bricket taking in hand to fill the grave, I said, Forbear a little, and suffer me to say that amidst our bereaving sorrows we have the comfort of beholding this saint put into the rightful possession of that happiness of living desir'd and dying lamented. She liv'd commendably four and fifty years with her dear husband, and my dear father: And she could not well brook the being divided from him at her death: which is the cause of our taking leave of her in this place. She was a true and constant lover of God's word, worship and saints: and she always with a patient cheerfulness, submitted to the divine decree of providing bread for her self and others in the sweat of her brows. And now . . . My honored and beloved Friends and Neighbors! My dear mother never thought much of doing the most frequent and homely offices of love for me: and lavished away many thousands of words upon me, before I could return one word in answer: And therefore I ask and hope that none will be offended that I have now ventured to sneak one word in her behalf: when she herself has now become speechless."¹

These were the tributes to Jan Turell:

". . . As a wife she was dutiful, prudent and diligent, not only content but joyful in her circumstances. She submitted as is fit in the Lord, looked well to the ways of her household. . . She respected all her friends and relative, and spoke of them with honor, and never forgot either their counsels or their kindnesses. . . I may not forget to mention the Strong and Constant guard she placed on the door of her lips. Who ever heard her call an ill name? or detract from anybody?"²

General Philip Schuyler wrote thus to his son-in-law, Alexander Hamilton, on the death of his wife:

". . . My trial has been severe. . . but after giving and receiving for nearly a half a century, a series of mutual evidences of affection and friendship which increased as we advanced in life, the shock was great and sensibly felt, to be thus suddenly deprived of a beloved wife, the mother of my children, and the soothing companion of my declining years. . ."³

At the death of Mrs. Adams, the Rev. Dr. Dirckland, President of Harvard University, in a tribute to her said, "Ye will seek to mourn, bereaved friends. . . You do, then, bless the Giver of life, that the course of your endeared and honored friend was so long and so bright: that she entered so fully into the spirit of those injunctions which we have explained, and was a minister of blessings to all within her influence. You

¹Sewall's Diary, n. 31, Vol. II.

²Trent: Rev. Literature, p. 95.

³Letters of Abigail Adams, n. 57.

are soothed to reflect, that she was sensible of the many tokens of divine goodness which marked her lot: that she received the good of her existence with a cheerful and grateful heart: that, when called to weep, she bore adversity with an equal mind: that she used the world as not abusing it to excess, improving well her time, talents, and opportunities, and, though desired longer in this world, was fitted for a better happiness than this world can give."¹

Here and there we glean a line praising women for their good judgment, business ability, or some particular phase, as their willingness to aid, when necessary. Benjamin Franklin writes:

"We have an English proverb that says, 'He that would thrive, must ask his wife.' It was lucky for me that I had one as much dispos'd to industry and frugality as myself. She assisted me cheerfully in my business, folding and statching pamphlets, tending shop, purchasing old linen rags for the paper makers, etc. We kept no idle servants, our table was plain and simple, our furniture of the cheapest. . . . One morning being call'd to breakfast, I found it in a China bowl, with a spoon of silver! They had been bought for me without my knowledge by my wife. . . . she thought her husband deserv'd a silver spoon and china bowl as well as any of his neighbors. This was the first appearance of plate and china in our house, which afterward, in a course of years, as our wealth increas'd, augmented gradually to several hundred pounds in value."²

Again he notes on going to England: "April 5, 1757. (In a letter to his wife). I leave home, and undertake this long voyage more cheerfully, as I can rely on your prudence in the management of my affairs, and education of my dear Child: and yet I cannot forbear once more recommending her to you with a Father's tenderest Concern. My Love to all. . ."³

John Lawson, who made a surveying journey through North Carolina in 1760, says of the women, probably of the laboring class: "The women are the most industrious sex in that place and by their good housewifery, make a great deal of cloth of their own cotton, wool and flax: some of them keeping their families, though large, very decently appareled, both with lincens and woollens, so that they have no occasion to run into the merchants debt, or lay their money out on stores for clothing."⁴

Sewall notes in his diary: "Second-Day: Jan. 24.,

¹Letters of Abigail Adams, p. 57.

²Smth: Letters of B. Franklin, Vo. I. p. 324.

³Ibid: no. 378, Vo. III.

⁴Lawson: History of Carolina, p. 113.

1703/4. . . . Took 2/3 in my pocket, and gave my Wife the rest of my cash 1/3. 3-8, and tell her she shall now keep the Cash: if I want I will borrow of her. She has a better faculty than I at managing affairs. I will assist her: and will endeavour to live upon my Salary: will see that it will doe. The Lord give his blessing."¹

John Adams in writing to Benjamin Rush, tells of the willingness of his wife to aid in any way possible:

"May 1770. When I went home to my family in May 1770 from the town meeting in Boston. . . . I said to my wife, ' I have accepted a seat in the House of Representatives, and thereby have consented to my own ruin, to your ruin, and to the ruin of our children.' 'I give you this warning that you may prepare your mind for your fate.' She burst into tears, but instantly cried in a transport of magnanimity, "Well, I am willing in this cause to run all risks with you, and be ruined with you, if you are ruined.' These were times my friend in Boston which tried women's souls as well as mens'."²

From these tributes surely we may infer that these women of whom Margaret Winthrop, Martha Washington, Jane Furell, Eliza Pinckney, Abigail Adams and other are typical, were women, who, above all, had a womanly dignity, loving their homes, sacrificing much of the loved home life in the interest of the public, though placed before the public eye, they drew a veil over the private life, and the finest tribute is theirs that man, can pay to woman, that they were "virtuous, pious, modest, and womanly", -- that they builded a home wherein was peace, gentleness and love, a haven for their husbands, who in times of great public woes and the burdens of public trust could retire, and for a time, lay aside the cares of state. As the author of "Catherine Schuyler" has fittingly said of the home-life of the later, and that of her daughter Elizabeth, the wife of Alexander Hamilton: Their homes were centers of peace; their material considerations guarded. Whatever strength they had was for the fray. No men were ever better entrenched for political conflict than Schuyler and Hamilton. . . . The affectionate

¹Sewall's Diary, Vol. II, p. 93.

²Stedman and Hutchinson, Vol. III, p. 201.

intercourse between children, parents, and grandparents reflected in all the correspondence accessible makes an effective contrast to the feverish state of public opinion and the controversies than raging. Nowhere would one find a more ideal illustration of the place home and family ties should suble as an alleviation for the turmoils and disappointments of public life."¹

And there are many other women -- Martha Washington, Mercy Warren, Mrs. Knox, and scores of others, whose beautiful touch to the home life could be cited. Who shall say, how much of the success of these men was due to the loving care, forethought, and sympathy of these women? And, if the real truth of the story could be written -- and let us be glad it will never be accomplished, for there are some pages so private and sacred in the lives of the men and women who have done their duty, that even the most indefatigable student may not scan -- perhaps, we would learn that, far more than we realize, did the man owe his achievements to the love and trust of the woman. These women surely have left as a legacy the lesson that women ever need to learn -- the beauty in a woman's life of home-keeping, home-loving, home-influencing, and a consideration of the true dignity which comes from simplicity in dress and simplicity of living. One incident serves well to illustrate this, related by several women of the camp at Morristown, of Martha Washington -- her dignity and charm of manner, and the simplicity shown by her, when there was occasion for it. One of the ladies of the camp, telling the incident to another, when asked how the wife of the general appeared, and what she said, replied:

"Well, I will honestly tell you, "I never was so ashamed in all my life. You see, Madame ---, and Madame ---, and Madame Budd, and myself thought we would visit Lady Washington, and as

¹Humphreys: Catherine Schuyler, p. 228.

she was said to be so grand a lady, we thought we must put on our best bibbs and bands. So we dressed ourselves in our most elegant ruffles and silks, and were introduced to her ladyship. And dontv you think we found her knitting and with a speckled (check) apron on ! She received us very graciously, and easily, but after the compliments were over, she resumed her knitting. There we were without a stitch of work, and sitting in State, but General Washington's lady with her own hands was knitting stockings for herself and husband!

"And that was not all. In the afternoon her ladyship took occasion to say, in a way that we could not be offended at, that it was very important, at this time, that American ladies should be patterns of industry to their countrywomen, because the separation from the mother country will dry up the sources whence many of our comforts have been derived. We must become independent by our determination to do without what we cannot make ourselves. Whilst our husbands and brothers are examples of patriotism, we must be patterns of industry!"

There are hints of "home touches" given in the letters showing us that the men and women of that period were very much like modern people. Little courtesies on both the part of men and women: sets of love for the loved ones. We have been taught only about the devotion to duty, the bravery and sacrifices of these men and women, and the emphasis has been so much on these things, we are prone to think of them as spending their lives, searching in the by-ways and lanes for duty, always on parade, talking in stately, dignified language: we forgot they were just as men and women of today, that they laughed and played and sorrowed, as people have ever done. Sometimes it is only a line from a letter, just a word that shows us the sense of humor, the domestic trait, or the understanding, that they, too, loved, laughed, and went.

Franklin writes in 1772 to his sister:

"I have been thinking what would be a suitable present for me to make, and for you to receive, as I hear you are grown a

Wharton: Martha Washington, p. 116.

celebrated beauty. I had almost determined on a tea-table: but when I considered that the character of a good housewife was far preferable to that of being only a pretty gentlewoman, I concluded to send you a spinning-wheel."¹

Writing from London to his wife, he says:

"In the great Case. . . . is contain'd some carpeting for a best Room Floor. There is enough for one large or two small ones: it is to be sow'd together, the Edges being first fell'd down, and Care taken to make the Figures meet exactly: there is Bordering for the same. This was my Fancy. Also two large fine Flanders Bed Ticks, and two pair large superfine Blankets, 2 fine Damask Tablecloths and Napkins, and 43 Ells of Ghentish Sheeting Holland. . . . There is also 56 yards of Cotton, printed curiously from Cooper Plates, a new Invention, to make Bed and Window Curtains: and 7 hard Chair Bottoms. . . ."²

Again his interest in the furnishing of the house is evident from the following:

"Lond. Feb. 10. 1765. Mrs. Stevenson has sent you, with Blankets, Bedticks. . . . The blue Mohair Stuff is for the Curtains of the Blue Chamber. The Fashion is to make one curtain only for each Window. Hooks are sent to fix the Rails by at the Top, so that they might be taken down on Occasion. . . ."²

While we are not accustomed to thinking of Benjamin Franklin sending such messages as this to his wife: "I send you some curious Beans for your Garden", yet I do not think that it adds or detracts anything from his role of the philosopher to know that he had other interests in life. Surely, it makes him more lovable than only his cold philosophy and materialism. This domestic touch is found in the concern of Mrs. Franklin that he should be well cared for, while away. He writes, "The apples are extremely welcome. . . .the minced nies are not yet come to hand. . . .As to our lodging (she had evidently inquired) it is on deal featherbeds, in warm blankets, and much more comfortable than when we lodged at our inn. . . ."³

This comment in a letter written by Thomas Jefferson, while in Paris, to Mrs. Adams in London is far removed from

¹Ibid: Writings of B. Franklin, Vol. II, p. 87.

²Ibid: Vol. III, p. 131

³Ibid. Vol. IV, p. .

⁴Ibid. Vol. III, p. 325.

from the affairs of state:

He tells of ordering the shoes for Mrs. Adams, sending them to London, and "To show you how willingly, I shall ever receive and execute your commissions. I venture to impose one on you. From what I recollect of the diaper & damask we used to import from England I think they were better & cheaper than here. . . .If you are of the same opinion I would trouble you to send me two sets of tablecloths & napkins for 20 covers each."¹

Eliza Pinckney records in her memorandum (1712):

"Acknowledged the rest of a piece of rich yellow lutestrine consisting of 19 yds for myself -- do of blue for my Mama. & thanked My Father for them, also for a piece of Hollands and Cambrick need from London."²

Franklin also sends table furnishing to his wife:

"The same box contains 1/2 silver Salt Ladles, newest, but ugliest Fashion: a little instrument to core apples: another to make little turnips out of great ones: six coarse diaper Breakfast Cloths: they are to spread on the Tea Table, for nobody breakfasts here on the naked Table: but on the cloth set a large Tea Board with the Cups. . . ."³

Jefferson sends to his sister: "Two pieces of linen, three gowns, and some ribbon. They are done in paper, sealed, and packed in a trunk."⁴

There are many domestic touches in Sewall's record.

deeds of kindness for those he loved. He records June 20th,

1685: "Carried my Wife to Dorchester to eat Cherries, Raspberries, chiefly to ride and take the Air. The time my Wife and Mrs. Flint spent in the Orchard, I spent in Mr. Flint's Study, reading Calvin on the Psalms. . . ."⁵

Again we note this: "July 8, 1687, Carried my wife to Cambridge to visit my little Cousin Margaret. . . ."⁶

This is recorded Jan. 23, 1698. "I carry my two sons and three daughters in the Coach to Danford, the Turks head at Dorchester: eat sage Cheese, drunk Beer and Tider and came homeward. . . ."⁷

Some of these domestic touches bring us close, indeed, to

¹Ford: Writings of T. Jefferson, Vo. IV, p. 101.

²Ravenel: Eliza Pinckney, p. 58.

³Smyth: Writings of B. Franklin, Vol. III, p. 431

⁴Ford: Writings of T. Jefferson, Vol. IV, p. 208.

⁵Sewall's Diary, Vo. I, p. 83.

⁶Ibid: Vol. I, p. 170.

⁷Ibid: Vol. I, p. 492.

those men and women of whom we think generally so dignified and stately.

"The dignified Washington becomes to us a more approachable personality who, in a letter written by Mrs. John M. Bowers, we read that when she was a child of six he dandled her on his knee and sang to her about 'the old, old man and the old, old woman who lived in the vinegar-bottle together.' . . . or again, when General Greene writes from Middlebrook, 'We had a little dance at my quarters. His Excellency and Mrs. Greene danced upwards of three hours without once sitting down. Upon the whole we had a pretty little frisk.'"1

Or, John Adams loses some of his coldness and seems more alive "in a picture that his wife draws of him, submitting to be driven about the room with a willow stick by one of his small grandchildren"2

Surely this scene of domestic life has its counterpart, or, at least a portion of it, even today. The story is told of Nellie Custis and some young women visiting her: that they came down to breakfast in their morning gowns, and one version gives it, curlpapers, too, although we can scarcely believe the latter. After a few moments a coach was seen coming up the drive-way. When several young, handsome, army officers (French at that) were announced, they turned to the mistress of Mount Vernon, asking to be excused. But, shaking her head, she said: "No, what is good enough for General Washington is good enough for any of his guests."3

The story often told of Martha Washington gives us a hint of the "home" touch of that stately colonial dame: "When Mr. Peale was engaged to paint Mrs. Washington's portrait, the time set for the first sitting was seven o'clock in the morning. At this early hour the painter hesitated to disturb the 'First lady in the land,' and he took a short walk before knocking at the Washingtons' door. Upon his arrival, Mrs. Washington looked at the clock and reminded Mr. Peale that he was late. And after he had explained, the industrious little woman informed him that she had already attended morning worship, given Nellie a music lesson, and read the morning paper."4

One incident with the domestic touch is related of John Adams, concerning his wife. Mrs. Adams had expressed her wish for

1Wharton: Through Colonial Doorways, p. 8.

2Ibid: p. 11.; 3-4 Brooks: Colonial Dames and Daughters, p. 163.

green tea for her headaches, but was unable to secure, writing her husband to send her a canister. Some time after she visited her friend Mrs. Samuel Adams, where she was entertained with a "very fine dish of green tea. "The scarcity of the article made me ask where she got it. She replied that her sweetheart sent it to her by Mr. Gerry. I said nothing, but thought my sweetheart might have been equally kind considering the disease I was visited with, and that was recommended as a bracer."¹

". . . But in reality !Goodman! John had not been so unfeeling as he appeared. For when he read his wife's mention of that pain in her head he had been properly concerned and straightway, he says, asked Mrs. Yard to send a pound of green tea to you by Mr. Gerry. Mrs. Yard readily agreed. When I came home at night,¹ continues the much !vexed! John, "I was told Mr. Gerry was gone. I asked Mrs. Yard if she had sent the canister. She said Yes and that Mr. Gerry undertook to deliver it with a great deal of pleasure. From that time I flattered myself you would have the poor relief of a dish of good tea, and I never conceived a single doubt that you had received it until Mr. Gerry's return. I asked him accidentally whether he had delivered it, and he said. "Yes: to Mr. Samuel Adams's lady!".

However, realizing the mistake a second canister was sent, "with very careful instructions this time as to which Mrs. Adams was to receive it."¹

The letters of the absent ones abound in love for those at home, and gifts are sent back as tokens of that love. Mrs.

Washington writes her brother in 1778: "Please to give little Patty a kiss for me. I have sent her a pair of shoes -- there was not a doll to be got in the City of Philadelphia or I would have sent her one (the shoes are in a bundle for my mamma). . ."²

"And again from New York in 1789 to "My Dear Fanny:

"I have by Mrs. Sime sent for a watch it is one of the cargoes that I have so often mentioned to you, that was expected, I hope is such a one as will please you -- it is of the newest fashion, if that has any influence in your taste. . . .The chain is of Mr. Lear's choosing and such as Mrs. Adams the vice President's Lady and those in the polite circle wears and will last as long as

¹Brooks: Colonial Dames and Daughters, pp. 188-9.

²Wharton: Martha Washington, p. 127.

the fashion -- and by that time you can get another of a fashionable kind -- I send to dear Maria a piece of Chintz to make her frock -- the piece of muslin I have is long enough for an apron for you, and in exchange for it, I beg you will give me the worked muslin apron you have like my gown that I had just before I left home of worked muslin as I wish to make a petticoat of the two aprons. -- for my gown. . . . Kiss Maria I send her two little handkerchiefs to wipe her nose. . . .

I am my dear Fanny yours most affectionately

M. Washington."¹

Many other quotations could be given showing the scenes of the home and domestic life but these are sufficient to show that the men and women of that period were as men and women have ever been, interested in the love of home and family, though burdened with state cares and great public trust.

It is quite evident that the colonial man considered the home the proper place for women. And they pay no higher tribute to the women than those who helped, in every way possible, their husbands. This idea that the home was the only place for woman's activity is not strange, as there were no other channels open to women of that day. Governor Winthrop has recorded his opinion in no uncertain words:

(1645) "Mr. Hopkins, the governour of Hartford upon Connecticut, came to Boston and brought his wife with him (a godly young woman, and of special parts,) and was fallen into a sad infirmity, the loss of her understanding and reason, which had been growing upon her divers years, by occasion of her giving herself wholly to reading and writing, and had written many books. If she had attended to her household affairs and such things as belong to women, and not gone out of her way and calling to meddle in such things as are proper for men, whose minds are stronger, etc., she had kept her wits, and might have improved them usefully and honorably in the place God had set her."²

Thomas Jefferson writing from Paris in 1788 to Mrs.

Ringham, says: "The gay and thoughtless Paris is now become a furnace of Politics. Men, women, children talk nothing else, and you know that naturally they talk much, loud and warm. . . . You too have had

¹Wharton: Martha Washington, p. 205.

²Stedman and Hutchinson, Vol. I, p.

your political fever. But our good ladies, I trust, have been too wise to wrinkle their foreheads with politics. They are contented to soothe and calm the minds of their husbands returning ruffled from political debate. They have the good sense to value domestic happiness above all others. There is no part of the earth where so much of this is enjoyed as in America. You agree with me in this; but you think that the pleasures of Paris more than supply its wants; in other words that a Parisian is happier than an American. You will change your opinion my dear Madam, and come over to mine in the end. Recollect the women of this capital, some on foot, some on horses, and some in carriages hunting pleasure in the streets, in routs and assemblies, and forgetting that they have left it behind them in their nurseries and compare them with our own countrywomen occupied in the tender and tranquil amusements of domestic life, and confess that it is a comparison of Americans and Angels."¹

Franklin writes thus to his wife from London in 1758:

"You are very prudent not to engage in part Disputes. Women never should meddle with them except in Endeavours to reconcile their husbands, brothers, and friends, who happen to be of contrary sides. If your sex can keep cool, you may be a means of cooling ours the sooner, and restoring more speedily that social Harmony among Fellow-citizens, that is so desirable after long and bitter Dissension."²

This is to his sister: "Remember that modesty, as it makes the most homely virgin amiable and charming, so the want of it infallibly renders the perfect beauty disagreeable and odious. But when that brightest of female virtues shines among other perfections of body and mind in the same mind, it makes the woman more lovely than angel."³

The women, likewise, seemed to feel they owed it to their husbands to aid them in every way possible. They felt it a duty, as well as a pleasure, and there are very few instances where a woman allowed her work, or career, to interfere with her home.

Abigail Adams expressed this (see n. 61) by saying it was a woman's business to help her husband. That was the end and aim of her existence, and what more could any woman desire? "To be the strength, the inmost joy, of a man who, within the conditions of his life, seems to you a hero at every turn -- there is no happiness more penetrating for a wife than this."⁴ And women like

Elize Pinckney, Mercy Warren, Jane Turell, Margaret Winthrop,

¹Ford: Writings of T. Jefferson, Vol. V, n. 81

²Smith: Writings of B. Franklin, Vol. III, n. 138.

³Ibid. Vol. II, n. 87.

⁴Wharton: Martha Washington, n. 86.

Catherine Schuyler, Elizabeth Hamilton, and scores of others surely believed this, and their lives testify to their success. Mercy Warren was a writer, composing verses, and even writing a "History of the Revolution", but that did not hinder her from doing her best for her husband and children, and Eliza Pinckney with her varied interests in agriculture -- indigo and the culture of silk -- found time first to be a real home maker. And yet this same loyalty to the husband and the home saddens us when we think of the tragedy in the life of one woman -- the beautiful Peggy Shippen, wife of Benedict Arnold. It was little more than a year after her marriage with the handsome general, so full of high hopes for the future, that the tragedy occurred that blackened her entire life. Hamilton in a letter to his future wife tells how she received the news of her husband's guilt: "She for a considerable time entirely lost her self-control. The General went up to see her. She unbraided him with being in a plot to murder her child. One moment she raved, another she melted into tears. Sometimes she pressed her infant to her bosom and lamented its fate, occasioned by the imprudence of its father in a manner what would have pierced insensibility itself." Hamilton was deeply moved, and added: "Could I forgive Arnold for sacrificing his honor, reputation, duty, I could not forgive him for acting a part that must have forfeited the esteem of so fine a woman. At present she almost forgets his crime in his misfortunes: and her horror at the guilt of the traitor is lost in her love of the man."¹

Friends of the Shippen family asserted that the young wife would have gladly returned to her father, forsaking her husband. If so, she was prevented by this notice served upon her a month after Arnold's treason:

"IN COUNCIL

Philadelphia, Friday, Oct. 27, 1780.

"The Council taking into consideration the case of Mrs. Margaret Arnold (the wife of Benedict Arnold, an attainted traitor

¹Humphreys: Catherine Schuyler, p. 183.

with the enemy at New York), whose residence in this city has become dangerous to the public safety, and this Board being desirous as much as possible to prevent any correspondence and intercourse being carried on with persons of disaffected character in this State and the enemy at New York, and especially with the said Benedict Arnold: therefore

"RESOLVED, That the said Margaret Arnold depart this state within fourteen days from the date hereof, and that she do not return again during the continuance of the present war."¹

This seemed surely harsh, as Philadelphia had been her home from her earliest childhood. However, keenly she felt the disgrace and however reluctant she was to follow him to New York, there was no other course. She bore him four children after leaving her Philadelphia home, and remained with him until her death.

There is evidence in the writings of this period that the women were allowed considerable power in conducting the affairs of the family: and especially was this true in the absence of the husband. Something more will be said under the initiative assumed by women, but a few instances may be noted now, showing this was true. We have noted Judge Sewall's comment (see n. 101) concerning the financial ability of his wife, and also Franklin's letter (see n. 100) saying because of the ability of Mrs. Franklin he is content to be away for some time. Several other letters of Franklin's to his wife indicate his confidence in her skill in looking after business matters. In 1756, while away on a trip through the colonies, he writes:

"If you have not Cash sufficient, call upon Mr. Moore, the Treasurer, with the Order of the Assembly, and desire him to pay you 100 L of it. . . . I hope in a fortnight. . . to make a trip to Philadelphia, and send away the Lottery Tickets. . . . and pay off the prizes, etc., tho' you may pay such as come to hand of those sold in Philadelphia, of my signing. . . . I hope you have paid Mrs. Stephens for the Bills."²

¹Crawford: Romantic Days in the Early Republic, n. 17.

²Smyth: Writings of B. Franklin, Vol. III, n. 323.

In 1767 he writes to his wife concerning the marriage of his daughter:

"London, June 22, . . . It seems now as if I should stay here another Winter, and therefore I must leave it to your Judgment to set in the Affair of your Daughter's Match, as shall seem best, if you think it a suitable one, I suppose the sooner it is completed the better. . . . I know very little of the Gentleman (Richard Bache) or his Character, nor can I at this Distance. I hope his expectations are not great of any Fortune to be had with our Daughter before our Death. I can only say, that if he proves a good Husband to her, and a good Son to me, he shall find me as good a Father as I can be: -- but at present I suppose you would agree with me, that we cannot do more than fit her out handsomely in cloaths, of Value. For the rest, they must depend as you and I did, on their own Industry and Care: as what remains in our Hands will be barely sufficient for our Support, and not enough for them when it comes to be divided at our Decease. . . ."¹

Abigail Adams' skill in financial affairs is so well known as hardly to need any comment. It was her shrewd, practical judgment during the years when her husband was absent that enabled them to live in easy circumstances during the last years of their life. Her letters to her husband show how hard-pressed she was at times. In 1779 we find this:

". . .The safest way, you tell me, of supplying my wants, is by drafts: but I cannot get hard money for bills. You had as good tell me to procure diamonds for them; and, when bills will fetch but five for one, hard money will exchange ten, which I think is very provoking; and I must give at the rate of ten, and sometimes twenty, for one, for every article I purchase. I blush whilst I give you a price current: -- all butcher's meat from a dollar to eight shillings per pound: corn twenty-five dollars: rye thirty, per bushel: flour fifty pounds per hundred: potatoes ten dollars per bushel: butter twelve shillings a pound; sugar twelve shillings a pound: molasses twelve dollars per gallon: . . .I have studied, and do study, every method of economy in my power: otherwise a mint of money would not support a family."²

For other illustrations of the executive ability of women see Eliza Pinckney, Martha Washington, and other given under a discussion of the initiative of the colonial woman.

¹Smith: Writings of B. Franklin, Vol. V., p. 31.

²Letters of A. Adams, p. 104.

This brief glance at the colonial home indicates that both men and women believed most thoroughly in its influence. The women believed it their work to aid their husbands, by establishing a home wherein was peace, love and gentleness. Both the colonial man and woman were interested in the training and rearing of the children, and the latter had always as a memory the love and interest manifested in their childhood days. However, the women had the larger care of the children, and likewise most of the training fell upon her.

There were many trials and hardships endured by the women, in the home, largely due to the manner of the housekeeping and the large families. She exerted a great influence, and was indeed a power in the affairs of the home. Both men and women, were interested in petty domestic affairs, showing that their time and attention was not given entirely to state problems. However, though there were hardships, the women seem to have been happy, their loyalty to home and family being undoubted, and their faith and trust in those homes is worthy our most careful consideration. Let us give all honor and due merit to those women, who amidst the pioneer conditions of a new, unsettled country, beset with many wearisome, petty tasks, bearing and rearing many children, yet builded so well those homes of two hundred years ago, that their sweetness, love and sympathy has lasted until the present.

IV

DRESS

No discussion of the status of the colonial woman would be complete without at least a reference to that which is dear to every feminine heart -- dress. Of one thing we may be assured that dress did not occupy the conspicuous place then it does now -- or at least the same proportion of the income of the man was not expended for such purposes. It has remained for the twentieth century to make of dress, nearly a god. And yet we shall note the same hue and cry among the colonial men that one hears from the masculine portion of the population now -- that men are dress-crazy, and that the manner of the dress of women is largely responsible for much of the crime in the world. But that cry is as old as the world itself, at least as old as the age of women: men said this when Sodom and Gemorrah fell; when Greece perished, and when the Gauls sacked Rome. So, we shall find in this colonial period both the man and woman were true to the lasting type.

However, to the colonial sister dress was very important, and early in the history of the colonies the magistrates tried to control it. The poor, deluded Puritan elders, who believed everything should be controlled by laws even attempted to decide until late into the eighteenth century how women should array themselves. But the eternal feminine was more than a match for

them, and they finally gave up in despair.

Early in the history of Virginia and New England, dress was regulated according to the income. "Sept. 27, 1653, the wife of Nicholas Mays of Newbury, Conn. was presented for wearing silk cloak and scarf, but cleared, proving her husband was worth more than 200 l."²

There seemed to be some connection between dress and public spiritdness, for he who dressed well, was supposed to be open-hearted. For public contributions "every unmarried man must be assessed in church 'according to his own apparel:' and every married man must be assessed 'according to his own, and his wife's apparel.'"¹

"In 1651 the Court expressed its 'utter detestation that men and women of meane condition, education, and calling, should take upon them the garbe of gentlemen by wearinge of gold or silver lace, or buttons or povnts at their knees, or walke in great boots, or women of the same ranke to wear silke or tiffany hoods or scarfs!"³

Many persons were "presented" under this law. We find that constantly were the officers harassed by this love of dress, which at this time extended to both men and women. But as the country grew older, the magistrates gradually gave up the matter, and each man and woman was allowed to buy as he wished.

We find more reference to descriptions of dress in the writings of the 18th century than in the previous one. This is to be expected, as the colonists became more prosperous, they also became a little more worldly. Travellers from Europe brought new fashions, and as the travel to Europe became more and more each year, provincialism of manner, style and dress disappeared. Social life became more gay, as wealth increased.

Madam Knight who made a journey from Boston to New York

¹Fiske: Old Virginia, Vol. I, p. 246.

²Earle: Home Life in Colonial Days, p. 283.

³Ibid:

in 1704 has told us something of the dress in the different colonies. She says of the country women of Connecticut: "They are very plain in their dress, throughout all the colony, as I saw, and follow one another in their modes; that you may know where they belong, especially the women, meet them where you will."¹

Her description of the dress of the Dutch women is as follows:

"...The English go very fashionable in their dress. But the Dutch, especially the middling sort, differ from our women in their habit, go loose, wear French mouches, which are like a cap and a head band in one, leaving their ears bare, which are set out with jewels of a large size and many in number: and their fingers hooped with rings, some with large stones in them of many colors, as were their pendants in their ears, which you should see very old women wear as well as young."²

We have a picture of the riding-habit of Sarah Knight, and perhaps it is of interest to know what she considered fashionable, since she passed on the costume of the women in the colonies through which she travelled.

"Debby looked with curious, admiring eyes at the newcomer's costume, the scarlet cloak and little round cap of Lincoln green, the puffed and ruffled sleeves, the petticoat of green druggat-cloth, the high-heeled leather shoes with their green ribbon bows, and the riding-mask of black velvet, which Debby remembered to have heard, only ladies of the highest gentility wore."³

Mrs. Grant speaking of the Dutch women, especially of Albany says: "Of money there was little: and dress was, though in some instances valuable, very plain, and not subject to the caprice of fashion!"⁴

This was the Dutch women before the English influence was marked, and we shall notice that the luxury and extravagance of New York later in the century was commented on many times by European travellers.

Even kindly old Judge Sewall whose diary is a veritable mine of information could take time from his visiting and duties

¹—Murray: Colonial Literature, pp. 336-342.

²Brooks: Dames and Daughters of Colonial Days, p. 76.

³Grant: Memoirs of an American Lady, p. 28.

to record: "April 5th. 1722. . . My wife wore her new Gown of
Smyrna Persian"¹

Again we note the philosophical Franklin writing rather
fluently to his wife of dress: and from what we glean he seems

to have been well "up" on styles. This is in 1766. "As the
stamp Act is at length repeal'd. I am willing you should have a
new Gown, which you may suppose I did not send sooner, as I knew
you would not like to be finer than your neighbours, unless in a
Gown of your own spinning. Had the trade between the two Countries
totally ceas'd, it was a Comfort to me to recollect, that I had
once been cloth'd from Head to Foot in Woolen and Linnen of my
Wife's Manufacture, that I never was prouder of any Dress in my
Life, and that she and her Daughter might do it again if it was
necessary. . . . Joking apart, I have sent you a fine Piece of
Pompadour Sattin, 14 yards, cost 11 shillings a Yard: a silk
Neglige and Petticoat of brocaded Lutestring for my dear Sally,
with two dozen Gloves. . . ."²

This letter dated from London, 1758 reads: ". . . I send
also 7 yards of printed Cotton, blue Ground, to make you a Gown.
I bought it by Candle-Tight, and lik'd it then, but not so well
afterwards. If you do not fancy it, send it as a present from
me to sister Jenny. There is a better Gown for you, of flower'd
Tissue, 16 yards, of Mrs. Stevenson's Fancy, cost 9 Guineas:
and I think it a great Beauty. There was no more of the Sort, or
you should have had enough for a Neglige or Suit."³

Again: ". . . Had I been well, I intended to have gone
around among the shops and bought some pretty things for you and
my dear, good Sally (whose little hands you say eased your head-
ache) to send by this ship, but I must not defer it to the next,
having only got a crimson satin cloak for you, the newest fashion,
and the black silk for Sally: but Billy sends her a scarlet
feather, muff, and tippet, and a box of fashionable linen for
her dress. . . ."⁴

He sends her also in 1758 ". . . a newest fashion'd
white Hat and Cloak and sundry little things, which I hope will
get safe to hand. I send her a pair of Buckles, made of French
Paste Stones, which are next in Lustre to Diamonds. . . ."⁵

Mrs. Adams has written a detail description of her dress
on several occasions. When presented at Court, she says: "Your
Aunt, then wore a full-dress court cap without the lappets, in
which was a wreath of white flowers, and blue sheafs, two black
and blue flat feathers, (which cost) pins, bought for Court, and
a pair of pearl ear-rings, the cost of them -- no matter what:

¹Sears: American Literature, n. 60.

²Smyth: Writings of B. Franklin, Vol. IV, n. 1119.

³Ibid: Vol. III, n. 131.

⁴Ibid: Vol. III, n. 119.

⁵Ibid: Vol. III, n. 138.

less than diamonds, however. A sapphire blue demi-saison with a satin strine, sack and petticoat trimmed with a broad black lace: crane flounce, and leaved made of blue ribbon, and trimmed with white floss: wreaths of black velvet ribbon spotted with steel beads, which are much in fashion, and brought to such perfection as to resemble diamonds: white ribbon also in the Vandvke style, made up of the trimming, which looked very elegant: a full dress handkerchief, and a bouquet of roses. . . . Now for your cousin: a small, white Tephorn hat, bound with pink satin ribbon: a steel buckle and band which turned up at the side, and confined a large pink bow: large blow of the same kind of ribbon behind: a wreath of full-blown roses round the crown, and another of buds and roses withinside the hat, which being placed at the back of the hair brought the roses to the edge: you see it clearly: and red and black feather, with two white ones, completed the head-dress. A gown and coat of Chamberi gauze, with a red satin strine over a pink waist, and coat flounced with crane, trimmed with broad point and pink ribbon; wreathes of roses across the coat: gauze sleeves and ruffles."¹

Surely this sounds like elegance, although it is absolutely impossible to form the picture. Again she writes:

"Cousin's dress, is white, . . . like your aunt's, only differently trimmed and ornamented: her train being wholly of white crane, and trimmed with white ribbon: the petticoat, which is the most showy part of the dress, covered and drawn up in what are called festoons, with light wreaths of beautiful flowers: the sleeves white crane, drawn over silk, with a row of lace round the sleeve near the shoulder, another half way down the arm, and a third upon the top of the ruffle, a little flower stuck between: a kind of hat-can, with three large feathers and a bunch of flowers, a wreath of flowers upon the hair. . . ."²

We have the description of a dress worn by Miss Chambers in Philadelphia, late in the eighteenth century: "On this evening my dress was white brocade silk, trimmed with silver, and white-silk, high-heeled shoes, embroidered with silver, and a light blue sash, with silver cord and tassel tied at the left side. My watch was suspended at the right, and my hair was in its natural curls. Surmounting all was a small white hat and white ostrich feather, confined by brilliant band and buckle."³

A tutor in the Virginia homes records in 1773 that "Almost every Lady wears a red Cloak: and when they ride ou they tve a red handkerchief over their Head and face, so that when I first came into Virginia, I was distressed whenever I saw a Lady, for I thought she had the Tooth-ache!"⁴

If we deplore the fact that we find so little concerning

¹Letters of A. Adams, p. 282.

²Ibid: p. 250.

³Wharton: M. Washington, p. 227.

⁴Trent: Rev. Literature, p. 318.

women in the writings of the period. we have reason to rejoice at the comments on dress. Occasionally, a woman wrote of this, but the comments by the men are many, satirical, and humorous. Ward, better known as "the simple Cobbler of Aggawam" is especially bitter in his remarks. He waxes warm on the subject, and seems to have a personal grievance. No doubt, he took a special delight in ridiculing the good colonial dames. A portion of his many remarks is given below:

"It is a more common than convenient saying that nine tailors make a man: it were well if nineteen could make a woman to her mind. If tailors were men indeed well furnished, but with here moral principles, they would disdain to be led about like anes by such mimic marmosets. It is a most unworthy thing for men that have bones in them to spend their lives in making fiddle-cases for futilous women's fancies: which are the very nettitoes of informity, the gilets of perquisquilian toys. . . . It is no little labor to be continually putting up English women into outlandish casks: who if they be no shifted anew once in a few months grow too sour for their husbands. . . . He that makes coats for the moon had need take measure every noon, and he that makes for women. as often to keep them from lunacy."¹

His ideas seem to become more intensified, until he writes not only ridiculous things, but foolish and even coarse. Again he states: "I shall make bold for this once to borrow a little of their long-wasted but short-skirted patience. . . . It is beyond the ken of my understanding to conceive, how those women should have any true grace, or valuable vertue, that have so little with as to disfigure whith themselves with such exotic garbes, as not only dismanls their native lovely lustre, but transclouts them into gant bargees, ill shake-shotten-shell-fish, Egyptian Hieroglyphs, or at the best French flirts of the pastery, which a proper English woman should scorn with her heels. . . ."²

The following poem contains a hint as to what the men considered important from the standpoint of dress:

"Young ladies, in town, and those that live 'round,
Let a friend at this season advise you:
Since money's so scarce, and times growing worse,
Strange things may soon hap and surprize you.

"First, then, throw aside your topknots of pride,

¹Holliday: Wit and Humor of Colonial Days, p. 23.

²Sears: American Literature, p. 118.

Wear none but your own country linen,
of Economy boast, let your pride be the most,
To show clothes of your own make and spinning.

"What if home-spun, they say, is not quite so gay,
As brocades, yet be not in a passion,
For when once it is known, this is much worn in town,
One and all will cry out -- 'Tis the fashion!"

.

"Throw aside your Rohea and your Green Hyson tea,
And all things with a new-fashion duty:
Procure a good store of the choice Laborador
For there'll soon be enough here to suit you.

"These do without fear, and to all you'll appear
Fair, charming, true, lovely and clever,
Tho the times remain darkish, young men may be sparkish,
And love you much stronger than ever."1

An article appearing in the Essex Journal enumerates several vices common to females, viz., vanity, affectation, talkativeness, and lastly, dress. Under the latter heading this is given:

"Dress. Too great delight in dress and finery by the expense of time and money which they occasion in some instances to a degree beyond all bounds of decency and common sense, tends naturally to sink a woman to the lowest pitch of contempt amongst all those of either sex who have capacity enough to put two thoughts together. A creature who spends its whole time in dressing, prating, gaming, and gadding, is a being -- originally indeed of the rational make, but who has sunk itself beneath its rank, and is to be considered at present as nearly on a level with the monkey species. . . ."2

Since this was written before the appearance of Darwin's "Descent of Man", the idea expressed in the latter part of the above was, no doubt, original. However, had the author been acquainted with the theory of man's descent, he would probably enlarged on this thought.

The boon especially seems to have aroused the ire of the

¹Buckingham's Reminiscences, Vol. I, p. 31.

²Ibid: p. 301.

of the men, and many were the "unkind cuts" against this innocent article of dress. The following notice appeared in the Boston News Letter:

"Just published, and Sold by the Printer hereof, HOOP=
P~~E~~M~~T~~COATS Arraigned and U~~C~~ondemned, by the Light of Nature, and
Law of God."²

The New England Weekly Journal in 1726 printed a series of essays on the vanities of women, one of which contained this:

"I shall not busy myself with the Ladies' shoes and stockings at all, but I can't so easily pass over the Hoop when 'tis in my way, and therefore I must beg pardon of my fair readers if I begin my attack here. 'Tis now some years since this remarkable fashion made a figure in the world and from its first beginning divided the public opinion as to its convenience and beauty. For my part I was always willing to indulge it, under some restrictions: that is to say if 'tis not a rival to the dome of St. Paul's to incumber the way, or a tub for the residence of a new Diogenes. If it does not eclipse too much beauty above or discover too much below. In short, I am for living in peace, and I am afraid a fine lady with too much liberty in this particular would render my own imagination an enemy to my repose."¹

Small wonder the men felt it necessary to protest against this article of dress: perhaps it was in a spirit of self-preservation. We can understand, somewhat their feeling, when we learn the size of it: This account was written by Margaret Hutchinson, in 1774, when she was presented at the Court of St. James:

"We called for Mrs. Keene, but found that one coach would not contain more than two such mighty hoops: and papa and Mrs. K. were obliged to go in another coach. . . ."³

But there were other accessories of dress that disturbed the men, and in the Weekly Rehearsal of 1731 we note:

"I come now to the Head-Dress, the very highest point of female eloquence, and here I find such a variety of modes, such a medley of decoration, that 'tis is hard to know where to fix, lace and cambrick, gauze and fringe, feathers and ribbands, create such a confusion, occasion such frequent changes that it defies art,

¹Buckingham's Reminiscences, Vol. I, p. 100.

²Ibid. p. 88.

³Stedman and Hutchinson, Vol. III, p. 65.

judgment or taste to recommend them to any standard, or reduce them to any order. That ornament of the hair which is styled the Horns, and has been in vogue so long, was certainly first calculated by some good natured lady to keep her spouse in countenance."¹

This last proved too much: it was the straw that broke the camel's back. even the meek, colonial women could not suffer this to go unanswered. The insult must be avenged, and in the next number of the Rehearsal appeared the following, written by some high-spirited colonial dame:

"You seem to blame us for our innovations and fleeting fancy in dress which you are most notoriously guilty of, who esteem yourselves the mighty, wise, and head of the species. Therefore, I think it highly necessary that you show us the example first, and begin the reformation among yourselves, if you intend your observations shall have any with us. I leave the world to judge whether our naticcoat resembles the dome of St. Paul's nearer than you in your long coats do the Monument. You complain of our masculine appearance in our riding habits, and indeed we think it is but reasonable that we should make reprisals upon you for the invasion of our dress and figure, and the advances you make in effeminency, and your degeneracy from the figure of man. Can there be a more ridiculous appearance than to see a smart fellow within the compass of five feet immersed in a huge long coat to his heels with cuffs to the arm pits, the shoulders and breast fenced against the inclemencies of the weather by a monstrous cape, or rather short cloak, shoe toes, pointed to the heavens in imitation of the Lap-landers, with buckles of a harness size. I confess the beaux with their toupee wigs make us extremely merry, and frequently put me in mind of my favorite monkey both in figure and anishness, and were it not for a reverse of circumstances, I should be apt to mistake it for Pug, and treat him with the same familiarity."²

The stronger sex were not as safe in colonial days in their ridicule of women's dress, as now, for then, they, themselves, did go to the extreme in velvets, brocades, satin, and wigs, whereas, at the present time, there is no doubt, their dress is more simple, and less showy than that of their sisters.

The greater number of comments on the luxury and extravagance of dress occur during the latter part of the eighteenth century. Chastellux, visiting Boston at the close of the Rev-

¹Buckingham's Reminiscences, Vol. I, p. 115.

²Ibid.

'says there was 'ton of ease and freedom which is pretty general at Boston and cannot fail of being pleasing to the French.' He says the 'ladies, though well dressed, had less elegance and refinement than at Philadelphia.'"¹

Grieve, an Englishman, the translator of Chastellux, adds in a foot-note an interesting comment on the dress of the women,

"The rage for dress amongst the women in America, in the very height of the miseries of the war, was beyond all bounds: nor was it confined to the great towns, it prevailed equally on the sea coasts, and in the woods and solitudes of the vast extent of country from Florida to New Hampshire. In travelling into the interior parts of Virginia I spent a delicious day at an inn, at the ferry of Shenandoah, on the Catacton Mountains, with the most engaging, accomplished and voluptuous girls, the daughters of the landlord, a native of Boston transplanted thither, who with all the gifts of nature possessed the arts of dress not unworthy of Parisian milliners, and went regularly three times a week to the distance of seven miles, to attend the lessons of one De Grace, a French dancing master, who was making a fortune in the country."²

However, this comment above must be taken not literally, for we know from the testimony of many of the men, the women during the days of the war, did everything they could to aid, and the charge of extravagance in dress cannot apply to all. Women such as Martha Washington, Abigail Adams, Eliza Pinckney, and others were far too sensible to spend money needed for other purposes on the vanities of dress, and there were thousands of sensible women in the colonies. On the other hand, there probably were, some who were foolish, and who were extravagant even during those trying times, but we can scarcely believe the testimony of this man, belonging to the race, lately defeated by the colonists, against the testimony of native Americans.

Interesting hints have come to us through the old diaries and account books of different articles of dress. George Washington has left, the account of articles ordered for his

¹Fisher. Men, Women & Manners in Colonial Times, p. 185.

²Ibid. p. 92. (Chastellux, Travels, Vol. II, p. 115).

wife. Among these ordered from London are "A salmon-colored

tabby velvet of the enclosed pattern, with satin flowers, to be made in a sack and coat, ruffles to be made of Brussels lace or point, proper to be worn with the above negligee, to cost, 20l.; 2 pairs of white silk hose: 1 pair white satin shoes of the smallest fives: 1 fashionable hat or bonnet: 6 pairs woman's best kid gloves: 6 pairs mitts: 1 dozen breast-knots: 1 dozen most fashionable cambric pocket handkerchiefs: 6 pounds perfumed powder: a buckered petticoat of fashionable color; a silver tabby velvet petticoat; handsome breast flowers: . . ." For little Miss

Custia was ordered, "A coat made of fashionable silk, 6 pairs of white kid gloves, handsome egrettes of different sorts, and one pair odd neck thread stays, . . ."¹

Little girls wore dresses similar to the older women,

high-heeled shoes, heavy stays, and great hoop-petticoats. Their

complexions were carefully cared for: "they wore masks of cloth or velvet to protect them from the tanning rays of the sun, and long-armed gloves. Little Dolly Payne, went to school wearing a white linen mask to keep every ray of sunshine from the complexion, a sunbonnet, sewed on her head every morning by her careful mother, and long gloves covering the hands and arms."² And they were well-rewarded, for the colonial women

had beautiful skins and delicate colorings, strangely unlike the coarser, sunburned complexions of today.

There has been preserved a list of clothes, the ward of Colonel John Lewis, sent from Virginia in 1737 to England to attend School: It reads as follows:

"A can ruffle and tucker, the lace 5 shillings per yard.	
1 pair White Stays,	1 pair plain Spanish shoes,
8 pair White kid gloves.	2 pair calf shoes.
2 pair coloured kid gloves	1 mask,
2 pair worsted hose,	1 fan,
3 pair thread hose,	1 necklace.
1 pair silk shoes laced.	1 Girdle and buckle
1 pair morocco shoes.	1 piece fashionable Calico,
1 Hoop Coat,	1 Yards ribbon for knots.
1 Hat,	1½ yard Cambric
	1 Mantua and coat of lute-string." ³

¹Wharton: M. Washington, n. 49.

²Earle: Home Life in Colonial Days, n. 290.

³Ibid:

One New England miss send to Boston, when twelve years of age, to "finish" school, had twelve silk gowns, but her teacher "wrote home that she must have another gown of a 'recently imported rich fabric,' which was at once bought for her because it was 'suitable for her rank and station.'"¹

Even the frugality of Benjamin Franklin did not prevent his wife and daughter from dressing in rich gowns of silk. In the Pennsylvania Gazette this advertisement appeared in 1750:

"Whereas on Saturday night last the house of Benjamin Franklin of this city, Printer, was broken open, and the following things feloniously taken away, viz., a double necklace of gold beads, a woman's long scarlet cloak almost new, with a double cape, a womans gown, of printed cotton of the sort called brocade print, very remarkable, the ground dark, with large red roses, and other large and yellow flowers, with blue in some of the flowers, with many green leaves; a pair of womens stays covered with white tabby before, and dove colour'd tabby behind, . . . "²

During the later days of the colonial history and early days of the republic, we find extravagance of dress on the part of both men and women. Philadelphia was the leader in social affairs, but after New York became the capitol, here, too, were seen rich velvets, satins, brocades, etc. St.-John de Crevecoeur, says: "You will find here the English fashions. In the dress of the women you will see the most brilliant silks, gauzes, hats, and borrowed hair. . . If there is a town on the American continent there English luxury displayed its follies, it was in New York".³

But surely, all the blame for luxurious dressing must not be laid at the feet of the women, for, what they could do? They must present an equal appearance with the men, and the latter were costumed in fine silks and satins. George Washington, on state occasions, and at social functions appeared in the black velvet "of the old cut", a silver or "steel hilted small sword at the left side, pearl satin waistcoat, fine linen and lace, hair full powdered, black silk rose and bag".⁴

¹Earle: Home Life in Colonial Days, p. 291.

²Ibid. p. 292.

³Wharton: Through Colonial Doorways, p. 89.

⁴Wharton: M. Washington, p. 225.

The description of a "Boston printer just after the Revolution shows his style of dress: "He wore a pea-green coat, white vest, nankeen small clothes, white silk stockings, and pumps fastened with silver buckles which covered at least half the foot from instep to toe. His small clothes were tied at the knees with ribbon of the same colour in double bows, the ends reaching down to the ancles. His hair in front was well loaded with pomatum, frizzled or craped and powdered. Behind, his natural hair was augmented by the addition of a large queue called vulgarly a false tail, which, enrolled in some hards of black ribbon, hung half-way down his back."¹

With the men arrayed in such costumes, small wonder that the man likewise dressed in satins and brocades.

We have recorded the description of the dress of Dorothy Payne Todd -- better known as "Dolly Madison," upon the first meeting with the "great, little Madison." . Her gown of mulberry satin, with tulle kerchief folded over the bosom, set off to the best advantage the pearly whites and delicate rose tints of that complexion which constituted the chief beauty of Dolly Todd."²

This luxuriance was indeed a long way from the quiet gray dress of the Quaker maidens, the faith of Dolly Payne's girlhood.

During the British occupation of Philadelphia there were many gay events. The officers with their military carriage, gold lace, and shining buttons caused the gay Tory matrons and "maids", many a flutter indeed. One great fete known as the "Meschianza" seems to have been indeed a wonderful affair, similar to a gorgeous pageant. Time does not permit a description of this, but wonderful indeed were the costumes worn by the fair ones.

Miss Franks, a gay Tory maid, of Philadelphia has left a hint of the costume worn by herself: "The dress is more ridiculous and pretty than anything I ever saw -- great quantity of different colored feathers on the head at a time besides a thousand other things. The Hair dress'd very high in the shape

¹Earle: Home Life in Colonial Days, p. 294.

²Goodwin: Dolly Madison, p. 54.

Miss Vining's was the night we returned from Smiths -- the Hat we found in your Mother's Closet wou'd be of a proper size. I have an afternoon cap with one wing -- tho' I assure you I go less in the fashion than most of the Ladies -- not being dress'd without a hoop. . ."¹

One colonial landlady in writing to her niece says of her boarders: "Had I time and spirits, I could acquaint you of an expedition the two sisters made to Dorchester, a walk begun at sunrise last Thursday morning -- dress'd in their damasks, paduscy, gauze, ribbins, flappets, flowers, new white hats, white journey, garmetns, ornaments and all quite finish'd on Saturday before noon (mud over shoes) never did I behold such destruction in so short a space -- bottom of padusoy coat fring'd quote around, besides places worm entire to floss, and besides frays, dammask from shoulders to bottom not lightly soil'd but as if every part had rub'd tables and chairs that had long been us'd to wax mingl'd with grease."²

Miss Chambers has left the following description of the birthday ball tendered to the President in 1795. Of the costumes she says: "She (Mrs. Washington) was dressed in a rich silk, but entirely without ornament, except the animation her amiable heart gives to her countenance. Next her were seated the wives of the foreign ambassadors, glittering from the floor to the summit of their head-dress. One of the ladies wore three large ostrich-feathers. Her brow was encircled by a sparkling fillet of diamonds; her neck and arms were almost covered with jewels, and two watches were suspended from her girdle, and all reflecting the light from a hundred directions. . . ."³

A costume of the inaugural ball of 1789 is described:

"It was a plain celestial blue satin gown, with a white satin petticoat. On the neck was worn a very large Italian gauze handkerchief, with border stripes of satin. The head-dress was a pouf of satin in the form of a globe, the Creneaux or head-piece of which was composed white satin, having a double wing in large pleats and trimmed with a wreath of artificial roses. The hair was dressed all over in detached curls, four of which in two ranks, fell on each side of the neck and were relieved behind by a floating chignon."⁴

The costume of Miss Sally McKean at a state function late in the eighteenth century is "a blue satin dress trimmed with white crape and flowers, and petticoat of white crape richly em-

¹Wharton: Through Colonial Doorway, p. 219.

²Earle: Child Life in Colonial Days, p. 99.

³Wharton: M. Washington, p.230.

⁴Wharton: Through Colonial Doorways, p. 79.

broidered, and across the front a festoon of rose colour caught up with flowers. . ."¹

But this dress worn by Sally McKean was simplicity itself, as compared with that of the Spanish minister, upon this occasion, and the man whom she afterwards married. He was dressed this:

"His hair powdered like a snowball; with dark striped silk coat lined with satin, black silk breeches, white silk stockings, shoes, and buckles. He had by his side an elegant-hilted small-sword and his chapeau, tipped with white feathers, under his arm. . ."¹

There were no fashion plates during colonial days, and dolls were used instead. They were dressed in the prevailing fashion and sent from town to town. There used in America to guide the style of dress were sent from London. An account of fashions during the last of the century has been given in "A

New England Bride in New York", by Eliza Southgate Bowne. She

says in part; "Caroline and I went a-shopping yesterday, and 'tis a fact that the little white satin Quaker bonnets, cap-crowns, are the most fashionable that are worn -- lined with pink or blue or white -- but I'll not have one, for if any of my old acquaintance should meet me in the street they would laugh; . . . Large sheer-muslin shawls, put on as Sally Weeks wear hers, are much worn; they show the form through and look pretty. Silk nabobs, plaided, colored and white, are much worn -- very short waists -- hair very plain. . . "²

There were many comments in the papers of the day about the vanity of women in regard to their interest in men, their attempt to capture them, etc. While these probably did not represent then the opinions of the majority of the people, any more than the witty sayings in "Life," and "Judge," do today, however, they are interesting. The following account is surely interesting:

"To Be Sold at Public Vendue,
The Whole Estate of
Isabella Springtly, ^Toast and Coquette,
(Now retiring from Business)

"I primis, all the tools and utensils necessary for

¹Crawford: Romantic Days in the Early Republic, p. 53.

²Stedman and Hutchinson, Vol. III p. 495.

carrying on the trade, viz., several bundles of darts and arrows well pointed and capable of doing great execution. A considerable quantity of patches, paint, brushes and cosmetics for plastering, painting and white-washing the face; a complete set of caps, 'a la mode a Paris,' of all sizes, from five to fifteen inches in height; with several dozens of cupids, very proper to be stationed on a ruby lip, a diamond eye, or a roseate cheek.

"Item, as she proposes by certain ceremonies to transform one of her humble servants into a husband and keep him for her own use, she offers for sale, Florio, Daphnis, Cynthio, and Cle-anthes, with several others whom she won by a constant attendance on business during the space of four years. She can prove her indisputable right thus to dispose of them by certain deeds of gifts, bills of sale, and attestation, vulgarly called love letters, under their own hands and seals. They will be offered very cheap, for they are all of them broken-hearted, consumptive, or in a dying condition. Nay, some of them have been dead this half year, as they declare and testify in the above mentioned writing.

"N. B. Their hearts will be sold separately."¹

A poem with the same thoughts is "The Progress of Dullness. It reads in part:

"Poor Harriett now hath had her day; no more the
beaux confess her sway;
New beauties push her from the stage;
She trembles at the approach of age,
And starts to view the altered face
that wrinkles at her in her glass.

.
Despised by all and doomed to meet
Her lovers at her rivals feet,
She flies assemblies, shuns the ball,
And cries out, vanity, on all;

.
Now careless gown of airs polite
Her noon-day night-cap meets the sight;
Her hair uncombed collects together
With ornaments of many a feather.

.
She spends her breath as years prevail
At this sad wicked world to rail,
To slander all her sex impromptu,
And wonder what the times will come to."²

Others could be given, showing the same trend, but it is not necessary. These are only the continuation of the ever-present satire and irony in regard to women -- her dress,

¹⁻²Tyler: Literary History of the American Revolution, pp. 203, 216.

her vanities, her weaknesses and faults -- the same old story that man, in every century, finds pleasure in ridiculing.

During the early years of colonial history, dress was regulated by law. Many were the "Presentations" of our good ancestors, both men and women, but mostly women. The magistrates were greatly troubled, owing to the effort made to control the dress. As the colonies became more populous, it was impossible to do this, and, finally the laws became archaic. As the material wealth increased, likewise, the dress of the people became more elaborate. Fashions were patterned after dolls, dressed in the European styles, sent from London, and passed from town to town in the colonies. Both men and women wore beautiful satins, brocades, silks and velvet. When the occasion was fitting these men and women of the new world dressed themselves in their luxurious clothing and entertained with a grace and dignity equal to that of the courts of Europe. Likewise, when necessary they laid aside their rich garments and donned the homespun. The women brought out again the spinning wheel, as Martha Washington and Sarah Bache testified, and once more the families were garbed in clothes of the material woven by the hands of the women. Then again when the war had ended they assumed the richer fabrics.

Travellers from England and France, accustomed to the luxuries of the courts of Europe commented on the elegant clothing worn by the men, and women, especially the latter. That it met their approval is evident from their comments; indeed they were surprised to see the quality and good taste displayed by these people of a new world. Possibly they had expected a little of the uncouth, but on the other hand they were entertained with a courtesy that charmed them.

V

SOCIAL LIFE

In a social way, similar to the religious states, we find the standards of the colonies not as homogenous as the ideas on education and the home. We find a social life of more gaiety in the south, than perhaps any other section, unless Philadelphia late in the century. The visitings, balls, dinner parties, and hunts of the south are proverbial. Nearly all the travellers in that section mention the generous hospitality of the southern people. The accounts of the pleasure-loving, happy, joyous mode of living read like an existence in the Golden Age, or some fairy world. The climate, the occupation of the people, manner of living, etc., developed naturally a social life different from that of the colonies of the north. Agriculture was the chief occupation, and tobacco the staple crop. But tobacco exhausts the soil, and the planter instead of enriching the soil, moved farther back into the virgin forest, cleared more land, and planted new tobacco fields. Thus, since the plantations contained many hundreds of acres, naturally the houses were far apart. Washington's estate at Mt. Vernon contained over four thousand acres, and many were larger than this. Towns were miles apart, and there but few of them. Eliza Pinckney writing about 1740 to a friend in England says. "We are 17 miles by land, and 6 by water from Charles Town. . ."¹

¹Ravenel: Eliza Pinckney, p. 5.

There were many streams, and the planter had a landing or wharf where he loaded his tobacco, and unloaded his purchases. Thus, instead of the people living in compact centers or towns, as in New England, they were widely scattered. Consequently it was necessary to go several miles often to the nearest neighbor, and

sometimes, miles, to a relative. "In striking contrast to New England was the absence of towns, due mainly to two reasons -- first the wealth of the water-courses, which enabled every planter of means to ship his products from his own wharf, and, secondly, the culture of tobacco, which scattered the people in a continual search for new and richer lands. This rural life, while it hindered co-operation, promoted a spirit of independence among the whites of all classes which counteracted the aristocratic form of government. . ."¹

One historian, writing of conditions in 1800, the close of this period says: "The great Virginia plantations were practically self-sustaining, so far as the actual necessities of life were concerned; the slaves had to be clothed and fed whether tobacco and wheat could be sold or not, but they produced, with the exception of the raw material for making their garments, practically all that was essential to their well-being. The money which the Virginia planters received for their staple products was used to purchase articles of luxury -- wine for the men, articles of apparel for the women, furnishings for the house, and things of that kind, and to pay the interest on the load of indebtedness which the Virginia aristocracy owed at home and abroad. . ."²

Again, the same historian says: "The plenty of everything made hospitality universal, and the wealth of the country was greatly promoted by the opening of the forests. Indeed, so contented were the people with their new homes (1652) that the same writer declares, 'Seldom (if ever) any that hath continued in Virginia any time will or do desire to live in England, but post back with what expedition they can, although many are landed men in England, and have good estates there, and divers ways of preferments propounded to them, to entice and persuade their continuance.'³

The hospitality and spirit of kindness among the Virginiana seems to date from the early settlement of the colony. Hammond writing in 1656 noted this. "If any fall sick, and cannot compasse

¹Hart: American Nation Series, Vol. IV, p. 114.

²Ibid: Vol. XII, p. 218.

³Ibid: Vol. IV, p. 114.

to follow his crope, which if not followed, will soon be lost, the adjoyning neighbours will either voluntarily or upon a request joyn together, and work in it, by spels, untill the honour recovers, and that gratis, so that no man by sticknesse loose any part of his years worke.

"Let any travell, it is without charge, and at every house is entertainment as in a hostery, and with it hearty welcome are strangers entertained.

"In a word, Virginia wants not good victuals, wants not good dispositions, and as God hath freely bestowed it, they as freely impart with it, yet are there as well bad natures as good."¹

The spirit of interest and kindness developed when the colony was struggling for existence seems to have lasted throughout the colonial period, and every traveller speaks of it, and emphasizes the fact.

A great part of the population were descendants of the cavaliers, and naturally loved amusements and gayety. Beverly comments: "Thus, in the time of the rebellion in England, several good Cavalier families went thither with their effects, to escape the tyranny of the usurper, or acknowledgment of his title."²

His testimony of the hospitality and character of the people of Virginia is as follows:

"For their recreation, the plantations, orchards and gardens constantly afford them fragrant and delightful walks. In their woods and fields, they have an unknown variety of vegetables, and other varieties of Nature to discover. They have hunting, fishing and fowling, with which they entertain themselves an hundred ways. There is the most good nature and hospitality practised in the world, both towards friends and strangers; but the worst of it is, this generosity is attended now and then with a little too much intemperance.

"The inhabitants are very courteous to travelers, who need no other recommendation but the being human creature. A stranger has no more to do, but to enquire upon the road, where any gentleman or good housekeeper lives, and there he may depend upon being received with hospitality. This good nature is so general among their people, that the gentry, when they go abroad, order their principal servant to entertain all visitors, with every-

¹Narratives of Early Maryland, p. 285.

²Library of Southern Literature, p. 392, Vol. I.

thing the plantation affords. And the poor planters, who have but one bed, will very often sit up, or lie upon a form or couch all night, to make room for a weary traveller, to repose himself after his journey. . . ."¹

The Marquis de Chastellux, one of the generals in the French army at the time of the Revolution, a polished man of the world, who had mingled with the courts of Europe, and knew the society of the old world, has given us many hints of the society of Virginia. And he seems to have found pleasure in the social life of the plantations, so we may be sure that the people were not as rude as we sometimes believe. "This distinguished Frenchman, with his charming manners, tells us considerable about the women of Virginia. He thinks the Virginia women might become musicians if the fox-hounds would stop baying for a little while each day. He found 'some good French and English authors,' in some of his visits, and also met several Virginia ladies 'who sang and played on the harpsichord.'

"He describes one of the Nelsons who had been secretary of the province before the Revolution as an 'old magistrate whose white locks, noble figure, and stature, which was above the common size, commanded respect and veneration;' and, like all true Virginians, he was badly afflicted with the gout. On the plantation where he lived he could within less than six hours assemble thirty of his children and grandchildren, besides nephews and nieces in the neighborhood, amounting in all to seventy. These enormous families which were to be found in colonial times in Virginia and New England, where the people were very homogeneous and united, always astonished the Frenchmen."²

The description of a Virginia planter's mansion has been recorded by a tutor in the wealthy families of the south. This is in 1774:

"Mr. Carter has chosen for the place of his habitation a high spot of Ground in Westmoreland County. . . .where he has erected a large, Elegant House, at a vast expense, which commonly goes by the name of Nomini-Hall. This House is built with Brick but the bricks have been covered with strong lime Mortar, so that the building is now perfectly white; (erected in 1732). It is seventy-six Feet long from East to West; and forty-four wide from North to South, two stories high; . . . It has five stacks of chimneys, tho' two of these serve only for ornaments.

¹Library of Southern Literature, Vol. I, p. 392.

²Fisher; Men, Women and Manners in Colonial Times, p. 79.

"There is a beautiful Jutt, on the South side, eighteen feet long, and eight feet deep from the wall which is supported by three tall pillars -- on the South side, or front, in the upper story are four Windows each having twenty-four lights of Glass. In the lower story are two Windows each having forty-two lights of Glass, and two Doors each having Sixteen Lights -- At the east and the upper story has three windows each with 18 lights; and below two windows both with eighteen lights and a door with nine. . .

"The North side I think is the most beautiful of all. In the upper story is a row of seven windows with 18 lights a piece; and below six windows, with the like number of lights; besides a large portico in the middle, at the sides of which are two windows each with eighteen lights. . . . At the west end are no Windows -- The number of lights in all is five hundred, and forty nine. There are four Rooms on a Floor, disposed of in the following manner. Below is a dining room where we usually sit; the second is a dining-room for the children; the third is Mr. Carters study, and the fourth is a Ball-Room thirty feet long. Above stairs, one room is for Mr. and Mrs. Carter; the second for the young ladies; and the other two for occasional company. As this House is large, and stands on a high piece of Land it may be seen a considerable distance."¹

This was, no doubt, a typical house of this period. These houses were well furnished, generally with imported furnishings.

"They were crammed from cellar to garret with all the articles of pleasure and convenience that were produced in England; Russia leather chairs, Turkey worked chairs, enormous quantities of damask napkins and table linen, silver-and pewter-ware, candlesticks of brass, silver, and pewter, flagons, dram cups, beakers, tankards, chafing dishes, Spanish tables, Dutch tables, valuable clocks, screens, and escritaires."

Chastellux describes the Nelson house at Yorktown as very handsome, 'from which neither European taste nor luxury were excluded; a chimney-piece and some bas-reliefs of very fine marble exquisitely sculptured were particularly admired!'"²

This luxurious manner of living resulted in a social life of much gayety. There were balls, parties, dinners, visits, and races. Mere hints of this pleasant social intercourse are found in scraps of notes in connection with the life of Eliza Pinckney and her daughter. The latter was a charming young woman, one of the belles of Charleston, and, if we can read between the lines,

¹Trent: Rev. Literature, p. 318.

²Fisher: Men, Women and Manners in Colonial Times, p. 89.

thoroughly enjoyed the gay life in that city. The following

comments are interesting: "Governor Lyttelton will wait on the ladies at Belmont;" (the home of Mrs. Pinckney and her daughter) "Mrs. Drayton begs the pleasure of your company to spend a few days:"', "Lord and Lady Charles Montagu's Compts to Mrs. and Miss Pinckney, and if it is agreeable to them shall be glad of their company at the Lodge"', "Mrs. Glen presents her Compts to Mrs. Pinckney and Mrs. Hyrne, hopes they got no cold, and begs Mrs. Pinckney will detain Mrs. Hyrne from going home till Monday, and that they (together with Miss Butler and the 3 young Lady's) will do her the favour to done with her on Sunday"', etc. (Mr. Pinckney had been dead for several years).¹

In a letter written in her girlhood to her brother about 1743, Eliza Pinckney says of the people of Carolina: "The people in genl are hospitable and honest, and the better sort add to these a polite gentile behaviour. The poorer sort are the most indolent people in the world or they could never be wretched in so plentiful a country as this. The winters here are very fine and pleasant, but 4 months in the year is extreamly disagreeable, excessive hott, much thunder and lightening and muskatoes and sand flies in abundance.

"Crs town, the Metropolis, is a neat, pretty place. The inhabitants polite and live in a very gentile manner. The streets and houses regularly built -- the ladies and gentleman gay in their dress; upon the whole you will find as many agreeable people of both sexes for the size of the place as almost anywhere. . . ."²

Great companies were entertained at dinner, and many of the planters kept "open house." This was especially true of Mt. Vernon; and Washington records in his diary, several years after the war, that for the first time since returning to Mt. Vernon, he and Mrs. Washington dined alone. Naturally visitors of note, and the Americans who were able to do so wished to visit the beloved General, so that while this accords for the great throng at his home, and though he possibly entertained more than the average planter, however, we may be sure the life here was typical of the South. Many hints have come down to us of this charming hospitality here. "Warm-hearted, open-handed hospitality was constantly exercised at Mount Vernon, and if the master humbly recorded that,

¹Ravenel: Eliza Pinckney, p. 227.

²Ibid, p. 13.

although he owned a hundred cows, he had sometimes to buy butter for his family, the entry seems to have been made in no spirit of fault-finding."¹

A young French traveller, Brissot de Warville, has recorded his impressions of the hospitality of Mount Vernon: "Everything has an air of simplicity in his (Washington's) house; his table is good, but not ostentatious; and no deviation is seen from regularity and domestic economy. Mrs. Washington superintends the whole, and joins to the qualities of an excellent housewife, that simple dignity which ought to characterise a woman whose husband has acted the greatest part on the theatre of human affairs; while she possesses that amenity, and manifests that attention to strangers, which renders hospitality so charming."^{1-1/2}

We have noted on page 77 the description of the home of Colonel Spotswood. This picture described was similar to those found all through the southern colonies. Charleston was the most important city both commercially and socially, in the later part of the century. Here was wealth, leisure, and to a degree culture. Josiah Quincey visited the city just before the Revolution, and was charmed with the society here. He attended a St. Cecilia concert, and says of the ladies here: ". . .(they) are in taciturnity during the performance greatly before our (Boston) ladies; in noise and flirtation after the music is over, pretty much on a par. If our ladies have any advantage, it is in white and red, vivacity and spirit."²

"Mr. Quincey went to a dinner at Miles Brewton's 'with a large company, -- a most superb house said to have cost him £8000 sterling."³

Charleston was burned by the British, but by 1789 had been almost entirely rebuilt. One social feature of this city was the musical society, St. Cecilia, organized in 1737 "as an amateur concert society and amateurs long continued to compose the bulk of its membership;"⁴

Until 1822 an annual concert was the feature of this organization, but since then the entertainment is in the form of a ball.

¹Wharton: M. Washington, p. 65.

^{1-1/2}Ibid: p. 166.

²⁻³Crawford: Romantic Days in the Early Republic, p. 292.

⁴Ibid: p. 307.

The social life in the south seems to have been the happy median between the corrupt, vicious life of Louisiana, and the morbid, dull life of the Puritans of New England, where, in the early days, all amusements were forbidden. How enjoyable that social life in the south was is indicated by Miss Pinckney, who with the cares of three large plantations on her slender shoulders, no doubt, longed for the gayities of the other young ladies of the neighborhood. On being present at a social function, and returning to the dull routine of her supervision of the farms, she writes: "At my return thither every thing appeared gloomy and lonesome, I began to consider what attraction there was in this place that used so agreeably to soothe my pensive humour, and made me indifferent to everything the gay world could boast; but I found the change not in the place, but in myself. . ."¹

In 1742 we have this note from the same pen as the above:

". . . The Govr gave the Gentlemen a very gentile entertainment at noon, and a ball at night for the ladies on the Kings birth-night, at which was a Crowded Audience of Gentn and ladies. I danced a minuet with yr old acquaintance Capt Brodrick who was extremely glad to see one so nearly related to his old friend. . ."²

A few details of a typical southern entertainment has been reconstructed by the writer of the life of Eliza Pinckney.

She says: "On such an occasion as that referred to, a reception for the young bride who had just come from her own stately home of Ashley Hall, a few miles down the river, the guests naturally were all their braveries. Their dresses, brocade, taffety, lute-string, etc., were well drawn up through their pocket holes. Their slippers, to match their dresses, had heels even higher and more unnatural than our own. . . .With bows and courtesies, and by the tips of their fingers, the ladies were led up the high stone steps to the wide hall, . . . and then up the stair-case with its heavy carved balustrade to the panelled rooms above. . . . Then, the last touches put to the heads (too loftily piled with cushion, puffs, curls, and lappets, to admit of being covered with anything more than a veil or a hood). . . . Gay would be the feast. . .

"The old silver, damask, and India china still remaining, show how these feasts were set out. . . .Miss Lucas has already told us something of what the country could furnish in the way of good cheer, and we may be sure that venison and turkey from the

¹Ravenel: Eliza Pinckney, p. 49.

²Ibid: p. 20.

forest, ducks from the rice fields, and fish from the river at their doors, were there...Turtle came from the West Indies with 'saffron and negroe pepper, very delicate for dressing it! Rice and vegetables were in plenty -- terrapins in every pond, and Carolina hams proverbially fine. The desserts were custards and creams (at a wedding always bride cake, and floating island), jellies, syllabubs, puddings, and pastries. . . . They had port and claret too . . . and for suppers a delicious punch called 'shrub,' compounded of rum, pine-apples, lemons, etc., not to be commended by a temperance society.

"The Dinner over, the ladies withdrew, and before very long the scraping of the fiddlers would call the gentlemen to the dance, -- pretty graceful dances, the minuet, stately and gracious, which opened the ball; and the country dance, forerunner of our Virginia Reel, in which every one old and young joined. . . ."1

The family life in the south was beautiful, and, to us, from this distance seems ideal. There were large families, who inter-married and settled near each there. This led to constant visits and social events. The various members often corresponded, quite regularly, and it is in these letters that we find much of the material to reconstruct again the pictures of those far-away days. There are hints of visits in both the diary of General

Washington, and the letters of his wife. He records that he "set off with Mrs. Washington and Patcy, Mr. (Warner) Washington and wife, Mrs. Bushrod and Miss Washington and Mr. Magowen for 'Towelston,' in order to stand for Mr. B. Fairfax's third son, which I did with my wife, Mr. Warner Washington and his lady." "Another day he returns from attending to the purchase of Western lands to find that Colonel Bassett, his wife and children, have arrived during his absence, 'Billy and Nancy and Mr. Warner Washington being here also.' The next day the gentlemen go a-hunting together, Mr. Bryan Fairfax having joined them for the hunt and the dinner that followed. . . ."2

Mrs. Washington writes to her sister:

"Mt. Vernon Aug 28 1762.

MY DEAR NANCY, --I had the pleasure to receive your kind letter of the 25 of July just as I was setting out on a visit to Mr. Washington in Westmoreland where I spent a weak very agreeably I carried my little patt with me and left Jackey at home for a trial to see how well I could stay without him though we were gone but won fortnight I was quite impatient to get home. If I at any time heard the doggs barke or a noise out, I thought thair was a person sent for me. . . .

1Ravenel: E. Pinckney, pp. 46-48

2Wharton: M. Washington, p. 63.

"We are daly expect(ing) the kind laydes of Maryland to visit us. I must begg you will not lett the fright you had given von prevent you comeing to see me again -- if I coud leave my children in as good Care as you can I would never let Mr. W -- n come down without me -- Please to give my love to Miss Judy and your little babys and make my best compliments to Mr. Bassett and Mrs. Dawson.

I am with sincere regard
dear sister
vours most affectionately

MARTHA WASHINGTON."¹

Because of the lack of good roads and the great distance between plantations, travelling was an important part of the social life. An account of the journey of Mrs. Washington to New York to join her husband has been told by her grandson. He recounts how one team proving baulky, and delaying the progress for two hours, "we again set out for Major Snowden's where we arrived at 11 o'clock in the evening. The gate (was) hung between 2 trees which were scarcely wide enough to admit it. We were treated with great hospitality and civility by the major and his wife who were plain people and made every effort to make our stay as agreeable as possible.

"May 19th. This morning was lowering and looked like rain -- we were entreated to stay all day but to no effect we had made our arrangements & it was impossible. . . Major Snowden accompanied us 10 or a dozen miles to show a near way and the best road. . . We proceeded as far as Spurriors ordinary and there refreshed ourselves and horses . . . Mrs. Washington shifted herself here, expecting to be met by numbers of gentlemen out of B -- re -- (Baltimore) in which time we had evervthing in reddiness, the carriage, horses, etc. all at the door in waiting."²

This journal recounts exciting events, as crossing the ferry, accidents on the way, of the hospitality of the people, who sent messengers to them, insisting on the party sharing the homes, of how they were entertained, etc. It is truly an accurate picture of how, in a country with no public houses, the private houses were opened to travellers, and the charm and hospitality of the country gentry throughout the south.

¹Wharton: M. Washington, p. 56.

²Ibid: p. 186.

For the social life of New England, we are dependent almost entirely again on Judge Sewall, and something from the diary of Judge Pyncheon, with hints from one or two others. During the early days of the colony of Massachusetts, amusements were "under the ban". The church formed the only social life of the community, attendance at meetings, and the calls and visits made upon the neighbors. We have mentioned the strictness of the New England, somewhat, under the home, and a further discussion of this is unnecessary. This incident from the diary of Nathaniel Mather, indicates, how the children were taught to re-
vers the Sabbath: "Of the manifold sins which then I was guilty of none so sticks upon me as that being very young I was whitling on the Sabbath day; and for fear of being seen I did it behind the door. A great reproach to God."¹

However, Sewall has given us many glimpses of a kindly, simple-hearted people interested in each other. That was the day when everyone in a community knew every one else. And all were interested in each other, in all the affairs of each family, social, finances, sickness. And each felt free to discuss them; it was his right to offer advice. This had its beginning, naturally in the nature of the conditions surrounding the settlement of the colonies. All were drawn together by common ties; theirs was a community interest. What was true in one colony was true in all, to some degree. A mere handful of people who settled Plymouth, naturally had become interested in each other during the voyage. Then, after the settlement, if they were to prosper they must be united. If one fell ill, all were interested and concerned.

¹Fischer: Men, Women & Manners in Colonial Times, p. 162.

and if death occurred, that meant one less of the numbers. Thus, when many settlements had been made, and they had become so prosperous and strong they no longer needed to be so vitally concerned about each one, the interest, however, remained. And the "inquisitiveness" of the Yankee is proverbial. Many sarcastic references are found in the writing. Samuel Peters, writing in 1781 of the people of Connecticut, says: ". . .After a short acquaintance, they become very familiar and inquisitive about news. 'Who are you, whence come you, where going, what is your business, and what your religion?' They do not consider these and similar questions as impertinent, and consequently expect a civil answer. When the stranger has satisfied their curiosity, they will treat him with all the hospitality in their power. . ."¹

"A . . . Virginian who had been much in New England in colonial times used to relate that as soon as he arrived at an inn he always summoned the master and mistress, the servants and all the strangers who were about, made a brief statement of his life and occupation, and having assured everybody that they could know no more, asked for his supper; and Franklin, when travelling in New England, was obliged to adopt the same plan."²

Certainly Judge Sewall was interested in his neighbors, for the kind-hearted old gentleman has left us many, many notices of visits to the sick, friendly calls, of help to the dying and attendance at funerals. While there was no gawdy as in the south, yet there are pleasant visits, dinner-invitations and hints of more of a social life than we are wont to think of in New England. The following indicate this:

"Tuesday, January 12. I dine at the Governour's: where Mr. West, Governour of Carolina, Capt. Blackwell, his wife and Daughter, Mr. Morgan, his wife and Daughter, Mrs. Brown, Mr. Eliakim Hutchinson and Wife. . .Mrs. Mercy sat not down, but came in after dinner well dressed and saluted the two Daughters. Madm Bradstreet and Blackwell sat at the upper end together, Governour at the lower end."³

"Dec. 20, 1676. . . Mrs. Usher Lyes very sick of an

¹Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. III, p. 212.

²Fisher: Men, Women & Manners in Colonial Times, p. 205.

³Sewall's Diary, Vol. I, p. 116.

inflammation in the Throat. . . Called at her House coming home to tell Mr. Fosterling's Receipt, i.e. A Swallows Nest (the inside) stamped and applied to the throat outwardly."¹

"Satterday, June 5th, 1686. I rode to Newbury, to see my little Hull, and to keep out of the way of the Artillery Election, on which day eat Strawberries and Cream with Sister Longfellow at the Falls. . ."²

"Monday, July 11. I hire Ems's Coach in the Afternoon, wherein Mr. Hez. Usher and his wife, and Mrs. Bridget her daughter, my Self and Wife ride To Roxbury, visit Mr. Dudley and Mr. Eliot, the Father who blesses them. Go and sup together at the Grayhound Tavern with boil'd Bacon and rost Fowls. Came home between 10 and 11 brave Moonshine, were hinder'd an hour or two by Mr. Usher, else had been in good season."³

"Thursday, Oct. y, 1687. . . On my Unkle's Horse after Diner, I carry my wife to see the Farm, where we eat Aples and drank Cider. Shew'd her the Meeting-house. . . In the Morn Oct. 7th Unkle and Goodm. Brown come our way home accompaning of us. Set out after nine, and got home before three. Call'd no where by the way. Going out, our Horse fell down at once upon the Neck, and both fain to scabble off, yet neither receiv'd any hurt. . ."⁴

A century later Judge Phycheon of Salem has recorded for us glimpses of a similar social life, although more liberal.

"Saturday, July 7, 1784. Dine at Mr. Wickham's with Mrs. Browne and her two daughters. . . . In the afternoon Mrs. Browne and I, the Captain, Blaney, and a number of gentlemen and ladies, ride, and some walk out, some to Malbon's Garden, some to Red-Wood's several of us at both; are entertained very agreeably at each place; tea, coffee, cakes, syllabub, and English beer, etc. (and) punch and wine. We return at evening; hear a song of Mrs. Shaw's, and are highly entertained; the ride, the road, the prospects, the gardens, the company, in short, ~~every~~thing was most agreeable, most entertaining -- was admirable."⁵

"Thursday, October 25, 1787. . . Mrs. Pynchon, Mrs. Orne, and Betsy spend the evening at Mrs. Anderson's; musick and dancing."⁶

"Monday, November 10, 1788. . . Mrs. Gibbs, Curwen, Mrs. Paine, and others spend the evening here, also Mr. Gibbs, at cards."⁷

"Friday, April 19, 1782. Some rain. A concert at night; musicians from Boston, and dancing."⁸

"June 24, Wednesday, 1778. Went with Mrs. Orne (his daughter) to visit Mr. Sewall and lady at Manchester, and returned on Thursday."⁸

These pages from Judge Pynchon's diary show the changes

1-2-3-4; Sewall's Diary, Vol I, pp. 31, 143, 171, 191.
5-6-7-8; Pynchon's Diary, pp. 189, 289, 321, 119, 54.

As in the earlier days, Lecture-day and Fast days were still observed at the close of the century, and this provided a part of the social life.

Pynchon observes: "April 25, Thursday, 1782. Fast Day. Service at church, A. M.; none P. M. . . ."1

"Thursday, July 20, 1780. Fast day; clear . . ."2

Funerals and weddings were a large part of the social life. We shall consider weddings more in detail under marriage. With no amusements they made use of what occupations they had to take the place of the social life all men craze. We shall note later the morbid pleasure taken in executions, and while the pleasure to us, seems a grim one in attending the funeral service, we know they were very faithful in this. In the absence of balls, parties, dancing, card-playing, social functions, the importance of funerals in the social life of the community must be noticed. They were invited affairs during the time of Sewall. Gifts of gloves, rings, and scarfs were exchanged, and if we may draw any inference by reading between the lines it is that, while no real pleasure was derived from attendance, yet surely the Puritan did not consider a funeral with anything like the depression and sadness, as does the twentieth century attendant. One reason for this, that he was constantly surrounded by death. The death rate was very high, the community small, and from his earliest childhood he had been accustomed to attending such services. Then, possibly, if we had no amusements but funerals to fill the social craving, we might attend them, together with weddings and executios in a different spirit. Since man is a gregarious creature, and

¹Pynchon's Diary, p. 121.

²Ibid: p. 69.

craves the intercourse with his fellows, if these instincts do not develop normally, they become abnormal, and this was the result with the Puritan.

Sewall seems to have been not only a constant attendant at funerals, but also a very important member, whose presence was required. He has many comments as to funerals attended.

"Midweek, March 23, 1714/5. Mr. Addington buried from the Council-Chamber. . . 20 of the Council were assisting, it being the day for Appointing Officers. All had Scarvs. Bearers Scarvs, Rings, Escutcheons. . ."1

"My Daughter is Inter'd. . . Had Gloves and Rings of 2 pwt and 1/2. Twelve Ministers of the Town and Rings, and two out of Town. . ."2

"Tuesday, 18, Novr. 1712. Mr. Benknap buried. Joseph was invited by Gloves, and had a scarf given him there, which is the first. . ."3

"Feria sexta, April 8, 1720. Govr. Dudley is buried in his father Govr Dudley's Tomb at Roxbury. Boston and Roxbury Regiments were under Arms, and 2 or 3 Troops. . . . Scarves, Rings, Gloves, Schutcheons. . . . Judge Dudley in a mourning Cloak led the Widow; . . . Were very many people, spectators out of windows, on Fences and Trees, like Pigeons. . ."4

"July 25th, 1700. Went to the Funeral of Mrs. Sprague, being invited by a good pair of Gloves."5

This comment is made upon the death of Judge Sewall's father:

"May 24th. . . My Wife provided Mourning upon my letter by Severs. All went in mourning save Joseph, who staid at home because his mother lik'd not his cloaths. . ."6

"Febr. 1, 1700. Waited on the Lt. Govr. and presented him with a Ring in Remembrance of my dear Mother, saying, please to accept of the Name of one of the Company your Honor is preparing to go. . ."7

"July 15, 1698. . . On death of John Ive. . . I was not at

1Sewall's Diary, Vol. III, p. 43.

2Ibid: p. 341.

3Ibid: Vol. II, p. 367.

4Ibid: Vol. III, p. 7.

5-6Ibid: Vol. II, pp. 11, 20.

7Ibid. p. 32.

his Funeral. Had Gloves sent me, but the knowledge of his notoriously wicked life made me sick of going. . . . and so I staid at home, and by that means lost a Ring. . ."1

"Friday, Feb. 10, 1687/8. Between 4 and 5 I went to the funeral of the Lady Andros, having been invited by the Clerk of the South Company. Between 7 and 8 (Lechus (Lynchs? i. e. links into the Herse drawn by Six Horses. The souldiers making a Guard from the Governour's House down the Prison Lane to the South-meetinghouse, there taken out and carried in at the western dore, and set in the Alley before the pulpit, with Six Mourning Women by it. . . .Was a great noise and clamor to keep people out of the House, that might not rush in too soon. . . On Satterday Feb. 11, the mourning cloth of the Pulpit is taken off and given to Mr. Willard. (the pastor). "2

Funerals seem to have required invitations in order to be able to attend. "Satterday, Nov. 12, 1687. About 5 P. M. Mrs. Elisa Saffin is entombed. . . . MOther not invited."3

"Decr. 20, feria sexta. . . .Had a letter brought me of the Death of Sister Shortt . . . Not having other Mourning I look'd out a pair of Mourning Gloves. An hour or 2 later Mr. Sergeant, sent me and wife Gloves; mine are so little I can't wear them."4

Before Judge Sewall's death the use of scarfs, gloves and rings as gifts in connection with funerals seems to have been passing.

"August 7r. 16, 1721. Mrs. Frances Webb is buried, who died of the Small Pox. I think this is the first public Funeral without Scarves. . ."5

However, the Puritans were not the only colonists who celebrated funerals with pomp and ceremony. No doubt, they filled a larger place in the social life in Massachusetts, than in the other colonies, where there were a variety of social functions but, while they were important here, they were not celebrated with the pomp and ceremony as in the other colonies. Under the social life of the Dutch we shall have occasion to notice that funerals

¹Sewall's Diary, Vol. I, p. 481.

²Ibid: p. 202.

³Ibid: p. 195.

⁴Ibid: Vol. II, p. 175.

⁵Ibid: Vol. III, p. 292.

were events to be celebrated with feasting, pomp and ceremony.

The funeral of William Lovelace is an example of this: "The room was draped with mourning and adorned with the escutcheons of the family. At the head of the body was a pall of death's-heads, and above and about the hearse was a Canopy richly embroidered from the centre of which hung a garland and an hour-glass. At the foot was a gilded coat of arms, four feet square, and near by were candles and fumes which were kept continually burning. At one side was placed a cupboard containing plate to the value of 200 L. The funeral procession was led by the captain of the company to which deceased belonged, followed by the preaching minister, two others of the clergy, and a squire bearing the shield. Before the body, which was borne by six 'gentlemen bachelors,' walked two maidens in which silk, wearing gloves and 'cyprus scarves' and behind were six others similarly attired, bearing the pall. . . . Until ten o'clock at night wines, sweet-meats, and biscuits were served to the mourners." (1689)¹

Mourning rings, were however, given in practically all the colonies, regardless of race or religion.

The New England Puritan seems to have had a fancy and liking for the morbid, the sensational. They delighted in details, and the nature of the revelations seldom grew too repulsive or foul for their hearing. Cases of adultery and incest were always well-aired. If the offender would confess, before the entire congregation at meeting, he might be restored. Many did this, and the listeners apparently sat, closely attentive, drinking in all the hideous facts. The good fathers in their respective histories and diaries have not only mentioned the names of the parties in crime, but have enumerated every minute detail, until we turn from the reading in disgust. Winthrop in his "History of New England" has cited details so revolting and distasteful that it is impossible to quote them, and in this instance the reader must accept the word of the writer as sufficient, or consult the

¹Hart: American Nation Series, p. 302, Vol. V.

original source. However, we should add that the Puritans were not the only colonists who delighted in this. It was quite general through the colonies, but did not play as important a part in the lives of the others, since they had other outlets for their emotions, whereas, the Puritans, with little social life, did not.

This enjoyment in the risque and foul, is seen, also, in the delight of the morbid. Condemned criminals were taken to church at the last service before the execution, and the clergyman, dispensing with the regular order, took the full time (several hours) in thundering at the wretched victim, telling of his awful crime, and describing the yawning pit of hell which Satan and his devils were then preparing for his discomforture. If the doomed one was able to withstand this and did not break down, the audience went away disappointed, feeling him to be hard-hearted, stubborn and wilful. But, if, amid loud lamentations and wails, he proclaimed his sin, and called on God for mercy, then his hearers were truly pleased. A similar scene was enacted at the gallows. A minister attended him until the last moment and both men and women crowded near to see all. Our good friend, Judge

Sewall has recorded for us: "Feria Sexta, June 30, 1704. . . After dinner, about 3 P.M. I went to see the Execution. . . Many were the people that saw upon Bloughton's Hill. But when I came to see how the River was cover'd with people, I was amazed: Some say there were 100 Boats. 150 Boats and Canoes, saith Cousin Moody of York. He told them. Mr. Cotton Mather came with Capt. Quelch and six others for Execution from the Prison to Scarlet's Wharf, and from thence . . . When the scaffold was hoisted to a due height, the seven Malefactors went up; Mr. Mather pray'd for them standing upon the Boat. Ropes were all fasten'd to the Gallows (save King, who was Repriev'd.) When the Scaffold was let to sink, there was such a Screech of the Women that my wife heard it sitting in our Entry next the Orchard, and was much surpris'd at it: yet the wind was sou-west.

Our house is a full mile from the place."¹

This also from the kindly judge indicates the interest in the last service of the condemned one:

"Thursday, March 11, 1685/6. Persons crowd much into the Old Meeting-House by reason of James Morgan. . . and before I got thither a crazed woman cryed the Gallery of Meetinghouse broke, which made the people rush out, with great Consternation, a great part of them, but were seated again. . . Morgan was turned off about $\frac{1}{2}$ hour past five. The day very comfortable, but now 9 l'clock rains and has done a good while. . . . Mr. Cotton Mather accompanied James Morgan to the place of Execution, and prayed with him there."²

This seems as though these occasions would have been times when the Puritan woman might have used her influence, by, at least, refusing to attend. However, we must not censure her too severely. In Merrie England, from whence their fathers had come there were many things more revolting than this common happenings. We must not expect the women of any age to be much farther ahead in morals than the men. Looking backward with three hundred additional years of culture and training it seems so, and yet, let us not judge. Three hundred years from now, posterity will, no doubt, wonder at many things in the present century as to why women tolerated them. And, who knows, if a confession similar to those given in Boston during colonial days were scheduled the next Sabbath day in a modern meeting house, perhaps the confessor would not speak to empty seats. For humanity ever takes an interest in the morbid. The persons who attended the executions in Puritan New England were surely not related in spirit to those who attended recently in the south the execution of two negroes where seats were built, the women brought their crocheting, and vendors sold soft drinks. Probably, for lack of social life,

¹Sewall's Diary, Vol. II, p. 109.

²Ibid: Vol. I, p. 125.

the Puritan did attend more regularly than his twentieth century cousin, these distasteful forms of the life then, and there seems to have been no voice raised in protest, or no one shocked. Perhaps that is the only difference between the nerves of our ancestors who lived in staid old Plymouth, and those who crowd today to see the morbid and vulgar. Now, there are people who are properly shocked. Not so then. However, Judge Sewall or none of the colonial writers have left us the record of any of the women sending pink-scented notes, flowers, and photographs to the cell of Morgan, or crowding around to kiss him, as he was led to his execution. But Harry Thaw, and others who might be named have received such treatment from some modern women.

While probably not common, yet Sewall records the mention of a ball given, and apparently this was not unheard of, or the pious judge would have been properly shocked.

"Tuesday, Jan. 7, 1719. The Govr. has a Ball at his own House that lasts to 3 in the Morn."¹

Three o'clock seems rather late for Salem people, or any people of Massachusetts. Sewall evidently did not attend, but seems not to have thought it scandalous as Winthrop would, undoubtedly have done. However, it is well to recall this is nearly one hundred years after the time of Bradford, and gradually more tolerant ideas are creeping in.

We have also the record of a dancing master in Boston, and, while this was amusement was not common among the Puritans, at this time, it was creeping in, and we have noted under the discussion on education the record of girls being taught, as

¹Sewall's Diary, Vol. II, p. 158.

early as 1719 the graceful old-time dances, but these were probably not the daughters of the Puritans. But the dancing master must have been member of the community, for Sewall makes no comment as to the disgrace of having such a teacher. "July 28 (about 1685) Francis Stepney, the Dancing Master runs away for Debt. Several attachments out after him."¹

Other social features of New England, were the observance of Lecture Day, generally on Thursday. This was kept much like the Sabbath, attendance at meeting and no working. Generally banns were published on Lecture Day, and condemned sinners preached to or at.

"Feb. 23, 1719/20. Mr. Cooper comes in, and sits with me, and asks that he may be published; Next Thursday was talk'd of, at last, the first Thursday in March was consented to."²

One custom which had much to do with developing the social spirit and a feeling of kindness toward one's neighbors, is told us by Sewall -- the posting of a note or bill in the house of worship, asking the prayers of friends. Many times in his own life, he felt the need of this.

"Saturday, Augt. 15. Hambleton and my Sister watch (his oldest daughter was ill) I get up before 2 in the morning of the Lecture Day, and hearing an earnest expostulation of my daughter, I went, down and finding her restless, call'd up my wife. . . I put up this Note at the Old (First Church) and South, 'Prayers are desired for Hanah Sewall as drawing near her end.'" . . .³

When his wife was ill, we have this: "Oct. 17, 1717. Thursday, I asked my wife whether twere best for me to go to Lecture: She said, I can't tell: so I staid at home. Put up much notice of"⁴

The editor of Sewall's diary, makes this comment: "Judge Sewall very seldom allowed any private trouble or sorrow.

¹Sewall's Diary, Vol. I, p. 145.

²Ibid: Vol. III, p. 244.

³Ibid: Vol. III, p. 341.

⁴Ibid. p. 143.

and he never allowed any matter of private business, to prevent his attendance upon 'Meeting,' either on the Lord's Day or the Thursday Lecture. On this day, on account of the alarming illness of his wife, -- which proved to be fatal -- he remains with her, furnishing his son, who was to preach, with a 'Note' to be 'put up,' asking the sympathetic prayers of the congregation in behalf of the family. He is touched and gratified on learning how much feeling was manifested on the occasion. The incident is suggestive of one of the beautiful customs once recognized in all the New England churches, in town and country, where all the members of a congregation knit together by ties and sympathies of a common interest, and a share in each other's private and domestic experiences of joy and sorrow."

With the passing of this and other customs we are losing the sympathy and kindness for each other, and become more self-centered. This custom surely was one that promoted the social feeling and brought the neighborhood in close touch like one large family.

Fast days and days of prayer, observed late into the eighteenth century were one feature of the social life here. They were kept for various reasons, as thanks for deliverance, petitions for help and aid, and as a means of living nearer to the precepts of Christ. Sewall records several fasts: "Wednesday, Oct. 3rd, 1688. Have a day of Prayer at our House: One principal reason as to particular, about my going for England. Mr. Willard pray'd and preach'd excellently. . . . Intermission. Mr. Allen pray'd, then Mr. Moody, both very well, then 3rd -- 7th verses of the 86th Ps., sung Cambridge Short Tune, which I set. . . ."1

"Febr. 12. I pray'd God to accept me in keeping a private day of Prayer with Fasting for that and other important Matters: Perfect what is lacking in my Faith, and in the faith of my dear Yokefellow. Convert my children: especially Samuel and Hanah; Provide Rest and Settlement for Hanah; Recover Mary, Save Judith, Elisabeth and Joseph: Requite the Labour of Love of My Kinswoman, Jane Tappin, Give her health, find out Rest for her. Make David a man after they own heart, let Susan live and be baptised with the Holy Ghost, and with fire. . . ."2

"Third-day, Augt. 13, 1695. We have a Fast kept in our new Chamber. . . ."3

1Sewall's Diary, Vol. I., p. 228.

2Ibid: vol. II, p. 216.

3Ibid: Vol. I, p. 410.

Such days as Thanksgiving and Christmas seem to have been observed somewhat, although with nothing like the regularity and ceremony, in New England, as now. In the South Christmas was a regular festival, as in Old England, but not so with the Puritans. But both these holidays were observed in New England, and we have the following notices by Sewall: noting, first the account of the first Christmas Day in New England given by Bradford in his Log-book:

"The day called Christmas Day ye Govr cal'd them out to worke (as was used) but ye moste of this new company excused themselves, and said ye went against their consciences to work on yt day. So ye Govr tould them that if they made it mater of conscience, he would spare them till they were better informed. So he led away ye rest and left them; but when they came home at noon from their work he found them in ye street at play openly, some pitching ye bar, and some at stoolball and such like sports. So he went to them and took away their implements and tould them it was against his conscience that they should play and others work."¹

Sewall records: "Dec. 25, Friday, 1685. Carts come to Town and shops open as is usual. Some somehow observe the day; but are vexed I believe that the body of the people profance it, and blessed be God no authority yet to compell them to keep it."²

"Decr. 25, 1717. Snowy Cold Weather; Shops open as could be for the Storm; Hay, wood and all sorts of provisions brought to Town."³

"Midweek, Decr. 25, 1718/9. Shops are open, Hay, Hoop-poles, Wood, Faggots, Charcole, Meat brought to Town. 1 ."⁴

"Tuesday, Decr. 25, 1722/3. Shoos are open, and Carts came to Town with Wood, Hoop-Poles, Hay & as at other Times; being a pleasant day, the street was fill'd with Carts and Horses -- "⁵

Judge Pynchon records one hundred years later: "Fryday, December 25, 1778. Christmas. Cold continued."⁶

"Monday, December 25, 1780. Christmas, and rainy. Dined at Mr. Wetmore's (his daughter) with Mr. Goodale and family, John and Patty. Mr. Barnard and Prince at church; the music good, and Dr. Steward's voice above all."⁷

¹Earle: Child Life in Colonial Times, p. 353.

²Sewall's Diary, Vol. I, p. 355.

³⁻⁴⁻⁵: Ibid, pp. 157, 394, 316.

⁶⁻⁷: Pynchon's Diary, pp. 60, 81.

Sewall notes on "Thursday, Novr. 25. Public Thanksgiving."¹

And again, "1714. Novr. 25. Thanks-giving day; very cold, but not so sharp as yesterday. My wife was sick, fain to keep the chamber and not be at Diner."²

If Thanksgiving had become an annual day for observance, as at present, Sewall fails to note it, hence, we may believe that it was not regularly observed, at present.

Madam Sarah Knight travelling through New England early in the eighteenth century gives a hint of the people of Connecticut, their social customs, etc. She says in visiting New Haven:

"They are governed by the same laws as we in Boston, (or little differing,) throughout this whole colony of Connecticut. . . but a little too much independent in their principles, and as I have been told, were formerly in their zeal very rigid in their administrations towards such as their laws made offenders, even to a harmless kiss or innocent merriment among young people. . . They generally marry very young; the males often, as I am told, under twenty than above: they generally make public weddings, and have a way something singular (as they say) in some of them, viz., just before joining hands the bride-groom quits the place, who is soon followed by the bridesmen, and as it were dragged back to duty -- being the reverse to the former practice among us, to steal mistress bride.

"They (the country women) generally stand after they come in a great while speechless, and sometimes don't say a word till they are asked what they want, which I impute to the awe they stand in of the merchants, who they are constantly almost indebted to; and must take what they bring without liberty to choose for themselves; but they serve them as well, making the merchants stay long enough for their pay. . ."³

Samuel Peters wrote in 1780 of Connecticut: "Dancing, fishing, hunting, skating and riding in sleighs on the ice, are all the amusements allowed in this colony. . ."⁴

Josselyn, travelling in New England in 1638, when social conditions were more rigid than later, visited both Winthrop and John Cotton. His criticism seemed severe to the Puritans,

¹Sewall's Diary: Vol. I, p. 159.

²Ibid: Vol. III, p. 27.

³Trent, Colonial Literature, p. 335.

⁴Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. III, p. 213.

but their theology and views were new to him, and as an impartial observer he records:

"They that are members of their churches have the sacraments administered to them, the rest that are out of the pale as they phrase it, are denied it. Many hundred souls there be amongst them grown up to men and women's estate that were never christened."

"There are many strange women too, (in Solomon's sense), more the pity; when a woman hath lost her chastity she hath no more to lose. There are many sincere and religious people amongst them. . . They have store of children, and are well accomodated with servants; many hands make light work, many hands make a full fraught, but many mouths eat up all, as some old planters have experimented."¹

Women were not allowed to lodge men, even friends or relative in the absence of their husbands. This was a constant source of bickering on the part of the magistrates, and many and amusing are the incidents, between relatives, when sometimes, the wife of one man, was not allowed to remain with her father, but must be sent home to her husband, etc. Sewall records one instance: "Midweek, May 12, 1714. Went to Brewster, the Ancher in the Plain; . . . Took Joseph Brewster for our guide, and went to Town. Essay'd to be quarter'd at Mr. Knight's, but he not being at home, his Wife refused us. . ."²

Some of the laws concerning social conditions in force in Massachusetts in 1650, certainly seem rigid to us. "No one could run on the Sabbath Day, or walk in his garden or elsewhere, except reverently to and from meeting. No one should travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep house, cut hair, or shave, on the Sabbath Day. No woman should kiss her child on the Sabbath or fasting day. Whoever brought cards into the dominion paid a fine of 5 l. No one could make minced pies, dance, play cards, or play on any instrument of music, except the drum, trumpet, and jewsharp.

"None under 21 years, nor any not previously accustomed to it, shall take tobacco without a physician's certificate. No one shall take it publicly in the street, or the fields, or the woods, except on a journey of at least ten miles, or at dinner.

¹Trent: Colonial Literature, p. 69.

²Sewall's Diary, Vol. III, p. 1

Nor shall any one take it in any house in his own town with more than one person taking it at the same time."¹

In the rural communities, as mentioned briefly under the home there were social entertainments by one neighbor helping another, or a community helping another. There were log-rolling contests, "bees" of different kinds; born-raising and house-raising, quilting bees, paring bees, etc. In the autumn the corn-husking was a source of pleasure. This account has come down to us.

"Made a husking Entertainm't. Possibly this leafe may last a Century and fall into the hands of some inquisitive Person for whose Entertainm't I will inform him that now there is a Custom amongst us of making an Entertainm't at husking of Indian Corn where to all the neighboring Swains are invited and after the Corn is finished they like the Hottentots give three Cheers of Huzza's, but cannot carry in the husks without a Rhum bottle; they feign great Exertion but do nothing till Rhum enlivens them, when all is done in a trice, then after a hearty Meal about 10 at Night they go to their pastimes." (Dedham, Mass, 1767.)²

Mrs. Grant has pictured to us the social life of the Dutch. It reads like the delightful pastimes of one large family.

"Every house had its garden, well, and a little green behind; before every door a tree was planted, rendered interesting by being coeval with some beloved member of the family; many of their trees were of a prodigious size and extraordinary beauty, but without regularity, every one planting the kind that best pleased him, or which he thought would afford the most agreeable shade to the open portico at his door, which was surrounded by seats, and ascended by a few steps. It was in these that each domestic group was seated in summer evenings to enjoy the balmy twilight, or the serenely clear moonlight. Each family had a cow, fed in a common pasture at the end of the town. In the evening the herd returned all together . . . with their tinkling bells. . . . along the wide and grassy street, to their wonted sheltering trees, to be milked at their master's doors. Nothing could be more pleasing to a simple and benovelent mind than to see thus, at one view, all the inhabitants of a town, which contained not one very rich or very poor, very knowing or very ignorant, very rude or very polished, individual; to see all these children of nature enjoying in easy indolence, or social intercourse.

'The cool, the fragrant, and the dusky hour,'

¹Weeden: Economic & Social History of New Eng., Vol. I, p. 223.

²Earle: Home Life in Colonial Days, p. 136.

clothed in the plainest habits, and with minds as undisguised and artless. . . .At one door were young matrons, at another the elders of the people, at a third the youths and maidens, gayly chatting or singing together, while the children played round the trees. . . ."¹

In imagination we re-construct the picture, a kindly, simple-hearted people, with little learning but the knowledge of how to enjoy life, no pretense of false culture, but without the false values and artificialities that are found in an older community.

Madam Knight says of their amusements: "Their diversion in the winter is riding sleighs about three or four miles out of town, where they have houses of entertainment at a place called the Bowery, and some go to friends' houses, who handsomely treat them. Mr. Burroughs carried his spouse and daughter and myself out to one Madame Dowes, a gentlewoman that lived at a farmhouse, who gave us a handsome entertainment of five or six dishes and choice beer and metheglin, cider, etc., all of which she said was the produce of her farm. I believe we met fifty or sixty sleighs that day; they fly with great swiftness, and some are so furious that they will turn out of the path for none except a loaded card. Nor do they spare for any diversion the place affords, and sociable to a degree, their tables being as free to their neighbors as to themselves."²

One characteristic of the Dutch women was her love of flowers and children. Surely we may infer something of their character from this -- since they loved the two most beautiful and innocent forms of life God has created. She says:

"Not only the training of children, but of plants, such as needed peculiar care or skill to rear them, was the female province. . . . I have so often beheld both in town and country, a respectable mistress of a family going out to her garden, in an April morning, with her great Calash, her little painted basket of seeds, and her rake over her shoulder to her garden labors. . . . A woman, in very easy circumstances, and abundantly gentle in form and manners, would sow, and plant, and rake, incessantly. These far gardeners were also great florists."³

Like all the colonists eating was an important part of the social life. Again, Mrs. Grant has drawn for us pleasant

¹Grant: *Memoirs of an American Lady*, p. 331

²Trent: *Colonial Literature*, p. 335, ff.

³Grant: *Memoirs of an American Lady*, p. 29.

pictures of the dinners and tea-drinking.

"They (the people) were exceedingly social, and visited each other frequently, besides the regular assembling together in their porches every evening.

"If you went to spend a day anywhere, you were received in a manner we should think very cold. No one rose to welcome you; no one wondered you had not come sooner, or apologized for any deficiency in your entertainment. Dinner, which was very early, was served exactly in the same manner as if there were only the family. The house was so exquisitely neat and well regulated, that you could not surprise these people; they saw each other so often and so easily that intimates made no difference. Of strangers they were shy; not by any means from want of hospitality, but from a consciousness that people who had little to value themselves on but their knowledge of the modes and ceremonies of polished life, disliked their sincerity and despised their simplicity. . . .

"Tea was served in at a very early hour. And here it was that the distinction shown to strangers commenced. Tea here was a perfect regale, being served up with various sorts of cakes unknown to us, cold pastry, and great quantities of sweet-meats and preserved fruits of various kinds, and plates of hickery and other nuts ready cracked. In all manner of confectionary and pastry these people excelled. . . ."¹

Madam Knight observes: "There are also Dutch and divers conventicles, as they call them, viz., Baptist, Quakers, etc. They are not strict in keeping the Sabbath, as in Boston and other places where I had been, but seem to deal with exactness, as far as I see or deal with. They are sociable to one another and courteous and civil to strangers; and fare well in their houses. . . ."²

In speaking of marriage among the Dutch she tells us of a custom so closely related that it belongs, possibly, under the discussion of the latter, but since much of the social life grow from it, it is necessary to mention it here. "The children of the town were all divided into companies, as they called them, from five or six years of age, till they became marriageable. How those companies first originated, or what were their exact regulations, I cannot say; though, I belonging to nine, occasionally mixed with several, yet always as a stranger, notwithstanding that I spoke their current language fluently. Every company contained as many boys as girls. But I do not know that there was any limited number; only this I recollect, that a boy and girl of each company, who were older, cleverer, or had some other pre-eminence above the rest, were called heads of the company, and,

¹Grant: *Memoirs of an American Lady*, p. 53.

²Trent: *Colonial Literature*, p. 335.

as such, were obeyed by the others. . . . Each company, at a certain time of the year, went in a body to gather a particular kind of berries, to the hill. It was a sort of annual festival, attended with religious punctuality. . . . Every child was permitted to entertain the whole company on its birthday, and once besides, during the winter and spring. The master and mistress of the family always were bound to go from home on these occasions, while some old domestic was left to attend and watch over them, with an ample provision of tea, chocolate, preserved and dried fruits, nuts and cakes of various kinds, to which was added cider or a syllabub. . . . The consequence of these exclusive and early intimacies was, that, grown up, it was reckoned a sort of apostacy to marry out of one's company, and indeed it did not often happen. The girls, from the example of their mothers, rather than any compulsion, very early became notable and industrious, being constantly employed in knitting stockings, and making clothes for the family and slaves; they even made all the boys' clothes."¹

There was a love of simple pleasure among the Dutch which manifested itself in social groups, picnics in summer, and

skating and sleighing parties in the winter. "In spring, eight or ten of one company, young men and maidens, would set out together in a canoe on a kind of rural excursion. . . . They went without attendants. . . . They arrived generally by nine or ten o'clock. . . . The breakfast, a very regular and cheerful one, occupied an hour or two; the young men then set out to fish, or perhaps to shoot birds, and the maidens sat busily down to their work. . . . After the sultry hours had been thus employed, the boys brought their tribute from the river. . . . After dinner they all set out together to gather wild strawberries, or whatever fruit was in season; for it was accounted a reproach to come home empty-handed.

"The young parties, or sometimes the elder ones, who set out on this woodland excursion, had no fixed destination. . . . when they were tired of going on the ordinary road, turned into the bush, and whenever they saw an inhabited spot. . . . they went in with all the ease of intimacy. . . . The good people, not in the least surprised at this intrusion, very calmly opened the reserved apartments. . . . After sharing with each other their food, dancing, or any other amusement that struck their fancy, succeeded. They sauntered about the bounds in the evening, and returned by moonlight. . . . " ²

Surely this was a more wholesome social life than that of finding it necessary to attend funerals and executions to satisfy

¹Grant: *Memoirs of an American Lady*, p. 35.

²Ibid: p. 55.

the instinctive craving for emotion. "In winter the river. . . formed the principal road through the country, and was the scene of all these amusements of skating and sledge races common to the north of Europe. They used in great parties to visit their friends at a distance, and having an excellent and hardy breed of horses, flew from place to place over the snow or ice in these sledges with incredible rapidity, stopping a little while at every house they came to, where they were always well received, whether acquainted with the owners or not. The night never impeded these travellers, for the atmosphere was so pure and serene, and the snow so reflected the moon and starlight, that the nights exceeded the days in beauty."¹

Speaking of the love of children among the Dutch, she says: "Orphans were never neglected. . . . you never entered a house without meeting children. Maidens, bachelors and childless married people, all adopted orphans, and all treated them as if they were their own."²

The description of "The Flatts" the family residence of the Schuylers is interesting, as compared with the homes of the

southern wealthy planters. "It was a large brick house of two, or rather three stories, (for there were excellent attics) besides a sunk story. . . . The lower floor had two spacious rooms. . . on the first there were three rooms, and in the upper one, four. Through the middle of the house was a very wide passage, with opposite front and back doors, which in summer admitted a stream of air peculiarly grateful to the languid senses. It was furnished with chairs and pictures like a summer parlor. . . . There was at the side, a large portico, with a few steps leading up to it, and floored like a room; it was open at the sides, and had seats all round. Above was . . . a slight wooden roof, painted like an awning, or a covering of lattice-work, over which a transplanted wild vine spread its luxuriant leaves. . . .

"At the back of the large house was a smaller and lower one, so joined to it as to make the form of a cross. There one or two lower and smaller rooms below, and the same number above, afforded a refuge to the family during the rigors of winter, when the spacious summer-rooms would have been intolerably cold, and the smoke of prodigious wood-fires would have sullied the elegantly clean furniture. . . ."³

The funeral customs of the Dutch are interesting, and different from those of the other colonies. The following bill,

¹Grant: *Memoirs of an American Lady*, p. 57.

²Ibid: p. 62.

³Ibid: p. 83.

found among the Schuyler papers, indicates somewhat the elaborate mourning among these people:

"Funeral Feb 27th 1763".

Tobacco	2,	
Fonda for pipes		14s.
2 casks wine 69 gal 11,		
12 yds Cloath	6	
2 barrels strong beer	3	
To spice from Dr. Stringer		
To the porters		2s.
12 yds Bombazine	5,	17s.
2/ Tammise	1,	
1 Barcelona handkerchief		10s.
2 pr. black chamois Gloves		
6 yds crape		
5 ells Black Shalloon		
Paid Mr. Benson his fee for opinion on will		9."1

"Many of the houses had a room set apart called the 'dead room.' Here the body lay in state, for a funeral was an occasion. The women did not attend, but remained in an upper room."1

A funeral service which occurred during the war is related by Tench Tilghman:

"This morning" he writes, "I attended the funeral of old Mr. Doer. . . . This was something in a stile new to me. The Corpse was carried to the Grove and interred with out any funeral Ceremony, the Clergy attended. We then returned to the home of the Deceased where we found many tables set out with Bottles, cool Tankards, Candles, Pipes & Tobacco. The Company sat themselves down and lighted their pipes and handed the Bottles & Tankards pretty briskly. Some of them I think rather too much so. I fancy the under takers had borrowed all the silver plate of the neighborhood. Tankards and Candle Sticks were all silver plated."1

However these distinct Dutch customs underwent a change after the English occupation of New York, and the city soon took on a gayety unknown before. William Smith writing in 1757 while the colony still clung to the old Dutch manners says:

"In the city of New York, through our intercourse with

1Humphreys: Catharine Schuyler, p. 77.

the Europeans, we follow the London fashions; though, by the time we adopt them, they become disused in England. Our affluence during the late war, introduced a degree of luxury in tables, dress, and furniture, with which we were before unacquainted. But still we are not so gay a people as our neighbors in Boston and several of the Southern colonies. The Dutch counties, in some measure, follow the example of New York, but still retain many modes peculiar to the Hollanders."¹

Speaking of the society of New York and the women, he records:

"New York is one of the most social places on the continent. The men collect themselves into weekly evening clubs. The ladies, in winter, are frequently entertained either at concerts of music, or assemblies, and make a very good appearance. They are comely and dress well. . . ."

"Tinctured with a Dutch education, they manage their families with becoming parsimony, good providence, and singular neatness. The practice of extravagant gaming, common to the fashionable part of the fair sex in some places, is a vice with which my countrywomen cannot justly be charged. There is nothing they so generally neglect as reading, and indeed all the arts for the improvement of the mind, -- in which, I confess, we have set them the example. They are modest, temperate, and charitable; naturally sprightly, sensible, and good-humored; and, by the helps of a more elevated education, would possess all the accomplishments desirable in the sex."²

However, the viccitudes of war brought both sorrow and gladness. As in Philadelphia, the coming of the soldiers seemed the signal for a season of gayety, although not as marked as in Philadelphia, for here it was at its height, while New York was yet enough under the dominance of the Dutch manners to be conservative, and did not rush head long into the social phase of living. After the war New York was one of the social centers, although still eclipsed by Philadelphia. But when the capitol was located here, then indeed did pleasure reign. Foreigners noted the luxury and extravagance. Brissot de Warville in 1788, wrote: "If there is a town on the American continent where

¹Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. II, p. 485.

²Ibid: p. 486.

English luxury displays its follies it is in New York. . ."1

James Pintard wrote to his sister after taking tea at Mrs. Washington's New Year's Eve: "You will see no such formal bows at the Court of St. James," and indeed the first administration was a time of social gayety in the city, The New York Gazette of May 15, 1789, describes several dresses worn at this time, and if these were any indication, indeed the social life must have been one of luxury. "A plain celestial blue satin with a white satin petticoat. On the neck a very large Italian gauze handkerchief with white satin stripes. The head dress was a puff of gauze in the form of a globe on a foundation of white satin having a double wing in large plaits with a wreath of roses twined about it. The hair was dressed with detached curls, four each side of the neck, and a floating chignon behind.

"Another was a periot made of gray Indian taffetas with dark stripes of the same color with two collars, one white, one yellow with blue silk fringe having a reverse trimmed in the same manner. Under the periot was a yellow corset of cross blue stripes. Around the bosom of the periot was a frill of white vandyked gauze of the same form covered with black gauze which hangs in streamers down her back. Her hair behind is large braid with a monstrous crooked comb."2

This notice by a Frenchman has a strangely, familiar sound to the modern reader: "Luxury is already forming in this city a very dangerous class of men, namely the bachelors, the extravagance of the women makes them dread marriage."3

Noah Webster remarked "In point of hospitality New York is exceeded by no other town in the country, and contrasts favorably with Philadelphia in the mingling of classes."4

John Adams' daughter, Mrs. William Smith, wrote her mother: "You would not be pleased with society here, it is quite enough dissipated." And Miss Franks of Philadelphia, who knew what social life should be, and naturally contrasted it with her native city, says: "Here you enter a room with a formal set curtsy and after the 'How-dos' things are finished: all a dead calm until cards are introduced when you see pleasure dancing in the eyes of all the matrons and they seem to gain new life: the maidens

1Crawford: Romantic Days in the Early Republic, p. 73.

2-3 Humphreys: C. Schuyler, pp. 212-3.

4Ibid: p. 211.

decline for the pleasure of making love. Here it is always leap-year. For my part I am used to another style of behavior."¹

In comparing the girls of the two cities, she remarks: "They (the girls of Philadelphia her native city) have more cleverness in the turn of the eye than those of New York in their whole composition."¹

Governor Livingston, however, in a letter to his daughter Kitty says: "the Philadelphia flirts are equally famous for their want of modesty and want of patriotism in their over-complaisance to red-coats," alluding to the English officers, newly released prisoners, "who would not conquer the men of the country but everywhere they have taken the women almost without a trial -- damn them."¹

Card-playing was a favorite amusement. Hints of these games and the losses have come down to us. "Mary was asked to Church's to a great Twelfth Night Ball, . . . Apropos the day I dined there the Rest of the Company stayed and played Prag. . . It is reported from John street that Mrs. Sterret on one evening lost \$50 and another lady \$100 at cards. . . ."2

Apparently playing cards for money does not belong to the present history of the Republic. alone. Governor Livingston writes further: "My principal Secretary of State who is one of my daughters has gone to New York to shake her heels at the balls and assemblies of a metropolis which might be better employed, more studious of taxes than of instituting expensive diversions. ."2

However, what could be expected. The war was over, the country was facing a new future, even though it did look like it was to be a gloomy one. But the people tried to be gay, and succeeded fairly well if we believe the contemporary accounts. And they must meet the President half-way, and he always appeared in rich clothes, and displayed considerable dignity and wealth of livery when in his carriage. This story is told of his love of display, and when we learn he carried it so far, it is little wonder that the good people of the metropolis felt called upon to

¹Humphreys: C. Schuyler, p. 211.

²Ibid: p. 215.

entertain with a lavishness and pomp befitting the dignity of the

new republic and the first capitol. "The night before the famous white chargers were to be used they were covered with a white paste, swathed in body clothes, and put to sleep on clean straw. In the morning this paste was rubbed in, and the horses brushed until their coats shone. The Hoofs were then blacked and polished, the mouths washed and their teeth picked. It is related that after this grooming the master of the stables was accustomed to flick over their coats a clean muslin handkerchief, and if this revealed a speck of dust the stable man was punished."¹

And yet, in the midst of all this gayety the wife of the president wrote: "I lead a very dull life here and know nothing that passes in the town. I never go to any public place -- indeed I think I am more like a state prisoner than anything else there is a certain bound set for me which I must not depart from, and as I cannot do as I like I am obstinate and stay home a great deal."²

Senator Maclay of Pennsylvania has recorded in his "Journal" the account of a state dinner given at the executive mansion. He says in part:

"First was the soup: fish roasted and boiled: meats, gammon (smoked ham), fowls, etc. This was the dinner. The middle of the table was garnished in the usual tasty way, with small images, artificial flowers, etc. The dessert was first apples, pudding, etc., then iced creams, jellies, etc., then water-melons, musk-melons, apples, peaches, nuts. . . The President and Mrs. Washington sat opposite each other in the middle of the table; the two secretaries, one at each end. . .

"It was the most solemn dinner ever I sat at. Not a health drank, scarce a word said until the cloth was taken away. Then the President, filling a glass of wine, with great formality drank to the health of every individual by name around the table. Everybody imitated him and charged glasses and such a buzz of 'health, sir,' and 'health, madam,' and 'thank you, sir,' and 'thank you, madam' never had I heard before. . . The ladies sat a good while and the bottles passed about: but there was a dead silence almost. Mrs. Washington at last withdrew with the ladies.

"I expected the men would now begin but the same stillness remained. He (the president) now and then said a sentence or two on some common subject and what he said was not amiss. Mr. Jay tried to make a laugh by mentioning the Duchess of Devonshire leaving no stone unturned to carry Fox's election. (It will be recalled that she bartered kisses for votes.) There was a Mr. Smith who mentioned how Homer described Aeneas leaving his wife and carrying his father out of flaming Troy. He had heard somebody (I suppose) witty on the occasion: but if he had ever

¹Humphreys: C. Schuyler, p. 209.

²Ibid: p. 216.

read it he would have said Virgil. The President kept a fork in his hand, when the cloth was taken away, I thought for the purpose of picking nuts. He ate no nuts, however, but played with the fork, striking on the edge of the table with it. We did not sit long after the ladies retired. The President rose, went upstairs to drink coffee; the company followed. I took my hat and came home."¹

Senator Maclay spoke in the same grudging tone of Mrs. Washington's levees. But he was nearing old age, away from his home, afflicted with rheumatism, and as one writer says, "never so happy as when damning something".

An amusing incident, that might have resulted in a tragedy is told of one of the levees given by the first lady of the land.

"Miss Mary McIvers, a noted belle. . . wore an ostrich feather head-dress so monstrously tall that it caught fire from the candles of the chandelier, as Miss McIvers stood happily talking in the centre of the room. The 'hero' of this occasion was Major Jackson, aid-de-camp to the President, who flew to the rescue, clapped the burning plumes in his hands, and saved the lady with all passible gallantry. 'There was no undue rustling of stiff brocades or ruffling of pretty manners,' comments Miss Leila Herbert, 'for it was then, as now, good form for ladies to be perturbed only by mice and cows.'"²

This gives us some idea of the dignity and poise of the colonial dames, though exciting events were taking place.

If, however, there was much comment on the extravagance and luxury during the first administration, while New York was the capitol, let us remember that there are always those who find fault. And it was singularly fortunate that the first president and his wife were both people of such good sense and charm, that they established social etiquette and precedent which, without little change have come down through all the years, until the present time. "An executive mansion presided over by a man and woman who combined with the most ardent patriotism a dignity, elegance, and moderation that would have graced the

¹Crawford: Romantic Days in the Early Republic, p. 82.

²Ibid: p. 86.

court of any Old World sovereign, saved the social functions of the new nation from the crudeness and bald simplicity of extreme republicanism, as well as from the luxury and excess that often mark the sudden elevation to power and place of those who have spent their early years in obscurity."¹

New York, as Philadelphia, had its coterie of beautiful women and charming hostesses, who were the equal, in every way, of those of the rival city. Mrs. Chauncey Goodrich who, through her marriage, became a resident of the city in 1789 was very charming and beautiful, and appreciated by her countrymen, for when the British minister remarked to a colonial gentleman, "'Your countrywoman, Mrs. Wolcott, would be adm red even at St. James's" he replied, "'Sir, she is admired even on Litchfied Hill.'" She was called "'a divine woman"', and "'the magnificent Mrs. Wolcott"' and compared to Mrs. Bingham, of Philadelphia, who was considered probably, the most charming and beautiful woman in the colonies. Mrs. John Jay who returned to New York in 1784, after an absence of five years in Europe, was virtually recognized the leader of society. She was remarkably beautiful, and with her native charm and grace, had added the culture and polish of five years at the Court of Madrid and at Paris. In the latter place, she was very popular, that once, upon entering the theatre in Paris, she was mistaken for the queen. Mrs. Jay had a warm admiration for the unfortunate French queen, and was much grieved over the terrible death. Mrs. Elbridge Gerry, the beautiful wife of the senator from Massachusetts was another of the charming women of New York at this period. Still another was "lovely Mrs. James Beekman", Mrs. Ralph Izard, better known as "beautiful

¹Wharton: M. Washington, p. 195.

²Crawford: Romantic Days in the Early Republic, p. 93.

Alice de Lancey".

A glimpse of New York social life, after the removal of the capitol to Philadelphia has been preserved in the writings of Eliza Southgate Bowne, in a "New England Bride in New York". she says:

"Last night we were at the play -- 'The way to get married.' Mr. Hodgkinson in Tangent in inimitable. Mrs. Johnson, a sweet interesting actress, in Julia, and Jefferson, a great comic player, were all that were particularly pleasing. . .

"I have been to two of the gardens: Columbia, near the Battery -- a most romantic, beautiful place -- 'tis enclosed in a circular form and little rooms and boxes all round -- with tables and chairs -- these full of company. . . . They have a fine orchestra, and have concerts here sometimes. . .

"We went on to the Batters. This is a large promenade by the shore of the North River -- very extensive; rows and clusters of trees in every part, and a large walk along the shore, almost over the water. . . . Here too, they have music playing on the water in boats of a moonlight night. Last night we went to a garden a little out of town -- Mount Vernon Garden. This too, is surrounded by boxes of the same kind, with a walk on top of them -- you can see the gardens all below -- but 'tis a summer playhouse -- pit and boxes, stage and all, but open on top. . ."1

However, New York was not the only city in the colonies where there was a gay social life. Philadelphia laid claim to the distinction of having the most charming society and exclusive social functions. And while there are few writings that belong to the Middle colonies, however we must not omit an account of society here. For this was the scene of the gayest social life of the colonies for a period of years before the War, and even after New York had been made the seat of government, still it was Philadelphia who 'set the social pace'. Then, too, after the capitol was removed to the Quaker city, indeed, then was the gayety at its height. From the glimpses we see through the

¹Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. IV, p. 497.

hints found in diaries, journals and letters, we learn that not all the days in colonial history were gloomy and forbidding. This was especially true during the British occupation of the city. Though this was the home of the Quakers, there were wealthy Tories who loved the lighter side of life. "The Quaker City had, at the pleasure of her conqueror, doffed her sober drab and appeared in festal array. . . The best that the city afforded was at the disposal of the enemy, who seem to have spent their days in feasting and merry-making, while Washington and his army endured all the hardships of the severe winter of 1777-78 upon the bleak hill-sides of Valley Forge. Dancing assemblies, theatrical entertainments, and various gayeties marked the advent of the British in Philadelphia, all of which formed a fitting prelude to the full-blown glories of the Meschianza, which burst upon the admiring inhabitants on that last-century May day."¹

However, Philadelphia did not suddenly assume all its gayety on the advent of the British Commander Howe into the city. Long before this, there had been delightful social functions.

Dancing societies were organized as early as the middle of the eighteenth century. "As early as 1738 we read of a dancing class, instructed by Theobald Hackett, who engaged to teach
¹all sorts of fashionable English and French dances, after the newest and politest manner practised in London, Dublin, and Paris, and to give to young ladies, gentlemen, and children the most graceful carriage in dancing and genteel behavior in company that can possibly be given by any dancing-master whatever!"²

This account of an Assembly sounds as gay as those entertainments given forty years later, when social life was the gayest:

¹"By the Governor's encouragement there has been a very handsome Assembly once a fortnight at Andrew Hamilton's house and stores, which are tenanted by Mr. Englis (and) make a set of rooms for such a purpose & Consists of eight ladies and as many gentlemen, one-half appearing every Assembly Night. . . . There happened a little mistake at the beginning, which at some other times might (have) produced disturbances. The Governor would have opened the Assembly with Mrs. Taylor, but she refused him, I suppose because he had not (been to visit her.) After her refusal, two or three other ladies, out of Modesty and form no manner of ill design, excused themselves, so that the Governor was

¹Wharton: Through Colonial Doorways, p. 24.

²Ibid: p. 199.

put a little to his shifts when Mrs. Willing. . . . in a most Genteel Manner put herself into his way. . ."¹

Mrs. Taylor's refusal seems to have been because her husband had some trouble with the Provincial authorities, although the Governor seems not to have been responsible. However, she showed more spirit here than we are wont to accredit to the colonial woman, and there was here, little of the "meekness", one associates with those women of the far-away days.

These Assembly Balls were held regularly during the greater part of the century, and formed one of the chief amusements.

The rules were many and elaborate. The ball "should commence at precisely six in the evening, and not, by any means, to exceed twelve the same night." This notice in the Pennsylvania Journal of 1771 is interesting: "The Assembly will be opened this evening, and as the receiving money at the door has been found extremely inconvenient, the managers think it necessary to give the public notice that no person will be admitted without a ticket from the directors which (through the application of a subscriber) may be had of either of the managers."²

Rooms were provided for those who preferred card-playing to the dancing, as cards was one of the important pastimes. The Marquis de Chastellux gives an account of one of these balls which he attended during the Revolution:

"A manager or master of ceremonies presides at these methodical amusements; he presents to the gentlemen and ladies, dancers, billets folded up containing each a number; thus fate decides the male or female partner for the whole evening. All the dancers are previously arranged and the dancers are called in their turns. These dances, like the toasts we drink at table, have some relation to politics; one is called the Success of the Campaign, another the Defeat of Burgoyne, and a third Clinton's Retreat. . . . Colonel Mitchell was formerly the manager but when I saw him he had descended from the magistracy and danced like a private citizen. He is said to have exercised his office with great severity and it is told of him that a young lady who was figuring in a country dance, having forgotten her turn by conversing with a friend, was thus addressed by him, 'Give over, Miss, mind what you are about. Do you think you come here for your pleasure?'"³

¹Wharton: Through Colonial Doorways, p. 200.

²Ibid: p. 209.

³Crawford: Romantic Days in the Early Republic, p. 36.

Abigail Adams has given spicy, interesting accounts of this gay social life. She writes in 1790, "On Friday last" with her son, "I went to the drawing-room, being the first of my appearance in public. The room became full before I left it, and the circle very brilliant. How could it be otherwise, when the dazzling Mrs. Bingham and her beautiful sisters were there; the Misses Allen, and the Misses Chew; in short a constellation of beauties!"

"If I were to accept one-half the invitations I receive, I should spend a very dissipated winter. Even Saturday evening is not excepted, and I refused an invitation of that kind for this evening. I have been to one assembly. The dancing was very good; the company the best; the President and Madame, the Vice-President and Madame, Ministers of State and their Madames, etc."¹

Mrs. Bingham was the acknowledged social leader, and the English traveller, Wansey, has written something of her home;

"I dined this day with Mrs. Bingham. . . I found a magnificent house and gardens in the best English style, with elegant and even superb furniture. The chairs of the drawing-room were from Seddons, in London, of the newest taste, -- the backs in the form of a lyre with festoons of crimson and yellow silk; the curtains of the room, a festoon of the same; the carpet one of Moore's most expensive patterns. The room was papered in the French taste, after the style of the vatican at Rome."²

The Binghams were very wealthy and entertained in lavish style. For a number of years, there is no mention of any social event, without the mention of Mrs. Bingham, her attendance, and words of praise. Mrs. Adams writes: "Mrs. Bingham has been twice to see me. I think she is more amiable and beautiful than ever. . ."²

She was the daughter of Thomas Willing, and a relative of the famous Shippen family. Married when sixteen years of age in 1780, Mrs. John Jay, herself a famous beauty, wrote to Mr. Bingham, congratulating him on his marriage "with one of the most lovely of her sex."

She spent some years abroad at the court of Louis XVI, and attracted much attention here; her residence at the Hague was

¹Crawford: Romantic Days in the Early Republic, p. 46.

²Ibid: p. 49.

likewise commented on, and when she was in London, "her elegance and beauty attracted more attention than was perhaps willingly expressed in the old Court of George the Third." Mrs. Adams wrote

from England that she had never seen a lady in that country who could compare with Mrs. Bingham, and said, "She is coming quite into fashion here, and is very much admired. The hairdresser who dresses us on Court-days inquired . . . whether . . . she knew the lady so much talked of here from America -- Mrs. Bingham. He has heard of her . . . and at last speaking of Miss Hamilton he said with a twirl of his comb, 'Well, it does not signify, but the American ladies do beat the English all to nothing.'"1

It was Mrs. Bingham who introduced several foreign customs into Philadelphia social life. after her return from the Old World.

One of these was that of the servants' announcing the names of guests on their arrival at a party, at "different stages of the way from the hall to the drawing room. one evening a visitor, to whom this was an innovation, hearing this name called out repeatedly while he was removing his outer garments, cried out, 'Coming!' 'Coming!' and in a louder tone as he heard his name at the drawing-room door, 'Coming!' As soon as I can get my great-coat off!"1

Philadelphia seems to have had more than its share of beautiful women. Mrs. Walter Steward was a charming Irish beauty, who shared with Mrs. Robert Morris and Mrs. Bingham the distinction of being sent portraits of the first president, upon his retirement from public life. It is said that, for Mrs. Stewart, he also made one of his rare jokes. The Shippen girls, Misses Peggy and Sally Chew, Miss Sally MacKean, Miss Williamina Smith and others were all famous beauties. Rebecca Franks, beautiful, witty and wealthy was also one of the favorites. It was this spirited young woman who wrote of the dames of New York: "Few New York ladies know how to entertain company in their own houses, unless they introduce the card-table. . . . I don't know a woman or girl that can chat above half an hour, and that on the form of a cap, the color of a ribbon, or the set of a hood, stay, or union. I will do

1Crawford: Romantic Days in the Early Republic, p. 44.

our ladies, that is in Philadelphia, the justice to say they have more cleverness in the turn of an eye than the New York girls have in their whole composition. With what ease have I seen a Chew, a Penn, Oswald, Allen, and a thousand others entertain a large circle of both sexes, and the conversation, without the aid of cards, not flag or seem in the least strained or stupid."¹

However, when Philadelphia became the capital, the Misses Chew, Misses Shippen, Rebecaa Franks, and the other young women who had played havoc with the hearts of the British soldiers were married, and stately matrons, nearly all having left the city. But the ones who followed and took their places must have been as beautiful and charming for the Duke de Rochefoucauld Liancourt recorded in 1794: "In the numerous assemblies of Philadelphia it is impossible to meet with what is called a plain woman," and he, no doubt, was a competent judge, being a Frenchman, and accustomed to the beautiful women of the French Court.

During the residence of the Washingtons in the city the home of Mrs. Robert Morris was one where many social functions took place. Mrs. Morris was an intimate friend of the first lady of the land, and the President, himself, showed a decided preference for visiting here. We are told, "There was a luxury in the kitchen, table, parlour and street equipage of Mr. and Mrs. Morris that was to be found nowhere else in America. Bingham's was more gaudy but less comfortable. It was the pure and unalloyed which the Morrises sought to place before their friends, without the abatements that so frequently accompany the displays of fashionable life."²

Tea-drinking formed one of the regular social diversions, and even the grave and dignified Washington enjoyed this. The Prince de Broglie has left an amusing incident of his first tea-drinking in 1782, Mrs. Morris being the hostess. It was the custom to put the spoon across the cup when the desire was to "bring this warm water question to an end." Unhappily, "however, the prince was not

¹Wharton: Through Colonial Doorways, p. 212.

²Crawford: Romantic Days in the Early Republic

not informed of this bit of etiquette until he had already drunk twelve cups of tea!"¹

One social feature during Washington's stay in the city was the celebration which always occurred on the anniversary of his birth. These were a recognized social function of importance.

Miss Chambers described one of these, in part: "The morning of the 'twenty-second' was ushered in by the discharge of heavy artillery. The whole city was in commotion, making arrangements to demonstrate their attachment to our beloved President. The Masonic, Cincinnati, and military orders united in doing him honor. . . ."

In describing the hall she says: "The seats were arranged like those of an amphitheatre, and cords were stretched on each side of the room, about three feet from the floor to preserve sufficient space for the dancers. We were not long seated, when General Washington entered and bowed to the ladies as he passed round the room. . . . The dancing soon after commenced. . . ."²

Mrs. Washington, no doubt, enjoyed her stay here more than that in New York. Here there was a feeling of hospitality and easy friendliness more noticeable, and she was nearer her beloved south-land, where the manners were more free. She had here her beloved friends Mrs. Robert Morris, and Mrs. Richard Durdin, one of the beauties of the day. Also, Mrs. John Travis, one of the lovely Bond sisters, was a frequent visitor at the presidential home. Either her older grand-daughters or her nieces were with her also, so that there were often young people in the house. However, she enjoyed it, though her thoughts were turning to the plantation home, and we find her writing in 1794 to her niece; regarding the care of the house at Mt. Vernon, as she was not able to make the journey:

"I do not know what keys you have -- it is highly necessary that the beds and bed cloths of all kinds should be aired if you have the keys I beg you will make Caroline put all the things of every kind out to air and brush and clean all the places and rooms that they were in. . . ."³

¹Crawford: Romantic Days in the Early Republic, p. 58?

²Wharton: M. Washington, p. 230.

³Ibid: p. 246.

However, gay Philadelphia may have been at this time, the women did not spend all their time in attending social functions.

Sarah Bache wrote to her father in 1790: "If I was to mention to you the prices of the common necessaries of life, it would astonish you. I should tell you that I had seven table-cloths of my own spinning. . . ."¹

She writes further of sending to France for certain articles of dress, as they are so expensive in America, and Franklin's reply is certainly amusing, considering what a perfectly splendid time the old gentleman was having in France, with the worship of the French women:

"I was charmed, with the account you gave me of your industry, the tablecloths of your own spinning and so on: but the latter part of the paragraph that you had sent for linen from France and you sending for . . . lace and feathers, disgusted me as much as if you had put salt into my strawberries. The spinning, I see, is laid aside, and you are to be dressed for the ball! You seem not to know, my dear daughter, that, of all the dear things in this world, idleness is the dearest, except mischief. . . ."¹

Mrs. Bache says "There was never so much pleasure and dressing going on. . . ."¹

An officer writing to General Wayne makes this comment:

"Permit me to say a little of the dress, manners, and customs of the towns's people. In respect to the first great alterations have taken place since I was last here. It is all gayety, and from what I can observe, every lady and gentleman endeavors to out do the other in splendor and show. . . . The manner of entertaining in this place has likewise undergone its change. You cannot conceive anything more elegant than the present taste. You can hardly dine at a table but they present you with three courses, and each of them in the most elegant manner."²

One source of social life, noted throughout all the colonies in the eighteenth century was the theatre. In Philadelphia, the first regular season had its beginning in 1754. During the later years of the century the theatre filled an important place in the city. We have the notice of "The President honored the following performance by the Old American Company. Mr. and Mrs. Hallam had a

¹Crawford: Romantic Days in the Early Republic, p. 59, ff.

²Wharton: Through Colonial Doorways, p. 229.

benefit on Thursday evening, Dec. 4, at the South St. Theatre -- a comedy called 'The Young Quaker; or the Fair Philadelphian' by O'Keefe after which there was a 'pantomimic ballet' of the Two Philosophers, a musical Piece called The Children in the Wood, a recitation of Dr. Goldsmith's celebrated Epilogue in the character of Harlequin, -- the whole performance concluding with a Leap through a Barrel of fire. . ."1

The love of the theatre seems more marked throughout the Middle Colonies and the south than in New England, although in the latter colonies, the Puritan divines found it necessary to give way for they no longer were able to control Boston, which, during the later part of the century, grew notoriously wicked (so they thought) from the influx of English cavaliers.

Mrs. Adams writes from Philadelphia in 1791: "The managers of the theatre have been very polite to me and my family. I have been to one play, and here again we have been treated with much politeness. The actors came and informed us that a box was prepared for us. . . .The house is equal to most of the theatres we meet with out of France. . . .The actors did their best; 'The School for scandal' was the play. I missed the divine Farren, but upon the whole it was very well performed. . ."2

Annapolis had regular theatre performances in 1752. In Baltimore the first theatre was opened in 1782, and the following bill was published in the papers:

"THE NEW THEATRE IN BALTIMORE
WILL OPEN, This Evening, being the 15th of January. . .
With an HISTORICAL TRAGEDY, CALLED

KING RICHARD III

.

AN OCCASIONAL PROLOGUE by Mr. Wall

to which will be added a FARCE,

MISS IN HER TEENS

Boxes: one Dollar: Pit Five Shillings: Galleries 9d.
Doors to be open at Hal-past Four, and will begin at Six o'clock.

¹Wharton: M. Washington, p. 231.

²Crawford: Romantic Days in the Early Republic, p. 47.

No persons can be admitted without Tickets, which may be had at the Coffee House in Baltimore, and at Lindley's Coffee House on Fells-Point."¹

No persons will on any pretence be admitted behind the Scenes."¹

The first theatrical performance given in New York scandalised the Dutch. It was acted by English officers in a barn. "Great was the scandal in the church and among the burghers. Their indictment was searching. . . Moreover, they painted their faces, which was against God and nature. . . . They had degraded manhood by assuming female habits. . ."²

However, like all sinful pleasures it had come to stay. It was the custom for the performance to begin early, generally by six o'clock, and the fashionable folk sent the negroes ahead to keep their places: before the day of reserved seats. The audience, during the early years of the theatre in the colonies, often invaded the state. Later this was forbidden, also the throwing of eggs as a mark of disapproval from the gallery.

There are other social features we have not mentioned which formed an important part of the colonial life, such as the taverns in New York, the resorts at Vauxhall and Ranelagh; the famous fish dinners given at an inn on Brooklyn Heights; the "Kissing Bridge," in the city. Then in the south there were races, county fairs, in which the planters vied with each other, bringing their finest and fastest horses. These indeed, were social events, never-to-be-forgotten, by those who participated. But since this study is not complete, the picture given of social life gives us some indication, of the amusements of the colonial people.

The account of society in New Orleans has come down to us, and forms a very interesting chapter in the social life of the colonies. While the source material is very limited, yet from two

¹Crawford: Romantic Days in the Early Republic, p. 247.

²Humphreys: C. Schuyler, p. 45.

writers we have something of the lives of the women, their social life, and education. Because the source material is so limited, and since Louisiana is not classed as one of the thirteen colonies, I have seen fit to place all the quotations about this French province under the one heading of social, including here the education, marriage, and general observations on women. It must be remembered in this discussion of this southern settlement we are dealing with a French colony, and we shall find a marked difference between this and the English provinces. The French were a gay, pleasure-loving people, with little regard for the moral phase of life -- so the English thought. Nearly one hundred years had passed since the days of Louis XIV, but the "Grand Monarch" had so taught his admirers the passion for pleasure and merry-making that France was still living under his dominance; that is, when we say France, we mean the nobility, and at this time, the nobility ruled France, and the peasants were absolutely in their power. The France that settled the colony of Louisiana and the other French colonies in the new world was the France that was steadily and rapidly drifting toward the Revolution, when the goaded, desperate, hopeless masses, driven mad by centuries of poverty and excessive taxation were to rise and seize the government. France was a place where the nobility revelled in vice, ease and wealth. The country was corrupt -- rotten to the core. And the French colonies in the new world, in some instances, were apt pupils of the mother country. Then also the Creole population, who seemed devoid of morals, were a large part of the population. No one seems to have explained satisfactorily

the origin of the Creole, but it is enough for our purpose to note his existence, and to know he was ever a temptation to the courtier, reared in the unwholesome atmosphere of the French court. Then there was the negro in Louisiana, who seemed either wholly unregenerate, or devoid of any moral sense. The Louisianians had an active trade with the West Indies, and a portion of the population were West Indians. At this time, the West Indies, because of the importance of their products, attracted a class of traders, rough, immoral, and altogether undesirable. Desperate characters from all nations thronged here, criminals, sharpers, desperadoes, and above all, pirates. Many of these either visited regularly, or lived in Louisiana. Tiring of the rawness of the savage they looked to New Orleans as a place where some of the civilization they had left, existed. Thus, the city had little in common with Boston or Philadelphia. It was a river port, with all the vices and foulness which that term implies. Added to this, the mixture of races, and several of them little removed from the savage state, we can form some idea of conditions in New Orleans and Louisiana.

But since it is the women we are particularly interested in, let us note what is said about them. Berquin-Duvallon, writing in 1803, has given what is probably a true picture of the social conditions. While his writing is a little later than the period we are interested in, however, conditions do not change so rapidly, but that we may infer that they were similar in the latter part of the century, to what they were in 1803. He says speaking of the

physical appearance of the women: "The creoles of Louisiana -- are blonde rather than brunette. The women of this country who may be included among the number of those whom nature has especially favored, have a skin, which without being of extreme whiteness, is still beautiful enough to constitute one of their charms; and features, which although not very regular, form an agreeable whole; a very pretty throat; a stature that indicates strength and health; and is peculiar and distinguishing feature, lively eyes full of expression as well as a magnificent head of hair."¹

Concubinage was far more common than marriage. His comment is: "The rarity of marriage must necessarily be attributed to the causes which we have already assigned to that state of celibacy to that monkish life, the taste for which is extending here more and more among the men. In witness of what I advance on this matter, one single observation will suffice, as follows: For the two and one-half years that I have been in this colony, not thirty marriages at all notable have occurred in New Orleans and for ten leagues about it. And in this district, there are at least six hundred white girls, of virtuous estate, of marriageable age, between fourteen and twenty-five or thirty years. . ."²

Paul Alliot, writing of marriage says: "The inhabitants of the city of St. Louis like those old-time simple and united patriarchs do not live at all in debauchery as do a part of those of New Orleans. Marriage is honored there and the children resulting from it share the inheritance of their parents without any quarreling."³

One curse of the colony was the negro women, and women of "color", as they are called to distinguish them from the white women. "When the girls (negro) attain the age of thirteen or fourteen, their mothers usually place them with white men, who have generally much more regard for them in their domestic economy than they do for their legitimate wives. However, the (white) women show the greatest contempt and aversion for that sort of women."³

"As in all colonies their taste for women extends more particularly to those of color, whom they prefer to the white women, because such women demand fewer of those annoying attentions which contradict their taste for independence. A great number, accordingly prefer to live in concubinage rather than to marry. They find in that the double advantage of being served with the most scrupulous exactness, and in case of discontent or unfaithfulness, of changing their housekeeper (this is the honorable name given to that sort of woman. . ."⁴

Evidently social conditions were shocking, even to the visiting Frenchmen: ". . . And not far from the taverns are obscure

1-2 Robertson: Louisiana Under Spain, France & U.S., p. 70.

3-4 Ibid: Vol. 1, pp. 85, 204.

bawdy houses and dirty smoking houses, where the father on one side, and the son on the other, go, openly and without any embarrassment, as well as without shame . . . to revel and dance indiscriminately and for whole nights, with a lot of men and women of saffron color, or quite black, either free or slave. Will anyone dare to deny this fact? I will only designate, in support of my assertion (and to say no more) the famous house of Cocuet, located near the center of the city, where all that scum is to be seen publicly, and that for several years. . ."1

Apparently the color line was drawn very severely, at least by the women. Speaking of the kinds of social functions, he says: "The ladies ball is a sanctuary where no woman dare approach if she has even a suspicion of mixed blood. The purest conduct, the most eminent virtues, could not lessen this stain in the eyes of the immaculate ladies. One of the latter, married and known to have been implicated in various intrigues with men of the locality, one day entered one of those fine balls. 'There is a woman of mixed blood here,' she cried haughtily. This rumor ran about the ballroom. In fact, two young quadroon ladies were seen there, who were esteemed for the excellent education which they had received, and much more for their honorable conduct. They were warned and obliged to disappear in haste before a shameless woman, and their society would have been a real pollution for her."2

The tribute paid them is as follows: "The Louisiana women, and notably those born and resident on the plantations, have various estimable qualities. Respectful as girls, affectionate as wives, tender as mother, and careful as mistresses, possessing thoroughly the details of household economy, honest, reserved, proper -- in the van almost -- they are, in general, most excellent women."3

He accuses the Creole women of extravagance and low morals:

"A tone of extravagance and show in excess of one's means is seen there in the dress of the women, in the elegance of their carriages, and in their fine furnitures. . . .The women who live in the country and on their plantations, are still far from attaining to that nommous show of the women of the city; for they are not daily as are the latter, on show, and on the stage of fashion and gallantry."4

This love of dress and extravagance among these women seemed shocking to this courtier from France, and indeed it must have been something unusual, to have shocked a noble from the French

1Robertson: Louisiana Under Spain, France & the U.S., Vol. I, p. 216
2-3Ibid: pp. 214, 195.

4Ibid: p. 201.

Court. True, his visit was several years after the Revolution in France, when extravagance and luxury were somewhat checked. However, he must have known the extravagance of the days before the Revolution and in 1803 familiar with the Court of Napoleon, where dress and luxury were not of Puritan plainness. However, the sight of these people amid Indians and negroes, surrounded by virgin forests, living in a city where sanitary conditions were indescribable, displaying a luxury and extravagance equal to that of the courts of Europe, seemed to this man, at the least, decidedly inconsistent. So he grows sarcastic and ironical in his descriptions.

"The women of the city now dress tastefully, and their change of appearance in this respect in a very short space of time is really surprising. Not three years ago, with lengthened skirts, the upper part of their clothing being of one color, and the lower of another, and all the rest of their dress in proportion: they were brave with many ribbons and few jewels. Thus rigged out they went everywhere, on their round of visits, to the ball, and to the theatres. Today, such a costume seems to them, and rightly so, a masquerade. The richest of embroidered muslins, cut in the latest styles, and set off as transparencies over soft and brilliant taffetas, with magnificent lace trimmings, and with embroidery and gold embroidered spangles are today fitted to and beautify well-dressed women and girls: and this is accompanied by rich earrings, necklaces, bracelets, rings, precious jewels, in fine, with all that can relate to dress -- to that important occupation of the fair sex. . ."¹

Their education seems very limited: "There is no other public institution fit for education of the youth of this country than a simple school maintained by the government. It is composed of about fifty children, nearly all from poor families. Reading, writing, and arithmetic are taught there in the two languages, French and Spanish. There is also the house of the French nuns, who have some young girls, as boarders, and who have a class for day students. There is also a boarding school for young creole girls, which was established about fifteen months ago. . ."²

"The Creole women, lacking, in general, the talents that adorn education, have no taste for music, drawing, or embroidery, but in revenge they have an extreme passion for dancing and would

¹Ibid: 200.

²Robertson: Louisiana, p. 203.

pass all their days and nights at it. . ."¹

The theatre also formed one source of amusement, and was well attended by both men and women.

There was little of culture in the city. "Few good musicians are to be seen here. There is only one single portrait painter, whose talent is suited to the walk of life where he employs it. Finally, in a city inhabited by ten thousand souls, as is New Orleans, I record it as a fact that not ten truly learned men can be found. . . . There is found here neither shipyard, colonial post, college, nor public nor private library. Neither is there a bookstore, and for good reasons, for bookseller would die of hunger in the midst of his books. . . ."²

Even the manners and social forms at functions were disgusting: "I cannot accustom myself to those great mobs, or to the old custom of the men (on these gala occasions or better orgies) of getting more than on edge with wine, so that they get fuddled even before the ladies, and afterward act like drunken men in the presence of those beautiful ladies, who far from being offended at it, appear on the contrary, to be amused by it. . . ."³

This is indeed a dark picture, but the saddest feature is because of the irregular social conditions. "The most remarkable, as well as the most pathetic result of that gangrenous irregularity in this city is the exposing of a number of white babies (sad fruits of a clandestine excess) who are sacrificed from birth by their guilty mothers to a false honor after they have sacrificed their true honor to their unbridled inclination for a luxury that destroys them."⁴

Surely a little of the Puritan sternness and rigid moral code was needed here. True, in all the colonies, there were transgressors of the social laws, but not so general as this.

¹Robertson: Louisiana, Vol. I, p. 199.

²Ibid: p. 204.

³Ibid: p. 204.

⁴Ibid: p. 197.

VI

MARRIAGE

Under this heading will be given a discussion of the marriage ceremony -- whether performed by the church or the state; the customs surrounding courtship and marriage, punishment of offenders of the marriage law, and the general status of woman, after her marriage.

We have noted the rather somber social life of the Puritans. While marriage provided another means of social gatherings, however, there was not the ceremony, the feasting, and the general merry-making here, as in the other colonies. Judge Sewall, here, again, has given us most of our information concerning these various subjects treated under marriage, in regard to New England. In the record of his own courtships, we can make a keen analysis of the proper method and manner in Massachusetts. In addition to the notice given of marriages attended as a guest, he has left the record of several, where in his official capacity as a magistrate, he performed the ceremony. However, since courtship generally precedes marriage, let us note this first. The evidence shown indicates that, while the young woman was given her choice in the matter, yet the suitor asked permission, first of the parent or guardian, before paying his attention. Thus a marriage seldom occurred where the parents of the interested parties were ignorant of the state

of affairs. Sewall records: "Decr. 7, 1719. Mr. Cooper asks my consent for Judith's Company; which I freely grant him."¹

Also: "Feria Secunda, Octobr. 13, 1729. Judge Davenport comes to me between 10 and 11 a-clock in the morning and speaks to me on behalf of Mr. Addington Davenport, his eldest Son, that he might have Liberty to wait upon Jane Hirst (his kinswoman) now at my House in way of Courtship. . . ." ²

Not only were the parents of the young woman interested, but the parents of the young man, also: "Decr. 11. I and my Wife visit Mr. Stoddard. Madam Stoddard Thank'd me for the Liberty I granted her Son (Mr. Cooper) to wait on my daughter Judith. I returned the compliment and Kindness."³

From the records of the statutes we gather that, in case the young man paid his attentions to the maid of his choice, or "made love" to her without the consent of the father, or guardian, the latter could appeal to the law. "John Lorin stood 'convict on his own confession of making love to Mary Willis without her parents consent and after being forwarned by them." (1676)
(Records of the County Court of Buffaolk)⁴

Not only could the irate father appeal to the court, but the lover as well, provided, the father was unreasonable:

"In 1646, Richard Taylor complained to the general court of Plymouth that he was prevented from marrying Ruth Wheildon by her father Gabriel; but when before the court Gabriel yielded and promised no longer to oppose the marriage."⁵

Not only did the law prescribe the regulations concerning the engagement, and its fulfillment, but likewise provided the course to be followed for failure to carry it out. "The Mass. court 'orders that Joyce Bradwicke shall give unto Alex. Becke the some of XXS, for promising him marriage without her friends consent, & nowe refuseing to pforme the same". (Mass. Col. Rec. I.)⁶

"Richard Silvester, in the behalfe of his dautheter, and Dinah Silvester in the behalfe of herselfe 'to recover twenty

¹Sewall's Diary, Vol. III, p. 237.

²Ibid: Vol. III, p. 396.

³Ibid: p. 237.

⁴Howard: History of Matrimonial Institutions, p. 166.

⁵Ibid: p. 163.

⁶Ibid: p. 200.

pounds and coats from John Palmer, for acting fraudulently against the said Dinah, in not performing his engagement to her in point of marriage". (Ply. Co. Rec., VII, 101.)¹

"In 1735, a woman was awarded two hundred pounds and costs at the expense of her betrothed, who after jilting her, had married another, although he had first beguiled her into deeding him a piece of land 'worth L 100.'²

The dowery, or marriage portion was very important, and these devout elders, who taught devotion to heavenly things, only, shrewdly wrangled and higgled over a few pounds with the business sagacity of a modern capitalist. However, there were many occasions when the parents of the young people agreed on the settlement, in friendly spirit. "Oct. 13, 1729. Judge Davenport comes to me between 10 and 11 a-clock in the morning and sneaks to me on behalf of Mr. Addington Davenport, his eldest Son, that he might have liberty to Wait upon Jane Hirst now at my House in way of Courtship. He told me he would deal by him as his eldest Son, and more than so. Inten'd to build a House where his uncle Addington dwelt for him; and that he should have his Pue in the Old Meeting-house. . . He said Madam Addington would wait upon me."³

When the contract was signed, it was customary to state not only the dowry and settlement, but the sum to be given both parties, or one, in case of the death of either. Sometimes, when this was omitted in the contract, the surviving relatives adjusted the matter. Sewall records, after the death of his daughter

Mary: "Tuesday, Febr. 19, 1711/2. . . Done with Mr. Gerrish, son Gerrish, (Marh's husband), Mrs. Anne. Discourse with the Father about my Daughter Mary's Portion. I stood for making L550, doe; because now twas in six parts, the Land was not worth so much. He urg'd for £ 600, at last would split the £ 50. Finally, Febr. 20, I agreed to charge the House-Rent, and Differences of Money, and make it up £ 600. . ."⁴

The judge, who was married three times, has left us many hints which pieced together enables us to supply the omitted parts. Perhaps, a line here and there is more valuable than pages of explanation.

¹Howard: History of Matrimonial Institutions, p. 200.

²Ibid:

³Sewall's Diary, Vol. III, p. 396.

⁴Ibid: Vol. II, p. 336.

His wooing of Madam Winthrop was long and arduous, and a failure. There was trouble over the marriage settlement: the Judge would not keep a coach, and he did not follow the wishes of Madam Winthrop when she wanted him to wear a wig. His calls on Madam Winthrop tell us much of the courtship among the Puritans. It is well, however, to keep in mind that possibly the older woman was a little more practical and shrewd, less a believer in the romantic than the young woman, but, nevertheless, we see an independent, assertive woman, well able to care for herself, and not the clinging vine type we are led to believe through the reading of Cooper's novels, were the typical colonial women. And, no doubt, there were many widows, as capable and independent in character as Madam Winthrop.

We have this notice of the death of his first wife:

"Midweek, Sr. (October) 23, My dear wife is inter'd . . ."1

On Febr. 6 is given "This morning wandering in my mind whether to live a single or a married life. . ."2

His friends were interested in providing him with a second help-meet, for he records: "March 14, 1717. Deacon Marion comes to me, wits with me a great while in the evening; after a great deal of discourse about his Courtship -- He told (me) the Olivers said they wish'd I would Court their Aunt. I said little, but said twas not five Moneths since I buried my dear Wife. Had said before 'twas hard to know whethe best to marry again or no: whom to marry. . ."3

"July 7, 1718. . . .At night, when all were gone to bed, Cousin Moodey went with me into the new Hall, read the History of Rebekah's Courtship, and pray'd with me respecting my Widowed Condition."4

Shortly after this, he pays court to Mrs. Denison, but he was unsuccessful. He has not given much information in regard to this, but on October 29, 1719, practically a year after the death of

1Sewall's Diary, Vol. III, p. 114.

2Ibid: Vol. III, p. 165.

3Ibid: p. 176.

4Ibid: p. 180.

his first wife: "October 29, 1719. Thanksgiving Day: between 6 and 7 Brother Moody & I went to Mrs. Tilley's, and about 7 or 8 were married by Mr. J. Sewall, in the best room below stairs. Mr. Prince prayed the second time. Mr. Adams, the minister at Newington was there, Mr. Oliver and Mr. Timothy Clark. . . Sung the 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 verses of the 90th Psalm. Cousin S. Sewall set low-Dutch tune in a very good key. . . Distributed cake. . ."1

His happiness was short-lived, for in May of the following his wife died, and he was again seeking a companion. In August he calls on Madam Winthrop: ". . .Spake to her, saying, my loving wife died so soon and suddenly, 'twas hardly convenient for me to think of marrying again; however I came to this resolution, that I would not make my court to any person without first consulting with her."2

Two months later he says: ". . ."At last I pry'd that Catherine (Mrs. Winthrop) might be the person assign'd for me. . . She. . .took it up in the way of denial, saying she could not do it before she was asked."3

A few days later: "Madam seem'd to harp upon the same string. . . Must take care of her children; could not leave that house and neighborhood where she had dwelt so long. . . . I gave her a piece of Mr. Belcher's cake and ginger-bread wrapped up in a clean sheet of paper. . ."4

"In the evening I visited Madam Winthrop, who treated me with a great deal of courtesy; wine, marmalade. I gave her a Newsletter about the Thanksgiving. . ."5

Two days later: ". . .Madam Winthrop's countenance was much changed from what 'twas on Monday. Look'd dark and lowering. . . .Had some converse, but very cold and indifferent to what 'twas before. . .She sent June home with me, with a good lanter. . ."6

A week passed, and "in the evening I visited Madm Winthrop, who treated me courteously, but not in clean linen as sometimes. . . June came home with me. . ."7

Again he seeks the charming widow several days later, to find her "out." He goes in search of her. Finding her, he remains a few minutes, then suggests going home. ". . .She found occasion to speak pretty earnestly about my keeping a coach: . . . She spake something of my needing a wig. . ."8

Two days later when calling: ". . .I rose up at 11 o'clock to come away, saying I would put on my coat, she offer'd not to help me. I pray'd her that Juno might light me home, she open'd the shutte, and said 'twas pretty light abroad: Juno was weary and gone to bed. So I came home by star-light as well as I could. . ."9

1 Sewall's Diary, Vol. III, p. 232

2 Ibid: p. 262

3-7 Ibid: p. 269

2Ibid: p. 262.

4 Ibid: p. 265

8 p. 271

5 Ibid: Vo. III, p.2

But the Judge was persistent, and called again on November 4th. "I asked Madam what fashioned neck-lace I should present her with: she said None at all. . ."¹

Her coolness chilled his ardor, and only once more does he record a visit: . . . "Give her the remnant of my almonds; she did not eat of them as before: but laid them away. . . The fire was come to one short brand besides the block. . . at last it fell to pieces, and no recruit was made." The Judge took the hint. "Took leave of her. . . Treated me courteously. . . Told her she had enter'd the 4th year of her widowhood. . . Her dress was not so clean as sometime it had been. Jehovah jireh."²

Later we find him calling on Mrs. Ruggles: No doubt the Judge, by this time, was known as a persistent suitor, and had gained the reputation of being hard to discourage. Later he married Mrs. Gibbs, and was, no doubt, happy. His calls on Mrs. Winthrop, and his gifts of books, candy, almonds, and tracts, tell us much of the courtship of the times.

Evidently the young woman was allowed her choice in the question of marriage, or at least given considerable liberty. The father of Eliza Pinckney, writing to her concerning marriage, received the following letter from his daughter:

"As you propose Mr. L. to me I am sorry I can't have Sentiments favourable enough to him to take time to think on the Subject, as your indulgence to me will ever add weight to the duty that obliges me to consult that best pleases you, for so much Generosity on your part claims all my Obedience. But as I knot 'tis my Happiness you consult, I must beg the favour of you to pay my compliments to the old Gentleman for his Generosity and favorable Sentiments of me, and let him know my thoughts on the affair in such civil terms as you know much better than I can dictate; and beg leave to say to you that the riches of Chili and Peru put together, if he had them, could not purchase a sufficient Esteem for him to make him my husband.

"As to the other gentlemen you mention, Mr. W., you know, sir, I have so slight a knowledge of him I can form no judgment, and a Case of such consequence requires the nicest distinction of humours and Sentiments.

¹Sewall's Diary, Vol. III, p. 274.

²Ibid: Vol. III, p. 275.

"But give me leave to assure you my dear Sir, that a single life is my only Choice; -- and if it were not as I am yet but eighteen hope you will put aside the thoughts of my marrying yet these two or three years at least.

"You are so good as to say you have too great an opinion of my prudence to think I would entertain an indiscreet passion for any one, and I hope Heaven will direct me that I may never disappoint you. . . ."1

The Judge, again has told us about the courtship of timid, Betty, who was so troubled over her spiritual condition, in her childhood. When seventeen years of age, the first suitor appeared. The Judge finds he has an estate valued at £ 600, and after having his daughter read to him about the courtship of Adam and Eve "as a soothing and alluring preparation for the thought of matrimony," an invitation is sent to the lover to call. He records this visit as follows:

"Jany fourth-day, at night Capt. Tuthill comes to speak with Betty, who hid herself all alone in the coach for several hours till he was gone, so that we sought at several houses, then at last came in of her self, and look'd very wild."2

This lover is dismissed, and one, Mr. Hirst, is interested in Betty. But, poor, timid, Betty, could not consent, and the Judge mournfully says, he fears, even he, has "taken his final leave." But, a few days later, the father writes to the daughter, saying:

"Mr. Hirst waits upon you once more to see if you can bid him welcome. It ought to be seriously considered, that your drawing back from him after all that has passed between you, will be to your Prejudice; and will tend to discourage persons of worth from making their Court to you. And you had need to consider whether you are able to bear his final leaving of you, howsoever it may seem gratefull to you at present. When persons come toward us, we are apt to look upon their Undesirable Circumstances mostly: and therefore to shun them. But when persons retire from us for good and all, we are in danger of looking only on that which is

¹Ravenel: F. Pinckney, p. 55.

²Sewall's Diary, p. 191, Vol. II.

desirable in them to our woefull Disquiet. . .I do not see but that the Match is well liked by judicious persons, and such as are your Cordial friends, and mine also.

"Yet not withstanding, if you find in yourself an imovable incurable, Aversion, from him, and cannot love, and honour, and obey (*italics mine*) him, I shall say no more. nor give you any further trouble in this matter. It had better be off than on. So praying God to pardon us, and pity our Undeserving, and to direct and strengthen and settle you in making a right Judgment, and giving a right Answer, I take leave, who. am, dear child, your loving father. ."¹

These few hints lead us to believe that young women were given much liberty, although guided by the parents. These letters do not read like the story of Sophia Weston and other English heroines.

After the formal engagement, dowry, and contract had been signed, the publishing of the banns took place. This custom was probably, general throughout the colonies, although Sewall, again, is our only source. In the South, under the Church of England, banns, were required, in Maryland among the Catholics, in Pennsylvania, among the Quakers, and in New York among the Dutch, this was a recognized form of procedure. Sewall notes:

"Feb. 23, 1719/20. Mr. Cooner comes in, and sits with me, and asks that he may be published. . ."²

In speaking of his approaching marriage with Mrs. Gibbs, "I had moved to be published next Thursday. . ."³

In New England both the clergy and the civil magistrate performed the marriage ceremony. Although, it is difficult to determine from the writings, probably during the first years of the Massachusetts Bay and Plymouth colonies, only the magistrate could marry the contracting parties. Thus was due to the fact,

¹Sewall's Letter-Book, Coll. I, 213.

²Sewall's Diary, Vol. III, p. 244.

³Ibid: p. 300.

no doubt, that marriage was looked at as a civil contract, because of the property interest, and material matters surrounding it. And, though in Judge Sewall's time, either magistrate or the clergy could perform the ceremony, it was a simple affair, quiet, with little feasting, dancing, and no reception as in the south, or among the Dutch.

"Thursday, 1688. Mr. Nath. Newgate Marries Mr. Lynds daughter before Mr. Ratcliff, with church of England Ceremonies."¹

"Thursday, Oct. 11th, 1688. About 5 P. M. Mr. Willard (the pastor) married Mr. Samuel Danforth and Mrs. Hannah Allen."²

Marriage by a magistrate). "Feb. 21, 1717/8. . . . In the evening I married Joseph Marsh. . . I gave them a glass of Canary.

"Ann. 11, 1718. . . . In the evening I married Chasling Warwick and Esther Bates. . ."³

Sewall records the following concerning the law:

"Nov. 11, 1692. Law passes for Justices and Ministers Marrying persons. By order of the Committee, I had drawn up a Bill for Justices and such others as the Assembly should appoint to marry: but came new-drawn and thus alter'd from the Deputies. It seems they count the respect of it too much to be left any longer with the Magistrate. And Salaries are not spoken of: as if one sort of Men might live on the Air. . ."⁴

This would indicate that up to this time, the magistrates had largely controlled the marriage ceremony without the aid of the clergy. Sewall's daughter Betty, who married Mr. Hirst, whom we have noted she once refused, (see p. 188), was married by a clergyman: "Oct. 17, 1700. . . . In the following Evening Mr. Grove Hirst, and Elizabeth Sewall are married by Mr. Cotton Mather. . ."⁵

The refreshments seem to have been simple, and the entire affair in keeping with the simplicity of the Puritans. "Many of the Council, went and wish'd Col. Fitch joy of his daughter Martha's marriage with Mr. James Allen. Had good Bride-Cake, good Wine, Burgundy and Canary, good Beer, oranges, Pears."⁶

¹Sewall's Diary, Vol. I, p. 216.

²Ibid: p. 228.

³Ibid: Vol. III, p. 172.

⁴Ibid: Vol. I, p. 366.

⁵Ibid: Vol. II, p. 21.

Sewall in recording the marriage of his daughter Judith notes after the ceremony, "We had our Cake, and Sack-posset. And "May 13, 1720. Send out Cake."¹

"May 8th, 1712. At night, Dr. Mather married Mr. Sam Gerrish, and Mrs. Sarah Coney: Dr. Cotton Mather pray'd last. . . Had Gloves, Sack-Posset, and Cake. . ." ²

Apparently in the time of Judge Pyncheon marriages were celebrated with more elaborate ceremonies. He records: "Thursday, Jan. 2, 1781. . . A smart firing is heard today (Mr. Brooks is married to Miss Hathorne, a daughter of Mr. Estey), and was as loud, and the rejoicing near as great as on the marriage of Robt. Peas, celebrated last year: the fiddling, dancing, etc., about equal in each."³

The laws governing marriage were very strict: one reason for this was the character of the people: many were wild and reckless. It was a common happening for men and even women who had been married in the Old World to appear as unmarried in the new. One of the curses of the time was bigamy. Marriages took place between the man who had a wife in England, but who unknown in this country. And the court found it necessary to punish the husband by sending him back to his former wife. The records furnish instances, we must admit, of couples living together as man and wife, and fined every month, regularly, until married. Marriage with cousins, near relatives, and persons who were not considered respectable were forbidden. "Dec. 25, 1691. . . The marriage of Hana Owen with her Husband's Brother is declar'd null by the Court of Assistants. She commanded not to entertain him: enjoin'd to make a Confession at Braintree before the Congregation on Lecture Day, or Sabbath, pay Fees of Court and prison, & to be dismiss'd. . ." ⁴

"May 7, 1696. Col. Shrimton marries his Son to his Wive's Sisters daughter, Elisabeth Richardson. All of the Council in Town were invited to the Wedding, and many others. Only I was not spoken to. As I was glad not to be there because the lawfullness of the inter-marrying of Cusin-Germans is doubted. . ." ⁵

¹Sewall's Diary, Vol. III, n. 253.

²Ibid: Vol. II, n. 347.

³Diary of Judge Pyncheon, n. 82.

⁴Ibid: Vol. I, n. 354.

⁵Ibid: Vol. I, n. 124.

Marriage was early for both men and women, the former marrying at twenty and even earlier, the latter from sixteen years. There were very few unmarried people: those who were were looked upon somewhat with suspicion. There was but one fate for the unmarried woman to remain with her parents until their death, or live with a married brother or sister. Sad indeed was the lot of the old maid. Byrd has told us of Miss Theckv, who no doubt was typical of the maiden lady in the south. We have the comment concerning an unmarried lady of Boston. "It is true, an old (or superannuated) maid in Boston is thought such a curse, as nothing can exceed it (and looked on as a dismal spectacle): yet she, by her good nature, gravity, and strict virtue, convinces all (so much as the fleering Beaus) that it is not her necessity, but her choice, that keeps her a Virgin. She is now about thirty years (the age which they call a Thornback), yet she never disguises herself, and talks as little as she thinks of Love. She never reads any Plays or Romances, goes to no Balls, or Dancing-match, as they do who go (to such Fairs) in order to meet with Chapmen. Her looks, her speech, her whole behaviour, are so very chaste, that but once at Governor's Island, where we went to be merry at roasting a hog) going to kiss her, I thought she would have blused to death.

"Our Damsel knowing this, her conversation is generally amongst the Women. . . so that I found it no easy matter to enjoy her company, for some of her time (save what was taken up in Needlework and learning French, etc) was spent in Religious Worship. She knew time was a dressing-room for Eternity, and therefore reserves most of her hours for better uses than those of the Comb, the Toilet, and the Glass. . ."1

Marriage, in colonial days, meant, in the greater number of cases, for life. However, there were separations. Since only one cause was considered sufficient -- adultery -- the guilty party was not allowed to re-marry, but this restriction was not placed on the innocent member. While the magistrates made a great effort to enforce this, it was impossible among the rougher, coarser people to do this, and the guilty one did re-marry. Sewall mentions the application for a divorce. "Feb. 27, 1716/7. Council held about a Divorce. Capt. Taylor's petition for an Aneal referred to a Gen. Council. . ."2

1Weeden: Economic & Social Hist of N. Eng, Vol. I, p. 299

2Sewall: Vol. III, p. 123.

Judge Sewall's eldest son, Sam, had serious difficulty with his wife, and the story of their matrimonial troubles, gives us a glimpse of the liberty allowed women in this matter. We have the record of his marriage to Rebekah Dudley, Sept. 15, 1702. "Mr. Neneiah Walter marries Mr. Sam Sewall and Mrs. Rebekah Dudley. . ."1

We have only the briefest comments in the diary of the father, but by reading between the lines, we learn something of the "meekness" of the colonial woman. The first hint in the record of the Judge is in 1712, February 13, "When my daughter alone, I ask'd her what might be the cause of my Son's Indisposition, are you so kindly affectioned one towards one another as you should be? She answer'd I do my Duty. I said no more. . ."2

Eight days later we have this notice: "Daughter Sewall calls and gives us a visit: I went out to carry my letters to Savil's. . . While I was absent, my Wife and Daughter Sewall had very sharp discourse; she sholly justified herself, and said, if it were not for her, no Maid could be able to dwell at their house. At last Daughter Sewall burst out with Tears, and call'd for the Calashe. My wife relented also, and said she did not design to grieve her."3

However, two days before this occurred, we note: "Febr. 19, Lecture-day, son S. Goes to Meeting, speaks to Mr. Walter. I also speak to him to dine. He could not: but said he would call before he went home. When he came he discours'd largely with my Son. . . Friends talk to them both, and so come together again."3

A few months later: "I go to Brooklin, meet my daughter Sewall going to Roxbury with Hanah. . . Sam and I dined alone. Daughter return'd before I came away. I pronounded to her that Mr. Walter (the pastor) might be desired to come to them and pray with them. She seem'd not to like the motion, said she knet not wherefore she should be call'd before a Minister. I urg'd him as the fittest Moderator; the Govr. or I might be thought partial. She pleaded her performance of Duty, and how much she had born. . ."4

Surely, here is a spirit of independence and authority on the part of Mrs. Samuel Jr. There is a hint that jealousy may have been the cause: "Sam and his Wife dine here, go home together in the Calash. William Tlsly rode and pass'd by them. My son warn'd him not to lodge at his house; Daughter said she had as much to doe with the house as he. Tlsly lodg'd there. Sam grew so ill

1Sewall's Diary, Vol. II, p. 63.

2Ibid: p. 371.

3Ibid:

4Ibid: p. 400.

on Saterdag, that instead of going to Roxbury he was fain between Meetings to take his Horse, and come hither: to the surprize of his Mother who was at home. . ."¹

A few days later: "Sam is something better, yet full of pain; He told me with Tears that these sorrows would bring him to his Grave. . ."²

Abour five weeks passed, and "My Son Joseph and I visited my Son at Brooklin, sat with my Daughter, in the chamber some considerable time, Drank Cider, eat Apples. Daughter said nothing to us of her grievances, not we to her. . . ."³

The next entry shows the spirit of the Puritan mother aroused in the behalf of her son. "Son Sewall intended to go home on the Horse Tom brought, sent some of his linen by him; but when I came to read his wive's letter to me, his Mother was vehemently against his going: and I was for considering. . . . Visited Mr. Walter, staid long with him, read my daughters letters to her Husband and me; yet he still advis'd to his going home. . . . My wife can't yet agree to my Son's going home. . . ."⁴

Sam seems to have remained at his father's home. The matter was taken up by the parents, apparently in the hope, they with their greater wisdom might be able to bring about an understanding. "Went a foot to Roxbury. Govr. Dudley was gon to his Mill. Staid till he came home. I acquainted him what my Business was; He and Madam Dudley both, reckon'd up the Offenses of my Son; and he the Virtues of his Daughter. And alone, mention'd to me the hainous faults of my Wife, who the very first word ask'd my daughter why she married my Son except she lov'd him? I saw no possibility of my Son's return: and therefore asked, that he would make some Proposals, and so left it."⁵

From the evidence it would seem that Sam was justified in his leaving his wife. His children were born July 20, 1711, and March 1719, the 20th. He left his wife January 22, 1714-15 and returned March 3, 1718. On August 29, 1717, is given this notice by the judge: "Went, according, after a little waiting on some probat business to Govr. Dudley. I said my Son had all along insisted that Caution should be given, that the infant lately born should not be chargeable to his Estate. Govr. Dudley no ways came into it; but said 'twas best as 'twas, no body knew whose

¹Sewall's Diary, Vol. II, p. 405⁴ Ibid: Vol. III, p. 40.

²Ibid: Vol. II, p. 406. ⁵ Ibid: Vol. III, p. 108.

³Ibid: Vol. III, p. 31.

'twas. (word illegible) to bring it up. . . ."1

Mrs. Sewall the mother of Samuel, Jr., passed away Oct.

23, 1717, and the next notice of the matrimonial difficulty of Sam

is dated February 24, 1717-8. "My Son Sam Sewall and his Wife Sign and Seal the Writings in Order to my Son's going home. Govr. Dudley and I witnesses, Mr. Sam Lynde took the Acknowledgment. I drank to my Daughter in a Glass of Canary. Govr. Dudley took me into the Old Hall and gave me £ 100 in Three-pound Bills of Credit, new ones, for my Son. told me on Monday, he would perform all that he had promised to Mr. Walter. Sam agreed to go home next Monday, his wife sending the Horse after him. Joseph pray'd with his Bror and me. Note. This was my Wedding Day. The Lord succeed and turn to good what we have been doing. . ."2

Since there is nothing further, we may judge the domestic affairs of Samuel Jr., were peaceful from this time forth. But the evidence in these quotations shows that colonial women had spirit, and independence. Neither, this wife, or this mother were meek, down-trodden women, but assertive of their rights, regardless of the opinions of their husbands.

From the source material nothing was found concerning divorces in New York, or the Middle Colonies. Although it would seem the laws governing marriage in Pennsylvania were rather lax, for Franklin records for us, though his wife had formerly been married, and deserted by her husband, yet no divorce was granted Miss Reed, before her marriage to him. The rumor of his death had returned, and this was sufficient, apparently. He says in his autobiography: "Our mutual affection was revived, but there were now great objections to our union. The match was indeed looked upon as invalid, a preceding wix wife being said to be living in England: but this could not easily be prov'd, because of the distance, and, tho' there was a report of his death it was not certain. Then, tho' it should be true, he had left many debts, which his successor might be call'd upon to pay. We ventured, however, over all these difficulties, and I took her to wife, September 1st, 1730. . ."3

In Maryland either the civil or the religious ceremony was legal, but the banns must be published.

We have noted under the social discussion the marriage
1-2 Sewall, Vol. III, p. 137, 173. 3Franklin, Vol. I, p. 310.

customs of the Dutch, the forming of children into companies, and later, marrying in the same company. Mrs. Grant observes: "Love, undiminished by any rival passion, and cherished by innocence and candor, was here fixed by the power of early habit, and strengthened by similarity of education, tastes, and attachments. Inconstancy, or even indifference among married couples, was unheard of, even where there happened to be a considerable disparity in point of intellect. The extreme affection they bore to their mutual offspring was a bond that for ever endeared them to each other. Marriage in this colony was always early, very often happy. When a man had a son, there was nothing to be expected with a daughter, but a well-brought-up female slave, and the furniture of the best bedchamber. . . ."]

Marriage among the Quakers was merely the mutual pledges of the contracting parties, before the assembled congregation.

The following describing the marriage of Dolly Madison, was, no doubt, typical of the Quaker service: "After the simple Quaker fashion, the groom repeated the formula -- 'I, John Todd, do take thee, Dorothea Payne to be my wedded wife, and promise, through divine assistance to be unto thee a loving husband, until separated by death.' The bride in fainter tones echoed the vow, and then the certificate of marriage was read, and the register signed by a number of witnesses. . . ."2

The curious marriage customs of the Moravians of Pennsylvania is told us by Benjamin Franklin: He relates: "I inquir'd concerning the Moravian marriages, whether the report was true that they were by lot. I was told that lots were us'd only in particular cases; that generally, when a young man found himself dispos'd to marry, he inform'd the elders of his class, who consulted the elder ladies that govern'd the young women. As these elders of the different sexes were well acquainted with the tempers and dispositions of their respective pupils, they could best judge what matches were suitable, and their judgments were generally acquiesc'd in: but, if, for example, it should happen that two or three young women were found to be equally proper for the young man, the lot was then recurred to. I objected, if the matches are not made by the mutual choice of the parties, some of them may chance to be very happy. 'And so they may,' answer'd my informer, 'if you let the parties chuse for themselves'"3

The marriage ceremony in the South was performed by the clergy as this was the custom of the established church. There was much feasting and gayety, dancing and a reception, after the wedding

1Grant: *Memoirs of An American Lady*, p. 53.

2Smyth: *B. Franklin*, Vol. I, p. 113.

3Goodwin: *Dolly Madison*, p. 33.

party had returned from the Church. The old story of how the first settlers of Virginia received their wives, purchasing them for so much tobacco, is too well known to need any comment. This was not an established custom, however, but served the purpose at a time when there were few women in Virginia. Nor is there anything to lead us to believe that these marriages were not as happy as the customary one, surrounded by the established social customs. We know but little of the indented women in the south since they had little in common with the women of the wealthy class, and little notice of their condition has crept into the writings of the time. Hammond, writing in 1656, says: "The Women are not (as is reported) put into the ground to worke, but occupie such domestique employments and housewifery as in England, that is dressing victuals, righting up the house, milking, imployed about dayries, washing, sowing, etc., and both men and women have times of recreations, as much or more than in any part of the world besides, yet some wenches that are nasty, beastly and not fit to be so imployed are put into the ground, for reason tells us, they must not at charge be transported and then maintained for nothing. . ."¹

Many of these indented women served out their term, and later married. There is no doubt, however, that often they did work in the fields, and the wretched social conditions found here, are explained on that basis, largely, as they were thrown with rude, base men, forced to do manual labor.

Among the lower, or rural classes in all the colonies, there was considerable horse-play and rough, coarse happenings at weddings, such as bride-stealings, hilarity, drinking, and carousing. This was especially true in Connecticut among the farming class, and this has partially lasted until the present time, although we seem to be losing the idea that marriage is an occasion for rough, vulgar jokes

¹Narratives of Early Maryland (Leah and Rachel), p. 290.

and wide happenings.

It may seem that marriage with its fixed rules, permission to court the young woman, signed contract, dowry, and legal procedure, was very common-place and lacked the romantic. However, this is not the case, and the colonists loved as ardently as ever men and women have done. Several cases cited may serve to show this. Let us glance at the proposal of marriage from Benedict Arnold to

his "Peggy". "Dear Madam: Twenty times have I taken up my pen to write to you, and as often has my trembling hand refused to obey the dictates of my heart -- a heart which, though calm and serene amidst the clashing of arms and all the din and horrors of war, trembles with diffidence and the fear of giving offence when it attempts to address you on a subject so important to his happiness. Dear Madam, your charms have lighted up a flame in my bosom which can never be extinguished: your heavenly image is too deeply impressed ever to be effaced. . . .

"On you alone my happiness depends, and will you doom me to languish in despair? Shall I expect no return to the most sincere, ardent, and disinterested passion? Do you feel no pity in your gentle bosom for the man who would die to make you happy? . . .

Consider before you doom me to misery, which I have not deserved but by loving you too extravagantly. Consult your own happiness, and if incompatible, forget there is so unhappy a wretch: for may I perish if I would give you one moment's inquietude to purchase the greatest possible felicity to myself. Whatever my fate is, my most ardent wish is for your happiness, and my latest breath will be to implore the blessing of heaven on the idol and only wish of my soul. . . ."

Alexander Hamilton wrote this to his "Betty": "I suspect. . . that if others knew the charm of my sweetheart as I do, I could have a great number of competitors. I wish I could give you an idea of her. You have no conception of how sweet a girl she is. It is only in my heart that her image is truly drawn. She has a lovely form, and still more lovely mind. She is all Goodness, the gentlest, the dearest, the tenderest of her sex -- Ah Betty, how I love her. . . ."

The story of Agnes Surragé, shows us that there was romance and plenty of it, during those far-off days. She was the daughter of very poor parents, and one day, while scrubbing a tavern floor, attracted the attention of Harry Frankland, collector of the port

¹Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. III, p. 324.

²Humphreys: C. Schuyler: p. 185.

of Boston, the son of a noble English family. Interested in her beauty, he gained the consent of her parents to educate her, and for a number of years, she was given the best training, culture, and polish of the times. At the age of twenty-four, beautiful accomplished, and lovely, Frankland loved her, but his family, proud and aristocratic would not consent to the marriage. Defying the conventions, he took her to live with him at his Boston residence. Boston was scandalized, and, Frankland and Miss Surrage left the city, retiring to a beautiful country home near Boston. After a number of years, they visited England, but his family snubbed her, and made it so unpleasant, that they travelled in Europe, living at Madrid for some time. Finally, at Lisbon, they experienced the terrible earthquake, and Frankland, who was injured and separated from the woman, vowed if he ever found her to marry her. This he did, and when he returned to London, she was received very kindly by his family. Here she was a prominent figure in society, was presented at Court, and lived many years, one of the most charming women of London. In 1768 her husband died, and she returned to the country home near Boston. During the war she suffered heavy financial difficulties, as she was a Tory, and finally returning to England, she married, again, but died in a short time.

There are many other instances showing that men and women loved as ardently and romantically then, as now. And there are hints as to the independence of the young women of the period of which one writer says: "The independence of the modern girl seems pale and ineffectual beside that of the daughters of the Revolution."

The daughters of General Schuyler were certainly young

¹Humphreys: C. Schuyler, p. 187.

women of independence, and out of four daughters, beautiful, attractive, and charming, only one was married in her father's home -- Elizabeth, who became the wife of Alexander Hamilton. Shortly after the battle of Saratoga General Schuyler announced the marriage of his eldest daughter, saying: "Carter and my eldest daughter ran off and were married on the twenty-third of July. Unacquainted with his family connections and situation in life the matter was exceedingly disagreeable, and I signified it to them." However, Carter, proved a worthy husband and rose to high distinction later, and the forgiveness was forth-coming, and the two families were very happy. Six years later, Peggy, equally charming and lovely, eloped with Stephen Van Rensselaer. There was no reason why these two young people should not have married according to the most approved Dutch fashion, for they were both of fine old Holland stock, wealthy, and very popular in the community. However, perhaps, this was more romantic. They, too, were speedily forgiven, and Stephen became a man of power and influence in New York history. The third romance in the Schuyler family was the escapade of Cornelia. She had attended the wedding of Eliza Morton in New Jersey, and there the young brother of the bride. Mutual admiration followed, and when the father of Cornelia was asked to give his consent, he promptly refused. Even two elopements in the family had taught him but little. He asked Cornelia to promise to have nothing to do with him, and she refused. Not long after, one evening, "two muffled figures appeared under Miss Cornelia's window. At a low whistle the window softly opened and rope was thrown up. Attached to the rope was a rope ladder, which making fast like a veritable heroine of romance the bride descended. They were driven to the river, where a boat was waiting to take them across. On the other side was the coach-and-pair. They were then driven thirty miles across country to Stockbridge, where an old friend of the Morton family lived. The affair had gone too far. The judge sent for a neighboring minister and the runaways were duly married. So flagrant a breach of

the parental authority was not to be hastily forgiven. . . As in the case of the other runaways, the youthful Mortons disappointed expectation, by becoming important householders, and taking a prominent place in the social life of New York, where Washington Morton achieved some distinction at the bar. . ."¹

This latter elopment was in true Clarissa Harlowe style, and, while, possibly, not to be commended, shows no meekness nor air of being down-trodden on the part of the woman.

Many hints have come down to us in letters as to what the colonial man and woman considered important in the marriage relation. Washington in writing to Nelly Custis, advised her to beware of how she played with hearts, and her own in particular. Time does not permit to quote those. The women, also have left us hints. Jane Turell early in the eighteenth century established a set of rules to guide her. "I would admit the addresses of no person who is not descended of pious and credible parents.

"Who has not the character of a strict moralist, just and honest. sober, temperate, just and honest.

"Diligent in his business, and prudent in matters. of a sweet and agreeable temper; for if he be owner of all the former good qualifications, and fails here, my life will be still uncomfortable."²

As, today, there were many satires on marriage, at the expense of the women. One poor, abject husband has left us a picture of marriage in "Benedict the Married Man", in which he blames all the evils of that state on to the woman who shared his lot. These give us many hints, but are not important enough to consider in detail.

There is on phase of the marriage question we must consider, and that is the irregular marriage conditions, and the punishment for the violation of the marriage vows. There seems to have been much irregularity throughout all the colonies. This is

¹Humphreys: C. Schuyler, p. 204.

²Trent: Rev. Literature, p. 95.

known more from the legal records than the source material. However, in the latter, evidence is found to indicate it was a constant matter for the magistrates. On the whole, the material and facts used in his part of the discussion of irregular marriage relations and social conditions, were taken from the records, largely supplemented by quotations from writings. In the South and middle colonies, the records alone are used, but in New England the source contains a few references.

The punishment for adultery and any irregularity was very severe -- death, whipping at the cart's tail and banishment, were the three more common methods. It is well to remember that in this discussion, we should be very lenient in our judgment. It is a common teaching, that the colonists were men and women whose lives were devoted to God, and who led, upright, blameless, lives. This was true of many, and men of the highest ideals lived in the colonies. But, when we study them closely we find them to be men and women only human, like all people. There were crimes and punishments then as now. And if we follow the records closely it seems as tho there were many, many crimes. But we must keep in mind the country was new and raw. Conditions were unsettled, society was in the making, there were no old, established traditions; the social life was crude, naturally, as is always found in a new country. Many persons were adventuresome, daring, bold, with little respect for law. It was a time when men's passions ran riot, and under pioneer conditions we always find the man and woman of the lower type. There were many, dissolute, reckless characters. Many of the imigrants were from the prisons and streets of London, a class of people, vicious and

criminal. A new country has ever proven a refuge for the lazy, the careless, the lawless, the thief -- and the colonies were not the exception. The indented classes often were largely made up of loose characters, both men and women from the dives and callers of London. In the south especially, where the caste lines were more rigid than farther north, the women of the indented class -- a few of them -- were immoral, or, if not actually immoral, rough and rude. Economic conditions were no doubt the reason for this. The women worked in the fields and plantations, subject to temptations, and the wiles of unscrupulous men. Their very position wondered them unsafe. They had little protection, or no one to fight their battles for them.

Both Sewall and Winthrop early record grave offences, and transgressions of the social laws. Winthrop records in 1643: "At this court of assistants one James Britton. . . and Mary Latham, a proper young woman about 18 years of age. . . were condemned to die for adultery, upon a law formerly made and published in print. . ."1

A year or two before this he records: "Another case fell out about Mr. Maverick of Nottles Island, who had been formerly fined £ 100 for giving entertainment to Mr. Owen and one Hale's wife, who had escaped out of prison, where they had been put for notorious suspicion of adultery." The editor adds, "Sarah Hales, the wife of William Hales, was censured for her miscarriage to be carried to the gallows with a rope about her neck, and to sit an hour upon the ladder; the rope's end flung over the gallows, and after to be banished."1

About 1632 a law was passed, punishing adulter by death, Winthrop says: "At the next court of assistants such an act was adopted, though it could not at first be enforced. . ."2

However, several women were punished by death in Massachusetts, and as late as Sewall's time he mentions the passing of the law and punishment for incest: "June 14, 1695: The Bill against Incest was passed with the Deputies, four and twenty Nos, and seven and twenty Yeas. The Ministers gave in their arguments yesterday, else it had hardly gon, because several have married their wives sisters, and the Deputies thought it hard to part them. 'twas concluded on the other hand, tht not to part them, were to make the

¹Winthrop: History of N. England, Vol. II, p. 190, p. 61.

²Ibid: Vol. I, p. 73.

Law abortive, by begetting in people a concept that such Marriages were not against the Law of God."¹

Punishment by death for adultery, as far as could be learned, from the source material seems to have been more common during the early days of Massachusetts. Sewall records cases of adulter, but not punishment by death. However, women were not excused for crimes punishable by death, and suffered the same as the men, therefore the evidence from Sewall indicates that this punishment by death for adultery, had ceased. It is not strange that the penalty was as severe, when we recall that the English law was in force throughout the colonies, and many crimes were punished in this manner. The hanging of women was not uncommon in England, and naturally as the English law prevailed in the colonies, it was not an unheard of thing in the new world.

"Thursday, June 8, 1663. Elisabeth Emerson of Haverhill and a negro woman were executed after Lecture, for murdering their infant children. . . ."2

"Monday, 7r. 11th. . . The Mother of a Bastard child condemn'd for murdering it. . ."3

"Sept. 25th 1691. Elisabeth Clements of Havarill is tried for murdering her two female bastard children. . ."4

"Friday, July 10th, 1685: . . . Mr. Stoughton also told me of George Car's wife being with child by another Man, tells the Father, Major Pike sends her down to Prison. Is the Governour's grandchild by his daughter Cotton. . ."5

From the records we learn: "In 1648 the Corte acquit Elisa: Pennion of the capitall offence charged upon her by 2 sevrall inditelements for adultery,' but sentence her to be 'whiped' in Boston, and again at 'Linn within one month'." Mass. Col. Rec. II,(243).

"On a special verdict by the jury the assistants sentenced Elizabeth Hudson and Bethia Bulloine (Bullen) 'married women and sisters,' to 'be by the Marshall Generall. . . on ye next lecture day presently after the lecture carried to the Gallowes & there by

¹Sewall's Diary, Vol. II, p. 407.

⁵Ibid: Vol. I, p. 87.

²Ibid: Vol. I, p. 379.

³Ibid: Vol. II, p. 288.

⁴Ibid: Vol. I, p. 349.

ye Executioner set on the ladder & with a roape about her neck to stand on the Gallowes on half hours & then brought. . . to the market place & be seriously whipt with tenn stripes or pay the Sume of tenn pounds' standing committed till the sentence be performed.'" (Mass. Early Court Files of Buffalok, Sept. 11, 1667, No. 821).¹

Sometimes, whipping was deemed not sufficient, and the culprit was ordered to distinguish himself by a mark, that his neighbors might keep in mind his sin. Wearing a halter about the neck was also ordered. All are familiar with the Salem manner of punishing, which Hawthorne in his greatest of novels has immortalized -- the scarlet letter. This was sometimes worn on the sleeve, the breast, and there are actual instances where a letter was burned on the flesth.

"In 1639 in Plymouth a woman was sentenced to 'be whipt at a cart taylor through the streets, and to 'weare a badge upon her left sleeue during her abod' within the government. If found at any time abroad without the badge, she was to be 'burned in the face wth a hott iron.'" (Plym. Col. Rec. I, 132.) "Two years later a man and a woman for the same offence (adultery) were severely whipped 'at the publik post' and condemned while in the colony to wear the letters AD 'upon the outside of their uppermost garment, in the most eminent place thereof.'" Ibid²

"The culprit is to be 'publickly set on the Gallows in the Day Time, with a Rope about his or her Neck, for the Space of One Hour; and on his or her Return from the Gallows to the Gaol, shall be publickly whipped on his or her naked back, not exceeding Thirty Stripes, and shall stand committed to the Gaol of the county wherein convicted, until he or she shall pay all Costs of Prosecution."³

"Mary Shaw the wife of Benjamin Shaw. . . being presented for having a child in September last, about five months after marriage, appeared and owned the same. . . Ordered that (she) . . . pay a fine of Forty Shillings. . . Costs . . . standing committed." (1721) Mss. Records of Court of Gen. Sessions of Buffolks. I, 234)⁴

"Under the 'seven months rule,' the culpable parents were forced to humble themselves before the whole congregation, or else expose their innocent child to the danger of eternal perdition."⁵

¹Howard: History of Matrimonial Institutions: p. 170. Vo. II

²Ibid: p. 172.

³Ibid:

⁴Ibid: p.187

⁵Ibid: p. 196.

Many other instances could be quoted from the records showing that in many cases the woman was severely fined or both fined and whipped, with her husband, when children were born before the duration of the natural time. Judging from the frequency this is given, it must have been very common. One of the reasons I believe for this, was the curious social custom known as "bundling". The night following the drawing up of the formal contract in which the dowery had been determined, and the financial conditions adjusted, the young people were allowed to retire to the same bed, without the removal of the clothing. This seems to have been an innocent custom, allowed by a simple-minded people, living under somewhat primitive conditions. Houses were small, there was but one large living room, many were too poor to afford candles only for necessity, and there was little chance for the lovers to meet alone. This practise was common only in New York, in Pennsylvania among the Dutch, and somewhat in Connecticut and around Cape Cod. While, innocency surrounded, yet it often led to evil followings. It is uncertain where the custom originated. The people of Connecticut insist that it was brought to them from Cape Cod, from the Dutch, and in return, the Dutch say, it came from Cape Cod. It seems strange, but adultery between espoused people was not punished so severely as when committed by people unengaged. Generally it was only half as severe. This, of course, placed a premium upon wrong doing.

One phase of immorality must be mentioned particularly among the women of the south. As mentioned, heretofore, there was a large element of roughness and coarseness among the indented

women. Aside from illicit relations between white women and white women, there was also this condition between white women and negroes. "It is no ground for surprise that in the seventeenth century there were instances of criminal intimacy between white women and negroes. Many of the former had only recently arrived from England, and were, therefore, comparatively free from the race prejudice that was so likely to develop upon close association with the African for a great length of time. The class of white women who were required to work in the fields belonged to the lowest rank in point of character, not having been born in Virginia and not having thus acquired from birth a repugnance to association with the Africans upon a footing of social equality, they yielded to the temptations of the situations in which they were placed. The offence, whether committed by a native or an imported white woman, was an act of personal degradation that was condemned by public sentiment with as much severity in the seventeenth century as at all subsequent periods. . ."¹

"A certain degree of liberty in the sexual relations of the female servants with the male, and even with their master, might have been expected, but there are numerous indications that the general sentiment of the Colony condemned it, and sought by appropriate legislation to restrain and prevent it.

". . . .If a woman gave birth to a bastard, the sheriff, as soon as he learned of the fact was required to arrest her, and whip her on the bare back until the blood came. Being turned over to her master, she was compelled to pay two thousand pounds of tobacco, or to remain in his employment two years after the termination of her indentures.

"If the bastard child to which the female servant gave birth was the offspring of a negro father, she was whipped unless the usual fine was paid, and immediately upon the expiration of her term, was sold by the wardens of the nearest church for a period of five years. . . The child was bound out until his or her thirtieth year had been reached."²

Revoltng as it seems to us, we know there must have been considerable of this -- illicit relations between negroes and white women, for in 1691, a law was passed in Virginia that

"Any white woman marrying a negro or mulatto, bond or free" should suffer perpetual banishment."³ (Hening, Vol. 2, p. 267)

Adultery was punished severely, but not by death as in New England. "By an order of the justices of Northampton in

¹Bruce: Economic History of Va. in the 17th Cent. Vol. I, p. 111

²Ibid: p. 34.

³J. Hopkins Studies, p. 472.

in 1648 an adulteress was dragged through the water behind a beat passing between two previously designated points."¹

"Edith Tooker, having been found guilty of bastardy, was ordered by the justices to appear in her parish church at the hour of divine service. Clothed in a white sheet, she was led in after the worshippers had taken their seats. . ."2

Whipping was the common mode of punishment of the woman when convicted of adultery.

That there were women of loose character in the colonies, and public houses is evident from the mention in the writings.

Josselyn writing in 1638 of New England, said "There are many strange women too, (in Solomon's sense). . ."3

The story of Phoebe Kelly, the mother of Madame Jumel, who became the second wife of Aaron Burr, is the story of a woman from the public resorts of Providence in 1772. "Again in 1785, another disorderly house, of which Roebe was an inmate, was broken up and she imprisoned. . . ."4

Benjamin Franklin in his writings, mentions women of loose character in Philadelphia, and, there is no doubt at all, but that they were found in all the cities of the colonies.

Just a mention of one thing, the immorality of the men. All the men were not immoral, but there was a greater freedom among men, and apparently little effort was made to keep this covered. Men, prominent in public life were the fathers of illegitimate children, accused of intrigues with women, and it was known by their wives, families, and friends, yet it seems to have been taken, largely as a matter of fact. Benjamin Franklin was the father of a natural son, whom he took into his home, and his wife accepted the fact. Alexander Hamilton, when his children were practically grown, was the center of a wretched scandal,

¹Bruce: Institutional History of Va. in 17th Cent., Vol. I, p. 28.

²Ibid: p. 45.

³Trent: Col. Lit. p. 69.

⁴Crawford: Romantic Days in the Early Republic, p. 111.

which was made public, and which seems not to have created a great storm; certainly nothing like that of the present time. This was due to the times, which allowed a man to do such things, and apparently public opinion did not censure him severely. How much the women were responsible for this conditions, it is impossible to say. . . .

The inhabitants of all the colonies believed firmly in bringing offenders before the Court, and offences which we now believe are either too trivial or too much of a private nature to be noticed and dragged into the lime-light, were then punished to the extent of the law -- and if the English law failed to make provision for every known happening that might occur to mortal man, it was because mortal man had never thought of it. Surely our forefathers loved to "law." And as noted in the punishment meted out to women guilty of adultery and promiscuous marriage relations, likewise, they were brot before the court, and severely punished. The fate of the women accused of witchcraft we have already noted. Gossip, slander, and tale-bearing seem to have been common cri es among the women, and rebellious speeches. The latter especially was com-
mon in New England, where women spoke against the authority of the church. "The lady moodye, a wise and anciently religious woman, being taken with the error of denying baptism to infants, was dealt withal by many of the elders, and others, and admonished by the church of Salem, . . . but persisting still, and to avoid further trouble, etc., she removed to the Dutch against the advice of all her friends. . . . She was after excommunicated."¹

Sometimes the meekness of the colonial woman became rather Amazonian in character: "Joan, wife of Obadiah Miller of Taunton, was presented for 'beating and reviling her husband, and

¹Winthrop: Hist. of N. Eng. Vol. II, p. 1148.

egging her children to help her, bidding them knock him in the head, and wishing his victuals might choake him.'" (Fly. Col. Rec. III, 75)¹

"In 1637 in Salem, 'Whereas Dorothy the wyfe of John Talbie hath not only broak that peace & loue, with ought to haue beene both betwixt them, but also hath violentlie broke the king's peace, by frequent laying hands upon hir husband to the danger of his life. . . . It is therefore ordered that for hir misdemeaner passed & for prvention of future evils that she shall be bound & chained to some post where shee shall be restrained of her libertye to goe abroad or comminge to hir husband till shee manefest some change of hir course. . . . Only it is permitted that shee shall come to the place of gods worshipp, to enjoy his ordenances.'" (Hist. Coll. Essex Inst. VII, 129, 187)²

Women also could appeal to the strong arm of the law against the wrath of their loving husbands: "In 1638 John Emerson of Scituate, was tried before the general court for abusing his wife; the same year for beating his wife, Henry Seawall was sent for examination before the court at Ipswich; and in 1663, Easigne John williams, of Barnstable, was fined by the Plymouth court for slandering his wife. . ."³

Josselyn records that in New England in 1638, "Scolds they gag and set them at their doors for certain hours, for all comers and goers by to gaze at. . ."⁴

In Virginia: ". . .A wife convicted of slander was to be carried to the ducking stool to be ducked unless her husband would consent to pay the fine imposed by law for the offense. . . . Some years after (1646) a woman residing in Northampton was punished for defamation by being condemned to stand at the door of her parish church, during the singin of the psalm, with a gag in her mouth. . . . Deborah Heighram. . . was, in 1654, not only required to ask pardon of the person she had slandered, but was mulcted to the extent of two thousand pounds of tobacco. Alice Spencer, for the same offence, was ordered to go to Mrs. Frances Yeardley's house and beg forgiveness of her; whilst Edward Hall, who had also slandered Mrs. Yeardley, was compelled to pay five thousand pounds of tobacco for the country's use, and to acknowledge in court that he had spoken falsely."⁵

In Virginia, both woman and men were fined and punished for bring the charge of witchcraft against women. Women were punished for other crimes, and there was little thought of allowing them to go unpunished because they were women.

¹Hammond, Hist of Matrimonial Inst., Vol. II, p. 161.

²Ibid

³Ibid

⁴

⁵Bruce - Inst. Hist. of Va. in 17th Cent. Vol. I, p. 51, 52

There are many instances in the lives of the colonial women of what we may term the initiative, or possibly we may call it the modern spirit. And yet, while it is probably akin to the spirit which has developed into the woman movement, yet it is a spirit which is not modern, but old as the race; found among women in all ages. Under this term will be given instances which do not properly belong to any of the divisions discussed. There has been a hint of this throughout the general discussion; women such as Anne Hutchinson, and many others, who refused to believe in the established order and protested against it, or forced, through circumstances, found it necessary to assume the initiative and accomplish those tasks which, ordinarily, were outside "woman's sphere." One writer speaking of Anne Hutchinson says: "The Massachusetts records say that Mrs. Anne Hutchinson was banished on account of her revolutions and excommunicated for a lie. They do not say that she was too brilliant, too ambitious, and too progressive for the ministers and magistrates of the colony. . . . and while it is only fair to the rulers of the colony to admit that any element of disturbance or sedition, at that time, was a menace to the welfare of the colony, and that. . . her voluble tongue was a dangerous one, it is certain that the ministers were jealous of her power and feared her leadership."¹

Some of the earliest examples of women breaking away from the traditions of the established customs were certain Quaker women, who came to Massachusetts to preach their belief. Sewall records:

"July 8, 1677. New Meeting House (the third, or South) Mane: In Sermon time there came in a female Quaker, in a Canvas Frock, her hair disshevelled and loose (like a Periwigg, her face as black as ink, led by two other Quakers, and two others followed. It occasioned the greatest and most amazing uproar that I ever saw."²

The good elders of these Puritan colonies suffered intently from the Quakers. Those were troublesome times. Between Anne

¹Dames and Daughters of Colonial Days, Brooks, p. 26.

²Sewall's Diary, Vol. I, p. 43.

Hutchinson and the Quakers they were harassed to distraction. And it was the women of the Quakers, who gave them much trouble. Mary Dyer, one of the followers of Anne Hutchinson, after being ordered from the colony, returned repeatedly, after being warned if she came back she would be put to death. She disregarded the injunction, and was sentenced, but the intercession of her husband saved her life, but she returned again, and the Puritan magistrates kept their word, and she was put to death, her husband and son being unable to save her. The Quakers were ill-treated by the people of Massachusetts; they were whipped, banished, disfigured by having their noses and ears cut off, and even put to death. But they were persistent; the women especially, dressed themselves in "sack-cloth and ashes", and did very unseemly things. Fiske gives as a reason for their persistency, the following: "The reasons for the persistent idea of the Quakers that they must live in Mass. was largely because, though tolerant of differences in doctrine, yet Quakerism had freed itself from Judaism as far as possible, while Puritanism was steeped in Judaism. The former attempted to separate church and state, while under the latter belief the two were synonymous. Therefore, the Quaker considered it his mission to overthrow the Puritan theocracy, and thus we find them insisting on returning though it meant death. It was a sacred duty, and it is to the glory of religious liberty that they succeeded."¹

It seems that women often took it upon themselves to interfere where the men were not successful. Sewall tells of this incident:

"June 22, 1688. . . This day, Mrs. Joyliff and Mrs. Grecian goe to his Excellency, and expostulat with Him about his design of meeting first on Sabbath-days in our Meeting house." After this visit of the good sisters, who paved the way, a delegation of men also waited upon his Excellency, and later, July 1, Sewall says:

"Governour takes his old time again after our coming out."²

The story is told of Lady Phips, the wife of the Governor,

¹Fiske: Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America, Vol. I, p. 112.

²Sewall's Diary, Vol. I, p. 217.

who took the responsibility of liberating a prisoner, charged with being a witch, from the jail. "Hutchinson gives a well-authenticated story that Lady Phips, . . . did a brave and generous act by signing a warrant for the discharge of a prisoner. The jailkeeper obeyed, and lost his place therefor, but he must have rejoiced afterwards at his costly error."¹

Women seem to have taken some part in industry, although this was not customary. Sewall records the incident of "April 4, 1690. . . . This day Mrs. Averys Shop. . . shut by reason of Goods in them Attached."²

Women kept ordinaries and taverns, especially in New England. In Baltimore, in the later eighteenth century, "the retail dry-goods business was mostly in the hands of widows or maiden ladies."³

We have noticed the mention by Franklin of the woman who conducted her husband's printing business, after his death, until the son was grown. He also gives this item: in a letter written to his wife May 27, 1757, just before his sailing for Europe. . . "Mr. Colden could not spare his Daughter, as she helps him in the Post-Office, he having no Clerk. . ."⁴

Mrs. Franklin seems to have conducted business affairs, during the absence of her husband. "June 4, 1765: "You mention the Payment of the 500 pounds, but do not say that you have got the Deeds executed. I suppose however, that it was done. . .

Again, "Enclos'd I send his note for a Guinea. I would have you ask for it. . ."⁵

From the testimony given by Sewall, we know that his children attended schools taught by women. "The pay of women teachers who taught the dame-schools was meagre in the extreme. . . .In 1641 a highly respected widow, one Mrs. Walker, kept a school in a room of her own house. . . .She received finally from the town one shilling and three pence for her pedagogical work. . . .Boston gentlewomen from very early days had a mode of eking out a limited income by taking little girls and young ladies from country homes, especially from the southern colonies and the Barbadoes, to board while they attendedclasses and recited to these teachers."⁶

¹Sewall's Diary, Eds. note. Vol. I, p. 359.

²Ibid: Vol. I, p. 317.

³Crawford: Romantic Days in the Early Republic, p. 244.

⁴Smyth: Writings of B. Franklin, Vol. III, p. 395.

⁵Vol. IV, p. 382.

⁶Earle: Child Life in Colonial Days, pp. 97, ff.

We have noted the writings of Anne Bradstreet. She was the first poet of New England, and her writings were highly praised. While her verses seem to us little better than doggerel, they are characteristic of the beliefs and creed of the Puritan. Nathaniel Ward was lavish in his praise of Mistress Bradstreet.

"Mercury show'd Apollo, Bartas' book,
Minerva this, and wish'd him well to look,
And tell uprightly, which did which excel:
He view'd and view'd and vow'd he could not tell.
They bid him hemisphere his mouldy nose,
with's crack'd leering glasses, for it would pose
The best brains he had in's old punnind-pan
Sex weigh'd, which best, the woman or the man?
He peer'd, and por'd, and glar'd, and said for wore,
I'm even as wise now, as I was before.
They both 'gan laugh, and said, it was no mar'l
The auth'ress was a right Du Bartas girl.
Good sooth, quoth the old Don, tell me ye so,
I muse whither at length these girls will go.
It half revives my chill forst-bitten blood,
To see a woman once do aught that's good;
And chode by Chaucer's boots and Homer's furs,
Let men look to't, lest women wear the spurs." (Italics mine)¹

In the South, it seems to have been rather a common circumstance for women to manage plantations. While probably not typical, for Eliza Pinckney, was more interested in planting than, no doubt, most of the women of the times, yet her letters show that she was a remarkable woman, and assumed the initiative in caring for her father's farms. She was a woman with a remarkable personality, executive ability, and force of character. A descendant writing her life says she has attempted to picture: "A woman of character and capacity, who in a private station, by her enterprize and perseverance, conferred a great benefit upon her adopted home. . ."²

As has been stated she was left in charge of the estate while her father, an officer of the army, was absent. She was about sixteen years of age at this time. Her letters to her father show

¹Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. I, p. 285.

²Ravenel: E. Pinckney, p. 2.

her interest in the plantation: "I wrote my father a very long letter . . . on the pains I had taken to bring the indigo, Ginger, Cotton, Lucern, and Cassada to perfection, and had greater hopes from the Indigo. . .

To her father: "The Cotton, Guiney corn and most of the Ginger planted here was outt off by a frost

"I wrote you in former letters we had a fine crop of Indigo Seed upon the ground and since informed you the frost took it before it was dry. I picked out the best of it and had it planted but there is not more than a hundred bushes of it come up, which proves the more unlucky as you have sent a man to make it.

In a letter to a friend she indicates how busy she is:

"In genl I rise at five o'clock in the morning, read till seven -- than take a walk in the garden or fields, see that the Servants are at their respective business, then to breakfast. The first hour after breakfast is spent in music, the next is constantly employed in recolecting something I have learned, . . . such as french and shorthand. After that I devote the rest of the time till I dress for dinner, to our little Polly, and two black girls, who I teach to read. . . . The first hour after dinner, as. . . after breakfast, at musick, the rest of the afternoon in needlework till candle light, and from that time to bed time read or write; ' . . .Thursday, the whole day except what the necessary affairs of the family take up, is spent in writing, either on the business of the plantations or on letters to my friends. . ."1

Apparently this girl, seemed to find time for the general activities of woman, aside from her plantation duties. After her marriage she had all her time to devote to her household, until, at the age of thirty-six, on the death of her husband, she was again forced to look after the work of the plantations. She did a great service to Carolina during the years before the war, in her interest in Indigo. She introduced it into the country, and it was through her efforts "that it continued the chief highland staple of the country for more than thirty years. . . Just before the Revolution the annual export amounted to the enormous quantity of one million, one hundred and seven thousands, six hundred and sixty pounds. When will any 'New Woman' do more for her country?"2

Martha Washington, after the death of her first husband, and before her marriage to George Washington, personally conducted the affairs of her large estate, and also, during the long absences

¹Ravenel: E. Pinckney, pp. 7, 9, 30.

²Ibid: p. 107.

of her husband, while she remained at Mount Vernon. Together, with Lund Washington, she looked after the business the great plantation.

Just how much legal power women had, is difficult to learn from the writings. And since this study does not include the legal records, this phase of the power of the colonial women is incomplete. Until the adoption of the Constitution, the English law prevailed, and unmarried women could make deeds, wills, etc., but the identity of the married woman was largely merged in that of her husband. One or two hints remain. In 1793 John Todd, left the following statement

in his will: "I give and devise all my estate, real and personal to the Dear Wife of my Bosom, and first and only Woman upon whom my all and only affections were placed, Dolly Payne Todd, her heirs and assigns forever. . . Having a great opinion of the integrity and honourable conduct of Edward Burd and Edward Tilghman, Esquires, my dying request is that they will give such advice and assistance to my dear Wife as they shall think prudent with respect to the management and disposal of my very small Estate. . . . I appoint my dear Wife executrix of this my will. . ."1

Samuel Peters, writing in 1781 of Connecticut, mentions

this incident: "In 1740, Mrs. Cursette, an English lady, travelling from New York to Boston, was obliged to stay some days at Hebron; where, seeing the church not finished, and the people suffering great persecutions, she told them to persevere in their good work, and she would send them a present when she got to Boston. Soon after her arrival there, Mrs. Cursette fell sick and died. In her will she gave a legacy of 300 £ old tenor. . . to the church of England in Hebron; and appointed John Hancock, Esq. and Nathaniel Glover, her executors. Glover was also her residuary legatee. The will was obliged to be recorded in Windham county, because some of Mrs. Cursette's lands lay there. Glover sent the will by Deacon S. H -- of Canterbury, ordering him to get it recorded and keep it private, lest the legacy should build up the church. The Deacon and Register were faithful to their trust, and kept Glover's secret twenty-five years. At length the Deacon was taken ill, and his life was supposed in great danger. . . . The secret was disclosed."2

In the early days of the settlement of the colony, the women were granted lots, and grants of land, as the men.

The story of one woman of colonial days -- Margaret Brent of Maryland -- is interesting. She was indeed a woman as energetic

¹Goodwin: Dolly Madison, p. 46.

²Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. III, p. 210.

and forceful as any one of modern times. Born in England she came to Maryland in 1638, four years after the founding of the colony. Conditions were new, there were hardships, but this woman seems to have overcome them all. Indeed she was certainly the equal of any suffragist of today. "Margaret became as wise as her brothers, or even wiser, in the intricacies of the English law ruling estates and decedents. We hear of her registering cattle marks, buying and selling property, and signing herself "Attorney for my brother."¹

Her friendship with the Governor was close, and on his death-bed "his eyes rested upon Margaret Brent, perhaps with love, at least in the confidence and admiration. There was no one in the colony so wise, so able, so loyal as she. Leonard Calvert had always known that. Pointing to her so that all might see and understand, he made the will that has come down to us as the shortest one on record. 'I make you my sole executrix,' he said; 'take all and pay all.' After he had spoken these words of laconic instruction, he asked that all would leave him 'except Mistress Margaret.'"

"We cannot know what passed between Leonard Calvert and Margaret Brent in their last interview. . .Margaret never told."²

She conducted the affairs of the deceased governor, paying out moneys, looking after the estate, and no one questioned her ability. The people of Maryland loved and respected her, and only once did they refuse her request. "On the strength of her own assertions she decided that she had as good a claim as any one to a voice and a seat in the General assembly. Leonard Calvert in his lifetime, as Lord Baltimore's attorney, had the right to vote. . . and now since Leonard Calvert was dead, and she had succeeded as his lordship's attorney, it was only fair that the right to vote should pass on to her.

"Her astonishing stand for woman's rights was made on the twenty-first of January, 1648. . . When her opportunity came, she rose and put forward, for the first time in America, the claim of a woman's right to sit and vote in a legislative assembly." . . . There were some among them (the planters) who, moved by her forcible, persuasive eloquence, would have been willing to grant her request."³

But the Governor, who was weak and a poor ruler, suddenly became active. She was his most dangerous rival, and he feared her. Her next step, probably would be to want to be governor, and he knew

¹Brooks: Colonial Dames and Daughters, p. 62.

²Ibid: p. 64.

³Ibid: p. 66, ff.

if this was he would have little show against her. So the Governor refused. He remembered those whispers through the colony that she would make a better governor than himself. She protested, but to no avail. It was the only time she had been refused her desire by the people. She remained a maiden lady, to the end of her days, a capable, energetic woman, loved by the people, though she did believe in "woman's rights."

One incident that has come down to us of those far-away times. This was the time when the women fortified Boston Neck. The story is told by Benjamin Tompson:

(1675)

"A grand attempt some Amazonian Dames
Contrive whereby to glorify their names.
A ruff for Boston Neck of mud and turfe,
Reaching from side to side, from surf to surf,
Their nimble hands spin up like Christmas pyes,
Their pastry by degrees on high doth rise.
The wheel at home counts in an holiday,
Since while the mistress worketh it may play.
A tribe of female hands, but manly hearts,
Forsake at home their pastry crust and tarts,
To kneed the dirt, the samplers down they hurl
Their undulating silks they closely furl.
The pick-axe one as a commandress holds,
While t~~t~~other at her awk'ness gently scolds.
One puffs and sweat, the other mutters why
cant you promove your work so fast as I?
Some dig, some delve, and others' hands do feel
The little wagon's weight with single wheel.
And least some fainting-fits the weak surprize,
They want no sack nor cakes, they are more wise.
....."1

St. John De Crevecoeur in 1782 wrote an account of the women of Nantucket, their business ability, and their care of the family matters in the absence of their husbands. He says in part: "As the sea excursions are often very long, their wives in their absence are necessarily obliged to transact business, to set-

¹Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. II, p. 33.

tle accounts, and, in short, to rule and provide for their families. These circumstances, being often repeated, give women the abilities as well as a taste for that kind of superintendency to which, by their prudence and good management, they seem to be in general very equal. This employment ripens their judgment, and justly entitles them to a rank superior to that of other wives; . . . The men at their return, weary with the fatigues of the sea . . . cheerfully give their consent to every transaction that has happened during their absence, and all is joy and peace. 'Wife, thee hast done well,' is the general approbation they receive, for their application and industry. . ."

" . . . But you must not imagine from this account that the Nantucket wives are turbulent, of high temper, and difficult to be ruled; on the contrary, the wives of Sherburn, in so doing, comply only with the prevailing custom of the island: the husbands, equally submissive to the ancient and respectable manners of their country, submit, without ever suspecting that there can be any impropriety. . . . The richest person now in the island owes all his present prosperity and success to the ingenuity of his wife: . . . for while he was performing his first cruises, she traded with pins and needles, and kept a school. Afterward she purchased more considerable articles which she sold with so much judgment, that she laid the foundation of a system of business, that she has ever since prosecuted with equal dexterity and success. . . ."¹

There is one phase of the life of the colonial woman of the later eighteenth century which is very important -- her part in the war. There had been Indian raids and wars during the greater part of that century, but it was the war for freedom which touched most deeply her life. No one will ever know how far the success of the war depended on these women. But the aid they gave in their skillful management of affairs, at home, during the absence of their husbands, in their love and trust, their confidence in the men, their sympathy and kindness, played its part. The women were loyal and did everything in their power. The wives of the patriots were deeply interested in the cause, and their letters indicate as high a degree of intelligence and comprehension as the men. They do not read any differently from those penned by the men. Nor do they read like the written by the woman, who fainted when she saw a mouse. They were written by

¹Stedman & Hutchinson, Vol. III, p. 144/ ff.

women, strong, energetic, self-reliant, tender and loving.

The men of the Revolutionary days have been lauded for their bravery, courage, and patriotism amid those dark days. Nor do we wish to detract any from the highest estimate of that courage. But let us not forget the women. For their task is always the most difficult. It takes bravery and courage for men to march away from loved ones, leaving them to an unknown fate, and to cheerfully face death on the battle field. But it takes equal courage to remain at home, alone, with the little ones, writing, watching, hearing no news for long intervals, afraid to hear what the outcome may be. And news travelled slowly in those days -- no telegraph, railroad or postal service, only letters carried by friends, or scraps of news which an occasional traveller might bring. There were months when the anxious wife did not hear. We have noted in the letters of Mrs. Adams, there were periods of over three months, when she did not hear from her husband. In 1774, when John Adams was in Philadelphia, only a few miles away -- as we today think, when it takes but a few hours by rail to make the trip from Boston to the Quaker city -- she writes: "Five weeks have passed and not one line have I received. I would rather give a dollar for a letter by the post, though the consequence should be, that I ate but one meal a day these three weeks to come. . . ."1

These women faced actual danger: they were often near the firing line.. John Quincey Adams says of his mother: "For the space of twelve months my mother with her infant children dwelt, liable every hour of the day and of the night to be butchered in cold blood, or taken and carried into Boston as hostages. My mother lived in unintermitted danger of being consumed with them all in a conflagration kindled by a torch in the same hands which on the seventeenth of June (1775) lighted the fires of Charlestown. I saw with my own eyes those fires, and heard Britannia's thunders in the Battle of Bunker Hill, and witnessed the tears of my mother and mingled them with my own. . . ."2 in 1777, so anxious was the mother for news of her husband, that John Quincy became 'post rider' for her between Train-

¹Letters of A. Adams, p. 15.

²Earle: Child Life in Colonial Days, p. 171

tree and Boston, eleven miles, -- not a light or easy "task, for the nine-year-old boy with the unsettled roads and unsettled times."

Martha Washington was in constant danger for some time, and her friends feared for her safety, as Lord Dunmore was quite capable of capturing the wife of the "rebel" Chief, and holding her as a hostage. The General was anxious about her, and Mr. Mason writing to him said:

"I sent my family many miles back in the country, and advised Mrs. Washington to do likewise, as a prudential movement. At first she said 'No; I will not desert my post;' but she finally did so with relectance, rode only a few miles, and plucky little woman as she is, stayed away only one night."¹

During the later days of the war there was much suffering on the part of the women. This was especially true in the South where the British had overrun the country, destroying property, seizing food and supplies. In 1779, Mrs. Pinckney wrote to her son, who had written her that Provost, the British general had marched through the country and destroyed the plantation where the family treasures had been stored for safety -- everything had been burned -- "My Dear Tomm: I have just received your letter with the account of my losses, and your almost ruined fortunes by the enemy. A severe blow! but I feel not for myself, but for you. . . . Your Brother's timely generous offer, to divide what little remains to him among us, is worthy of him. . ."

Mrs. Pinckney suffered severely in a financial loss.

She writes in 1870: "I am sorry I am under a necessity to send this unaccompanied with the amount of my account due to you. It may seem strange that single woman, accused of no crime, who had a fortune to live Genteely in any part of the world, that fortune too in different kinds of property, and in four or five different parts of the country, should in so short a time be so entirely deprived of it as not to be able to pay a debt under sixty pound sterling, but such is my singular case. After the many losses I have met with, for the last three or four desolating years from fire and plunder, both in Country and Town, I still had something to subsist upon, but alas the hand of power has deprived me of the greatest part of that, and accident of the rest. . ."²

Those were stirring times; and women were often called upon in cases of emergency, to face danger. Several stories have come

¹Whartop: M. Washington, p. 90.

²Ravenel: Pinckney, p. 265, 301.

to us of the courage and bravery of the women. In the south, especially were the women forced to appear at balls, to entertain the British officers, to act as hostess, and as they were entirely powerless at the hands of the unscrupulous soldiers, there was nothing to do. The story is told of Mrs. Herry, daughter of Eliza Pinckney, that one evening Marion, the "swamp fox" came to the house, late, weary and tired. She prepared a meal, but he fell asleep in his chair. Suddenly the sound of soldiers was heard. She awakened him told him to follow the path from the back door to the river, swim to the island, and she would meet the soldiers. She opened the door, meeting Tarleton, who searched the house ate the supper, and carried off several fine books and other valuables, but did not find Marion. One other occasion, when all the Pinckney family (the women) were here, far away from another settlement, on the plantation, the house full of people, little Harriott, who was sleeping in the same room with her grandmother, Eliza Pinckney, was suddenly awakened, late at night, by the opening of the door, and a beautiful girl rushed into the room crying. 'Oh, Mrs. Pinckney, save me, save me. The British are coming after me.' "The old lady stepped from the bed, and pushing the girl under her own bed-clothes, said, 'Lie there and no man will dare to trouble you,' and 'such was the power of her presence, that those ruffians shrank abashed before her and offered no further insult.'"¹

There are many other stories -- Molly Stark -- Temperance Wicke, and others, but more are not necessary. What general, even the commander-in chief, could have written braver words than these: "All domestic pleasures and enjoyments are absorbed in the great and important duty you owe your country, 'for our country is, as it were, a secondary god, and the first and greatest parent. It is to be preferred to parents, wives, children, friends, and all things, the Gods only excepted, for if our country perishes, it is impossible to save an individual, as to preserve one of the fingers of mortified hand.'"²

She was literally in the midst of battles: "I went to bed about twelve, and rose again a little after one. I could no more sleep, than if I had been in the engagement; the rattling of the windows, the jar of the house, the continual roar of twenty-four

¹Ravenel: E. Pinckney, p. 300.

²Letters of A. Adams, p. 74.

pounders; and the bursting of shells, give us such ideas, and realize a scene to us of which we could form scarcely any conception."¹

Possibly the faith and confidence of these women inspired and helped these men, when it seemed useless to fight on. Martha's words: "I hope you will all stand firm -- I know George will", and A. Adams writing: ". . . And though I have been called to sacrifice to my country, I can glory in my sacrifice and derive pleasure from my intimate connexion with one, who is esteemed worthy of the important trust devolved upon him", may have cheered these men -- who knows -- more than we know.

John Adams fully appreciated his wife's efforts, her years of struggle on the farm to feed and clothe her children, while he was away looking after the affairs of the nation, for he writes her: "You are really brave, my dear. You are a heroine and you have reason to be. For the worst that can happen can do you no harm. A soul as pure, as benevolent, as virtuous, and pious as yours has nothing to fear but everything to hope from last of human evils."²

Mercy Warren was another woman who was intensely interested in the war. She could ridicule her sex in her "Woman's Trifling Needs", by enumerating dozens and dozens of things women must have, but when the hour came, she remained alone, and sent her husband away to fight, so did many others. And after the war, her history of those stirring times, shows the initiative spirit in this tireless woman.

Catherine Schuyler was one other woman, whose life the was touched deeply. A bride of a week, she saw her husband leave her in the terrible Indian wars, and he was absent many times after. From her girlhood to her old age she was surrounded by war. One incident in her life illustrates well her courage. The entire country had been aroused by the murder of Jane McCrea shortly after the battle of Saratoga. The country was aroused, and knew the meaning. Women and children fled, to the towns, having no protectors at home. The army, with the British, Tories and Indians were coming. Everything possible, must be done to prevent them. The country home of the Schuylers, lay in the path of the enemy. Here were many family treasures, dear to

¹Letters of A. Adams, p. 9 - 222 - 2 Brooks: Colonial Dames, p. 187

her woman's heart, and she determined to rescue these. She met, all along the way, fugitives, who appealed to her to turn back, as she had but one armed guard with her. But she pressed on. It was midsummer, and the great fields of grain around the country home were ripe for the harvest. "General Schuyler had warned her not to allow anything of value to fall into the hands of the British troops. She determined to fire the fields. Taking with her a negro to wield the torch, she descended to the flats below. Here the black's courage failed him. 'Very well, if you will not do it, I must do it myself! . . . She flung the blazing torches right and left among the grain, and the labor of months was destroyed. With her valuables Mrs. Schuyler retook her Journey, and arrived safely at Albany. . . ."¹

The evening before the battle of Saratoga Burgoyne and his officers occupied this country home of the Schuylers, making merry over their wine. The next day the house was burned by the British commander. A few days later Burgoyne found himself defeated, and a guest in the Schuyler home in Albany. He was given the following testimony: "I expressed my regret (to General Schuyler for the unnecessary burning of his home near Albany) at the event which had happened, and the reasons which had occasioned it. He desired me to think no more about it; said the occasion justified it, according to the rules and principles of war and he should have done the same."

Chastellux says: "Burgoyne was extremely well received by Mrs. Schuyler and her little family. He was lodged in the best apartment in the house. An excellent supper was served him in the evening, the honors of which were done with so much grace, that he was affected even to tears, and could not help saying with a deep sigh, 'Indeed this is doing too much for a man who has ravaged their lands, and burnt their home.'"²

Surely this was returning good for evil. All during this stay here, with his staff of twenty, he was treated with the greatest courtesy by Catherine Schuyler, and no finer testimony of the tact and inherent courtesy of any woman of those times has come down to us.

¹Humphreys: C. Schuyler, p. 153, ff.

²Ibid: pp. 159 - 162.

In conclusion, this incomplete study of the status of the colonial woman shows us she was not meek and down-trodden in the sense that man tyrannized over her. On the other hand, she was held in high respect by the men of that time. Although, taking little active part in affairs outside the home, this was due to the times and conditions, rather than the fact that she wished to, and was prevented. She did not care to be active outside the home-circle in industry, for she was busy with the home life. When she did wish to take part in outside happenings, she appears to have done so.

Her education was that for a home life -- how to conduct the household -- the care and supervision of a home -- a little knowledge of arithmetic, how to read and write, and spell, some times music, dancing, French, needlework, and above all, the art of being graceful, and charming as her position of hostess demanded this. The latter was true of only the women of the leisure classes. She was trained to be a skillful housekeeper, a skilled needlewoman, and above all, a home maker.

She was sensible, practical, doing her duty, loving her husband, and children, with the inconsistency that ever marks woman, loving the little vanities of dress, fitting herself to her surroundings, making herself as beautiful as possible, attracting men -- the same lovable, adorable, strange, incomprehensible being to man she has always been, and ever will be. She too, as she has ever done puzzled the man, but, yet, while unable to understand her loved her, and could not do without her.

In the home she held the love and respect of her husband

and children. When necessary she assumed the initiative -- when burdened with responsibilities, she met them and did not fail. Her opinion was valued; her advice sought, her influence over her children, marked. Much of the training of the children was in her hands. The care of her children weighed heavily upon her, and her constant thought was to teach them to be good men and women. She was loving, patient, and, -- a mother. She did not let the care of her children pass into the hands of paid domestics. She had no other duties more important than their welfare.

To her husband she was a companion, a helpmeet, in every sense a wife, with the full meaning of the word.

She loved deeply and long, through many years of married life, with heavy burden, and many children, and when her duty was finished, she passed on, mourned by her loved ones.

There were women who sinned then as now, and who suffered the severe penalties of the law. There was less intolerance and sympathy then as now, and conditions were harsh. There was little pity for the offender. For petty and serious crimes, women were dragged into the courts, and given the most humiliating of punishments.

All the women of the colonies were not women with high ideals. There were those, who had had less love, and the lack of clean environment, who were coarse and rough. But the majority of the women were clean, gracious, loving women, who realized the great privilege of being a woman, and did the best they knew.

Physically the lot of the colonial was hard. With

arduous home duties, at a time when little attention was given to the lightening of the woman's burdens, the mother of many children, she labored long and patiently, doing all she could.

While taught obedience to her parents, and while respectful to her elders, she was allowed much freedom in important questions as marriage, the care of her children, etc.

The life of the Puritan woman was saddened by her religion, but with the passing of years this harshness was softened.

She was not allowed the social freedom as now. She was somewhat carefully guarded and protected -- especially the women of the leisure class -- most of the business was transacted by the men. She was far less independent economically than her sister of today. Her place in industry was slight. She could not write a check, but she could keep a home, and which is better? But despite these differences, she was the same as her sister of today in her characteristics and traits, -- inherently the same "eternal feminine" note was there.

Economical conditions have played a great part during the past century in freeing woman from the drudgery of household work, and giving her more time for leisure. But the colonial woman despite these handicaps, seems to have been happy, and secured much enjoyment from life. If it seems, that the home has been emphasized in this discussion, it is because that phase was the most important one of her life; she was, first, and foremost, essentially a homemaker, who lived, loved and sorrowed the same, then as now. Held in great respect by her husband, she was sheltered in the home,

busy with her household duties, and her care as a mother, but when the occasion demanded, she could and did faithfully and ably look after those things, ordinarily not included among her duties.

Let us pay her this tribute, that she was patient, lovable, kind, sympathetic, practical, inconsistent, and as always -- a mystery.