



RHODE ISLAND HISTORY

VOL. 21, NO. 4

OCTOBER, 1962

PUBLISHED BY THE RHODE ISLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY
52 POWER STREET, PROVIDENCE 6, RHODE ISLAND

CLARENCE E. SHERMAN, *President*
FRANK L. HINGKLEY, JR., *Secretary*

NATHANIEL M. VOSE, JR., *Treasurer*
CLIFFORD P. MONAHAN, *Director*

CLARKSON A. COLLINS, 3RD, *Librarian*
*The Rhode Island Historical Society assumes no responsibility
for the statements or the opinions of contributors.*

ISSUED QUARTERLY AT PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND
(Second-class postage paid at Providence, Rhode Island)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
FRANCIS WAYLAND: POLITICAL ECONOMIST AS EDUCATOR	105
by Theodore R. Crane [concluded from July, 1962, v. 21, no. 2, p. 90]	
JOHN SMITH, THE MILLER, OF PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND SOME OF HIS DESCENDANTS	124
by Charles William Farnham [continued from July, 1962, v. 21, no. 3, inside back cover]	
CAPTAINS CAROUSING IN PROVIDENCE	136
by Clarkson A. Collins, 3rd	
NEW MEMBERS	Back Cover

COVER

THE OLD COLONY HOUSE, NEWPORT

Photograph by John T. Hopf

The Old Colony House in Newport, which served as one of Rhode Island's capitol buildings from 1742 to 1900, was formally designated a National Historic Landmark by the Historic Sites Division of the National Parks Service on August 31 of this year.

The building, in the tradition of Christopher Wren, is an outstanding example of the colonial interpretation of English baroque architecture. It was designed by Richard Munday, who also drew up the plans for Trinity Church (Newport). Probably he alone is responsible for the many buildings of architectural merit in Newport at this period. Construction began in 1739, and it is thought that the structure is the second oldest capitol building still standing in this country.

RHODE ISLAND HISTORY

VOL. 21

OCTOBER, 1962

NO. 4

FRANCIS WAYLAND: POLITICAL ECONOMIST AS EDUCATOR

by THEODORE R. CRANE

Department of History, University of Denver

[concluded from July, 1962, p. 90]

V

In the fall of 1840 President Wayland departed on a six-months tour abroad to observe educational institutions and practices. During his travels he visited Oxford and Cambridge, University College, London, the schools and universities of Edinburgh and Glasgow, and Thomas Arnold's school at Rugby. His health was poor during much of his journey; he was homesick and out of sympathy both with high-church Anglicanism and with the intolerant abolitionism of many of the Dissenters whom he met.⁹⁶ His moodiness affected his opinion of British society, though he came to England with a genuine attachment to his parents' homeland. "All I see renders me more doggedly a Democrat and a Puritan," he declared while abroad.⁹⁷ "Our country, bad as it may be, is simple, virtuous, moral, and religious, in comparison with other countries."⁹⁸ This attitude was reflected in his reaction to educational institutions. He respected Thomas Arnold as a great Christian and master teacher, and admired some features of Scotch

⁹⁶Excerpts from Wayland's journal during his travels are in Francis Wayland and H. L. Wayland, *A Memoir of the Life and Labors of Francis Wayland, D.D., LL.D., Late President of Brown University, Including Selections from His Personal Reminiscences and Correspondence. By His Sons* (2 vols.; New York: Sheldon and Company, 1867), II, 8-42 (hereafter cited as *Memoir*). Wayland was in Paris and vicinity from approximately December 10, 1840, to January 14, 1841, but his impressions of France were entirely negative.

⁹⁷Wayland's journal (January 26, 1841), in *Memoir*, II, 27.

⁹⁸Francis Wayland to Heman Lincoln, February 2, 1841 (excerpt in *Memoir*, II, 21-22). (Unless otherwise indicated all unpublished materials cited are in Brown University Library.)

education.⁹⁹ The English universities, however, he viewed critically. Of Oxford he wrote:

Its buildings are magnificent, the surroundings beautiful beyond description. Its foundations are princely. . . . But . . . this was designed to promote the prosecution of science and the advancement of learning, and not for the cultivation of luxurious ease; . . . it was for the education of the people of England, and not a part of them, and . . . it is now used for the good of a part, and is the avenue to all social and professional standing. . . . It seems to me a monstrous perversion.¹⁰⁰

Unquestionably Wayland's trip influenced his later proposals for educational reform, but its direct contribution should not be overrated.¹⁰¹ He did not propose the wholesale importation of British practices; instead he returned convinced

that the system of New England colleges is not only better adapted to meet the wants of our country but also more perfect in itself than either that of England or Scotland. It secures a greater amount of division of labor. It combines the benefits of recitation with those of teaching by lecture. It unites all the officers more perfectly in the labor of discipline and government as well as of scientific instruction. In these respects it has the advantage over those of the older Institutions of Europe. What we need therefore is not so much a change of system as a more perfect development of the system which we have adopted.¹⁰²

His observations abroad had supplied him with new illustrations of genuinely thorough instruction, just as he had been equipped to begin his duties at Brown in 1827 by his acquaintance with George Ticknor's Harvard and his experience at Union College. More important,

⁹⁹[Francis Wayland], Review of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D.*, *North American Review*, LIX (October, 1844), 411; Francis Wayland, *Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System in the United States* (Boston: Gould, Kendall and Lincoln, 1842), 126.

¹⁰⁰Excerpt from Wayland's journal in *Memoir*, I, 41; see also *Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System*, 129-130.

¹⁰¹Walter C. Bronson, *The History of Brown University, 1764-1914* (Providence: Published by the University, 1914), 274, states that Wayland's interest in collegiate reform was not evident until after his trip abroad. This was James Burrill Angell's opinion (see Bronson, Notes of My Talk with President Angell, November 12, 1910). Donald Fleming, *Science and Technology in Providence, 1760-1914. An Essay in the History of Brown University in the Metropolitan Community* (*Brown University Papers*, XXVI; Providence, 1952), 37 and 39, endorses this interpretation in unqualified terms.

¹⁰²Francis Wayland, Report to the Corporation, September 1, 1841.

however, was his unfavorable reaction to English society, with its rigid respect for precedent, privileged aristocracy, established church, and vast gulf between classes.¹⁰³ Returning home, more than ever committed to middle-class democracy and evangelical Protestantism, he reaffirmed with new urgency his early conviction that American education must serve the needs of the masses. Observing the close articulation between the English educational system and the elite groups of British cultural, social, and political life, he was aware that the United States had "nothing that bears even the shadow of a resemblance" to this.¹⁰⁴ Was it not time, then, for Americans to modify educational institutions originally designed for the aristocratic society of the Old World? Popularization of the college course, which he had hoped to undertake at Brown in 1827, should be postponed no longer.

After 1841 Francis Wayland became a "Dorr in the literary camp of New England,"¹⁰⁵ openly critical of many features of American higher education. Though other Eastern college presidents disagreed with him, his opinions carried weight throughout the country, for his textbooks were widely used and his leading position in the Baptist denomination enhanced his authority. In addition his critique struck a popular and potentially destructive note in the age of Jackson. There were several paradoxical features in Wayland's position. Though he gave new emphasis to popularizing collegiate education, he fully intended to retain and improve the traditional liberal arts course in an expanded curriculum. He no more desired in the forties to destroy what he had accomplished at Brown during the previous decade than he expected in 1827 to end medical instruction permanently or alienate the college from the Rhode Island community. Nor did he relish the role of controversialist. His charges were sweeping, but his tone was diffident.

Wayland's campaign for collegiate reform was affected by Brown University's financial difficulties. Student numbers ceased to increase in 1837. As late as 1839 the president expected that enrollment would still increase, but on the eve of his trip abroad he betrayed some alarm. He gave only passing attention to the national depression

¹⁰³See especially Wayland's journal in *Memoir*, II, 10.

¹⁰⁴*Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System*, 40.

¹⁰⁵Francis Wayland to Rufus Anderson, August 31, 1842, American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions Papers, Harvard College Library (excerpt in *Memoir*, II, 69-70).

as a basic cause of the decline; his main concern was that the college had lost reputation because of some internal deficiency.¹⁰⁶ As long as the situation did not reach critical proportions, a certain stringency might have a tonic effect. "We here have a tolerable college," he wrote in 1838, "not actually starved but in salutary fear of starvation."¹⁰⁷

Brown University's troubles during the ensuing decade were due to the Panic of 1837 and its aftermath, which led to a period of contraction for colleges as well as for theological seminaries, foreign missions, and ministerial aid funds.¹⁰⁸ To Wayland the depression was a moral crisis, more crucial as a test for individuals than for institutions. In 1837 he had urged his countrymen to abandon speculative practices which violated the laws of morals and economics and turn to piety, humility and benevolence. A man's only true riches, he declared, were "skill, and industry, and character, and talent."¹⁰⁹ For a college as for an individual, he felt, these qualities were more important than material wealth.

Under the president's prodding in 1841 the Brown Corporation considered sweeping curricular and disciplinary reforms. Ideally, Wayland insisted, a college should "furnish means for the most perfect development of the intellectual treasures of the country," by providing advanced education of high quality for all who could profit by it.¹¹⁰ This would necessitate elimination of the prescribed four-year course so that students might choose subjects suitable to their needs.¹¹¹

Wherever there exists any considerable demand for instruction in any branch of useful study, this constitutes a reason why such

¹⁰⁶Francis Wayland, Report to the Corporation, September 4, 1839; Francis Wayland to Ebenezer Thresher, May 7, 1840; Francis Wayland to Basil Manly, May 13, 1840.

¹⁰⁷Francis Wayland to Basil Manly, January 16, 1838.

¹⁰⁸See data on college enrollments in *The American Almanac and Repository of Useful Knowledge* (Boston: various publishers, 1838-1851); *Twenty-Seventh . . . Annual Report of the Directors of the Northern Baptist Education Society* (Boston: Printed by John Putnam, 1842), 6-8.

¹⁰⁹Francis Wayland, *The Moral Law of Accumulation; the Substance of Two Discourses Delivered in the First Baptist Meeting House, Providence, May 14, 1837*. (2d ed.; Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln, 1837), 29.

¹¹⁰*Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System*, 47-48, 76-77.

¹¹¹Francis Wayland, Report of Committee appointed by the Board of Fellows to take into consideration the communication of the President on the subject of the course of studies & discipline in the University, December 20, 1841; *Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System*, 153, 155-157.

study should be taught in such an institution. It must however be always understood that no class of the community can reasonably claim a right to exclude any particular branch of instruction.¹¹²

There was no more possibility of drastic change at Brown in 1841 than in 1827, however. Wayland did not abandon ship but was willing to accept various pedagogical improvements¹¹³ while continuing to urge that the curriculum be broadened. In 1842 he published his *Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System in the United States*, setting forth the results of his reflections since 1827 and the substance of the reports he had prepared for Corporation consideration since his return from England.

This little treatise is a mine of information about the deficiencies of the pre-Civil War American college and an essential source for understanding Wayland's educational reforms. It reveals his commitment to thorough teaching and democratic opportunity in education, his wide acquaintance with American collegiate practices, and the results of his observations in Great Britain. Every section reflects his dedication to duty and hatred of idleness and complacency in trustees, faculty, and students. It also suggests Wayland's most serious deficiencies as an educator. He viewed the functions of a college too narrowly in terms of his own belief in the prime importance of individual responsibility and moral improvement, and said nothing about the inherent value of liberal learning. In summarizing the possibilities for basic institutional reform, after listing several radical changes, he made no commitment to any of them. The existing course, he believed, might be narrowed, so that each subject could be taught more thoroughly, or lengthened, to allow sufficient time for students to master both the classical languages and the newer sciences. Another alternative would be to create true universities, embracing professional schools, offering a choice of courses for the bachelor's degree, and conferring the Master of Arts as an earned degree.¹¹⁴ If popular

¹¹²Francis Wayland, Report of Committee appointed [by the] . . . Board of Fellows to revise the present course of College studies . . . September, 1842. This is a restatement of the "principle of equity" set forth in Wayland's 1828 Providence school report.

¹¹³After the departure of Romeo Elton in 1843, James Robinson Boise (class of 1840) was appointed to teach Greek and John Larkin Lincoln (class of 1836) to teach Latin. Admissions requirements were stiffened in 1842, and beginning the same year faculty members were required to submit annual written reports on their duties to the Corporation.

¹¹⁴*Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System*, 108-111.

enlightenment were a principal objective, colleges might turn themselves into Lowell Institutes.¹¹⁵ Any of these changes, Wayland indicated, would be "preferable to our present system," but he made no choice himself.¹¹⁶ Nor had he clarified his priorities by 1850, when his reform proposals sought to achieve all these objectives at once.

From 1842 to 1850 Brown University's survival was in jeopardy. To most of her supporters the fate of an historic institution was involved, but Wayland was more concerned with the challenge to his own moral and economic principles. As a result there arose the most important controversies of his presidency. Brunonians concerned for institutional survival insisted that the obvious course was to raise funds for student aid or endowment to guarantee faculty salaries. The former alternative had greater appeal to clerical trustees concerned with ministerial education. To Wayland such funds were morally perilous, and in addition he was now out of sympathy with his denomination's efforts to sustain institutions for ministerial education.¹¹⁷

The issue was first joined over student aid. Since scholarship funds had been raised a decade earlier, it seemed obvious to many Corporation members that a new effort should be undertaken to replenish sources which were now exhausted. Wayland could not deny the need, but sought to promote a more acceptable method which would supply an element of incentive. Needy students, he believed, should be rewarded rather than subsidized by generous prizes and premiums, "offered only for the doing of particular things, the writing of essays, . . . the solution of high and difficult problems, and the authorship of dissertations of pre-eminent merit on some branch of science or literature."¹¹⁸ It was one thing "to aid the struggles of genius oppressed by adversity," and quite another, as he thought his associates intended, "to provide such inducements to education, that young men shall be enticed into the learned professions, who would be more useful and successful in other departments of life."¹¹⁹ Wayland's old friend, the Rev. Henry Jackson, donated \$1,250 in 1839 to support awards to

¹¹⁵*Ibid.*, 142, 156.

¹¹⁶*Ibid.*, 111-112.

¹¹⁷See criticism of ministerial education societies in Francis Wayland to Rufus Anderson, August 31, 1842, American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions Papers, Harvard College Library.

¹¹⁸*Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System*, 97-98.

¹¹⁹[Francis Wayland], *Report to the Corporation of Brown University, on Changes in the System of Collegiate Instruction, Read March 28, 1850* (Providence: George H. Whitney, 1850), 35.

authors of essays on appropriate subjects in the president's own classes in moral philosophy, political economy, and intellectual philosophy. Jackson had originally intended to establish a scholarship fund but was persuaded to sponsor the premiums by the president.¹²⁰ In 1843 Wayland himself donated \$1,000 in stock to the University to establish the President's Premiums for freshmen who performed impressively on their entrance examinations.¹²¹

These arrangements suggest the sort of fund raising Wayland was willing to undertake. Even more significant was his position in a dispute over the use of Nicholas Brown's last legacy to his University. The great benefactor, who died September 27, 1841, specified in his will that income from certain Providence real estate should be used to assist the education at Brown University of "deserving young men" selected on the advice of the Education Society of the Warren Baptist Association. He had obviously intended to contribute to the cause of Baptist ministerial education, but, over stiff opposition, Wayland induced the Corporation to appropriate the funds for a series of University Premiums, to be awarded in various subjects.¹²²

Wayland's faith in the premium system was over optimistic. Despite his attempts to publicize it, it never provided the incentive to student achievement he had expected. Henry Jackson concluded in 1850 that the prizes he had endowed a decade earlier had done little good. Few competitors submitted essays, and there was little opportunity for a real comparison of papers on merit. Many outstanding undergraduates avoided the prize contests, fearing to lose rank in their daily recitations.¹²³ Few of Wayland's associates shared his enthusiasm for the premium system, and they became increasingly discontented with its results during the forties. As student numbers continued to decline they insisted that all available funds should be used to subsidize

¹²⁰Francis Wayland, Report to the Corporation, September 4, 1839; *Providence Daily Journal*, December 6, 1839; Minutes, December 20, 1841, Brown University Corporation Records, II (1810-1843), University Hall, Brown University.

¹²¹Francis Wayland to Moses Brown Ives, July 12, 1843.

¹²²Francis Wayland, Report of Committee appointed by the Board of Fellows to take into consideration the communication of the President . . . , December 20, 1841; Minutes, September 8, 1842, Brown University Corporation Records, II (1810-1843), University Hall, Brown University; Francis Wayland, Report to the Corporation, [August 2, 1843].

¹²³Henry Jackson to Francis Wayland, July 23 and August 26, 1850, and February 10, 1854.

enrollment. In 1846 a group of Baptist Corporation members called for a re-examination of the premium system, insisting that the Nicholas Brown legacy could rightfully be used only for tuition grants. A Corporation committee noted the president's particular interest in the awards and concluded that they should be retained, but also supplemented by additional funds designated specifically for scholarship aid.¹²⁴ This was an important victory for Wayland. Brown University did not again offer scholarships until after his retirement.

In the late forties Wayland faced the crucial question of faculty compensation. Brown's salaries were more generous than those of many American colleges, but did not compare with the remuneration of ministers and other professional men in Providence, nor had they kept pace with the rising cost of living.¹²⁵ Wayland sympathized with the plight of his colleagues, which he shared,¹²⁶ but could not contemplate increases which violated his moral and economic principles. After observing the munificent foundations of the English universities with much the same distaste Adam Smith had felt, he returned home more than ever convinced that the Scotch system of compensation should be adopted in America. In 1841 and 1842 he urged unsuccessfully that salaries at Brown be made dependent in some way on the amount of instruction each officer gave.¹²⁷ This would necessarily require elective studies,¹²⁸ but in the long run both the college and individual faculty members would profit by it. Failing to establish such an arrangement, he persisted in his opposition to increasing endowment.

For look upon the subject as you will, when you come to the naked fact it seemed to be merely a question of our individual support. Education of the kind which we gave was abundantly

¹²⁴Minutes, September 3 and December 2, 1846, Brown University Corporation Records, III (1844-1866), University Hall, Brown University.

¹²⁵Francis Wayland, Report to the Corporation, September 1, 1846; Alexis Caswell, George Ide Chace, and William Gammell to the Corporation of Brown University, September 7, 1848; Wayland, *Report to the Corporation*, March 28, 1850, 47-48; compare salaries at various institutions cited in Frederick Rudolph, "Who Paid the Bills?" *Harvard Educational Review*, XXXI (Spring, 1961), 153.

¹²⁶Francis Wayland to Isaac Davis, September 14, 1844 (copy).

¹²⁷Francis Wayland, Report of the President and Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy to the committee of the Board of Fellows considering the course of study and discipline, n.d. [September 1-December 20, 1841]; Report of the Committee appointed by the Board of Fellows to take into consideration the communication of the President . . . , December 20, 1841; Report to the Corporation, September 1, 1846.

¹²⁸*Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System*, 64-65, 74-75, 128.

furnished in New England and furnished as cheaply as we could hope to furnish it. To ask men & women who labored for their subsistence to maintain a school to which not one in a hundred would ever expect to send a son seemed not desirable.¹²⁹

As Brown University's difficulties deepened and Wayland's attitudes hardened, he began to think of resigning his responsibilities. For a year or two the college's deficit exceeded \$1,200, and the spectre of bankruptcy loomed.¹³⁰ No sign of increasing enrollment appeared. Other colleges with ampler sums for scholarship aid were also suffering from the depression, and the times were inauspicious for fund drives, even had Wayland been willing to undertake them. He dreamed of retiring to a small village, as his father and uncle had done, to write and engage in religious and philanthropic activities.¹³¹

But the college's fate rested on his shoulders, and he was still determined to save it, if possible, by means which would vindicate his principles of democracy and self-help. Projects for technical schools were widely discussed in the late forties, and the Lawrence Scientific School had been established at Harvard in 1847. Wayland appealed to Horatio N. Slater, son of Samuel Slater, the immigrant textile pioneer, and received a tentative pledge of funds to establish instruction in the applied sciences at Brown. But in the winter of 1848 Slater concluded reluctantly that his own financial position would not permit him to make the gift.¹³²

The following autumn three of Wayland's colleagues forced his hand. Earlier appeals from individual instructors had brought slight readjustments in their compensation. Now Professors Caswell, Gammell, and Chace directly disputed the president's basic precepts of educational finance in a letter to the Corporation. Throughout the world, they declared, higher education was to a great extent eleemosynary; by the usage of ages it was "dependent on charity." No college in the country could achieve distinction without large funds devoted either to the payment of professors or to student aid.¹³³

¹²⁹Reminiscences, 129 (composed 1860-1865).

¹³⁰*Ibid.*, 129.

¹³¹Eliphalet Nott to Francis Wayland, May 22, 1845; Francis Wayland to Isaac Davis, July 8, 1845 (copy); Francis Wayland to Daniel S. Wayland, December 21, 1848.

¹³²Horatio N. Slater to Francis Wayland, February 9, 1848.

¹³³Alexis Caswell, George Ide Chace, and William Gammell to the Corporation of Brown University, September 7, 1848.

This challenge could not be ignored, and the Corporation voted to seek \$50,000 to support faculty salaries.¹³⁴ In September, 1849, Wayland reported the drive had been a failure. With this doleful news he tendered his resignation as president of Brown University.¹³⁵ As he insisted to a friend, the college could not have gone on for long no matter who was president.¹³⁶ The resignation, however, was also a politic move. Pressed by the Corporation to withdraw it, he acceded with the understanding he would have full authority to draw up a comprehensive scheme of reforms such as he had desired for a decade.¹³⁷ Inspired with new energy and determination Wayland set to work not merely to save Brown University from extinction but to demonstrate that American colleges need not decline if conducted according to correct principles.

VI

The president's plans were presented to the public in his *Report to the Corporation* of March 28, 1850, which began with a brief review of the development of American higher education. The English colleges on which American institutions were patterned were originally "ecclesiastical and monastic institutions . . . designed for the education of priests, who formed, in fact, the only educated class in the middle ages; and who probably intended, by means of an exclusive education, to render perpetual the influence over the masses which they had so successfully usurped." American colleges, to be sure, differed in various ways, "generally for the worse." They had been most influential in the colonial period, when they shaped the ideals of the generation which had created the American nation, but in the nineteenth century they had declined.¹³⁸

Wayland's purpose in this survey was not to establish that college presidents faced a difficult task in attempting to preserve the ancient

¹³⁴Minutes, September 7, 1848, Brown University Corporation Records, III (1844-1866), University Hall, Brown University; *Providence Daily Journal*, December 27, 1848.

¹³⁵Three subscriptions had been received in Providence, but many of those approached excused themselves as too hard pressed to contribute. There is no evidence that Wayland had pushed the drive with any vigor. Francis Wayland, Report to the Corporation, September 4, 1849.

¹³⁶Francis Wayland to Isaac Davis, September 12, 1849 (copy).

¹³⁷Minutes, September 6, 1849, Brown University Corporation Records, III (1844-1866), University Hall, Brown University.

¹³⁸*Report to the Corporation . . . March 28, 1850*, 6, 9, 11, 12-16.

traditions of liberal education in a materialistic democracy. Rather, he insisted, colleges would survive only if they re-examined their role and sought to serve the needs of the workingman and farmer as well as the learned professions. "It is manifest . . . that the movement of civilization is precisely in the line of the useful arts."¹³⁹ Summarizing his case for democratic and utilitarian higher education, he argued largely in the dialect of political economy:

Our colleges are not filled because we do not furnish the education desired by the people. We have constructed them upon the idea that they are to be schools of preparation *for the professions*. Our customers, therefore, come from the smallest class of society; and the importance of the education which we furnish is not so universally acknowledged as formerly, even by this class. We have produced an article for which the demand is diminishing. We sell it at less than cost, and the deficiency is made up by charity. We give it away, and still the demand diminishes. Is it not time to inquire whether we cannot furnish an article for which the demand will be, at least, somewhat more remunerative?¹⁴⁰

Brown University was now committed to drastic changes in its curriculum, degree requirements, and fiscal policies. The public was promised a more "useful" curriculum: specifically new courses in pedagogy, agriculture, chemistry applied to the arts, applied science, and law.¹⁴¹ Inauguration of the "new system" was made dependent on the success of an appeal for \$125,000, more than double the University's resources in 1850.¹⁴² Thus it was imperative for Francis Wayland to become a fund raiser, though this activity had always been distasteful to him. Now, however, he felt morally justified in assuming the role because his new curriculum would provide training Brown had never previously offered, and the additional students he hoped to attract, rather than being lured away from sister institutions, would be young men who would never have enrolled in a required liberal arts course at any college.¹⁴³ Historically Brown University's precarious situation during the forties and the controversies between

¹³⁹*Ibid.*, 21.

¹⁴⁰*Ibid.*, 34, following a detailed review of evidence (pp. 24-34) implying that attempts to increase endowment and student aid funds had not checked the decline of enrollment in New England colleges.

¹⁴¹*Ibid.*, 153.

¹⁴²*Ibid.*, 75-76; *A List of Subscriptions Made to Brown University, During the Twenty-Five Years, Terminating June 29, 1871* (Providence: Hammond, Angell & Co., Printers, 1871), viii.

¹⁴³Reminiscences, 134.

the president and his associates over fund raising had been necessary preliminaries to a final crisis which freed Francis Wayland to strengthen the college's resources in a way he could square with his own conscience. When the impracticability of most features of his "new system" had been demonstrated, the endowment secured in 1850 remained.

Actually nearly half of the required total had been assured before Wayland's *Report* was published. Alexander Duncan, English-born railroad promoter, had promised \$20,000, as had John Carter Brown, son of Nicholas Brown, and the widow and children of Thomas P. Ives. Horatio N. Slater, unable to contribute to an applied science course in 1848, now promised \$5,000.¹⁴⁴ It was not easy to raise the remaining \$60,000, particularly the final \$15,000, but extensive efforts achieved a total subscription of \$128,000 by September, 1850.¹⁴⁵ Much of this sum came from Rhode Island,¹⁴⁶ providing impressive evidence of the support Wayland had achieved in the community where his educational purposes had been misunderstood two decades earlier. Many of his favorite students made token contributions, but the response from alumni abroad was disappointing except for an early pledge of \$2,000 from Isaac Davis of Worcester, Wayland's traveling companion in England in 1841. The president was too reserved to follow Davis's forthright counsel to "make the men you have Doctorated fork over,"¹⁴⁷ but through friends he did tap wealthy prospects in Boston, and a few contributions came from business firms in New York and Philadelphia.¹⁴⁸ Most disappointing was the response of the New England Baptists who seemed almost to "abandon the institution."¹⁴⁹ Thus did they react to Wayland's earlier

¹⁴⁴*Report of the Committee of the Corporation of Brown University, Appointed to Raise a Fund of One Hundred Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars* (Providence: Knowles, Anthony & Co. Printers, 1851), 6-7, 9; Wayland, *Reminiscences*, 136.

¹⁴⁵Appeal for last \$17,000 is in *Providence Daily Journal*, August 6, 1850; on completion of subscription see *Providence Daily Journal*, September 6, 1850, and Minutes, September 5, 1850, Brown University Corporation Records, III (1844-1866), University Hall, Brown University.

¹⁴⁶*Providence Daily Journal*, July 23, 1850, indicates that of \$102,685 subscribed by that date, \$95,175 was from Providence residents.

¹⁴⁷Isaac Davis to Francis Wayland, November 12, 1849.

¹⁴⁸Gifts were received from members of the Appleton, Lawrence, and Shaw families in Boston. *Report of the Committee . . . to Raise a Fund of One Hundred Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars*, 9-14.

¹⁴⁹Francis Wayland to Heman Lincoln, June 20, 1850; in his *Reminiscences*, 137, Wayland declared that the generous response from members of other denominations vindicated his insistence that to administer Brown "without any sectarian bias was to act strictly on Baptist principles."

refusal to assist their scholarship projects and his apparent lack of interest in ministerial education.

The "new system" was launched in the fall of 1850. Students were offered a wide choice of alternatives, though the curriculum was not greatly increased in substance. The traditional classical course continued, and students who pursued it were promised an earned master's degree, which Wayland intended should require substantially greater effort in class and the completion of an independent reading program. The Bachelor of Arts degree was offered in a course including a number of elective options, and requiring only one ancient language. If standards were maintained, the president believed, this would provide as thorough an education as the baccalaureate then given in most New England colleges. A new Bachelor of Philosophy degree was awarded students in a course including numerous elective options which did not require any study of the classics. Moral philosophy, the president's own field, was the only subject required of all degree candidates; since it treated of God's laws for human conduct, it was more important than purely intellectual studies. In addition the University welcomed students wishing to study one or more subjects without becoming candidates for any degree.¹⁵⁰ This was the "partial course" device, an expedient long used by American colleges, including Brown, to attract additional students and increase tuition receipts. In a major effort to provide "practical" education two new professors with outstanding qualifications had been appointed: William A. Norton in Natural Philosophy and Civil Engineering and John A. Porter in Chemistry Applied to the Arts.¹⁵¹ A portion of the newly raised funds was used to equip laboratories and obtain materials for their courses. Engineering, applied science, and applied chemistry were not included in any of the degree programs. Thus Wayland's

¹⁵⁰*The Laws of Brown University* (Providence: Printed by Albert C. Greene, 1851), 13-14, 18-20.

¹⁵¹Norton was a West Point graduate who had taught at the University of the City of New York and Delaware College. Porter, a Yale graduate, had also been at Delaware College, and had studied agricultural chemistry with Justus von Liebig at Giessen and assisted Professor Eben N. Horsford of Harvard's Lawrence Scientific School. After their departure from Brown in 1852 both taught for many years at Yale's Sheffield Scientific School. (On Norton see Russell H. Chittenden, *History of the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale University, 1846-1922* [2 vols.: New Haven, Yale University Press, 1928], I, 61-62; on Porter see *Dictionary of American Biography* [New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935], XV, 96-97).

reforms involved not simply the introduction of elective studies, but, more significantly, the provision of a pattern of alternative degrees and educational opportunities for students who were not seeking any degree at all. Here, in a repudiation of the traditional curriculum which appears almost chaotic, was the ultimate expression of the president's utilitarianism and educational democracy.

For a year or two Wayland was heartened by the apparent appeal of his "new system." The increase in Brown's enrollment was so dramatic he could well believe his reforms were the key to the college's prosperity and that it was now offering a commodity which the public wished to buy.¹⁵² Close analysis, however, does not sustain the validity of the conviction on which his campaign for collegiate reform was based — that there was a declining demand for the liberal arts in New England. The major increase after 1850 consisted of candidates for the new master's degree, given for the full classical course.¹⁵³ Moreover Brown's prosperity was not an isolated phenomenon: a new period of growth began for many New England colleges in 1849-1850.¹⁵⁴ In 1850, as in the early thirties, Wayland could find in rising enrollment vindication of his educational philosophy, but in neither period did he really understand the relation of educational demand to the tides of national prosperity, for his views were rooted in devotion to moral law rather than in an understanding of historical development.

Brown's sudden growth tested other aspects of Wayland's educational policies. Failing in his desire to eliminate dormitory residence in 1850, he had decided that his paternalistic disciplinary rules should be strengthened. Dormitory supervision was distasteful to several instructors, and after disorders in the fall of 1851, stemming from the president's insistence that undergraduates should not attend public lectures in Providence, Professors Porter, Norton, and Greene were asked to resign in January, 1852. Once again, as when he enforced the residence rule in 1827, it appeared that student discipline which had

¹⁵²*Providence Daily Journal*, September 11, 1850; Francis Wayland to Heman Lincoln, April 21, 1851; *Providence Daily Journal*, September 16, 1851; Wayland, *Reminiscences*, 137-141.

¹⁵³Bronson, *History of Brown University*, 284, 323. The next largest number of students were not enrolled as degree candidates but attended individual courses. Many of them remained only briefly in Providence, and the annual catalogs consequently contain inflated statistics of enrollment (see Francis Wayland, Report to Executive Board, May 3, 1851 and November 10, 1851).

¹⁵⁴See data on college enrollment in *The American Almanac and Repository of Useful Knowledge* (Boston: various publishers, 1848-1855).

moral implications was more vital to Wayland than the retention of useful instructors. The ousted professors were replaced by trusted alumni, and the "new system" saved from collapse.¹⁵⁵ No more notable appointments were made, however, and the promised courses in agriculture and law were not undertaken. Though still firmly convinced of the correctness of his principles, Wayland was obviously tiring of his responsibilities.¹⁵⁶

Faculty morale had suffered seriously from the events of 1852, and Wayland's colleagues were out of sympathy with various features of his reforms. Their most serious grievance arose from his insistence on establishing the fee system of compensation. In 1851 instructors were offered their choice between a fixed stipend of \$1,200 per year and a basic salary of \$500 to be supplemented by fees from their students. Few of them preferred the latter option, but they accepted it under pressure. Inequities were soon evident, and the new arrangements were abolished immediately after Wayland's retirement. Meanwhile they rewarded teachers with large numbers of beginning students more generously than those who offered advanced studies, where enrollments were necessarily limited.¹⁵⁷

Francis Wayland resigned as president of Brown University in September, 1855. Exhausted by years of overwork, he was determined to devote his remaining days to religious concerns.¹⁵⁸ His successor, Barnas Sears, one of the leading Baptist supporters of ministerial education, was his antithesis in many ways. Though he had endorsed the broad purpose of the reforms of 1850 — to make Brown University useful to a larger constituency — Sears did not intend to do so at the expense of its reputation or academic standards. He was opposed

¹⁵⁵Theodore R. Crane, "Francis Wayland and the Residential College," *Rhode Island History*, XIX (October, 1960), 124-126.

¹⁵⁶H. Lincoln Wayland to Francis Wayland, Junior, December 15-[17], 1851; Francis Wayland to his sister, February 16, 1854, in *Memoir*, II, 131-132.

¹⁵⁷Francis Wayland, Report of Committee of Executive Board to which was referred the subject of officers' salaries, n.d. [June 30, 1851]; Minutes, July 3, 1851, Record of the Proceedings of the Executive Board of Brown University, 1850-1865, University Hall, Brown University; William A. Norton to Zachariah Allen, September 6, 1851; Alexis Caswell to John Kingsbury, September 8, 1851; George Ide Chace to Secretary of the Executive Board of Brown University, September 14, 1855; William Gammell to John Kingsbury, May 13, 1853.

¹⁵⁸Francis Wayland to the Corporation of Brown University, August 20, 1855 (in *Memoir*, II, 145-146); Francis Wayland to Cyrus A. Bartol, n.d. (excerpt in *Memoir*, II, 146).

to the alteration of traditionally accepted college degrees, and felt none of Wayland's doubts that liberal learning was compatible with the progress of religion. Sears was himself an accomplished classical scholar who had studied in Germany and admired European culture. His family had been poorer than Wayland's, and he had depended on charitable aid for his education. He saw nothing immoral in scholarships, and the establishment of substantial funds for student aid was his major permanent contribution to Brown University.¹⁵⁹

On his resignation Wayland had been elected a Fellow of the University in honor of his years of service. This position became increasingly uncomfortable as his successor proceeded to alter features of the "new system" to which he was deeply committed. Only two years after Sears's inauguration Wayland resigned all connection with Brown University, following a Corporation meeting at which it had been decided to return to the traditional degree system and also to aid indigent students with funds which had previously been appropriated for premiums.¹⁶⁰ The latter decision undoubtedly distressed him more than the former, for it represented a reversal of the position he had maintained with such determination during the forties.

The repudiation of various features of Wayland's reforms was based on their proven impracticability, but President Sears was also anxious to win the respect of his colleagues around the country who had viewed Brown's "new system" primarily as an attack on the ancient languages.¹⁶¹ Critics of Wayland's 1850 *Report* had paid

¹⁵⁹Bronson, *History of Brown University*, 317-325; Alvah Hovey, *Barnas Sears, A Christian Educator. His Making and Work* (New York: Silver, Burdett and Company, 1902); Barnas Sears "An Educated Ministry" (Address to the New York Baptist Union for Ministerial Education, Rochester, July 12, 1853), *Christian Review*, XVIII (October, 1853), 568-582; Reuben Aldridge Guild, *History of Brown University, with Illustrative Documents* (Providence: Published by subscription, 1867), 309.

¹⁶⁰Francis Wayland to the President and Executive Board of Brown University, September 10, 1857; Minutes, September 3, 1857, September 2, 1858, September 8, 1859, Brown University Corporation Records, III (1844-1866), University Hall, Brown University.

¹⁶¹Barnas Sears, Report to the Executive Board, July 5, 1856 (excerpt in Bronson, *History of Brown University*, 321-322). For criticism of Wayland's Report to the Corporation as hostile to the classics see A. C. Kendrick to Francis Wayland, May 6, 1850; article on University Grammar School, Providence, by "J. L. L. Brown University" [undoubtedly Professor John Larkin Lincoln], *Providence Daily Journal*, May 8, 1850; debate at American Association for the Advancement of Education, Cleveland, August, 1851 in *Proceedings of the First Session of the American Association for the Advancement of Education, Held at Cleveland, Ohio, August 19th, 20th, 21st & 22nd, A.D., 1851* (Philadelphia: E. C. & J. Biddle, 1852), 57-81.

much less attention to its use of the idiom of political economy, though those who did comment on this feature realized its importance, and were aware, often from personal acquaintance, of the full range of Wayland's purposes. "We cannot think that the principles which adjust supply to demand in ordinary trade should be fully trusted in matters of education," declared the Providence Franklin Society in February, 1850, in a statement favoring expanded offerings in applied science at Brown. "Education is not a commodity, the value of which is to be determined by the demand, and by its cash price in the market," concluded the authors of a proposed curriculum for the University of Rochester, who accepted Wayland's challenge to provide an alternative "popular" course. Professor William Gammell of the Brown faculty recalled Wayland's own early dedication to educational benevolence and suggested that his utilitarianism had led him astray. The principles of supply and demand, Gammell noted, might be applied to purely vocational training, but not to "the higher forms of intellectual and spiritual culture." Collegiate education could only be sustained "by the benevolence of men, and all expenditures in its behalf are made, not with any hope of a remunerating return in kind, but in a confiding trust that God in his providence will make them yield to society at large a richer than a golden harvest. . . ." Education in its broadest sense involved training the intellectual powers for logical thinking, cultivating sensibility for the sublime, disciplining human impulses, and "above all, imbuing the heart with that Christian spirit which gives the soul hopes and foretastes of the bliss of heaven." Most of the Brown faculty shared his sentiments, which recall the views of Nicholas Brown, William Giles Goddard, and Tristram Burges.¹⁶²

Characteristically Wayland made no direct reply to his critics in the fifties, nor did he stress his educational economics. He continued, however, to preach the gospel of popular education in terms which

¹⁶²Report of Committee of Providence Franklin Society on proposed reforms at Brown University, February 26, 1850; [Robert Kelly], *Report to the Board of Trustees of the University of Rochester, on the Plan of Instruction to be Pursued in the Collegiate Department*, (Rochester: Published by Sage & Brother, 1850), 5-11; [William Gammell], Review of Francis Wayland, *Report to the Corporation . . . March 28, 1850*, *Christian Review*, XV (July 1850), 449-451. See also Elisha R. Potter, *Report of the Commissioner of Public Schools of the State of Rhode Island; Made at the January Session of the General Assembly, 1853* (Providence: Sayles, Miller & Simmons, 1853), 14-17.

combined the religious imagery of his early sermons with a blunt vocationalism and revealed his increasing distrust of the "aristocratic" purposes of his former associates. In his eloquent oration at Union College on the fiftieth anniversary of Eliphalet Nott's presidency in 1854 he demanded:

Did God manifest himself in the flesh, in the form of a carpenter's son, to create an intellectual aristocracy, and consign the remaining millions of our race to daily toil, excluded from every opportunity for spiritual improvement?

His answer was much gentler:

When our systems of education shall look with as kindly an eye on the mechanic as the lawyer, on the manufacturer and merchant as the minister; when every artizan, performing his process with a knowledge of the laws by which it is governed, shall be transformed from an unthinking laborer into a practical philosopher; and when the benign principles of Christianity shall imbue the whole mass of our people with the spirit of universal love, then, and not until then, shall we illustrate to the nations the blessings of Republican and Christian Institutions.¹⁶³

A year earlier at Rochester Wayland had directly assailed Baptist ministerial education efforts in a speech which stirred wide controversy throughout the denomination.¹⁶⁴ A few months before this he had startled a Baptist educational meeting in Boston by declaring that his reforms at Brown contributed more to religion than the maintenance of seminaries.

We are the middling interests in the community. The average of our people are farmers, mechanics, manufacturers, merchants. We have but few large capitalists. Now it is in such a community that religion most generally circulates. Those who have a large portion of the world's goods are not apt to have large possessions in heaven. Now what should we aim at in laying out our plans of education? Whom should we educate? We ought to raise the tone of education in our middling interests. The farmer when he

¹⁶³Francis Wayland, *The Education Demanded by the People of the U. States. A Discourse Delivered at Union College, Schenectady, July 25, 1854, on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Presidency of Eliphalet Nott, D.D., LL.D.* (Boston: Phillips, Sampson and Company, 1855), 6, 29. "There is talent in a cotton mill as well as in an epic," Wayland declared at the dedication of the Free Academy, Norwich, Connecticut, October, 1856 (*Memoir*, II, 105).

¹⁶⁴Francis Wayland, *The Apostolic Ministry: A Discourse Delivered in Rochester, N. Y., Before the New York Baptist Union for Ministerial Education, July 12, 1853* (Rochester: Sage & Brother, 1853).

goes home from his work ought to be conversant with just as good books as his minister, or his lawyer or his physician. We in the Baptist denomination are all on the level, and we ought to endeavor to educate the masses. All our academies ought to be so arranged as to meet the wants of the people at large.

When this is done, education will be wanted, and will support itself.

... Let us strike at the great masses. This is the Baptist view.

These ideas seemed "politico-economical" rather than truly religious to Barnas Sears. Christian education, he insisted, should be adapted to the needs of men, not to the needs of any class. Wayland replied that "hitherto our systems of education have been aimed to meet the wants of one class, and that the higher class of society."¹⁶⁵ Thus by the fifties he had repudiated his ties both to the leading New England Baptists and to the Providence merchants who had sustained his early efforts at Brown.

As he looked ahead during the Civil War years Wayland was unqualifiedly optimistic about the financial prospects for American education. The Morrill Act donations and other land grants, if not wasted, seemed sufficient to render all education gratuitous. In half a century, he predicted, the United States would lead the world in per capita investment in education, and all levels of instruction would be free. By then public opinion would insist that schooling conform to the needs of the community. Already Western State universities — particularly the University of Michigan — offered a pattern for the future.¹⁶⁶ Wayland's conviction that American education must respond to popular demand was so strong that it overcame his deep-rooted distrust of politicians and partisanship, and he viewed public institutions more hopefully than private colleges. Discussing higher education in New York State in 1853, he endorsed a projected university whose faculty would be spurred by the fee system of salaries combined with annual legislative grants, renewable only if its instruction met the needs of prospective students.¹⁶⁷ And in the final year of his life he reasserted his belief that American colleges could be self-sustaining.

¹⁶⁵Remarks at New England Baptist Educational Convention, Boston, March 8-9, 1853, *Christian Watchman & Reflector*, March 17, 1853; compare *The Apostolic Ministry*, 60-62.

¹⁶⁶Reminiscences, 133-134.

¹⁶⁷Francis Wayland to H. S. Randall, Secretary of State of New York, February 7, 1853, New York State Library, Albany.

Why does not an apothecary or a carpenter or a butcher want an endowment? Education is as much *wanted* as anything. Teach well and teach what men want and you endow it yourselves. To beg for an endowment is to be always poor and always beggars.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁸Francis Wayland to H. Lincoln Wayland, July 17, 1865.

JOHN SMITH, THE MILLER, OF PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

SOME OF HIS DESCENDANTS

by CHARLES WILLIAM FARNHAM

[continued from July, 1962, inside back cover]

26 NOAH⁴ SMITH (*Elisha*,³ *John*,² *John*¹), b. 7 May 1705; d. 28 Sept. 1746. Marriage intentions of Noah Smith of Providence and Mary Bartlett of Attleboro 11 May 1728 appear in Attleboro vital records. The Bartlett genealogy states: "Mary Bartlett, b. 5 Jan. 1708/9 of Samuel and Mary, daughter of John and Mary (Whitman) Inman, m. — Smith and had (probably) Mary and Noah Smith."²⁰¹ She died before 1742. Noah m. (2) —; m. (3) 30 May 1736 Abigail Mowry of John 2nd and Marjorie (Whipple) Mowry.²⁰² Abigail died in September 1790 at her home in Smithfield.

On 29 June 1733 Elisha Smith deeded to his son Noah 117 acres in Smithfield, the northerly part of land Elisha had purchased from Col. Joseph Whipple. It was the place where Noah was then living.²⁰³

Noah Smith of Smithfield, son of Noah, on 2 May 1761 for payment from his mother-in-law (stepmother) Abigail Smith, widow, assigned to her all the farm given to him in his father's will.²⁰⁴ The land abutted his uncle Daniel Smith's.

Abigail, widow of Noah Smith, on 20 Jan. 1753 received a conveyance from her brother, Ananias Mowry, then of Smithfield, which was released to her and her son John Smith, consisting of a tract of 198 acres in Smithfield. The whole descended to her on the death of her son John, and she later conveyed this land to Abigail and Noah

²⁰¹Bartlett, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

²⁰²Arnold, *op. cit.*, Smithfield marriages, 3:67.

²⁰³Smithfield Deeds, 1:95. ²⁰⁴*Ibid.*, 5:290.

Smith, the two youngest living children of Sarah Sayles, "present wife of Sylvanus Sayles and widow of Abigail's son, John Smith." She named Philip and Ananias Mowry, nephews, to carry out the orders. The conveyance was dated 21 Aug. 1790, a short time before Abigail's death.²⁰⁵

Noah Smith's will, made in Smithfield 20 Sept. 1746, named his wife Abigail, sons Noah and John and "a daughter." John Aldrich, Simon Brown, and Thomas Steere were witnesses.²⁰⁶

CHILDREN OF NOAH SMITH²⁰⁷ AND FIRST WIFE MARY (BARTLETT) SMITH:

I MARY⁵ SMITH, b. 12 March 1729. Smithfield deeds offer evidence that she was the widow of John Whipple, who died in Smithfield in 1807, and there appears to have been no issue. On Oct. 14, 1808²⁰⁸ Mary Whipple of Smithfield and Abraham Smith of Wethersfield, Windsor County, Vermont, as attorney for Mary Whipple, widow, quitclaimed to Christopher Dexter of Smithfield her rights to 16 acres in Smithfield, which Christopher bought of John Whipple.²⁰⁹ On 23 Oct. of the same year articles of agreement were recorded between Mary Whipple, widow, and Abraham Smith of Wethersfield, Vermont, her attorney, on one part and Simon Aldrich of Smithfield on the other. The agreement provided that Mary Whipple, with Abraham Smith as attorney, quitclaim title to the homestead farm on which she dwelt to Simon Aldrich, with Simon providing necessities of life and support to Mary Whipple or to Abraham Smith, her attorney. The will of Mary Whipple, written 5 Nov. 1808 and probated in Smithfield 10 March 1810, bequeathed to her brother Noah Smith of Smithfield, \$5; to George Smith, son of her brother Noah, \$5; to Squire Smith, brother of George, \$20; remainder of estate to Abraham Smith, Noah Smith's son. Ahab Mowry was executor.²¹⁰

60 II NOAH⁵ SMITH, b. 10 July 1734.

²⁰⁵*Ibid.*, 8:150.

²⁰⁶Smithfield Wills, 1:310.

²⁰⁷Arnold, *op. cit.*, Smithfield births, 3:115-116.

²⁰⁸Smithfield Deeds, 12:27. ²⁰⁹*Ibid.*

²¹⁰Smithfield Wills, 3:355.

CHILDREN OF NOAH AND HIS THIRD WIFE,
ABIGAIL (MOWRY) SMITH:

III AMEY⁵ SMITH, b. 8 June 1739. Since Noah's will mentioned but one daughter and his daughter Mary outlived him, it must be assumed that Amey died young.

61 IV JOHN⁵ SMITH, b. 31 July 1744.

27 JONATHAN⁴ SMITH (*Elisha*,³ *John*,² *John*¹), b. in 1710; m. 19 Jan. 1734/5 Anne Wright, daughter of Benjamin and Lydia Wright of Smithfield.²¹¹ The will of Benjamin Wright in 1754 names his daughter Anne Smith and his granddaughter Lydia Smith.

Jonathan received from his father, Elisha Smith, a tract of 100 acres in Smithfield, the southerly part of the land Elisha bought from Col. Joseph Whipple and adjoining the land he gave to his son Noah. The date was 15 Oct. 1733.²¹²

Jonathan sold to Israel Phillips (his brother-in-law) on 10 Oct. 1753 the westerly part of his homestead in Smithfield, abutting his brother Daniel Smith.²¹³

No death dates for Jonathan or his wife have been found, nor are children recorded in Smithfield vital records.

CHILD OF JONATHAN AND LYDIA (WRIGHT) SMITH:

I LYDIA⁵ SMITH, named in her grandfather's will.

28 ABRAHAM⁴ SMITH (*Elisha*,³ *John*,² *John*¹), b. 19 July 1711; d. in Smithfield 3 Aug. 1786;²¹⁴ m. in Smithfield 9 June 1734 Rebekah Smith.²¹⁵ In 1733 he settled in the area that is now Spragueville in Smithfield, where he had a grist mill. He is buried in his family cemetery close by his home. There is no gravestone in the burial place off Riverview Avenue for Rebekah Smith, but a space beside the stone for Abraham indicates that she was also buried there.

Abraham received from his father Elisha Smith his farm in Smithfield of about 144 acres, about half a mile north of the land of Joseph Winsor, which included a dwelling house, saw mill, grist mill, and orchard. It abutted on the north on land of Thomas Steere, on the northeast on land Elisha gave to his son Philip Smith, and on the east on land of Capt. Joseph Mowry, and on the south on land of Joshua Winsor.²¹⁶

²¹¹Arnold, *op. cit.*, Smithfield marriages, 3:82.

²¹²Smithfield Deeds, 1:99. ²¹³*Ibid.*, 3:408.

²¹⁵Arnold, *op. cit.*, Smithfield marriages, 3:66.

²¹⁶Smithfield Deeds, 1:97.

²¹⁴Gravestone.

On 28 April 1798 Abraham Smith and his son Jahleel Smith conveyed to Thomas Steere of Smithfield 50 acres on the northeast side of the highway which led from Stillwater bridge toward Abraham's land. It abutted Abner Bishop's dwelling place and the land that Simon Smith bought of Abraham Smith. Abraham and wife Rebekah and Jahal or Jahleel Smith and wife Kezia signed the deed.²¹⁷

Two Smithfield deeds disclose the heirs of Abraham Smith. Jahleel Smith of Gloucester, Job Steere and Desire (Smith) his wife, Benjamin Burlingame and Rebecca Smith, his wife, and Abner Bishop and wife Alice of Smithfield for 60 pounds paid by James Smith of Smithfield quitclaimed on 28 April 1786 to James all title they had as heirs of Abraham Smith.²¹⁸ Abraham Smith (Jr.) of Newberry (Newburgh), Ulster County, New York, and Charles Smith of Foster, Rhode Island, for 30 pounds paid by James Smith of Smithfield also quitclaimed to James on 30 Dec. 1786 their rights as heirs of Abraham Smith.²¹⁹

Smithfield deeds and probate provide proof that Rebekah Smith who married Abraham was the daughter of Joseph Smith of Smithfield, a Quaker preacher, and his wife, Patience (Mowry) Smith. Joseph Smith was the son of Edward of Christopher Smith. Joseph Smith died in Smithfield 17 Feb. 1733/4, leaving a will made 19 June 1733. In it he bequeathed a tract of land to his four daughters, Susannah Aldrich, Abigail Harris, Rebekah Smith, and Bathsheba Smith.²²⁰

Susanna Smith married John Aldrich of Samuel; Abigail married Thomas Harris, Jr., in Gloucester; Bathsheba married Joseph Eddy in Smithfield. John Aldrich and Abraham Smith of Smithfield sold to Job Angell and Ezekiel Angell on 14 Sept. 1744 a tract abutting Thomas Harris "in perfect right as good, absolute state of inheritance in fee simple."²²¹ On 19 Aug. 1766 Abraham Smith and wife Rebekah Smith of Smithfield for six pounds quitclaimed to Job and Ezekiel Angell of Smithfield rights to a tract in Smithfield that came to Rebekah Smith through the last will of her father, Edward Smith, the property having been purchased earlier by Job and Ezekiel Angell.²²²

Neither Abraham nor his wife Rebekah left wills, but by the time of Abraham's death his holdings had been well distributed among his children and grandchildren.

²¹⁷*Ibid.*, 3:167.

²¹⁸*Ibid.*, 5:130.

²¹⁹*Ibid.*, 8:129.

²²⁰Smithfield Wills, 1:10.

²²¹Smithfield Deeds, 1:306.

²²²*Ibid.*, 6:61.

CHILDREN OF ABRAHAM AND REBEKAH (SMITH) SMITH:²²³

- I PHEBE⁵ SMITH, b. 16 Feb. 1734/5. No record of a marriage has been found. It would seem possible, however, that Rebecca, wife of Benjamin Burlingame, and Anne, wife of Abner Bishop, named as heirs of Abraham Smith in a previously mentioned deed, might have been daughters of Phebe.
- 62 II ABRAHAM⁵ SMITH, JR., b. 14 March, 1741/2.
- 63 III JALEEL⁵ SMITH, sometimes called Jahal or Jahleel, b. 7 Dec. 1743.
- 64 IV NATHANIEL⁵ SMITH, b. 21 Sept. 1745. Charles Smith of Foster, Rhode Island, named in the previous deed as an heir of Abraham Smith, might have been a son of Nathaniel, since the latter had died before the deed was executed and had been married for more than a year. Since Charles was of legal age in 1786 it is equally possible that he was a son of Abraham whose birth was unrecorded.
- 65 V JAMES⁵ SMITH, b. 7 or 11 Oct. 1748.
- VI DESIRE⁵ SMITH, b. 1751; d. 17 Oct. 1841 in 91st year; m. 17 Dec. 1772 Job Steere,²²⁴ son of Jonah Steere and grandson of Samuel Steere, who was b. 21 March 1747 and d. 6 Oct. 1837 in his 89th year. They had one daughter, ASENATH Steere, b. in Smithfield 5 April 1773, who m. James Aldrich Jr. of Scituate, Rhode Island, son of James and Alice (Smith) Aldrich. The latter was daughter of Benjamin Smith (John,⁴ Benjamin,³ John,² John¹).
- Job Steere bought a farm in Glocester and lived there until 1794 when he purchased a farm of 18 acres from Squire and Amey Smith of Scituate. His will, made 16 Jan. 1804, left the homestead to the widow and named her executrix. He also made provision for his daughter, Asenath Aldrich, and her two children, Job Steere Aldrich and James Aldrich. When his will was probated 12 May 1838, the widow requested appointment of James Aldrich as administrator and relinquished her dower right.²²⁵
- 29 RICHARD⁴ SMITH (*Elisha*,³ *John*,² *John*¹), b. 2 April 1714. He

²²³Arnold, *op. cit.*, Smithfield marriages, 3:116.²²⁴*Ibid.*, Glocester marriages, 3:34.²²⁵Report of the Genealogical Records Committee of Rhode Island, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, 1960, p. 76-84. Typewritten ms. at The Rhode Island Historical Society.

was living in 1774 in Smithfield. This is evidenced by the fact that Ezekiel Smith, son of Col. Richard, conveyed on 3 Jan. 1774 to Nehemiah Smith the farm in Smithfield "where Nehemiah Smith and Col. Richard Smith now dwell."²²⁶ Nehemiah, named as a grandson in a deed from Elisha³ Smith, probably was a son of Col. Richard. Richard had previously lived in Glocester where deeds designate him as Col. Richard Smith. He is probably the Richard Smith married by Valentine Whitman, justice, to Sarah Hawkins, daughter of William Hawkins of Providence, in Smithfield 21 June 1738.²²⁷

Richard received from his father Elisha on 5 Oct. 1733 107 acres in Smithfield adjoining the house of Isaac Ballard and on the east on land Elisha gave to his son Jonathan Smith.²²⁸

Elisha Smith deeded to his grandson Ezekiel Smith on 25 Nov. 1766 125 acres bounded on the west by land of Abigail Smith, widow, (probably the widow of Noah) and on the north by Thomas Steere and "includes half of the tract where my son Richard now lives."²²⁹

On 14 March 1746 Elisha Smith of Smithfield sold to his son Richard of Glocester 166 acres "all that I have where Richard now dwelleth."²³⁰ Richard Smith, then of Smithfield, conveyed to Mikel Cook of Glocester on 15 Nov. 1762 seven acres, "all that I own in Glocester."²³¹ Richard's wife Sarah signed off her dower rights in the sale of a farm of 130 acres in Glocester to William Dean of Plainfield, Connecticut, on 9 Feb. 1759.²³²

Births of children of Richard and Sarah Smith were not recorded in Smithfield or Glocester, and death dates for Richard and his wife have not been found.

Glocester probate records the death of Lt. Richard Smith on 6 Aug. 1758, intestate. He had died at Albany, New York, probably in the French and Indian War. Col. Richard Smith was granted administration 11 Dec. 1758. Glocester Town Council records on 7 April 1760 note that Richard Smith, infant son of Keziah Herendeen, was bound out to Col. Richard Smith of Smithfield.²³³

Another son was William Smith as shown in a Court of Common Pleas case in Providence in the December 1762 term, in which Elijah Phillips of Smithfield, under 21, by his father Michael Phillips sued

²²⁶Smithfield Deeds, 6:421.²²⁷Arnold, *op. cit.*, Smithfield marriages, 3:66.²²⁸Smithfield Deeds, 1:101. ²²⁹*Ibid.*, 5:428.²³⁰Glocester Deeds, 2:161. ²³¹*Ibid.*, 7:333.²³²*Ibid.*, 6:496.²³³Glocester Town Council, 1:33 A.

for false statements John Smith, son of Noah Smith, deceased, and William Smith, "son of Col. Richard Smith," both of Smithfield, both under 21. The son Ezekiel is identified as the son of Col. Richard Smith in the John Mowry genealogy which records the marriage 24 June 1772 of Ezekiel Smith and Ann Mowry, daughter of Judge Daniel Mowry, who was b. 21 June 1753.²³⁴ There may have been other children.

CHILDREN OF RICHARD AND SARAH (HAWKINS) SMITH:

- 66 I EZEKIEL⁵ SMITH.
 II WILLIAM⁵ SMITH.
 III RICHARD⁵ SMITH.
 IV NEHEMIAH⁵ SMITH, probably.
- 30 STEPHEN⁴ SMITH (*Elisha,³ John,² John¹*), b. 28 Oct. 1718. While Elisha Smith deeded farms to sons Philip, Jonathan, Abraham, and Richard, and two grandsons, Ezekiel and Nehemiah, the writer has found no transfers to Elisha's younger sons, Stephen and Daniel, in Smithfield. Stephen was living in Gloucester in 1745, however, for Sarah Williams of Scituate sued Stephen Smith "of Elisha" of Gloucester in the December 1745 term of the Court of Common Pleas, Providence, for failure to pay off a note.

Stephen and his brother Abraham were witnesses to a transfer made 18 April 1768 in Smithfield two years after their father's death. The conveyance explained that Elisha died seized of one tract of 44¼ acres and another of 46 acres, which fell to Philip as the eldest heir at law, but that Elisha had declared in his lifetime that it was his desire that this property should be divided between four sons: Jonathan, Richard, Stephen, and Daniel. In the meantime since Daniel had purchased the tracts from Jonathan, Stephen, and Richard, Philip quitclaimed his rights to his brother Daniel.²³⁵

Because Stephen is identified with Gloucester, the children of Stephen and Sarah Smith recorded in Gloucester births are presumably of Stephen of Elisha. The Root ms. identifies Stephen's wife as a Clemence, and Miss Bertha Clark of Boston refers to her as Sarah Clemence. Probably a son, Elisha, was named for Stephen's father and a son, Noah, for his brother.

²³⁴William A. Mowry, *Descendants of John Mowry of Rhode Island* (Providence, 1909), p. 34-38.

²³⁵Smithfield Deeds, 5:397.

CHILDREN OF STEPHEN AND SARAH SMITH:²³⁶

- 67 I STEPHEN⁵ SMITH, b. 23 July 1738.
 68 II HAZEL or HAZAEL⁵ SMITH, b. 15 Dec. 1740.
 69 III THOMAS⁵ SMITH, b. 1 Feb. 1745.
 70 IV ELISHA⁵ SMITH, b. 1 Feb. 1745.
 V ELIZABETH⁵ SMITH, b. 15 Dec. 1742.
 71 VI SYLVANUS⁵ SMITH, b. 2 Sept. 1752.
 72 VII NOAH⁵ SMITH, b. 6 Sept. 1746.
- 31 DANIEL⁴ SMITH (*Elisha,³ John,² John¹*), b. 1 March 1723/4; d. in Smithfield 25 Feb. 1797; m. (1) 23 Jan. 1743 Mary Smith, daughter of John and granddaughter of Benjamin,³ who d. 24 Dec. 1758 at 34 years; (2) 1 Dec. 1763 Else Mowry of Joseph and Margery (Mowry) Mowry, who was b. 5 Nov. 1738 and d. 18 Nov. 1795. Some of the data on this family was taken from notes in the Root ms. supplied from family papers of Mrs. Monroe Bartlett, a descendant of Daniel, who lived in Stillwater, Smithfield, Rhode Island.

Daniel lived most of his life in Smithfield although he held property in Gloucester. According to the Root ms. Daniel, his second wife, and his son Daniel, Jr., are buried "near Stillwater."

Elisha Smith of Smithfield on 12 May 1762 deeded to son Daniel of Smithfield, innholder, 70 acres in Gloucester near the swamp called Munhungony, adjoining the country road from Providence to Killingly.²³⁷

It has been previously stated that Daniel purchased two tracts in Smithfield from his brothers. On 28 Jan. 1764 Daniel quitclaimed to his brother Jonathan land on the western part of his dwelling farm in Smithfield where Jonathan then lived.²³⁸

An indenture made 10 July 1797 in Smithfield following Daniel's death covers at great length distribution of several tracts held in common by heirs of Daniel.²³⁹

The indenture was between Martin Smith of Gloucester, on one part, and on the other by Jesse Smith of Gloucester; Stephen Whipple of Gloucester and wife Mary in her right; Jeremiah Smith of Gloucester; Daniel Smith of Smithfield; Emor Smith of Smithfield, infant under 21, by John Smith Jr. of Smithfield, his guardian; Esek Smith of Smithfield; Jonathan Ballou of Adams, Massachusetts, and wife

²³⁶Arnold, *op. cit.*, Gloucester births, 3:61.

²³⁷Gloucester Deeds, 7:56.

²³⁸Smithfield Deeds, 5:412.

²³⁹*Ibid.*, 8:607.

Polly Ballou, said Esek and Polly being children of Sarah Smith, dec. and late wife of Emor Smith, late of Smithfield, claimants through Sarah Smith; Benjamin Waterman of Smithfield and wife Anna Waterman, in right of Anna; Mowry Smith of Gloucester; Duty Smith of Gloucester; Lindon Smith of Gloucester, tailor; Alfred Smith of Smithfield; Amey Smith of Gloucester, spinster; and Benjamin Mowry and wife Else, in her right.

On 18 Nov. 1811 Mowry Smith, Duty Smith, Jeremiah Smith, Lindon Smith, Alfred Smith, Emor Smith, Silas Comstock and wife Amey, and Benjamin Mowry and wife Alce, all children of Daniel Smith, late of Smithfield, dec., except Silas Comstock and Benjamin Mowry, whose wives were heirs, for \$350 to each, conveyed to Daniel Smith, Jr., of Smithfield rights in the so-called John Aldrich farm in Smithfield, which farm Joseph Mowry died seized of, the same being allotted to the heirs of Daniel Smith.²⁴⁰

CHILDREN OF DANIEL AND MARY (SMITH) SMITH:

- 73 I MARTIN⁵ SMITH, b. 15 Oct. 1747.
- II SARAH⁵ SMITH, b. 20 Jan. 1749; m. 14 Feb. 1773 Emor Smith, son of Capt. Daniel Smith²⁴¹ (William,³ John,² John¹) and his wife, Susannah (Winsor) Smith. They had a son, ESEK Smith of Smithfield, and a daughter MARY (Polly), who married Jonathan Ballou, later of Adams, Massachusetts. Sarah d. 12 Aug. 1790.²⁴²
- 74 III JESSE⁵ SMITH, b. 17 May 1751.
- IV ANNA⁵ SMITH, b. 14 April 1753; d. in Smithfield in 1833; m. (1) at Smithfield 9 May 1773 John Steere of Gloucester;²⁴³ (2) in Johnston, Rhode Island 3 March 1782 Benjamin Waterman²⁴⁴ of Job and Esther (Aldrich) Waterman, who d. at Smithfield 24 July 1832. No issue.
- Anna's will in Smithfield gave to nephew Ziba Whipple, son of Stephen Whipple, dec., "the land that fell to me from my brother, Emor Smith, dec."; to nephew Daniel Smith, Jr., son of Martin Smith, a silver spoon; to niece Sarah Steere, wife of Whipple Steere, a silver cup; to Mary

²⁴⁰*Ibid.*, 12:238.

²⁴¹Arnold, *op. cit.*, Smithfield marriages, 3:68.

²⁴²Gravestone in family burial ground of Major William³ Smith at Esmond, Rhode Island, opposite Esmond Mill.

²⁴³Arnold, *op. cit.*, Smithfield marriages, 3:72.

²⁴⁴*Ibid.*, Johnston marriages, 2:19.

Brown, daughter of George Brown; and to Anna Evans, wife of Stephen Evans. She named Ziba Whipple as sole executor.²⁴⁵

V ESEK⁵ SMITH, b. 5 Jan. 1755; d. 27 April 1766.

VI MARY⁵ SMITH, b. 25 Dec. 1757; m. at Smithfield by Elder Ezekiel Angell 13 Aug. 1780 Stephen Whipple of Gloucester, son of Jonathan Whipple of Daniel. Mary d. 24 May 1832 and Stephen d. 4 July 1818. Their children included NANCY Whipple, b. 5 Feb. 1782; SMITH Whipple, b. 19 June 1795; and ZIBA Whipple, b. 15 Aug. 1790;²⁴⁶ d. 26 Mar. 1867; m. Mary Mowry Sayles of Daniel and Phebe Sayles, b. Sept. 1793; d. 10 Aug. 1857. They lived in the Mapleville area of Burrillville, Rhode Island on land later owned by a grandson, Gilbert F. Whipple. Children of Ziba and Mary Whipple were DANIEL S. Whipple, b. 30 Jan. 1815; PHEBE S. Whipple, b. 7 Feb. 1817, m. Collins Keith; STERRY Whipple, b. 1 Feb. 1819, m. Maria Warner; ENOCH Whipple, b. 7 May 1821, m. Cynthia Switzer; CHARLES Whipple, b. 22 Feb. 1823; JOHN Whipple, b. 25 June 1825, unmarried; and GEORGE B. Whipple, b. 1 July 1832, m. Susan Arnold.²⁴⁷

CHILDREN OF DANIEL SMITH BY HIS SECOND WIFE,
ELSE (MOWRY) SMITH:

- 75 VII MOWRY⁵ SMITH, b. 30 March 1764.
- 76 VIII DUTY⁵ SMITH, b. 9 May 1765.
- 77 IX JEREMIAH⁵ SMITH, b. 19 May 1767.
- 78 X LINDON⁵ SMITH, sometimes appears as Lindol, b. 21 Nov. 1768.
- 79 XI ALFRED⁵ SMITH, b. 27 Feb. 1770.
- 80 XII DANIEL⁵ SMITH, JR., b. 28 Aug. 1771.
- XIII AMEY⁵ SMITH, b. 8 Aug. 1775; d. 30 Jan. 1857; m. in 1798 Silas Comstock, b. 28 Nov. 1771 in Burrillville, son of Samuel and Lucy (Arnold) Comstock of Smithfield and Burrillville, who d. 15 Sept. 1851 probably in Burrillville. Children of Silas and Amey Comstock: DANIEL Comstock, b. 21 July 1799; ALICE M. Comstock, b. 28 Sept. 1800, m. Willard Holbrook; LUCY A. Comstock, b. 1 Sept. 1803,

²⁴⁵Jacobus, *op. cit.*, v. 3, p. 245.

²⁴⁶Arnold, *op. cit.*, Burrillville births, 3:23.

²⁴⁷*Representative Men and Old Families of Rhode Island* (Chicago, 1907), 3:1699.

m. George Comstock; ALFRED L. Comstock, b. 15 March 1805, unmarried; EMOR B. Comstock, b. 11 Oct. 1806, m. Lucy Holloway; NATHAN C. Comstock, b. 30 Nov. 1808, d. in 1894 in California; SILAS A. Comstock, b. 1812, m. Rebecca B. Mason; AMY SMITH Comstock, b. 4 March 1814, d. Center Village, Connecticut, lived in Woonsocket; and SAMUEL Comstock, b. 16 July 1817, unmarried.²⁴⁸

XIV ALICE⁵ SMITH, b. 19 Sept. 1777; d. 24 Feb. 1851; m. Benjamin Mowry, son of David Mowry, b. in North Smithfield 24 May 1771; d. 3 Nov. 1833. Lived in Harrisville, Burrillville, Rhode Island. Children were: ALCY SMITH Mowry 1798-1829, unmarried; DANIEL SMITH Mowry 1801-1876; PHEBE Mowry; DAVID Mowry 1805-1897, unmarried; EMOR Mowry; BENJAMIN Mowry, Jr.; SMITH Mowry, unmarried; ALVAH Mowry, b. Burrillville 27 Feb. 1817; RUSSEL Mowry, d. 28 Jan. 1880, unmarried; and DENNIS Mowry, b. 25 Oct. 1821.²⁴⁹

XV EMOR⁵ SMITH, b. 23 Aug. 1780; d. 23 Sept. 1807.

XVI RUSSELL⁵ SMITH, b. 7 Nov. 1783; d. 25 April 1785.

32 DANIEL⁴ SMITH (*William,³ John,² John¹*), b. 28 Sept. 1712; Smithfield probate records the death of Capt. Daniel Smith 6 June 1769.²⁵⁰ The Roger Williams genealogy lists his marriage to Susannah Winsor, daughter of Rev. Joshua and Mary (Barker) Winsor, who was b. 19 June 1715 and d. in Smithfield in 1769.²⁵¹

William Smith of Smithfield deeded to his son Daniel Smith of Smithfield a tract on both sides of the Providence and Smithfield lines 26 Oct. 1733.²⁵²

CHILDREN OF CAPT. DANIEL AND SUSANNAH (WINSOR) SMITH:

81 I EMOR⁵ SMITH, b. 1755.

II ELIZABETH⁵ SMITH, b. 1750.

III SARAH⁵ SMITH, b. 17 March 1760; d. 8 Nov. 1822; m. Capt. John Jenks²⁵³ of Henry, b. 1759; d. 9 Nov. 1799. Children,

²⁴⁸John Adams Comstock, *A History and Genealogy of the Comstock Family of America* (Los Angeles, 1949), p. 120.

²⁴⁹Mowry, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

²⁵⁰Smithfield Probate, 3:6.

²⁵¹Mrs. Charles W. Anthony and Mrs. Charles H. Weeden, *Roger Williams of Providence, Rhode Island* (1949), p. 108.

²⁵²Smithfield Deeds, 1:412.

²⁵³William B. Browne, *Genealogy of the Jenks Family of America*, (Concord, 1952), p. 139.

born in Smithfield, were HENRY Jenks; ELIZABETH Jenks, 1785-1874; ANNA Jenks; and SARAH Jenks.

33 RICHARD⁴ SMITH (*William,³ John,² John¹*). In the will of his father, Major William, Richard was left land in Smithfield, and with his mother Mary was executor of the estate. He may have removed from Smithfield in 1765 for in that year he disposed of properties there. His wife, Meribah or Meribe, yielded her dower rights in these transactions.

On 25 Oct. 1738 William Smith of Smithfield transferred to his son Richard of Smithfield 130 acres on both sides of the Woonasquatucket River, taken off from the northerly side of William's farm.²⁵⁴

David Comstock of Smithfield sued Richard Smith, "son of Major William Smith, late of the same town" in the December 1762 term of Court of Common Pleas, Providence, for 260 pounds due by bond and the writ in the case was served on Richard Smith in Smithfield.

Richard Smith of Smithfield sold to Thomas Owen of Providence, blacksmith, on 9 Nov. 1741 for 700 pounds a tract of 130 acres on both sides of the Woonasquatucket River, "the northeasterly end of the farm where the father of Richard Smith once lived."²⁵⁵

Richard Smith, Jr., for 1600 pounds paid by John Farnum, forge master, on 3 April 1765 conveyed land and dwelling house "that came to me by division of the estate under the will of my honored father, William Smith." His wife Meribah signed.²⁵⁶ Presumably he was designated Richard, Jr., because Richard Smith, son of Elisha, was older and was then living in Smithfield.

The final deed was recorded in Smithfield 7 Dec. 1765 when Richard Smith, Jr., of Smithfield sold to Nicholas Bragg of Smithfield for 3000 pounds "all the farm where I dwell," containing 44¾ acres and abutting Capt. Enoch Barnes, John Austin, and Joseph Chillson. His wife "Meribe" signed.²⁵⁷

There is no evidence that Richard died in Smithfield. There may have been children, but none are recorded.

[to be continued]

²⁵⁴Smithfield Deeds, 1:412.

²⁵⁵*Ibid.*, 2:54.

²⁵⁶*Ibid.*, 6:65.

²⁵⁷*Ibid.*, 5:167.

CAPTAINS CAROUSING IN PROVIDENCE

AMONG THE WATERMAN FAMILY PAPERS in the Society's collection are a number of journals kept by Dr. Zuriel Waterman while serving as surgeon on privateers during the Revolutionary War. The following excerpt from one of them throws light on a seldom glimpsed side of the social life of eighteenth century Providence. Dr. Waterman, twenty-four years old at the time, had just returned from a seventy-five day cruise in the privateer *Argo*, and he and his shipmates no doubt felt fully entitled to a little hearty relaxation.

Dr. Waterman was born in Pawtuxet, 20 January 1756, son of Captain Christopher and Phebe (Aborn) Waterman. He died at Pawtuxet, 18 September 1786 as a result of inhaling the poisonous fumes in an empty gin vat from which he was trying to extricate a friend.

CLARKSON A. COLLINS, 3rd.

January 26 — 1780. Fair but very cold Breakfast aboard the *Argo* — was inform'd that Col. Talbot receid a Letter from CONGRESS to discharge the *Argo* in consequence of the Owner of the *Argo* is applying to Congress for her — Officers concluded to have a Bandge to Night — Met Lt. Springer went with him to Bradford's Tavern found nigh a Dozen officers there Drank several Bowls of Grog & Pots of Cyder there — at Night went on board the *Argo* Began our frolic with Several stout Bowls of grog & Toddy — raw Drams Slings &c. singing roaring &c. Till wee got too big for the Cabbin to hold us and then sallied out in the street but did not forget to carry a Bottle of Rum with us it being exceeding cold & about 8 o Clock — all in good Spirits & good Spirits in us not a Man of us wou'd flagg thus accoutred we went along street shouting & singing & now & then to cheer our hearts stop & take a drink — the word was ARGO! by this word we rais'd several of our Companions & so recruited our Company went over the Bridge got a Negro fidler & proceeding up town went in to a house to have a dance but a woman was sick there — so — we went along further over the Mill Bridge & went in a house to make our frolic there but they had got the start of us & had a frolic of their own one of the women was tumbling to pieces — this business being above our capacity in our present condition we thought fit to pack off — so went off like so many kegs of Rum tumbling down every now & then but that did not disconcert us so but that we rose again — stop'd at a house where S — y S — r was kept by W — m R — ll but made no tarry there & away — at length we all met at — Jenks' Tavern — & made

out this List Viz. R. Mumford E. Talbot W. Bucklin myself. Jno. Giffords L. Mumford J. Pollinshow — Lawrence. L. Olney. — Burkitt — Owens — Cozens — went to fiddling & Dancing But R. M. — L. O. got so that they were carry'd to bed & W. B. was no better he sat a sleep & nodding by the fire for 3 or 4 hours & then got so as to steal off & go home the others kept it up & intended to have a Supper but the Landlord affronting us we call'd for the Bill — disputed it & several of us came off — his Bill was this

Viz. To 4 Double Bowls of Grog	72 Dollars
8 Muggs of Cyder	16 do
A Rasher	4 do
2 Slings	7
A Chair broke & fire & Candles	21 do

120

we kept our own acc't & had but 4 Muggs of Cyder & 3 Bowls of grog no slings but one round of a Chair broke & his rasher but a small bit of Mutton no bigger than one's finger —

I went on board the vessel with J. Pollingshow cou'd not get my Boots off slept a very little it being 4 o Clock —

January 27. 1780 — very cold but fair day about 5 o Clock this morning E Talb. L. Mumf. & L. Olney came on board pretty high they brought fire from the house with them & made several fires in the street as they came along after they got a drink again they sally'd out for more fun carrying a Coffee Pot of strong sling with them a little after 7 they came on board again having took a Sentry's Gun away from him & perform'd several more exploits —

I dress'd a mans foot that was scalded last night aboard the *Argo* — Din'd at Capt. Castile went down to Pawt. log'd with Z. R. —

LECTURE

November 18, 1962, Sunday 3:30 p.m.

KING PHILIP — FRONT PAGE NEWS IN LONDON

DOUGLAS E. LEACH, Associate professor of
History, Vanderbilt University

STATED MEETING

THE RHODE ISLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY



NEW MEMBERS

May 31, 1962 to September 10, 1962

- | | |
|---|--|
| Mrs. James M. Armstrong
Rumford, R. I. | Miss Joanna Meader |
| Miss Rowena A. Bowen
Riverside, R. I. | Mrs. John Neuner
Chepachet, R. I. |
| Mr. Samuel Carter, III
Bedford, New York | Miss Nancy Ann Palmisciano |
| Mr. and Mrs.
Walter A. Connolly
Barrington, R. I. | Mr. Carl U. Peterson
Rumford, R. I. |
| Miss Mabelle L. Cullen | Mr. Adin C. Rider
Cleveland, Ohio |
| Mrs. William Grosvenor, Jr.
North Kingstown, R. I. | Mr. Eugene Franklin Salisbury
Grandview, Missouri |
| Mr. Fred C. Harrison
Seattle, Washington | Mr. Donald Shepard |
| Mrs. George E. Kirk | Miss Ruth Tripp |
| Mrs. Raymond E. Lawton
Warwick, R. I. | Miss Alice M. Waddington |
| Mrs. Walter R. Martin
Rumford, R. I. | Mr. F. Chauncey Whittelsey
Barrington, R. I. |
| | Mr. and Mrs. Robert D. Wood |

EXHIBITIONS

TOY DISHES *from the*

Mrs. Howard Johnson Greene Collection
(through October)

THE CARRINGTON COLLECTION

(permanent)

INDIAN MATERIALS of the CONTACT PERIOD

Loaned by the Haffenreffer Museum

Arranged by the Department of Sociology
and Anthropology — Brown University

(November — December)