

Analysis of the Claims of Southold, L. I.,

FOR PRIORITY OF SETTLEMENT OVER SOUTHAMPTON,
L. I., AND HOW THEY ARE DISPROVED BY THE
EARLY RECORDS AND CONTEMPORARY
MANUSCRIPTS.

BY WM. WALLACE TOOKER.

TRADITION, with its romantic vagaries and illusory recitals, quickly obliterates or distorts every vestige of fact, and carries the historian away into a perfect labyrinth of error. A period of time, looking through a vista of two hundred and fifty years, is inappreciable at the present moment, and minutely considered, is but an atom in the chemistry of our thoughts. Occurrences of twenty, ten, or even five years past, cannot be recalled without some boundary-mark to guide our memory. So it is with early events, unless carefully noted, and preserved, they are soon passed into oblivion. Settlements that were planted in the dawn of the colonial period are now celebrating their anniversaries. The desire for knowledge concerning these early towns and their people, is rapidly growing. Historical data and reminiscences relating to both, are found where least expected; they come up before us like mushrooms in a night, and the end is not yet. The publishing of the first records—torn, faded, and moth-eaten—is doing far more than its greater share in dispelling the myths of tradition in which truth has been buried for generations. May the good work continue until the sum of our knowledge is complete, with

nothing lacking. The two towns on Long Island, first settled by the English, celebrated their two-and-a-half centuries of existence in the summer of 1890; Southampton theirs on the 12th of June, because on that date in the year 1640, James Farrett granted a patent for land, which was then in their possession, with houses erected; Southold theirs on the 21st of August, not because that date represented anything historic, but because it was a convenient day, and a larger crowd could be brought together at that time. The claims of Southampton have been fully set forth by the *Hon Henry P. Hedges, †Geo. R. Howell, A. M., and ‡WM. S. Pelletreau, A. M. These historians have covered all the ground so far as that town is concerned, and prove by contemporary, corroborative and historical evidence, which commends itself to every unprejudiced mind, that Southampton was settled by the emigrants from Lynn, Mass., in the spring of 1640.

Let us look into the claims made on behalf of Southold—claims still grasped at as a drowning man clutches a floating chip—in the light of indisputable facts. Rev. Epher Whitaker, in his history of Southold, 1881, p. 41, reiterated in various articles on the subject of the town's anniversary, contributed to the Brooklyn Eagle, on July 12, 1890, and to other papers during the spring and summer of that year, makes the assertion that Southold obtained her Indian deed in the summer of 1640. Thus endeavoring to antedate that of Southampton by several months. This claim is also echoed, through the influence of Rev. Mr. Whitaker, by Mrs. Martha J. Lamb, in the Magazine of American History for October 1890, p. 280, in the following words:—"the testimony shows that some of them were in Southold as early as the summer at 1638, if not before, although the exact date when the ground was first broken is not known. There seems to be no lack of evidence as to its priority over South-

*Address before the Suffolk Co., N. Y. Hist. Soc. Oct. 1, 1889.

†When Southampton and Southold were settled, 1882.

‡Munsill's Hist. Suffolk Co., N. Y., (Southold town.)

ampton. The church was regularly organized on the 21st of October 1640, about two months after the title had been obtained from the Indians, which according to the records was just a little ahead of its neighbor. Four days later it is recorded that one of the settlers sold his land with the house upon it and other improvements for £5, which points to the probability of his having been an inhabitant of the place since 1639, if not longer." This is all sheer assumption. There is absolutely no authority on which any of these claims is based. It is a distortion of the records, that would not be tolerated in any court of law. They might just as well claim that Columbus first landed on Long Island in 1492, as to say settlers were there in 1638. No Indian deed whatever, can be found bearing the date of 1640. None is even alluded to, as having been given in that year.

Being greatly interested in everything appertaining to the aboriginal history of Long Island, especially for the information, philological, typographical, and ethnological that can be found in her Indian deeds, I wrote to a friend in Southold asking for a copy of this deed—unknown to me and to others—so much claim had been made and so widely published, I took it for granted, that they must have some basis for it: I was informed that the Indian deed in question would be found on pages 112 to 116 of the 1st volume of the printed records of Southold. No Indian deed appears on any of those pages, but on page 112 is found a copy of James Farrett's deed to Richard Jackson, dated August 15th, 1640, for "fifty acres of meadow and upland lying and being upon the North of the River called *Mahansuck* to the Eastward of the place commonly called the Five Wigwams. Together with a hundred acres of upland, adjoining to the aforesaid fifty acres to the Northwest of it." On October 25th following, Richard Jackson, Carpenter, conveys the same land, then called Hashammuck Neck, together with a house that he had erected upon it, to Thomas Weatherly, Mariner. These transactions occur two and four months after Farrett's second grant to the Southampton colonists. No mention whatever

of any Indian claim or deed. Stephen Goodyear of New Haven, as entered on the 116th page, sells the same tract to John Ketchum, as belonging to him both from Jackson and Weatherly *and by the Indian title*. In the 2nd Vol. of the Records p. 95, dated 1666, Ketchum's deed to Thomas Moore for the same, gives us:—"Whereas Stephen Goodyear * * * became legally possessed of the aforesaid several conveyances and of the interest in all the afore recited premises, *as also of the Indian title thereunto*." *Mr. Whitaker acknowledges that the Indian deeds almost invariably followed the English occupation, and he quotes the instances. These deeds show no exception, and prove conclusively, that the Indian title to this tract on which Southold's claim is based, was subsequent to both the Jackson and Weatherly deeds, and was obtained some time previous to 1653, the date of Goodyear's conveyance to Ketchum. †Charles B. Moore in his Anniversary Address at Southold says: "Goodyear bought it from Weatherly on Oct. 22d, 1640." This is a decided *lapsus calami*, for that is three days previous to Weatherly's ownership. Mr. Moore is greatly mistaken in naming any date, for there is no record, nothing in fact, to show what year it came into Goodyear's possession. It is not probable that it was synchronous with Weatherly's deed from Jackson, but, if it was, then the land must have been abandoned for thirteen years, for Goodyear never lived upon it.

Now the question arises, what year was the Indian title purchased? Was it in 1640 as claimed? No! All trace of the Indian deed for this part of the Island, was lost for many years. It is not mentioned in any history of Long Island. No copy was known to be in existence, but one has been found. Those interested in its discovery do not seem to recognize its application and bearing on this mooted question. Had it been known to the late J. Wickham Case, it would have changed the tenor of many of his notes to the 1st and 2d volume of the printed records of Southold.

*History of Southold, p. 39.

†Southold's Celebration, p. 127.

Eight years had flown between the time Jackson sold out to Weatherly and the date of the Indian deed to Goodyear and associates. It is stated to have taken place on May 16, 1648, by a copy made by the Recorder of Southold, from 1662 to 1674, which he states to be "A True coppie of the original by mee Richard Terry." This time stained paper was formerly in the library of the late J. Carson Brevoort, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and is now on sale at Dodd and Mead's N. Y. It is also on record in the office of Secretary of State, Albany, N. Y. A brief abstract is: "*Mammawetough*, Sachem of *Corchaug* grants to Theophilus Eaton, Esq., Governor of New Haven, Stephen Goodyear, Deputy Gouer, and Capt. Malborn of New Haven * * * all that tract or neck of land by some called *Hasshamommuck* Neck beginning at a creek called and known by the name *Paucakatum*, bounded on the west by land in the occupation of William Salmon, extending itself to the eastward towards Plum Island, the breadth thereof also to the North and South Sea, etc." This is not a confirmatory deed of an earlier purchase, but is the first and only deed of that tract. It states, however, that a deed was drawn ten days previous, which did not recognize the Indian *Uxquepassun's* claim, so another had to be drawn.

Richard Jackson in his deed of October, 1640, is said to have been of "*Yennacock*." Hereby hangs another claim—that it means Southold village. It does not follow that it means that limited tract. The early records do not indicate it, and the few times the name appears, seem to designate the whole of that part of Long Island, without regard to any particular spot. Charles B. Moore admits this, where he says of a *New Haven record:—"This †request shows that it was not intended to confine the name "*Yennycott*" to Mr. Goodyear's purchase." Mr. Moore is mistaken in considering this name, and that of the Shelter Island Sachem, *Yoco*, *Youghcoe*, *Roughcoe*, or *Yovawan*, to be synonymous, for they

*Rec. N. H. Colony, Vol 1, p. 97.

†Southold's Celebration, pp. 134, 139, 150.

are not; one is a personal name as all its variations prove, and the other a simple descriptive place-name. Now, as for its etymology and application. *Yean*, *Yeano*, *Yenny*, etc., is the Long Island dialectic equivalent of the Massachusetts *Yâen* = 'extended.' The terminal affix—cock, is a corruption by the English of *auk-ut*, sometimes abbreviated to *kut*, or *cot*. It is found in many Indian names of places on Long Island. Roger Williams in the *Narragansett*, wrote it *awkit*, and as a place-name terminal, signifies, 'land,' or 'country,' which gives us the compound name of *Yean-auk-ut* 'at the extended country.' See the Indian deed, where the land is said to be 'extending itself eastward,' as if those who drew the deed knew its meaning. This is repeated in other records. Those Indians living at *Ucquebaug*—head of the bay (at Pehik-konuk, "the little plantation," from which the Peconic River and Bay takes its name) were also called the *Yeanocock* Indians by the Montauk Sachem in 1667, all of which corroborates our study. Does it apply to the Southold settlement alone? No! But it does apply to the whole territory, and there it belongs.

Mr. Moore is also mistaken in designating the body of water that flows between Greenport and Shelter Island as a river. James Farrett would not have so called it. It is always designated as the 'south sea' in the early days. It is not a river in any sense of the word. No Indian would have called it a—suck, a term that was applied to the "mouth of a stream," or "outlet of a pond," etc. It is a common affix to many Indian names of places. The "Fifty acres" did not lie north of this body of water, called by Mr. Moore repeatedly, the Manhansett river. It lay, according to the record, "North of the river called *Mahansuck*." The etymology of this name describes the stream exactly, so that we can identify it beyond question. *Manhan*, 'an Island,'—*suck*, 'an outlet,' as a whole, "the Island outlet." This describes the outlet of Pipes Neck Creek, near Greenport, which has to-day, as well as two-and-a-half centuries ago, a small Island of woods at its mouth. Therefore this tract of fifty

acres, lies north of the mouth of this creek, and is included in the Indian purchase of 1648, for the creek called "*Paucakatum*" (or Paucuckatux, in another entry) is Pipes Neck Creek, in its entire length. This being the parallel of the Massachusetts, or in the Natick dialect, *Pohquta-tuk*, 'the dividing tidal-stream, or river,' because it divided or separated Wm. Salmon's purchase of 1645, and also that of 1648. *The late J. Wickham Case was inclined to think the "Five Wigwams" had lost all means of identity, and suggested the small Island of woods as its location. As will be seen, this could not be, for the land was "to the eastward" of the wigwams, not to the north. I would suggest as their proper location the "Salmon Neck," by some called the true "Hashamomuk," where the several swamps and tracts of land (Indian corn fields) were located that were exempted from purchase in the Indian deed to Salmon in 1645. They were at that time called **Poyhas*, *Weekewanopp*, *Mantoobaugs* and *Sonnquoquas*. These are all personal names of Indians living at those places, and represent four and perhaps the whole five of the wigwams. *Weekewanopp* in 1648, with his three brothers, gave a deed to Gov. Eaton and others for the tract called *Mattatuk*. † *Uzquepassun*, one of the three, had to be satisfied by the chief *Mammawetough* in the *Hashamomuk* purchase, as he claimed an ancient right in the land. † Another called *Noweconney* or † *Yowonocogus*, together with ‡ *Sonnquoquaesick* and other chief men, signed the deed to Sylvester for Shelter Island in 1652, showing that all belonged to the family of Sachems, and lived in the vicinity. Locating the "Five Wigwams" on the Salmon or Hashamomuk Neck proper, agrees perfectly with the points of the compass as given by Farrett in his deed to Jackson, and is corroborative evidence that the neck and land to the west were unoccupied by the whites in August, 1640.

*Southold Rec. Vol. 1, pp. 113, 208, 210.

†Brookhaven Rec. Vol. 1, p. 77.

‡East Hampton Rec., Vol. 1, p. 97.

Another claim by Mr. Whitaker, agreed to by Mrs. Lamb, is that the settlement was so old in October, 1640, that Jackson was able to sell his dwelling house and other improvements, which point to his having been a settler as early as 1639 or earlier. Here they ignore the fact entirely that Jackson never owned the land until two months previous. Further, if he was the same Richard Jackson of Cambridge as supposed, who laid out Sudbury, Mass., in 1637, who was fined £5 on the 22d of May, 1639, for going to Connecticut, and who is said to be still of Cambridge on Aug. 7, 1640, according to a letter of attorney. This being eight days before he bought the land of Farrett, he could not have been on Long Island in 1639 or earlier as a settler. The deed was probably drawn at Boston, as near as we can learn. Farrett was there the most of that month, possibly all of it. Jackson was in trouble and was persecuted through no fault of his own, and to escape it, went away until his affairs could be straightened out. His fine was at last remitted in September, 1640, and he went back to Cambridge after his sale to Weatherly. In the eighteen days that had passed, between Farrett's first grant to the Southampton settlers for the "eight miles square," and the time they were arrested by the Dutch soldiers under Van Tienhoven, on May 15, 1640,* they had already built one house and had another in progress, showing that the houses of that period were primitive in their character, built of hewn timber, "catted, daubed, and creek thatched," as was also Jackson's.

Jackson and Weatherly were but temporary sojourners — in fact, we have no knowledge that the latter ever lived there—and the erection of this house, vacant and abandoned for many years while in Goodyear's possession, does not make a settlement any more than the placing of a fisherman's cabin on our shores, or a woodchopper's turf and log hut in our woods. We might also say, any more than Capt. Gosnold's temporary occupation of the most westerly of the

*Col. Hist. N. Y., Vol. 2, p. 146.

Elizabeth Islands in the winter of 1602-3, began the settlement of New England.

Time and again it has been asserted that the records of Southold infer a settlement in 1639 or 40, by one Matthew Sinderland or Sutherland. This is based principally on the following (Vol. 1, pp. 168-9, dated 1661): "These p'sents witness to all it may any wise concerne, that whereas one William Salmon sometyme of *Hashammomuck* neere Southold on Long Island, blacksmith, deceased, in his lifetime was married unto Katherine the relect widdowe of Matthew Sutherland, seaman, who was then possessed of *Hashamommuck* aforesaid, for and on the behalf of James Farrett, agent to the Right honorable the Earl of Starling by vertue of a commission to him given by said Earle to dispose of Land on Long Island, etc." The late J. Wickham Case, who tries not to claim any more than he finds on record, in a note referring to this and other passages, says:—"We find many very strong assurances that he was the first permanent settler and proprietor through Farrett in *Hashamomack* and perhaps the first settler in the town." I agree with Mr. Case, partly, in this opinion, but the above record does not imply proprietorship. It was submitted to several legal gentlemen for their opinion. They all agreed that Sinderland and his wife were simply tenants of Farrett, and placed by him on this land, to look out for his interest and in his behalf, he looking forward, probably to his prospective return to New England. The story of Hashamomuk is a long one. We cannot now go into it in detail. Sinderland, Salmon and others were looked upon as squatters by their neighbors to the west without title to the land on which they lived. They were at last admitted into the township and the title to their farms allowed them in 1662.

Who was this Sinderland, about whom so much has been claimed and so little known? Savage shows that he existed, nothing more. He was a seaman in the employ of James Farrett, the navigator and pilot of his "small shallop of four tunnes or thereabouts." He accompanied Farrett during all

his voyages of inspection in and among the cove indented lands of Long Island and Islands adjacent. He was with Farrett and the Southampton settlers from Lynn, Mass., in the spring of 1640. He witnessed their grant from Farrett on June 12, 1640, at New Haven. He *went to Boston with Farrett and obtained the deeds for land at Oyster Bay, L. I., on June 18, 1640. Although dated a year previous, it is easily proven in many ways to be an error of—probably intention. One proof of this never before given, is as follows: The first mention we can find of Farrett's being in America, is on June 7, 1639, at Boston,† where he draws a bill of exchange on the Earl of Sterling, for one hundred pounds of current money in England. This must have been soon after his arrival, for he says the following spring in his patent to Lion Gardiner, dated March 10, 1639, O. S. March 20, 1640, N. S.:—"Which Island hath been purchased before my coming from the ancient Inhabitants, the Indians, Nevertheless, though he the said Lion Gardiner had his possession first from the Indians before my coming, yet is he now contented to hold the tenor and title of the possession of the above Island from the Earl of Sterling, etc." ‡Gardiner bought the Island from the Indians on May 10, 1639. This limits Farrett's arrival to sometime between May 10 and June 7, 1639. Consequently he could not have drawn the Sinderland deeds for land which he had never seen, so soon after his arrival. History and fact point to its being located soon after the time the Southampton settlers were driven away from the same neighborhood by the Dutch, in May, 1640. Sinderland never took possession of it, and its record at Southold twenty years afterwards, was done in order to recover it from parties §then in possession, and it has no bearing whatever on the settlement of Southold.

In order to follow in Sinderland's footsteps, it is stated,

*Rec. of Southold, Vol. 1, pp. 201, 202, 203, 204, 206.

†Archæologia Americana, Vol. 7, p. 87.

‡Archæologia Amer. Vol. 1, pp. 207-8.

§Col. Hist. N. Y., Vol. 14, p. 560.

that on Aug. 20. 1640, at Boston, *"Matthew Sutherland of Newporte, in the Island of Rhodes, was bound by bill to Thomas Robinson for £4, to be paid Oct. 9th, 1640," thus showing that three months after the settlement of Southampton, he gives his residence as being at Newport. Nine days later, and still at Boston, † "James Farrett makes a deed of gift to Thomas Robinson and Matthew Sutherland of one boate or small shallop of burden four tunnes or thereabouts, with main sayle, anchor, cable all new, and a compass with oares and appurtenances in payment of twelve parts of a greater debt owing by him unto them." This tells a long story, were we to stretch it out. Southampton settlers from Lynn, after many vicissitudes, have been planted on their purchase. Farrett is back at Boston again, owing considerable money, and is probably tired of the whole business, it being much more difficult to start a settlement than he anticipated. The boat in which he explored the shores of Long Island, with its fittings all new that spring, he gives up in part payment of his debts, and Sinderland is not yet on *Hashamomuk*.

‡On Oct. 1, 1640, Matthew Sunderland with 58 others, were admitted to be inhabitants of the Island called *Aqueed-neck* (Island of Rhode Island) having submitted themselves to the government that should be established according to the word of God, and Sinderland is not yet on *Hashamomuk*.

The fact, as proven, that he was of Newport, R. I., during most, if not all, of the year 1640, places him entirely out of the question as far as the priority of Southold over Southampton is concerned, but it does not militate against the late Mr. Case's belief and mine, that he was the first permanent settler through Farrett, not in 1639 or 40, but in the spring or summer of 1641. That this is the same person, is proven by the testimony§ of Wm. Coolenge of Newport,

*Archæologia Amer. Vol. 1, p. 282.

†Archæologia Amer. Vol. 1, p. 301.

‡Col. Rec. of R. I., Vol. 1, p. 90.

§Rec. of Southold, Vol. 1, p. 206.

then aged 60 (in 1662) who swore that he well knew both Mr. Farrett and Matthew Sinderland." Farrett, no doubt, made Newport his headquarters; being then only about a day's sail from this part of Long Island, made it very accessible.

Another claim of the Southold historians, that is veiled in doubt and problematic tradition, is the coming of the Rev. John Young, and company, and gathering his church anew on the 21st of October, 1640. I regard this as an error, and that the date should be 1641. There is no contemporary authority that states it to have occurred in the year 1640. The passage by Trumbull, given in his history of Connecticut (Vol. 1, page 119,) is probably a guess, from lack of positive knowledge. It has been repeated with slight variation, by nearly every historian since. It was written by Trumbull nearly one hundred and fifty years afterwards. Tradition and error had taken the place of truth. Almost all of the men, said by Trumbull to have accompanied Young in that year to Long Island, are shown by the light of recent research to have come later, and at different periods. In error in one statement, he is so, no doubt, in the other. In fact, according to his tombstone, being the "first settler of the Church of Christ in Southold," Young must have come alone. It is acknowledged that Young went there under the auspices and jurisdiction of the New Haven Colony. In sending him there, they must have had the right to do so. But there is no record whatever, that shows the New Haven Colony or any of its people had any claim on any part of Long Island during the year 1640; nor had they purchased any land or made any efforts to do so. *The Farrett mortgage of July 29, 1641, is their first claim, acquired through its Governor, Lieut. Governor, and principal merchants. No other paper, or a copy of one, is in existence or referred to. The condition of this deed was the repayment to the mortgagees within three years of £110, together with the charges and improvements in default of such payment, the title was to rest with them and their assigns. These charges and

*Thompson's Hist. L. I., Vol. 2, p. 311.

improvements were what the mortgagees might make in the way of settlements. Through the power conferred by this paper, the New Haven Colony gave Minister Young permission to locate on the "extended country," where in the fall of 1641, he tried to gather his church together; but who were the church? The time of his coming to America has really no bearing on the subject unless he can be traced. The ship he came on is unknown, as is the date. He may have remained several years in Salem, Boston or elsewhere before going to Long Island. *The year 1638 saw the arrival of twenty ships which brought three thousand passengers, probably as many more in the years following. Very few can be traced to their homes in England or America. †The former home of Young is not known with absolute certainty. Hence his arrival and doings in this country previous to locating on Long Island are simply guesses without any foundation of fact.

The records of the New Haven Colony by C. J. Hoadly Esq., on which so much stress has been laid by Mr. Moore, do not prove anything whatever, as to the assumed claims of Southold. On the contrary, the record that John Tottle of *Yennycok* was appointed constable on April 2, †1642, "till some further course be taken by this court for the settling of a magistracie there according to God," seem to follow and establish the fact that Minister Young went there the previous fall, else the Colony would not have waited nearly two years before making this appointment which would have been the case had Young made a settlement in the fall of 1640 as claimed. It also shows that no church had been gathered together at that time. All the records—and the first records especially of the early townships—show that a constable was an absolute necessity in the very beginning. The only allusion to the date of settlement is found in a letter of remonstrance, written in 1676 by the Southold people, against taking out the Andros patent, one passage being:—"We have possessed our lands above 30 years, which is a matter of some weight in law." This would make the date any time before 1646, without fixing it definitely. Long Island, through the terms of the Farrett mortgage, lapsed to the mortgagees on July 29, 1644. It was after this †that Wil-

*Winthrop 1, p. 268

†Hist. Southold (Whitaker,) pp. 20, 21, 22. Southold Celebration, p. 101.

‡N. H. Col. Rec. Vol. 1, p. 70.

§Munsell's Hist. S. C. (Southold town.)

||Southampton Rec., Vol. 1, pp. 27, 39, 53.

liam Wells, who became very prominent, and who is said to have been one of the original settlers with Young in 1640, went to Southold, for he was of Southampton in 1643, still owned land there in 1645, and in 1646 his name is among those who had left the town.

*Thomas Lechford, to whom I am indebted for many of the facts mentioned in this paper, was a lawyer in active practice at Boston from June 27, 1638, to Aug. 3, 1641. He was well acquainted with our friends Farrett, Jackson, Sinderland, Robinson and Weatherly. He drew the Indian deed for Gardiner's Island in 1639. Capt. Joseph Young of Salem, Master of the "Mary and Annie," later of Southold, is spread at length in a lawsuit in the same year. He refers to John Budd of Quinnapeage, (New Haven,) Sept. 10, 1640, Stephen Goodyear on same date, and many others.

Mr. Edward E. Hale, the editor of Lechford's note Book, says in his introductory note:—"It is one of the most valuable documents which have been preserved of the History of the first generation of Massachusetts. It is the daily record of work done in the office of the only professional lawyer in the colony. His duties brought him into close relation with people of every class; and in more than one instance his memoranda throws light on social customs, on questions of local geography, on points of family history, and on the development of the political life of the country, etc."

In Lechford's "Plain Dealing or News from New England," written in 1642, after his departure from the colony, he says: "Long Island is begun to be planted, and some two ministers are gone thither or to goe, as one master Pierson, and master Knowles, that was at Dover alias Northam, a church was gathered for that Island at Lynn, etc." Nothing whatever about Young or his church. Lechford was familiar with Farrett's aims and desires in regard to the settling of Long Island, and speaking of the Southampton minister Pierson, shows that the planting of that town was well known to him. Had Young been also planted on the "extended country" in the fall of 1640, by Farrett, Lechford would have mentioned its occurrence, but the evidence is, that it took place after his return to England. He sailed from Boston on August 3, 1641.

The title to the Southold plantation remained vested in New Haven until June 25, 1649, when: †The plantation

*Archæologia Amer. Vol. 7.

†N. H. Col. Rec., Vol. 1, p. 463.

of Southold upon Long Island are to have that plantation made over to them, and seeing it was purchased by this town, (New Haven,) it is by this town to be made over to them." Think for a moment what this quotation means, and consider its bearing on the following. It has been claimed by all the Southold historians, that the earliest records were lost or destroyed. This is based on the following order of Feb. 5, 1654, O. S., Feb. 15, 1655, N. S. : *"It was then ordered and agreed forasmuch as there is a book to record Lands and the Mapps thereof soe badly decayed that some are past remedie, as also for prevention of such inevitable disturbance as will growe in case the same bee not seasonably recorded that everie man (who hath not alreadie) bringe into the Recorder a p'ticular of all his p'sells of Land, how they ly, East, West, North and South: betweene whom, and in what places, within one month after the publication hereof, under penalty of 5s. as also all after purchases and exchanges, within one month after the purchase or exchange made under the penalty." †The late J. Wickham Case mistook the purport of this order entirely, and in a note, mournfully soliloquized over the loss of the "Book to record lands and the Maps thereof and filled with the record of the transactions of the colony for the first fourteen years of its existence, would now be the richest treasure this town could possess—a mine of facts and figures that would supply a deficiency in our town's history which nothing else could fill." What a mighty claim for something that never existed! What a misinterpretation of a record! ‡Charles B. Moore misquotes the order by substituting "no" in the place of "a," and adding "are" after "Mapps thereof," making it read: "forasmuch as there is 'no' book to record Lands and the Mapps thereof are so badly decayed, etc." "There is a book to record Lands," means simply a book then in being, ready for the recorder to enter therein, the lands of the dilatory owner (who hath not alreadie) done so. What book? Why the book that begins "anno domini 1651, as does the printed copy, called Liber A. Every part of this order points to it, and it means none other. "Mapps thereof" were simply diagrams of the lands, on separate sheets, torn and frayed, by frequent handling, by means of which, at that

*Rec. of Southold, Vol. 1, p. 324.

†Southold Rec., Vol. 1, pp. 324-5.

‡Southolds' Celebration, p. 175.

early period, they kept track of their holdings. A primitive way, but the owners were careless and negligent. The contents of the supposed lost book, as given by Mr. Case, would be an utter impossibility. The great dividends of Corchaug, Mattatuck, Occabaug, Oyster Ponds, and a large portion of Southold itself, had not been laid out at that period. They were still common lands and undivided according to the first order in Liber B, which begins Oct. 9, 1654. The "page after page of drafts, allotments, Indian deeds, orders, municipal regulations, etc., etc.," never had any existence, except in Mr. Case's own vivid imagination. A community of whom only nine, during a space of nearly four years from 1651 to 1655 (had already) recorded their lands, and the remainder obliged under penalty to do the same, would not be likely to have any earlier records. Even the orders in Liber B are desultory, without any regularity and at wide intervals. *The previous orders governing the settlement, were what the New Haven colony sent there through Mr. Good-year, which were accepted without question, without town meetings, or regulations of their own. That they had diagrams of their lands there is no question, but as far as written records went, they had none. Not owning the land prior to 1649, there was no incentive towards keeping books of record. Here is where they differed entirely from their Southampton neighbors, who owned their lands from the very beginning, and were beholden to none.

Therefore it will be seen by those who are prepared to accept the visible recorded evidences, and who study the subject carefully from the standpoint of facts, that all the information we have in its relationship to each other, is totally antagonistic to every claim of the Southold historians. I am no iconoclast, and do not desire to destroy the antiquated relics of tradition, if truthful, and can be proven so by comparison. But tradition is such a vague, indefinite, unsubstantial and visionary element of history, that no one ought to accept it fully in this year of light. Having been aware for some years, on how frail a foundation Southold's claims were resting, and finding that her historians still claimed its priority in every way in their power, has impelled me to give the facts as they really exist, from the standpoint of visible contemporary records, and not from the illusions of later history. Vincit omnia veritas.

*N. H. Rec., Vol. 1, p. 97.