

Dorothy Quincy's Wedding.

BY CHARLES BURR TODD.

Not long ago, I read in a Connecticut newspaper, printed one hundred and six years ago, this brief, business-like announcement: "September, 1775, on the 28th ult., was married at the seat of Thaddeus Burr, Esq., in Fairfield, by the Rev. Andrew Eliot, John Hancock, Esq., Pres. of the Continental Congress, to Miss Dorothy Quincy, daughter of Edmund Quincy, Esq., of Boston."

I must confess that this innocent paragraph awakened my curiosity; it seemed strange that such notable persons should choose a quiet Connecticut village for the celebration of their nuptials.

Madam Hancock belonged to one of the best American families. Her father was a judge of one of the Colonial Courts and a member of the famous circle of Revolutionary patriots that numbered Hancock, Adams, Otis and Warren among its members. Her grandfather, also named Edmund Quincy, was Judge of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, besides being the Colony's Agent to the Court of St. James.

Dorothy was the youngest of nine children, and in 1775 was living with her father in a pretty wooden dwelling on Summer Street, not far from the stately Hancock mansion, which fronted on the Common. She was fully the equal of Gov. Hancock in social position, if not in wealth, and had the advantage of him in age, he being some years her senior. She was the petted belle of Boston society at this time. The marriage was arranged, so the gossips said, by Madam Hancock, aunt to the Governor, and widow of Thomas Hancock, the great Boston merchant, from whom Gov. Hancock derived the bulk of his fortune. Miss Dolly being motherless, the madam chaperoned her about, and conceiving a deep affection for the beautiful girl, busied herself in promoting a union between her two proteges with such good effect that in this winter of 1775, their engagement was announced.

On the eve of the eventful 28th of April, 1775, Madam Hancock and Miss Dolly were visiting in Lexington, at the house of a relative of the former—a Rev. Mr. Clark. This had been the home of Gov. Hancock that winter during the sitting of the Provisional Congress at Concord, and as it happened, both he and Samuel Adams were present on this occasion.

At midnight Paul Revere startled this company by riding up with a message from Dr. Warren advising them to save themselves and alarm the country, as Gen. Gage had ordered a force to march that night to destroy the stores at Concord. There was great excitement in the little village; the church-bell was rung, and the patriots came pouring in from all sides. Hancock and Adams remained on the green, organizing and encouraging the militia until daybreak, when, learning that their capture was one of the objects of the expedition, they retired to Woburn, and found shelter at the house of the Rev. Mr. Jones. The ladies remained in Lexington and witnessed the fight, Madam Hancock from the open door, and Miss Dolly from the chamber window, until they were called away to attend to the wounded who were brought in.

After the British had passed on to Concord, a message from Mr. Hancock arrived telling them where he and Mr. Adams were, and asking them to drive over in the carriage and bring the fine salmon they had ordered for dinner. The ladies did so; the salmon was cooked, and the party was just sitting down to it when a man rushed in with the news that the British were coming, and the persecuted patriots were again obliged to flee—this time to a friendly swamp, where they remained until the alarm

was proven a false one.

Next day Miss Dolly informed Mr. Hancock that she should return to her father in Boston.

"No, madam," he replied, "you shall not return as long as there is a British bayonet in Boston."

"Recollect, Mr. Hancock," she replied, "I am not under your control yet. I shall go in to my father to-morrow."

She did not go, however; Madam Hancock would not hear of it, and it was nearly three years before she saw her native town again. Madam Hancock, poor lady, never returned.

After the battle, Hancock and Adams found themselves proscribed men, and as the neighborhood of Boston was unsafe, they passed down through the interior counties of Massachusetts and Connecticut to Fairfield and the hospitable mansion of their mutual friend, Thaddeus Burr.

Madam Hancock and Miss Dolly accompanied them. Mr. Burr was a gentleman of good family and ample estate, and received his guests with the utmost cordiality. At his hospitable mansion the two refugees remained for several weeks, and then went on to the Second Continental Congress, which met at Philadelphia, and of which Mr. Hancock was President. Miss Dorothy and the madam, however, remained at Fairfield all through this eventful summer.

In August Governor Hancock returned from Congress, and on the 28th, they were married at Mr. Burr's house, by the Rev. Andrew Eliot, pastor of the Fairfield church. It could not have been a very merry gathering; I think, for the groom was a proscribed man, and his house and property, as well as that of his bride, were in the hands of the enemy. Quite a number of guests were present, however, political friends of the Governor, and young lady companions of Miss Dorothy's, whom the war had driven into exile. After the blessing had been pronounced, the newly wedded pair entered their carriage and were driven by slow stages to Philadelphia, where Mr. Hancock resumed his duties as President of the Congress.

Perhaps the reader is curious to know how this bride of high degree spent the hours of her honeymoon? Chiefly, she tells us, in packing up commissions to be sent to the officers of the volunteer army recently created by Congress.

After the evacuation of Boston, Mr. Hancock became Governor, and he and his wife took up their residence at the Hancock House.

During this period an amusing episode took place, of which we have the following account.

When the French fleet were in Boston in 1778, under the Count D'Estaing, Governor Hancock ordered a breakfast to be provided for thirty of the officers whom he had invited. But the Count brought up almost all the officers of his fleet, midshipmen included, and the whole Common, to use Mrs. Hancock's expression, was "bedizened with lace."

Mr. Hancock sent word for her to get breakfast "for one hundred and twenty more," and she was obliged to prepare it.

She sent to the guard on the Common to milk all the cows and bring her milk. She then sent to all her neighbors for cake. The Frenchmen, she said, ate voraciously, and one of them drank "seventeen cups of tea" at the table. The midshipmen made sad destruction with the fruit in the garden.

The Count d'Estaing, however, politely said he would make it up to her, and told her she must come down to the fleet and bring all her friends with her; and true enough she did, she says, for she went down and carried a party "of five hundred."—*Companion*.

—Say nothing respecting yourself, either good, bad or indifferent; nothing good, for that is vanity; nothing bad, for that is affectation; nothing indifferent, for that is silly.

The United States and Mexico.

Within the past two or three years, the attention of American merchants and capitalists has been turned more than ever before towards "our next-door neighbor," Mexico. Enormous investments have been made by them during that time in enterprises intended to develop the resources of that republic, and our trade with it.

Not very long ago such investments would have been deemed crazy speculations, and capitalists who had made them would have been thought on the high road to ruin. Now, however, men of large means and sound sense are not unwilling to be known as having become pecuniarily interested in such enterprises.

One reason for this change is of itself almost sufficient to account for it. Mexico has been gradually, but steadily, becoming a country with a settled government. Formerly revolutions and rebellions followed each other, with almost uninterrupted regularity, and had justly given it a bad name.

This monotony of discord and turbulence was at length broken, and the Republic was beginning to enjoy the blessings of internal peace, when France interfered, and the unfortunate Maximilian was thrust upon the people as their Emperor. This was a political speculation of the third Napoleon. It failed, as it deserved; but it failed only after long years of war. Since then the wise government of Juarez has enabled the people to know how much better it is to have good order than to be in a chronic state of revolution. The more recent administration of President Diaz has opened Mexico so effectually to foreign enterprise as Japan was opened a few years earlier.

Of course a turbulent people are not converted into a law-abiding community in a day, or by simply having one or two rulers who appreciate the advantages of quiet and order. But in any society save that of savages, there is always a strong element that favors good government. Such administrations as those which Mexico has lately enjoyed, make peace popular. They develop an earnest public sentiment in support of order.

But aside from the change in Mexico itself, there is a strong feeling in this country that the interchange of trade with that Republic has been too long neglected by our merchants. Mexico, commercially and in its natural resources, offers unusual attractions to capital, and the infusion into it of a new business element will contribute to the maintenance of good order and a permanent government. The experiment is certainly worth making.

At all events, Americans are making it. The Mexican government has offered great inducements to capitalists to build railroads in the country. The offers have been accepted. It has promised to give to the companies who build the roads a large part of the land over which the roads will pass; to exempt from duty the materials used in building the roads; to exempt the roads themselves from taxation, and to grant heavy subsidies for all the lines constructed.

Two companies have been organized to build roads from the Rio Grande, lengthwise across the country, to the city of Mexico. Several others are projected to cross the country from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean, or as branches of one of the main lines. One or two other lines run south from the capital.

Mexico is a land of vast resources. If its people become enterprising, and industrious, and thrifty, a great future lies before it. Its mines are among the oldest and most famous in the world. Some of the richest of them have been worked in a slipshod way for centuries. Its agricultural resources in parts of its territory are unsurpassed.

It is possible the sanguine expecta-

tions of the capitalists who have invested their money in the hope that these vast resources will be developed, may not be realized; but it cannot be denied that they have reasonable grounds upon which to base their expectations. If they should be met, the result will be not simply a great addition to the commerce and wealth of the United States, but a most important work will be performed in civilizing a nation which at present needs nothing else so much as help from without.—*Ex.*

The Treatment of Sea Sickness.

The *Tribune* has been making inquiries among prominent physicians touching the cause and cure of sea-sickness:

"What advice in regard to sea-sickness would you give a patient going to sea?" was asked of Dr. Alonzo Clark.

"I should tell him to take a wash basin into his state-room," responded Dr. Clark, cheerfully.

"Then there is no remedy?"

"One remedy, yes—to stay ashore."

Dr. Clark continued: "I think people will be sea-sick until the millennium comes. The disorder is in a way a puzzle to doctors. It is caused by a disordered action in the brain and nervous system, and the stomach feels it as a part supplied with nerves. There is no perceptible change in the nerve tissue, but a nerve disturbance, and probably all the brain is affected. It is unaccountable that the practice of going to sea cures the disorder, although this may be owing to a circulatory accommodation. I have never made use of the various remedies suggested. Sea-sickness is modified by a low diet, and if health is much depressed the patient should keep his bed. Food should be taken as constantly as possible, and the best form is soup with toasted crackers. Any alcoholic drink will soothe some stomachs. The supposed benefit to be derived from sea-sickness amounts to very little, except, perhaps, in the case of large feeders. Of course, land-sickness, caused by riding backward and in railway cars, is practically the same as sea-sickness. An instance has been lately related of a woman cured by wearing a sheet of paper over her chest, which illustrates the power of faith."

Dr. George M. Beard said: "A year ago there was no disease of which so little was known and which was so incurable as sea-sickness; now there is no disease of which so much is known and which is so perfectly curable. It is a functional disease of the central nervous system, mainly of the brain, but sometimes also of the spinal cord, and comes from purely mechanical and physical causes, being the result of a series of mild concussions. No more benefit can be derived from it than from an attack of typhoid fever. Infancy and old age are least affected by it, and it is most frequent and severe with the nervous and sensitive. In some cases there is simply congestion of the brain. The chief symptoms are headache, backache, nausea, vomiting, pain in the eyes, mental depression, neuralgic pains, sleeplessness, and nervous exhaustion. Dr. F. D. Lente, of Florida, first suggested the use of bromide of potassium as a preventive of sea-sickness in voyages between the North and South, and it was used with good results. This had also been recommended by Dr. Barker, who carefully studied the subject. My experience had led to my developing this treatment for long voyages and suggesting bromide of sodium in large doses instead of bromide of potassium. The former is less irritating to the stomach and contains more bromine than the latter, but when not procurable bromide of potassium may be used. The patient should take thirty, sixty, or ninety grain doses of bromide of sodium three times a day a few days before embarking and keep it up

at sea until the danger seems to be past. The result aimed at is a mild bromization of the central nervous system, rendering it less susceptible to the disturbances caused by the movements of the ship. There is a great difference in people about the effect, and the great point is to know when to stop taking it, avoiding an excess, and not to take too little. A few people have an idiosyncrasy against bromide, but there is little or no danger from its use if patients will carefully watch for the sleepiness and indisposition for exercise which are the symptoms of mild bromization. I have known of but one failure from the proper use of bromides, and I have here several letters from persons who have crossed safely by their use, although always sick before. Of course the drug should be taken intelligently and under competent directions, as there is a great difference in different people, and every case ought to be studied separately so far as possible."

"What is sea-sickness?" was asked of Dr. William A. Hammond.

"Well, I should call it a disorder of the nervous system."

"Is there any remedy?"

"I can't lay down rules for other people, but I can tell what I have found beneficial in my own case, and that is ten or fifteen drops of chloroform on lump sugar, and the use of bromide of potassium."—*Scientific American*.

—The Rock River M. E. Conference some time ago took the following action on the marriage question:

First Statement.—The Bible does not warrant the annulling of the marriage relation except for the crime of adultery.

Second Statement.—In cases where, in consequence of the desertion or perverseness (or incapacity) of one of the parties, the other party is unable to perform such moral duties as are involved in the transaction of business, the payment of debts, and the transfer of property, we hold that the aid of the courts of law may be invoked to accomplish these ends. But we do not believe that such an act of the court constitutes divorce in the Scriptural sense, or authorizes either party to marry during the life of the other.

Third Statement.—The laws of our State do not recognize the distinction between divorces made by the old English law, and known as release "a mensa et thoro" (from bed and board), and "vinculo matrimonii" (from the marriage bond), the latter of which alone entitled parties to remarry; and, in consequence, the idea has prevailed that divorce obtained on any ground conferred this privilege; we, therefore, not only enter solemn protest against such a construction of the authority of the law of the land by our members, but earnestly advise all good people to unite in petitioning the legislature of the State to amend the laws of divorce so as to establish the above mentioned distinction, and prohibit marriage to the party guilty of adultery, as well as to any and all parties who apply for divorce on any other ground than adultery.—*Christian Statesman*.

—Pliny states that the coffin of the ancient Romans was generally of stone. In some cases it was made of a certain stone in Troas, which had, or was believed to have, the peculiar faculty of destroying all the body, the teeth excepted, in forty days. Hence the name "sarcophagus," which literally means flesh-eater. This stone was probably a species of limestone.

—Prentice Mulford declares that two hours' work about a hot stove is more exhausting than four hours' work out of doors, and thinks the women who in Europe do men's work in the fields are better off than the American housewife, of whose life five-sixths are spent in the kitchen. There is more truth than poetry in this.