

shore of Long Island which are inhabited and valuable are as nothing compared to the wastes of equally pleasant land upon which a poor family may "squat" during hot weather, either free of rent or for a trifling payment to the owner of the land. If all the poor of New York wanted to "squat" on the Long Island beach, there might be objections raised; but of that there is no danger. The man who can get out of town must have at least a few dollars in his pocket, and every one who has worked among our city poor knows that the majority of these people live from hand to mouth; they are chained by the hardest of poverty to the great city. Fortunately, the average sober mechanic needs but a very few dollars to make such an experiment possible.

In some figures I gave in the course of an article published on this question I estimated, judging by what such outings in the past have cost me, that a poor family of six persons — two adults and four children — would be able to spend ten weeks out of New York at an average weekly expense of not more than \$5. A tent, an oil-stove, some cots, and a few boxes of bedding and stores would complete the whole outfit. Even the oil-stove would not be needed every day if the family "squatted" on the ocean beach, for the beach is strewn with kindling-wood. I leave out of the calculation the cost of getting from and back to New York, as that depends upon the distance. Our typical family could go fifty miles and back for \$10. The cost of getting a big bundle of clothing from New York once a week by express would not be more than a dollar. In case steady work was carried on, there would also be a sewing-machine to take. The oil-stove, the cots, the sewing-machine, are already owned by most of these poor families. The tent would cost from \$15 to \$25, according to size, and would last for years. The food would certainly cost less than in New York, for in most places along the Long Island shore there are clams, oysters, crabs, and fish, which the children can get with little trouble.

Now consider the drawbacks and advantages of such a life. Upon one side we place the isolation which seems to have such terrors for the tenement-bred poor; but if two or three families made the experiment together, this would disappear. There would be rainy days and the various unpleasant features and hardships of camping out. There would be no corner liquor-store for the man, nor corner gossip for the woman. The daily toil might be even a trifle harder, owing to lack of conveniences. Meat would be difficult to get and to keep. But look at the other side of the picture. First of all, while New York baked night and day, there would be clear, cool air for the little ones, worth all the medicines in the world. The children could run barefoot on the beach, could bathe in the surf and play in the sand; and what more, after all, can the millionaire give his children during these hot weeks?

If the man and his wife are above the common herd and are able to appreciate the quiet and beauty of the ocean beach in summer, the glorious rising and setting of the sun, a series of pictures beyond the power of any artist to copy, they will find more than repayment for any personal sacrifice they may make for the children's sake. I should imagine that most men not wholly unfitted for decent things and depraved by the corner grogshop would find in the majesty, the quiet, and the beauty of a summer evening on the ocean beach a comfort beyond words. Think of smoking a pipe after a

day's labor, and watching the flame of a driftwood fire rising against a background made up of ocean and bay!

I should like to see some society undertake to teach poor people the possibility and value of such an outing as I have in mind. It would virtually be camping out for the hot months, a pastime commonly considered as within the reach of the rich or the well-to-do only. The proprietors of many large shops and factories ought to be members of such a society, for they can arrange to do without half their force in summer and save money by so doing. Employer and employed ought to cooperate in such a scheme. The employer will not be afraid of losing good clerks and salesmen; the employed will not fear loss of position, and will return in September better fitted for ten months of work than if he had lounged the summer away behind a counter. The tremendous waste of time in summer is recognized by every business man. If work of every description could stop from the first of July to the first of September, our mechanics would certainly have more to do when they returned to their shops, and they would be in better trim to do it, provided their eight weeks of vacation had been wisely spent.

Perhaps the greatest obstacle in the way of a wholesale realization of a scheme upon this plan is the fact that so few poor people have even the small number of dollars necessary to it. A man cannot stop work or stop looking for work if there is no bread in the house. Upon the other hand, it may be said that persons and families likely to enjoy and appreciate camping out in July and August are usually fairly provident. What might be done by a Camping-out Society would be to tell poor people where and how they might camp out, the advantages and disadvantages of the life, its cost, its ways and means. I should like to hear camping-out lectures in which people who had camped out would give their experiences for and against the life.

I should like to say to such of my conservative friends as scent socialism and vicious idleness in this idea, that if one per cent. of the tenement-house population is induced by a vigorous advocacy of the camping-out idea to make the experiment, I shall be amazed. One poor man whom I urged to make the experiment and take his sickly children to a bit of beach I knew, told me that the noise of the "bloomin'" ocean made him "blasted" tired. There are too many people who cannot see the trees for the forest. They have been in the Bastille of vile air, dirt, and death too long to realize what a world of content lies beyond the grimy tenement. But even if one family in every thousand could be induced to camp out next summer, the experiment would be worth making. I have been accused of fanaticism in my detestation of city life,¹ especially in summer, and I have advised people to try the country even if at some sacrifice of dollars and personal comfort. But in this instance I merely advise a better use of time that is now nearly or wholly wasted.

Philip G. Hubert, Jr.

A Search for Shelley's American Ancestor.

THE tradition that the grandfather of the poet Shelley was born at Newark, in America, of an American mother, was the scent which led me off upon a two-

¹ "Liberty and a Living," Putnam's Sons, New York.

weeks' record hunt, in behalf of *THE CENTURY*, and apropos of the Shelley centennial.

Timothy Shelley, born April 19, 1700, third son of John Shelley, of Sussex, England, emigrated to America, and is said to have married here a widow named Johanna Plum, and to have had two children born here, and named respectively John and Bysshe. It is said that Bysshe Shelley was baptized August 1, 1731, at Christ Church, Newark. With this tradition comes the statement that the house at Guilford, Connecticut, in which the poet Fitz-Greene Halleck passed the closing years of his life, had once belonged to an ancestor of Shelley, the English poet. There are other statements—such as that Timothy Shelley had followed the trade of apothecary in the colonies; that he had practised as a quack; that he had deserted his American wife, and that he had run away to England to avoid his creditors. It seemed natural to me to seek information where the American land-holding was, so I turned my attention first toward Guilford.

The New Haven Colony came from Massachusetts early in the seventeenth century, and in 1666 sent a branch colony to the Passaic, so that there is close historic connection between Guilford and Newark. In the library of the Historical Society at New Haven there is a carefully written manuscript of Guilford births, marriages, and burials, in which I found several pages of Shelleys. Among the 162 individuals therein mentioned there are many who bear Old Testament baptismal names, such as Shubael, Ebenezer, Benjamin, and Reuben, and two or three known by that of Timothy. There is no record of any Shelley taking a wife named Plum, maid or widow, and the name of Bysshe does not appear at all. Guilford still keeps its old colonial records, and there I found in the vault of the office of the town clerk vellum-bound volumes containing notes of the original apportionment of lands, minutes of boundary settlements, copies of wills, deeds, and bonds from the earliest date of the settlement. In these books are names of many Shelleys, from the first Robert, who came over in the *Lion* in 1632, and married Judith Garnet of Boston in 1636, to another Robert who owned the land upon which the old-fashioned frame-house once occupied by Halleck now stands. From this Robert this portion of the "home lot," to follow the description considered sufficient in the simple old days, came to Nathaniel Elliott, who gave it to his daughter Mary, the wife of Isaac Halleck and mother of Fitz-Greene Halleck, the poet. From this, doubtless, grew the story which gave the Halleck house to an ancestor of Percy Bysshe Shelley.

The Shelleys of the seventeenth century were nearer to the common ancestor, and when Timothy came over early in the eighteenth it may be that he found his first welcome from kinsfolk in Guilford, and that the first American Timothy, who died at Branford in 1738, was named for him.

A close search amongst the archives of the New Jersey Historical Society in Newark revealed the existence of a Samuel Shelley who in 1776 was a soldier in the War of Independence. The family of Plum is here abundantly evidenced by both printed and manuscript references.

Samuel Plum was one of the original party who came from New England. From his stock, which continued prosperously in Newark for many generations, came

most likely the American wife of Timothy Shelley, who became thus an ancestress of the English poet. The Newark records show that the family of Plum was large and widely connected, and might well have furnished a daughter or a widow to mate with the handsome young Englishman. There is indeed notice of a Johanna Plum who died March 9, 1760, at the age of fifty-two, but it is difficult to decide whether she was spinster, wife, or widow. It is curious and apt that in the story of these early days there is much mention of a certain Captain Giles Shelley of New York, master of the bark *Nassau*, who fell into trouble with the New Jersey authorities in 1699 by landing a cargo of contraband goods at Woodbridge, and who lived not free from suspicion of strange doings upon the far high seas, and association with Captain Kidd. The church records, which would tell us beyond question where and when the marriage of Timothy Shelley and the births of his two sons occurred, went to feed the bivouac fire of some Hessian contingent or British troop; for it is well established that when Newark was occupied by the King's forces in the Revolution, old Trinity was used as a stable for the horses of the troopers, and on their departure only the blackened stones of the old building remained to witness the work done both by the priest who came to the cure of souls at the beginning of the century, and by the soldiers who came at its end to dispose of the bodies of the colonists.

In the office of the clerk of Essex County at Newark there is a book of old colonial court records which contains the information that "at a Courte holden the 4th Tuesday of November, A. D. 1734," Timothy Shelley sued David Hayward for the sum of £15, and that the sheriff returned that he had attached the body of the defendant. It also contains the entry of an action for slander during the January term, 1738, wherein Timothy Shelley was plaintiff and John Nettle was defendant, and the sheriff's return of arrest of the latter. The original narration or statement of the cause of suit might give us much information, but though I made a thorough examination of the papers relating to early litigation which are preserved in the custody of the Essex county clerk, I found neither the narration in *Shelley vs. Hayward*, nor that in *Shelley vs. Nettle*. It appears from these papers that there was a Benjamin Shelley in Newark in 1732, and that on April 10, 1734, one "Cunney High, Shelley's godson," was indebted to Samuel Wheaton in the sum of one shilling and one penny.

The office of the Secretary of State at Newark contains the colonial probate and real-estate records of East New Jersey, and here I found the will of a Widow Shelley, but she was of New York; her name was Heelegand, she had been a Van Horne as a maiden, and she had died in 1716, all against the hope that she had been the widow of Timothy. I suspect she was the widow of the sea-rover Giles, for I find that after writing his owners in 1699 that he had brought back with him from "Macadagascar" to their account twelve thousand pieces of eight and three thousand "Lyon" dollars, he soon after loaned three hundred "Mexican pillar pieces of eight" on a mortgage of lands on the Raritan River and at Barnegat, which mortgage, as is indicated by a subsequent record, appears to have come to the executor of his will. Heelegand Shelley seems to have had some interest in East New Jersey lands

and this mortgage is the only record by which such an interest is traceable.

The last place of my search was the office of the Register of Deeds in New York city. Little thinking to find anything of importance there, I found the most definite and interesting of all the records. In Liber 32 of Conveyances, at page 368, is a copy of a document which is in form a post-obit, and is curious enough to be repeated here in words and letters as it stands upon the record-book:

RECORDED for Capt. William Bryant of the City of New York, Mariner, this 30th day of May Anno Dom. 1743.

KNOW ALL MEN by these presents that I Tim^o Shelley of Newark In America, Merchant, my heirs &c am held and firmly bound unto William Bryant of the City of New York in America, Marriner in the sum of Two hundred pounds of Sterling money of Great Britain to be paid to the said William Bryant, his certain attorney, Executors, Administrators or assigns, to which payment well and truly to be made and Done I do bind my Self my heirs Executors and administrators and every of them firmly by these presents. Sealed with my seal dated the six day of December In the ninth year of the Reign of our Sovereign Lord George the Second by the grace of God King of Great Britain, France and Ireland Defender of the faith and so forth and in the year of our Lord One Thousand Seven hundred and thirty five.

THE CONDITION of this obligation is such that if the above bounden Tim^o Shelley his heirs Executors or administrators shall and do well and truly pay or cause to be paid unto the above named William Bryant his certain Attorney Executor administrators or assigns the full and just sum of One hundred pounds sterling money of Great Britain aforesaid and that so soon as he the said Tim^o Shelley shall be possessed of an Estate of the value Two hundred pounds a year sterling which now belongs to his father John Shelley of Fenn place in the county of Sussex in Great Britain Esq. and that without fraud or further Delay then this obligation to be void and of none effect otherwise to be and remaine in full force and virtue.

TIM^o SHELLEY [Seal].

Sealed and delivered in the presence of JOHN SHURMUR and THO. NIBBLETT.

MEMORANDUM that on the Twenty-eighth day of May Anno Dom. 1743 personally appeared before me John Cruger Esq^r Mayor of the City of New York Thomas Niblett of the same city victualler and made oath upon the Holy Evangelists of Almighty God that he was present and saw the within named Timothy Shelley sign seal and deliver the within written Bond or obligation as his Voluntary Act and Deed and that he the Deponent together with John Shurmur Did at the same time subscribe their names as witnesses thereto.

JOHN CRUGER.

It will be observed that this bond was not recorded until more than seven years after its execution.

The father of Timothy had died in 1739, and, presumably, Timothy had returned to England, taking with him his children John and Bysshe, and had entered upon the enjoyment of the "Estate," at least as guardian of the interests of a lunatic elder brother. The prudent mariner, since he was careful to put it on record, probably as soon as he learned that Timothy had left the colonies, doubtless enforced his bond in England against the Newark merchant, "his heirs, executors, or administrators." It may have been the enforcing of this obligation which created the report that Timothy Shelley had absconded from his creditors on this side of the water, but, reasonably considered, that should not, and no other record does, reflect discredit on his honest dealing in America.

John Malone.

"Southern Womanhood as Affected by the War."

MY circumstances, before and since the war, have enabled me to judge clearly and impartially, I think, of the ability and fairness of the views and conclusions of Dr. Tillett in his important paper in the November CENTURY entitled "Southern Womanhood as Affected by the War." A Southern boy, educated in Pennsylvania, and when a man married to a New York woman, and subsequently the president of one of the most important of the Southern female colleges, I can confirm almost everything on the subject that has been said by the author of the article and the correspondents whom he so freely quotes.

But there is one thing I know, which Dr. Tillett could not know, because he is so much younger a man, and has had his observations almost entirely confined to the South. For instance, he cites the fact that before the war self-support was never thought of by young women of good social standing in the South, and that their male relatives would never have allowed it. Was not that just as true of the North? Since reading the article I have reviewed my recollection of the state of affairs in social life, and I cannot recall a single girl of all my college acquaintances of whom that was not just as true as of the girls I had known in my boyhood in the South. Fifty-three years ago I came to New York, and the same was true of all the young ladies with whom I became acquainted here. Not one pursued studies that had any reference to self-support. I can recall the names of a number of leading families in the city, which then terminated on the north at 14th street. There was not a father in any household I entered who ever expected his daughter to become self-supporting; not a young man who, if the idea had been suggested to him, would not have regarded his sister as forfeiting social position if she had sought to "make her own living." Thirty years ago I first saw England, and the same was to a large extent true of social life there. I am sure that at that time no titled lady would have dreamed of opening a large millinery establishment in Regent street, London.

But now that is all changed. The last quarter of a century has altered woman's relative social condition in all lands, and Southern women have shared the general progress; and it is more remarkable in the South because young women in high social life there occupied a position very nearly that of the daughters of the English aristocracy, though their circumstances were suddenly and startlingly changed by the results of the war.

I can confirm the opinion of the distinguished educator whom Dr. Tillett quotes and whom I think I know. While I was president of the college in North Carolina "I had no pupils preparing for their own support." In 1853 M. W. Dodd, then a publisher whose store was in "Brick Church Chapel," which stood where the "Times" building now stands, published a little book of mine entitled "What Now?" It was an address to my graduating class of that year, a class composed of young ladies, the daughters of wealthy or well-to-do planters and professional men. After the war the American Tract Society desired to republish it, and, in preparing it for the general public of young women just beginning life, the changes I was compelled to make to fit the book for its new mission show