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Abstract

As the only city occupied for the duration of the American Revolution, 1776-1783, New York City has been the subject of numerous studies that have sought to evaluate the nature of the British occupation, its significance militarily and culturally, its impact on the populace, and the loyal or rebel character of the population. In general, these studies single out specific individuals or groups; themes or trends; or attempt to place the story of New York City during the American Revolution in the greater context of the founding of a nation and the development of a people. The character and impact of many of the most important events in New York City during the Revolution have already been given sufficient and thorough treatment by scholars; however, the development, importance, and impact of specific geographical “regions” within New York City have only been sparsely evaluated. The area known now, and then, as Hanover Square is a prime example.

The importance of the geographic location “Hanover Square” has been understated in the history of New York City, but it should not be construed or represented as something other than what it is. Hanover Square was not the site of any major battles; few if any “momentous” events have occurred there, and it is not particularly known for its unique architecture. What makes a study of Hanover Square especially valuable is the fascinating web of individuals who lived, worked and frequented Hanover Square from the earliest settlements at New York to the end of the Revolution. Hanover Square is also known for its tradition of being a center of trading and business, and for having the proud distinction of being the location of the first newspaper in New York City and one of the
first four regular newspapers in the colonies. Hanover Square has boasted the nicknames “Printers Square,” “Merchants Row,” and “Newspaper Row,” at various points in its history.

Hanover Square has also had several notable residents who contributed significantly to the history of New York City, and in some cases to the military efforts of the Continental Army and to the founding of America. These residents include: James Rivington, Hugh Gaine, John Holt, Robert Townsend, Jacob Walton, Theophylact Bache, Admiral Robert Digby, Prince William Henry (later King William IV of England), Sir Henry Clinton, Gerardus William Beekman, and Henry Remsen. Of these residents the most important are undoubtedly James Rivington; the inveterate printer, publisher and bookseller accused of spying and curiously central to the right to freedom of the press; Hugh Gaine, printer; Robert Townsend, also known as “Samuel Culper, Jr.” of Washington's infamous Culper spy ring; and Prince William Henry, who for a short time was resident at the distinguished “Beekman House” and who was the first member of the Royal Family to set foot in America.

This study will rely upon mainly primary sources in the form of personal and family papers and correspondence; maps, diagrams, and plans of Hanover Square from the earliest settlements at New York to the end of the Revolution; chamber of commerce and common council records; genealogical and business data from the newspapers of the period – primarily Rivington's Gazette and Hugh Gaine's Mercury; and many published primary and secondary sources. These archival sources will be drawn from: the New York Historical Society; The New York Public Library, Rare books and Manuscripts Division;
The East Hampton Public Library, Morton Pennypacker Long Island History Collection; Raynham Hall Museum; Stony Brook University, Special Collections and Archives; The New Jersey Historical Society; Northern Illinois University Library (digital archive); and Columbia University Library, Rare Books and Manuscripts Division.
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I. Introduction

As the only city occupied for the duration of the American Revolution, 1776-1783, New York City has been the subject of numerous studies that have sought to evaluate the nature of the British occupation, its significance militarily and culturally, its impact on the populace, and the loyal or rebel character of the population. In general, these studies single out specific individuals or groups; themes or trends; or attempt to place the story of New York City during the American Revolution in the greater context of the founding of a nation and the development of a people. The character and impact of many of the most important events in New York City during the Revolution have already been given sufficient and thorough treatment by scholars; however, the development, importance, and impact of specific geographical “regions” within New York City have only been sparsely evaluated. The area known now, and then, as Hanover Square is a prime example.

The importance of the geographic location “Hanover Square” has been understated in the history of New York City, but it should not be construed or represented as something other than what it is. Hanover Square was not the site of any major battles; few if any “momentous” events have occurred there, and it is not particularly known for its unique architecture. What makes a study of Hanover Square especially valuable is the fascinating web of individuals who lived, worked and frequented Hanover Square from the earliest settlements at New York to the end of the Revolution. Hanover Square is also known for its tradition of being a center of trading and business, and for having the proud
distinction of being the location of the first newspaper in New York City and one of the first four regular newspapers in the colonies. Hanover Square has boasted the nicknames “Printers Square,” “Merchants Row,” and “Newspaper Row,” at various points in its history.

Hanover Square has also had several notable residents who contributed significantly to the history of New York City, and in some cases to the military efforts of the Continental Army and to the founding of America. These residents include: James Rivington, Hugh Gaine, John Holt, Robert Townsend, Jacob Walton, Theophylact Bache, Admiral Robert Digby, Prince William Henry (later King William IV of England), Sir Henry Clinton, Gerardus William Beekman, and Henry Remsen. Of these residents the most important are undoubtedly James Rivington; the inveterate printer, publisher and bookseller accused of spying and curiously central to the right to freedom of the press; Hugh Gaine, printer; Robert Townsend, also known as “Samuel Culper, Jr.” of Washington's infamous Culper spy ring; and Prince William Henry, who for a short time was resident at the distinguished “Beekman House” and who was the first member of the Royal Family to set foot in America.

Central to the latter half of this study are the exploits of both James Rivington and Robert Townsend, who have been heretofore intertwined in an almost too-good-to-be-true tale of double agents, spies, and intelligence. This study will seek to untangle them based on critical re-interpretations of existing and previously analyzed documentation as well as newly identified manuscript evidence. Through this analysis and re-interpretation a new and more plausible thesis emerges pertaining to James Rivington's supposed involvement
in the Culper spy ring, based heavily on evidence that has been omitted from analyses for the last half-century. The weight of evidence against James Rivington's role as a spy has been in plain sight for nearly a century, and even the most frequently cited “definitive” source cast serious doubt on James Rivington's implicit role as a proffer of intelligence: Morton Pennypacker's 1939 treatise and oft cited “General Washington's Spies on Long Island and in New York.” The critical link between James Rivington and Robert Townsend will be analyzed in depth, and will be framed heavily in the physical geography of Hanover Square, something which until now has been very difficult as few, if any, detailed maps of the square exist from the period in question.

The exploits of James Rivington and Robert Townsend stray somewhat from the introductory analysis of the history, physical geography and layout of Hanover Square; however, they are linked in more implicit and less explicit ways. Paired with this study has been a detailed reconstruction of Hanover Square during the period 1755-1785, that has drawn together disparate and often contradictory evidence for the location, tenure and numbering of the residences, businesses and individuals who are associated with Hanover Square. Until recently, only two semi-detailed maps existed of Hanover Square, and both were based on data after the period in question – from 1787 and 1793-94. The first map, hastily drawn by hand in 1837 by an author only known by the initials “H.B.H,” located in the Maps division of the New York Historical Society, illustrates mainly the numbering of Hanover Square when Queen Street was renamed Pearl St. and how the former Hanover Square numbers were integrated into existing addresses on that section of Pearl (Queen) Street between 1793-94.¹ The second map is part of a cursory study of important

¹. See Appendix A, Maps of Hanover Square from Archival Sources, “Reconstruction of Hanover Square
neighborhoods and regions of New York City by Kenneth Holcombe Dunshee entitled “As You Walk By,” published in 1952. Dunshee's map was based primarily on data from the “New York Directory, 1786” which was only partially accurate and hardly comprehensive, and his map only showed the lower portion of Hanover Square.

Both of these maps in conjunction with countless other maps of lower Manhattan from the 1630s through the 1790s were consulted and compared with existing data from the New York Directory, the Colonial Record of the New York Chamber of Commerce, advertisements in both James Rivington's Royal Gazette and Hugh Gaine's New York Weekly Mercury and numerous other primary and secondary sources that mentioned locations, businesses and residences on or around Hanover Square. A reasonably accurate map was the product of this analysis – see Appendix B “Reconstruction of Hanover Square ca. 1755-1785,” drawn by the author – and from this map the relative locations of the businesses of James Rivington, Hugh Gaine and other notable merchants as well as the residences of Jacob Walton and Gerardus Beekman can be seen. While this may seem to be a relatively mundane and simple task, until this map was compiled no definitive location for James Rivington or Hugh Gaine presses existed, and the location of many other merchants on Hanover Square consisted of jumbled directions or numbers rendered useless without the aid of a detailed map.

James Rivington was known to be located at “northeast corner of Wall and Queen streets” after 1773, and prior to that in the house formerly occupied by “Dr. Richard Aysough,” both locations generally in the vicinity of Hanover Square. The former set of

directions is far more useful geographically than the latter, but with the aid of the New York Historical Society Collections for 1896, Wills; the exact location of the house of Dr. Richard Ayscough could then be pinpointed (118 Pearl Street or 40 Hanover Square). 5

This data was then compared to one of the existing maps – the Dunshee or H.B.H maps – for determining the exact location of 118 Pearl or 40 Hanover Square. A similar process was used to determine and plot the locations and dates for all of the other individuals listed on the map included in Appendix B. 6 The table located in Appendix C “Residents of Hanover Square, 1750-1790,” is an extensive list of nearly all of the individuals plotted on the map in Appendix B, organized by: name, address, dates, occupation/business, notes and source.

Simple questions such as “what was the exact address of James Rivington's infamous press?” were among the most difficult to answer; however, through an analysis of the physical geography and layout of Hanover Square several important themes emerge. Many merchants remained at a single location for the duration of the period (1770s to 1780s) while others moved on nearly a yearly basis while staying within Hanover Square. Concurrently, many merchants and individuals were in Hanover Square either before and after, or only during, the British occupation from 1776-1783 – or a combination of the two (before and during, or during and after). Hanover Square boasted

6. Each individual was not linked to a will, but the process involved remained the same for all persons plotted: Reference to name → location of business/residence → corroborate with existing maps → corroborate with another, generally primary, source → plot location on “Reconstruction” map. Some locations and individuals are estimations more than exact locations. For a further explanation see Appendix C.
almost every possible type of business and nearly every good or service imaginable was offered at one point or another in Hanover Square, confirming that it was a center for trade. Some locations in Hanover Square are more well documented than others and these locations were generally ones in which multiple merchants or tenants resided. Other locations, such as 30 and 31 Hanover Square, have almost no available data, records or references. Few, if any, of the geographic landmarks of Hanover Square exist today in 2012.

The following analysis represents a compilation of detailed secondary histories of New York City seen through the filter of Hanover Square supplemented with additional primary and secondary source data that enhances the picture of Hanover Square during the Dutch period, British colonial period and after. The primary source, archival, “meat” is found primarily within the sections pertaining to James Rivington and especially Robert Townsend, who have both had significantly less secondary treatment from scholars. The thesis postulated as an explanation of previous interpretations of James Rivington's activities as a spy relies heavily on the lack of links between him and Robert Townsend, the lack of evidence for “Rivington's Coffee-House” and a lack of sources definitively naming Rivington as an informant.

The story and history of New York City during the Revolutionary era is far from complete, and this study represents a small addition to the both the geographic history of New York as well as the mercantile history. When included, words in Dutch and Dutch names have been spelled to the best knowledge and transcription of the author, or copied directly as printed in sources, misspellings and all.
The settlement of New York and the early constructions on the southern tip of Manhattan bare little resemblance to the area later known as Hanover Square, but the tradition of lower Manhattan as a center of trade and commerce date to the earliest Dutch settlers. Geography played no small role in the development of lower Manhattan as a center of trade. Situate at the point of confluence between the Hudson River and the Long Island Sound, Manhattan was a natural location for settlement and trade. Famously, the Hudson River adorned the name “North River,” despite its location directly west of Manhattan, and to the south and east the tidal estuary leading to the Long Island Sound was dubbed the “East River,” despite not being a river at all. In early New York, crops were difficult to come by, the woods were dense and numerous, and the shoals were rocky and unforgiving. As Henry Collins Brown eloquently said “it is hard to believe that only a little more than three hundred years ago the great City of New York was a far-flung outpost on the shore of an unknown rocky region beyond the rim of the world.”

New York would not remain isolated for very long, and the web tying Manhattan to the surrounding region began soon after the Dutch arrival.

As early as 1642 a ferry connected the Dutch settlement at New York with Long Island, and New York's first ferryman, Cornelius Dircksen, made trips from the present day location of Fulton ferry to about Peck slip. Dircksen owned land near Peck slip, which was located to the northeast of the site of Hanover Square, and it is possible that

---

some of his land may have bordered later Wall Street. Dircksen, who is described as running a “little skiff,” charged rates that were regulated by city authorities after 1654, and that were described as “three stivers for foot passengers, except Indians, who paid six, unless there were two or more.” From the ferry the main road from Peck slip ran southeast down Stone Street, crossing William Street and down to the fort, while a second path ran north that eventually became, appropriately, Ferry Street. The main road, which ran approximately in the location of Pearl Street through the site of Hanover Square, was one of two main thoroughfares on which people could travel into New Amsterdam. The other was Sheera Straat or “Great Highway” (Broadway), and most of the visitors to New Amsterdam came from Long Island.

Land grants from this period began after 1642, and the area south of Broadway was laid out starting in 1643, with the first lot in the vicinity of Hanover Square described as a “lot south-east of the fort, along the river, 1643.” This lot ran along Pearl Street and was evidently very close to the shoreline, which was considerably closer inland than it was by the 18th century, and far distant from the present day shore. The Dutch land grants were separated into seventeen “sections,” given letters A through Q. The site of Hanover Square was roughly in the sections K, L, M, N, O, P and Q, with the “Waal” bordering the northeastern side of plots K and Q, and the shoreline along plots O, P, and

---

13. Present day this location is nearly 1000 feet from the shoreline, with the additional Streets, Water, Front, and the FDR Drive East in between.  
Q.15 Upon another plot in the vicinity of the north-western side of Hanover Square, the City Tavern was erected in 1642 and near the tavern, Jacob Wolferstsen Van Couwenhoven established a brewery.16 Van Couwenhoven's two stone houses and brewery were constructed between September 15, 1646 and February 1655, on a land plot that he acquired from his brother-in-law Govert Loockermans.17 Van Couwenhoven's brewery lasted until at least the early 1670s and it is mentioned in both the tax list from 1665 and in a deed to the plot of land next to “the great stone brewhouse,” in 1670.18

Similarly, to the south-east the “lot behind the public tavern,” bordering Stone Street was granted in 1645.19 By 1646, a vacant lot adjacent was granted to Wessel Evertsen containing “a front of two hundred and twenty feet in depth and forty feet in front and one hundred and thirty feet in depth.”20 Just beyond this lot, and in Hanover Square proper, land was granted to Borger Jorisen, of similar dimensions. From Jorisen, the old name of the southern end of William Street is derived, known for more than a hundred years as “Borger Jorisen's (or Burgher's) Path” as well as the name of the “Old Slip,” the southern boundary of Hanover Square.21 Jorisen was evidently a blacksmith as he had both a stone house, which was already on his plot when granted in 1644, and a “smith's shop.” Jorisen had been in New Amsterdam since May 26, 1637, when he had signed a contract with the council of Rensselearswyck to take over the the work of the

15. Appendix B, “Hanover Square Vicinity, ca. 1642-1664.”
18. Ibid., 305.
20. Ibid., 36.
previous smith, Cornelis Tomassen, after his death. After 22 years, Jorisen sold the smithy to Marten Jansen Meyer, in 1659, who occupied the property through at least 1667, and who became a “prosperous smith.” In 1668, Jorisen sold his dwelling-house to Thomas Lewis, a mariner, and he removed to Long Island.

The area between William Street, Hanover Square and Wall Street began to be settled more densely after the 1650s and it is in this period that one of the earliest true “merchants” occupied Hanover Square. Govert Loockermans resided in a stone house that was on the north side of the site of Hanover Square and Loockermans is described as “a shipping merchant and general trader, and one of the wealthiest citizens of his time.” Loockermans came to New Amsterdam in 1633 aboard the ship St. Martin as a ship's cook, and he later “became a freeman, and finally took charge of the trading business for Gilles Verbruggen and his company in New Netherland.”

According to his family bible he married Ariantie Jans in New Amsterdam in 1641 and he died in 1671, leaving three children. Interestingly, one of his daughters later married the ferryman Cornelius Dircksen. It is likely that Loockermans remarried as it is recorded that he married Marritje Jans, widow of Tymen Jansen, on July 11, 1649 and that it is through this marriage that Loockermans was able to acquire most of the land along the shore between Jorisen's plot and that of “Sergeant Litschoe” (near the wall).

Loockermans moved at least once during this period, as he sold his “little house”

23. Ibid.
to David Provoost (see Table I), in 1653, and another one of his plots with a “house upon the north end of it,” was sold to Samuel Edsal in 1657. 27 By 1660, Loockermans still held most of the land that ran along later Pearl Street and the site of Hanover Square and it is here that Loockermans built his third house, near the site of 119-121 Pearl Street, that was likely his final residence. 28 In addition to being a merchant, Loockermans was a fire-warden (1655-56); church warden (1656-65); elected schepen (similar to a government representative) in 1657 and 1660; and in “August, 1668, he became 'Leftenant' of the military company.” 29 I. N. Phelps Stokes summed up Loockermans as “a typical Dutch burgher, thrifty, industrious, and hard at a bargain.” 30

On the south side of Hanover Square, adjoining William Street, Johannes Pietersen Van Brugh lived with his wife on a plot that was described as being “one of the best in town.” This plot had a stone house and on the land in front of it “several immense forest-trees cast their broad shadows over a handsome green, where the Indians used to camp, during their visits to the city, and where market wagons were often left standing...” 31 Van Brugh was involved in the West India Company and his house stood at the corner of William Street and Hanover Square until at least the late 1690s. 32 This description of the green in front of Van Brugh's house as a point of congregation for Indians and “market wagons” may very well be one of the first to indicate that the site of Hanover Square was used as an impromptu market as early as the 1650s. The “green”

27. Ibid., II, 234-35.
28. Ibid., II, 329.
30. Ibid., 329.
32. See Appendix B for the location of Van Brugh's house and plot. Labeled “Johannes Van Brugh, 1692,” at 1 Hanover Square (65 Stone Street).
was located on the plots of land later comprising 2-9 Hanover Square, roughly in the shape of a trapezoid, and bordered by William (Smith) Street, Queen (Pearl) Street, and the “wretched ditch,” or “sheep's path;” that later evolved into Sloat Lane.

Van Brugh was one of the wealthiest citizens in New Amsterdam and he was taxed in the highest class of property. In addition to his mercantile endeavors, he was elected schepen in 1655, 1656, 1659, 1661, 1662 and 1665; he was listed as a “great-burgher” in 1657; and in 1663 he traveled to Holland as one of the agents of the city, and on behalf of the West India Company. Van Brugh's residence was passed along to his son, Pieter Van Brugh, and remained until it was conveyed to Philip Livingston in 1719, who married Catarina Van Brugh.

Table I: Residents of William Street and the area between Hanover Square and Wall Street, ca. 1650-1680.\textsuperscript{34}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Class of Property</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abel Hardenbrook</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Trumpeter</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Andrews</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Hendricks</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Rees</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Strangwide</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balthazar de Hart</td>
<td>n/a (likely First)</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardus Hessel</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borger Jorisen</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Lauries</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Provoost</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elias Provoost</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emetje Dircks</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Harmens</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garret Hendricks</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govert Loockermans</td>
<td>n/a (likely First)</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Volkersten</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Israel</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Woodruff</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes Pietersen Van Brugh</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Andross</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cornelius</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Henry</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Johnson</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Peters</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pieters Rosch</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ray</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smeedes</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pieter Heermans</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Whitty</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Lewis</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tymen Van Borsum</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{34} Valentine, \textit{History of New York City}, Appendix, 326. Re-typed and formatted to include Borger Jorisen, Govert Loockermans, Johannes Van Brugh, and Balthazar de Hart. The location of these residents is an estimation at best, yet they most certainly resided at least in the vicinity of the site of Hanover Square. The class of property can be loosely correlated to wealth, but Valentine's estimations of wealth were not included as they are not in relative currency.
Balthazar de Hart was another of the early merchants who resided in the vicinity of Hanover Square, and he was described as a “wealthy merchant, who commenced trade here about the year 1658.” His trade consisted mainly of shipping and he likely frequented both the Old Slip and Peck Slip, as his ships had links to both the West Indies and other settlements in the region of New Amsterdam. He died in 1672, leaving three brothers and several “illegitimate children” who were supposedly provided for out of his large estate. As the Dutch settlement of New Amsterdam transitioned to English rule the development of the site of Hanover Square and of lower Manhattan increased proportionally.
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III. The English Period: Transition and Upheaval, 1664-1714

The true development of the site of Hanover Square began in earnest after the transition to English rule in 1664, and it is around this time that the first descriptions of the site of Hanover Square emerge and begin to reflect the commercial and trading nature that Hanover Square would become known for in later years. Johannes Van Brugh and his wife were supposedly the first of the Dutch residents of the newly re-named New York to give a dinner party “in honor of the new English Governor.”\(^{37}\) As terms of the surrender, the Dutch residents of former New Amsterdam were allowed to retain both their religious freedom and continue in their occupations. Records show that merchants like Van Brugh, de Hart, and Jorisen continued their businesses well after the transition to English rule.

After 1665, the common Dutch names of the Streets in the vicinity of Hanover Square were phased out, and in some instances the Dutch was bastardized or Anglicanized through repetition. Between 1665 and 1671 “Smee Straat,” became first Smith Street and later William Street; the path between the green and later Sloat Lane changed from “Schaape waytie” to “sheep path;” and “Breedwegh” (the Great Highway) became Broadway.\(^{38}\)

In order to entice English settlers to move to New York, the first, and favorable, description was published in London in 1670. Written by Daniel Denton, the short tract described New York as a city “built most of Brick and Stone, and covered with red an black tile, and the land being high, it gives at a distance an appeasing aspect to the

Denton went on to describe in brief the nature of the inhabitants, the Indians in surrounding lands, the crops that could be grown and the animals to be hunted as well as a favorable description of the whaling prospects off the southern shore of Long Island. His picture of New York gave the impression of almost an ideal location where “The inhabitants are blest [sic] with Peace and plenty, blessed in their Countrey [sic], blessed in their fields, blessed in the fruit of their bodies, in the fruit of their grounds...In a word, blessed in whatsoever they take in hand....” While New York was certainly not as ideal as Denton may have observed, increasing numbers of English settlers arrived in the coming years.

By the 1680s the population of New York had risen to the point that the ill defined Dutch “sections” were no longer sufficient. On December 8th, 1683, the common council voted to divide the city into at least six wards. The general character of these wards would remain the same throughout the rest of the seventeenth century and through much of the eighteenth with several additions. The council described the second or Dock ward as beginning at “the corner house of Mr. Steph Van Courtland by ye Watter syde [sic] and so north wards to ye corner house of Geesie Denys, from thence east wards to ye house of Dauid Prouost and from thence to ye house of Tryntie Clox.” In more understandable terms, the ward began “at the river at the south-east corner of Pearl and Broad Street, extended along the shore to Hanover Square; thence northward through William to Beaver Street; thence along Beaver to Broad Street; thence back through Broad Street to

40. Ibid., 19-20.
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What is important to note is that the second, dock, and later “East” ward, included the site of Hanover Square.

The following year, 1684, the area behind Johannes Van Brugh's house that had previously contained several immense forest-trees was cleared and that “vacant ground” was appointed to be a location for fire wood to be brought, corded and stored. It appears that this land remained undeveloped and “vacant” for the better part of the next decade, and in 1691 a small controversy erupted about the nature of the plot, the path along the southern side, and the necessity of a fence or other land markers. In December of 1691, the Common Council commissioned a survey and inquired into the possibility of a plan to divide the lots in the site of Hanover Square, including the “vacant” property in front of the Van Brugh's. In February of 1693, a complaint to the council was registered that “a fence was being set up in the Highway and Street of Mr. Broughan” (Mr. Broughan refers to Johannes Pietersen Van Brugh). A group of aldermen were instructed to stop any such constructions and a committee was formed to hear the testimony of Mr. and Mrs. Van Brugh concerning the nature of the plot of land that extended from their door. The Van Brugh's stated that for at least the last 30 years “itt [sic] hath always been vacant and high ways for the use of the city...” and that “there hath been no fence or any thing in that nature about said ground.” Still, the committee was asked to “view the ground in controversy and to continue the Streets former breath of forty foot” (see to it that the Street retained its current width). On March 22, 1693, the committee came to the conclusion that “for as many as 56 years the ground has been vacant and a highway for
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the city,” thus, Colonel Nicholas Bayard dismissed the complaint.47

The ground in question and much of the area surrounding the lower portion of the site of Hanover Square is depicted in Figure 1 below. As the ground stood in 1673, number 1 represents the lower portion of the wall and land that likely belonged to Joseph Van Tymen or Cornelius Dircksen; 2 is near the site of Hanover Square and the residences of Van Brugh, Loockermans, and Jorisen as well as the “Burgher’s path;” 3 stands near the site of the Stadt Huys, or City Hall, and; 4 is situate on a slip or dock that is very similar to what would have existed at the terminal points of the Burgher’s path, Old Slip, and Coenties Slip, as well as near the ferry.48 Jutting from the shore north of the slip are “ronduyten,” Dutch for small stone extensions of the wall designed for keeping back inundations from the ocean tides. Built of excess earth, the shore wall was improved with stone after the construction of the general city wall after 1653.49 This rendition is likely embellished from an artistic perspective, as the areas near the shore and close to the wall and slips were not nearly as heavily settled by 1673 as the drawing depicts. For example, in 1674, the length of Smith Street had only 26 buildings and “Slyck” Street, had no residences.50

In 1692, Hanover Square was graced with another of its early notable residents, the infamous Captain William Kidd. Kidd was Captain of the “Antigua” packet ship and he traded between New York and London, but he is better known for his accused deeds as

47. Stokes, Iconography, II, 379.
48. Appendix B, “Hanover Square Vicinity, ca. 1642-1664.” Rough locations of the land of Van Tymen, houses of Loockermans and Jorisen and the shore line from an aerial perspective.
49. Charles W. Darling, New Amsterdam, New Orange, New York, with Chronological Data (Privately Printed, 1889), 30.
50. Valentine, History of the City of New York, 179. See Appendix B, “Hanover Square Vicinity, ca. 1642-1664” for relative location of “Slyck” Street.
a masterful and ruthless pirate harassing English and French trading in the Caribbean and Indian Ocean. In 1692, he married Sarah Oort, widow of John Oort, and “settled down” at a large residence in the vicinity of Hanover Square. They were evidently well off as “upon the marriage of the widow Oort with Captain Kidd, the style assumed by the happy couple could favorably compare with that of any household establishment in the city.”

They were not the “happy couple” for long, as Kidd was arrested in Boston in 1699, imprisoned, and sent for trial in England where he was executed by hanging in 1701. Kidd's legacy has a positive note as well: in 1697 Kidd donated a large sum of money for the establishment of the original Trinity Church in New York City.

Figure 1: New Amsterdam, Site of Lower Wall and Shoreline, ca. 1673

As another point of interest, the site of Hanover Square was the location of New York's first printing press and the site of one of the first four regular newspapers in the colonies. William Bradford set up his press in late 1693 at the location of present day 81 Pearl Street, to the south and west of the house of Johannes Van Brugh. Bradford had come to New York from Philadelphia to be the first “Printer to the Crown,” and it is generally believed that he assumed his duties as government printer on April 10th, 1693. It is possible that he did not actually begin printing until after that date, as he had not yet officially been released from his duties in Philadelphia, and he is not specifically mentioned in the list of Civil Officers of the City of New York from April 20th, 1693. By October, the council had decided on Bradford's salary and had made it retroactive to “six months ended on the 10th preceding,” which would actually place his starting date at March 10th, 1693. Regardless, by the beginning of 1694 Bradford had resumed the publication of almanacs that he had begun in Philadelphia in 1686 and started to print official government documents.

One of Bradford's first official publications was a compilation of the provincial laws of New York, of which – as I.N. P. Stokes states – only seven copies have survived (or existed in 1909). Bradford charged the common council ten pounds for the printing of this compilation along with the Dongan Charter – the common name for the Charter of the City of New York. While Bradford published official documents for the council and
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government of the City of New York in the late 1690s, he would not begin publication of a true “newspaper” for almost 30 years. The first issue of Bradford's New York Gazette came out in November, 1725 and Bradford continued publication through 1744.59

The physical appearance of New York City evolved with the passing of the seventeenth century and by the beginning of the eighteenth century the common council began to pass resolutions to re-define the borders of the 1683 wards and for general improvements to existing infrastructure. In 1700, Hanover Square resident David Provoost – who had purchased his house and plot from Govert Loockermans in 1653 – was both Mayor and Deputy recorder of the City of New York. On September 24th, 1700 a portion of the East Ward (which contained the site of Hanover Square) was extended to include the “east side of the Street which Runs from the North side of the City [sic] Hall...” that effectively extended the boundary East Ward to its furthest position south in the colonial period.60 At the same meeting the council agreed that in order to facilitate the construction of many of the “publick [sic] and necessary buildings thereof not yet built,” a tax would need to be levied, specifically a tax on imported “flower or Biskett [sic].”61

The following year, Provoost returned to his duties as alderman (presumably of the East Ward) and Isaac D. Riemer assumed the role of Mayor. Riemer and the council continued to pass resolutions to improve infrastructure, ordering on the 24th of May, 1701 that “the Dock Street Queen Street from Mr. Theobald's to Maiden Lane Beauer Street and the Wall Street as far as the well be forthwith paved...” and that if any residents refused to allow paving in front of their residences – harkening to the controversy of

60. M. C. C., II, 112-113.
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public fences and highways on the land of Johannes Van Brugh in 1694-95 – then “every such neglect or refusal shall be liable to such pains and penalties fines and forfeitures as mentioned and contained in an ordinance of this city....” It is not recorded if there were any such fines penalties during this period.

The original ferry operated by Cornelius Dirksen had also changed significantly since the 1640s and included at least three more locations for regular transit between Manhattan and “Nassaw [sic] Island” (termed for Long Island). In 1707, the common council agreed upon a set of rules and regulations for the renting of ferry houses, points of transit, schedules and rates for the ferry's operating between Manhattan and Long Island. One of the ferry's was to “take on and discharge goods and passengers...every Tuesday and Friday at Burgher's Path (Hanover Square)...” and another at the site of Coenties Slip (near Hanover Square) on Wednesdays and Saturdays. The rates were set as follows: individuals “Eight Stivers in Wampum or A silver two pence;” each horse or single animal “one shilling in company nine pence;” each colt or calf three pence; as well as additional rates for hogs, sheep, barrels of rum, empty barrels, tubs of butter, bushels of salt and hogsheads of tobacco. As import taxes and regular rates for transit were set, the development of Hanover Square as an esteemed mercantile center was underway.

---

62. Ibid., II, 144. The [sic] spellings for this particular passage were so numerous and egregious that the author simply corrected them to the modern for the convenience of the reader.
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IV. The “Green” Becomes Hanover Square: 1700-1730

Until 1714, the area between William Street, along Stone and Queen Streets, from the shore north to Broadway and back again to Wall Street had no official name. Given divisions and schepens under the Dutch and a portion of a Ward and aldermans under the English, the area in the vicinity of Hanover Square had already begun to be solidified as a center of trading and transport. With ease of access to the waterfront and regular transport to and from Long Island for passengers and goods, it was likely that Hanover Square would become a “niche” location within New York City. Sedimentary deposits and land-fill had extended the south eastern shoreline of Hanover Square to the point that an additional Street was added in the mid 1690s. Water Street, as an extension of Dock Street, had officially opened on January 18th, 1694, and became a regularly trafficked Street by the early eighteenth century.65

With the death of Queen Anne in August of 1714, the reign of King George I began and with it came the official naming of Hanover Square: “in honor of the accession of George I, King of Great Britain and Ireland, and Elector of Hanover, the square was named Hanover Square, an echo of London's Hanover Square....”66 Unlike London's Hanover Square, which is actually a geometric square, Hanover Square in New York City is, oddly enough, a right triangle. The “square” of this period was formed roughly between Smith, Duke, and Dock Streets on the south; Queen Street on the south eastern edge; Wall Street on the north, and the top end of Smith Street and the Sloat Lane to the
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northwest. These general geographic boundaries would define Hanover Square until the end of the eighteenth century. The name Hanover Square would be loosely applied to merchants and prominent individuals who resided outside of the traditional geographic boundaries of the square, but those individuals had strong links to businesses or people in Hanover Square proper.

William Bradford, the first Royal Printer in New York, began his paper between October 23rd and November 1st 1725, under the tenure of Mayor Johannes Jansen, and his press was the first of several that were located on or near Hanover Square in the eighteenth century. By his own admission, Bradford's first issue was published November 1st, 1725, but no copy is known to exist, and the earliest copy extant is no. 18, published March 7th, 1726. His press of this period was located at the site of Burger Jorisen's “second house, built in 1657, at the north-west corner of the present William and Stone Streets, on Hanover Square.” An interesting, if apocryphal, tale of Benjamin Franklin on his first visit to New York as a boy of 17, offering his services to the “old Mr. William Bradford,” and being denied, occurs around the establishment of Bradford's paper.

Within the next half century three additional printers occupied presses on or near Hanover Square: Parker's *Weekly Post Boy*, 1742; Hugh Gaine in 1753, and Weyman's *New York Gazette* in 1759. Newspapers of this time were very different from the
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common format devised in the mid-nineteenth century. They generally consisted of one to four half-sheet pages and came out once or twice weekly. Each edition was filled with government directives and news, occasional letters from readers, advertisements for businesses, and public notices. Papers were distributed almost exclusively by subscription, although some were sold second hand or available in coffee houses for general consumption.

At the same time as the solidification of the site of Hanover Square and the development of weekly newspapers, the population of New York City was expanding. In 1703, there were 750 houses and 4,500 “white-inhabitants” as well as 750 slave and free blacks. On a ride through New York City in 1704, one “Madam Knight” recounted that the buildings in New York were “mostly of brick, some of them glazed, of divers [sic] colors laid in cheques, and look very well....” In 1712 the population was 5,840 and by 1723 the population of the city had risen to 7,248 and the population of the colony to 40,564. Undoubtedly the demand for goods rose proportionally.

As early as 1656, city ordinances established locations for the general sale of goods and public markets wherein “divers [sic] articles, such as meat, pork, butter, cheese, turnips, cabbage and other country produce...” were sold, specifically on Saturday each week which was appointed to be “market day.” One such market was at the corner of Pearl and Whitehall Streets, just south of the site of Hanover Square near Burger

---
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Jorisen's 1643 home\textsuperscript{76}, and a second “meat market” was established at the site of the Bowling Green in 1658. By 1675, additional markets set at regular intervals began to supplement the permanent ones, such as a market at “Breucklyn near the ferry for all grain, Cattle, or other produce of the Country; To be held the first Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday in November and in the City of New Yorke the thursday, friday and Saturday following.”\textsuperscript{77} The terminus of the Breucklyn ferry was near the southern end of the wall, near the shore line, which ensured that goods transported via this route came down Pearl Street, adjacent to the site of Hanover Square, and then to the markets at either Bowling Green or at the corner of Pearl and Whitehall, and to the furthest point south: the fort.

In 1701, the common council voted to make the “Old market house” near the custom house bridge a public market house for “the benefit and conveniency [sic] of all persons that shall resort thereunto in as full and ample manner as any other market house or market place within this city....”\textsuperscript{78} This market house was located near the southern end of Hanover Square, near the intersection with the Old Slip and Smith Street. Over the next three years Hanover Square became one of two formal market places, with the other still at Bowling Green, and fish supplied from Coenties Slip supplemented the meat already offered for sale in the square. By establishing this market house and regulating the locations and frequency of public markets, a “regular and systematic sale of produce” and other goods became the norm for Hanover Square.\textsuperscript{79}

The market established in 1675 near the terminus of the Breucklyn ferry expanded

\textsuperscript{76} See Appendix B, “Hanover Square Vicinity, ca. 1642-1664,” for relative location of Burger Jorisen's 1643 home, near plot O.
\textsuperscript{77} M. C. C., I 1673-1696, October 17, 1675, 4.
\textsuperscript{78} M. C. C., II 1696-1711, June 30, 1701, 146.
\textsuperscript{79} James Grant Wilson, \textit{Memorial History}, II, 376.
and saw more traffic through the turn of the century such that in 1727 the common
council again passed a law to specifically regulate commerce and trade through public
markets. The Breucklyn market was common referred to by the mid 1720s as the Wall
Street Market House, and it had moved south of its previous location to the lower end of
Wall Street near the shore. In January, 1727 the council passed a law designating the Wall
Street market to be only for “the sale of all sorts of Corn, Grain and Meal,” and that after
the end of March “no corn, grain or meal be sold in Publick Market within this City at
any other place.”80 If such goods were sold at another location then a penalty of “six
shillings for every bushell of corn or grain,” would be assessed to the seller that must be
paid “one half to the informer and the other half to the treasurer of this City....”81 This
constituted a rudimentary and indirect tax that also helped to ensure that only specific
locations were utilized as markets, possibly for ease of transport along more trafficked
streets and for a level of control over commerce.

Aside from commerce and printing this period also saw the establishment of the
first regular public and society libraries within New York City. New York's first library,
aptly called the New York Society Library, opened in 1700 and was located in a room in
the first English City Hall located on Wall Street.82 The society library still exists today;
however, it is the second incarnation of the New York Society Library, and was founded
in 1754. It is unclear how long the original library lasted, but the first public and
municipal library came almost three decades later. In June 1729, the first public and
municipal circulating library was founded from the bequest of the late Rev. Dr.
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Millington, rector of Newington, and member of the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts. It was decided by the board of the Society that a library of 1,000 volumes was to be located in the City of New York and that “a proper place may be provided wherein this Library may be reposited [sic] for the publick use and that an act be made providing for the due preservation of these books and all others which shall be added to them....” The books, totaling 1,642, were shipped to New York and received the following year in June, 1730 and the room across from the sitting room of the common council was agreed upon for the location of the library. The first “keeper of the library,” Alexander Lamb, assumed his duties in 1734 at a rate of 3 pounds per year.

One of the first and accurate surveys of New York City from this period was done by James Lyne in 1728 and the map he compiled from it was published by William Bradford in 1731. The map depicts lower Manhattan and the expansion and development of the residential and commercial areas is clearly evident when compared to earlier, albeit less accurate, maps. In Figure 2, number 1 represents the area of Hanover Square and the East or Second Ward, and number 2 is located at the bottom of Wall Street at about the point of both the public market house and the slave market.
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85. Stokes, Iconography, IV, 512. His rate was increased to a paltry 4 pounds in 1737. It is unclear if the first society library cited in A Home Geography is actually just a misinterpretation of the Society Library formed in 1729, and if that library is in fact the same as the one still in existence. According to the current New York Society Library they began operation in 1754, not 1729, although the existence of three separate “New York Society Libraries” seems unlikely.
Figure 2: Plan of the City of New York Printed by William Bradford from a Survey by James Lyne, 1728.\textsuperscript{86}

\textsuperscript{86} Printed by William Bradford, 1731. Out of copyright reproduction. Numbers added by the author.
From the Lyne Plan it is evident that New York City more than doubled in size from 1664 to 1728 and the areas surrounding Hanover Square and lower Manhattan became more densely settled while outlying areas to the north beyond Wall Street and further out William Street were still sparsely settled. From Hanover Square west and south the general character of neighborhoods, markets, and residential areas began to take shape. In 1728, there were five general market locations: the end of Broad Street near the shore; at the corner of Pearl and Whitehall Streets; Hanover Square at the Old Slip; the end of Wall Street at the shore; and near Coenties Slip at the end of Maiden Lane. These markets were regulated to a certain degree by the common council by type of good or produce available; however, as population expanded and demand for goods rose, there was a proportional increase in the demand for public market houses and diversity of goods. At the time of the publication of the Lyne or Bradford map – 1731 – it is estimated that there were approximately 1,400 households in the city and a population of 8,600, which constituted nearly double the number from 1703.
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The merchants of Hanover Square were representative of the general wealth and status of merchants in colonial New York City. Distribution of wealth and land was generally concentrated in the hands of an upper class of residents and merchants who tended to maintain continuous residences and shops for extended periods of time. For example, data from 1701, 1708 and 1730 shows that the wealthiest 10% of the city owned more than 46% of the total land.\(^8^9\) Notable merchants and residents of Hanover Square followed the same pattern of continuous land ownership and mercantile endeavor as correlated to general wealth. Starting in the Dutch period, wealthy merchants such as Govert Loockermans, Johannes Van Brugh and Burger Jorisen, had residences and businesses in the same general physical locations for several decades – Jorisen into the 1680s and the Van Brugh family until 1719 – and they were considered to be in the first class of land ownership as a measure of either total wealth or land holdings. The Royal Printer, Bradford, had his press in the general location of Hanover Square from 1693 to 1744 and as for many years the only official printer in New York, he attained moderate wealth.

During the “prime” development of Hanover Square as a mercantile center in the colonial period – 1730 to 1760 – wealthy merchant Thomas Duncan and his family had residences and businesses in the vicinity of Hanover Square until well after the Revolutionary War.\(^9^0\) Numerous other well-off merchants resided in or near Hanover

\(^8^9\) Rothschild, *Neighborhoods*, 111.
Square in this period including William Bradford, Jr. (Pewterer), Thomas Brown, Theophylact Bache, William Walton, and Gerardus William Beekman. This “generation” of merchants bridged the gap between the late Dutch merchants and those of the Revolutionary era, 1765-1783, and many of them continued business through the British occupation of New York and after. Merchants like Theophylact Bache and Gerard Beekman began their businesses in the 1750s, but didn't become mainstay or wealthy merchants until the 1760s or 70s. They did maintain and expand personal land holdings in the vicinity of Hanover Square and the public market places.

By 1703, the East and Dock wards – adjacent to one another with the former containing Hanover Square – had a total of 270 merchants, professionals, retailers and artisans, many of whom were in the upper half of the tax bracket by total wealth or land holdings. As Nan Rothschild affirms: “Pearl Street and Hanover Square were affluent areas where many merchants had their homes (and counting houses). In 1703, Dock (now Pearl) Street, the location of the Stadt Huys [city hall] and Hanover Square Blocks, had the highest mean tax rank in the Dock ward....” A centralization and development of a mercantile center also meant that the general infrastructure of public markets and municipal locations needed to be improved and regulated.

As a measure of commercial progress, the common council continued to support and pass laws for the regulation of specific goods and services in the same fashion as the laws from the early 1700s that regulated what could be brought through specific markets.

91. Rothschild, Neighborhoods, 114-17; 121. There is some debate about whether or not the loose geographic boundaries of Hanover Square place it primarily in the Dock or East Wards during this era. The southern end near the Old Slip is certainly in the Dock Ward, but most of the “square” itself could be considered to be in the East Ward.
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By 1729, laws had been passed regulating the sale of and production of: butter, the cutting of timber in the commons for bricklayers and masons, fees for slaughter houses, regulation of repacking of beef and pork, places for unloading hay, the distribution and danger of gunpowder, burial of slaves, and for the establishment of a market specifically for corn and meal.\textsuperscript{93} This meal market was established at or around the intersection of Wall and Queen Streets in the 1730s and was later removed to the former location of the slave market at the end of Wall Street at the shore line. In 1741, the council agreed that an additional law was needed for “better Regulating and Ordering the Publick Markets of the City of New York,” and that pursuant to this legislation funds should be appointed at regular intervals to repair and support all of the public market houses as “needful and necessary.”\textsuperscript{94}

The appointed funds in question came both from public tax rolls – of which Hanover Square had a large portion of top tier payers – and from general revenues put in place on transit, previous regulations of markets, and land tax. Additional taxes on markets may not have been necessary until the 1740s as the City of New York ran a balance that, according to available data, was only in deficit one year from 1715 to 1730 (Table II).

\textsuperscript{93} M. C. C., IV 1730-1740, 2-3.\textsuperscript{94} M. C. C., V 1740-1751, 39.
Table II: City of New York, Common Council:
Receipts, Expenditures, and Balance, 1715-1730.\textsuperscript{95}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Receipts (in pounds)</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>320; 3; 5</td>
<td>321; 6; 11</td>
<td>1; 3; 6 (deficit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>495; 3; 6</td>
<td>252; 7; 5</td>
<td>242; 16; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>621; 17; 1</td>
<td>477; 12; 1</td>
<td>144; 5; 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>569; 1; 9</td>
<td>215; 8; 4</td>
<td>353; 3; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>704; 10; 11</td>
<td>310; 6; 4</td>
<td>394; 4; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td>730; 11; 6</td>
<td>604; 0; 6</td>
<td>126; 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724</td>
<td>430; 4</td>
<td>428; 12; 6</td>
<td>1; 11; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>256; 18; 6</td>
<td>248; 10; 10</td>
<td>8; 7; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>287; 15; 7</td>
<td>224; 8; 4</td>
<td>63; 7; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>271; 5; 3</td>
<td>230; 11; 3</td>
<td>40; 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727-1730</td>
<td>1199; 1; 11</td>
<td>1116; 18; 11</td>
<td>82; 3; 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The large surpluses of the early 1720s likely faded with additional expenditures for both the enforcement of new laws and the upgrading and repair of city infrastructure. After 1730 the city began to collect additional duties on ferries, docks, markets, lands, water lots, buildings, and licenses. These duties also increased from 1730 to 1760, with 1745 listed as the first year that revenue was collected from markets (Table III).

\textsuperscript{95} Stokes, Iconography, IV, 516. Data taken from M. C. C., III, 106. Rounded down to not include fractions of pence and 1716-18 were not included in the data set.
Table III: City Revenue, by Year and Source. 1730-1760

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ferries</th>
<th>Docks</th>
<th>Markets</th>
<th>Lands</th>
<th>Water lots</th>
<th>Buildings</th>
<th>Licenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The markets located near the Old Slip, end of Wall Street and at Coenties slip were likely hit with several of these duties at once, because the goods were shipped by ferry from Long Island or elsewhere; docked to unload, and the markets themselves were taxed as well as the owner of the water lot if it was a private place of business (public market houses were owned by the city). Revenue increased not just because of additional rates, but because of increased traffic and usage.

New York continued to grow and by 1749 the city contained an estimated 1,834 houses with 356 of those in the East Ward and 233 in the Dock Ward. In that same year Edmund Burke observed that the city had more than 2,000 houses and over 12,000 inhabitants and that the city was “well and commodiously built...the houses are built of brick in the Dutch taste; the streets not regular, but well paved....” He also noted that the ports saw traffic of a total of more than 500 ships entering and leaving and that they carried “6,731 tons of provisions, chiefly flour, and a vast quantity of grain...” and went
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98. Edmund Burke, An Account of the European Settlements in America containing an accurate Description of their Extent, Climate, Productions, Trade, Genius, and Dispositions of their Inhabitants: the Interests of the several Powers of Europe with respect to those Settlements; and their Political and Commerical Views with regard to each other. 2 vols. (London: John Joseph Stockdale, 1808), II, 220-21.
as far as to say that the merchants were wealthy and the people were well provided for with little labor. In concert with Burke's observations, John Harris concurred that “As this town stands upon an Eminence, and contains upwards of a thousand houses well built with Brick and Stone...there is scarce any town in North America that makes a better … appearance.” Harris and Burke both noted that the harbors and docks were of excellent quality and were serviced by many quays, markets and warehouses.

At mid-century funds were appointed by the common council to establish a fire house in Hanover Square, where previously none had existed. Specifically, a committee was appointed to “get a sufficient house built for one of the Large fire Engines to be kept in some part of Hanover Square,” and that at least fifty buckets should be hung there. By August of 1750 the council had paid “20:1:11” (pounds:shillings:pence) for the construction of a similar fire house in the South Ward and another payment was set aside for the construction of a house in Hanover Square. The house eventually built in Hanover Square housed Engine 11 until it was demolished along with the triangular block in the center of the Square in the mid 1820s.

In addition to becoming a center of trade, Hanover Square was also becoming known for printers and newspapers and was thus also adorned with the name “Newspaper Row,” or “Printers Row,” beginning in the 1730s and 1740s. It appears that the only newspaper printed on Hanover Square during the 1730s was Bradford's New York Gazette; however, Bradford did have ties to arguably the most famous printer in New York at this time, John Peter Zenger. Bradford's press had moved several times back and forth.
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forth across Hanover Square, and in 1734 was located at “the house where the Brasier lately dwelt, in Hanover Square, against Capt. Walton's.” Roughly in the middle of Hanover Square, on the even side of the street, near the site of Jacob Walton's 1772 home. Bradford moved again in 1737 to “the Sign of the Bible near the Fly-Market, next door but one to the Treasurers.”

The case of John Peter Zenger and his debacle with the city council over accused libelous printings is an interesting case and one that has received much treatment from scholars. His trial is seen by many as the first true defense of freedom of the press; however, as will be shown, the case against James Rivington almost four decades later proved far more influential and relevant to the development of the First Amendment. As Zenger was not located on Hanover Square, his exploits fall somewhat outside the scope of this work. Nevertheless, Zenger began publication of his *New York Weekly Journal* on November 5, 1733 and continued until 1748 with a minor gap in the years 1734-35 while he awaited trial for libel. Stokes sums up the trial and acquittal best:

[August 4, 1735] Zenger is finally tried for libel, in the supreme court at the city hall, Chief-Justice James de Lancey presiding, with Frederick Philipse, second justice. The attorney for the government offers no proof of Zenger's papers being false, malicious, and seditious, as charged, but insists that they are libels, even though true. The court concurs in opinion; but the attorney for the defense, Andrew Hamilton...overwhelms his opponents by citing English precedents. He admits that his client has published the statements, as charged, but insists that they are true, and therefore not libelous, and offers to prove them. Despite the unfavorable charge of the chief-justice, the jury returns in about ten minutes with a verdict of 'Not Guilty.'

The Zenger trial did establish the absolute supremacy of truth as a tenet of

---
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defamation law and utilized English precedents, but it was a uniquely colonial affair settled within the confines of city government and the colonial legal system. The case against James Rivington was settled by a fledgling congress operating against the backdrop of an imminent revolution to specifically overthrow British rule and precedent.

After Zenger was acquitted he returned to his press and was awarded official publishing contracts by the City and Colony of New York in 1737 and 1738. He stated upon his release that “the printer now having got his liberty again, designs God willing, to finish and Publish the Charter of the City of New York next week.” Curiously, the common council had awarded this publishing contract to Zenger while he was in prison awaiting trial for libel in August of 1734. Bradford, who played a role as the opposing printer in the Zenger trial, continued to print his Gazette for another decade, enlisting the assistance of an apprentice, Henry DeForeest, who became another notable printer in New York. After his retirement from printing in 1744, William Bradford (Sr.) moved in with his son William Bradford (Jr.) who lived and worked on Hanover Square as a Pewterer. Bradford passed away May 23, 1752 and Zenger on July 28, 1746. With them passed the first generation of printers of New York City.

One of Bradford's early apprentices, James Parker, established the third press and newspaper in New York City in 1741. In 1743 he began to publish the New York Weekly Post Boy, and he partnered with another of Bradford's apprentices, William Weyman, in 1753 and they continued publication of the Post Boy through 1759. Parker was
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appointed an official printer by the common council on March 18th, 1749 and he was instructed to “print the By Laws of this City on the following conditions viz. To print the same on good paper at his own Cost and risque together with what acts of assembly or abstracts shall be thought necessary....” Since Bradford was the only printer in New York from the late 1690s through the mid 1730s it is not surprising that so many of his apprentices went on to found presses of their own. Samuel Brown, another apprentice, founded his press and bookbinders shop in 1755 and it is possible that he continued the business of DeForeest after his death. Another bookbinder, Robert A. McAlpine founded his shop in Hanover Square in 1752, where he remained until 1755.

Printing a newspaper in the mid eighteenth century was a difficult endeavor. Initially, paper was scarce, of inconsistent quality, and expensive. The price of paper and a relative lack of suppliers influenced the size, length and frequency of early newspapers. In New York, there was not a local supply of paper until well into the second “generation” of printers, or after the 1760s. Prior to local production, paper had to be imported, although it is not clear exactly which market or slip received the paper as the common council passed no resolutions regulating the sale or import of paper during the period 1740-54. Despite being a necessary and common commodity, paper was sold by general traders and merchants alike, but often in small quantities.

The earliest date yet established for the creation of a paper mill in New York City is 1768, when John Keating set up a mill at some direction to the rear of the original Trinity Church. Prior to this, paper was imported largely from New England,
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Pennsylvania, and New Jersey – where printers like Bradford also held additional printing offices. Unfortunately, Keating's mill didn't last long and by the following year he had been dispossessed of his land for not paying rent to the Church.\textsuperscript{113} Keating's mill was “probably small, and was operated by a windmill, drawing its water from a well...” and as paper making was relatively simple, it could have been run by few people or possibly just Keating himself.\textsuperscript{114} This mill was either not very successful or did not produce paper of sufficient quality, price, or quantity to compete with paper imported from other colonies to be used in the printing of newspapers. It seems that another paper mill was not set up in New York City until the 1840s.

Printers like Parker, Weyman, DeForeest and Brown bridged the gap between the first true generation of Printers in New York; Bradford and Zenger, and the second; Hugh Gaine and James Rivington.

\textsuperscript{113} Others Connected with or Interested in Bookmaking. vols. IV and V, January to December, 1887, August, 1887; 63.
\textsuperscript{114} Ibid.
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VI. Hugh Gaine and James Rivington: the Printers of Hanover Square, 1752-1775

As mid-century came and went Hanover Square and lower Manhattan continued to develop rapidly. In 1756, the Historian William Smith described New York as a city “of about two thousand five hundred buildings,” with irregular streets lined with brick houses and tiled roofs. With the flurry of new people, buildings and businesses came two of the most famous individuals, and printers, of New York City: Hugh Gaine and James Rivington. Both established themselves on Hanover Square and were notable for bringing recognition to the Square through their publications, activities, and tag lines: “Printed in Hanover-Square.”

Hugh Gaine was born in Belfast, Ireland in 1726 and was at a young age apprenticed to a printer, James MacGee, from who he learned his trade. MacGee was printer at the house of Wilson and MacGee in Beaver Street, Belfast, at the Sign of the Crown and Bible. It was from his early experiences apprenticed there that Gaine developed his “habits of diligence and sobriety,” and where he likely derived the name of his later printing shop on Hanover Square: “The Bible and Crown.” Gaine came to New York in 1745, “without basket or burden,” and he found employment with printer James Parker at “a dollar and a quarter a week.” Also employed as a journeyman in the same shop was William Weyman, and after a dispute between Parker and Gaine's brother in 1751, Weyman was given financial support to procure his own press and types and
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enter into partnership instead of Hugh. As a result, and due to his diligent and penurious habits, Gaine had saved enough money – with the support of an unknown friend in London – to purchase his own press and types.\textsuperscript{119} Gaine had written Weyman, who was in London at the time procuring his press, to enter into partnership with him instead of Parker, but Weyman declined.

With this news, in 1752 Gaine began his own press and started to print the \textit{New York Weekly Mercury}, from his office on Hunter's key, “next door to Mr. Walton's Storehouse.”\textsuperscript{120} Gaine ran into trouble early in his publishing career after printing part of the Resolves and Proceedings of the House and General Assembly, in 1753, without their consent. He was called before the general assembly and asked to account for his actions, to which he testified: “that he had no authority for doing it, and knew not that he did amiss in doing so; that he was very sorry that he had offended the House, and humbly asked for their pardon.”\textsuperscript{121} It was resolved that he was to be reprimanded for his offense, which apparently constituted a rough, verbal reprimand from the speaker of the House, and a small fee.\textsuperscript{122}

The Assembly was known for stiff punishment and at around the same time a man named William Bishop was “whipped at the Cart's Tail, at City Hall...” for stealing linen out of a washing tub. He was sentenced to be exiled from the city after 48 hours, “never to be seen here again under very severe penalties.”\textsuperscript{123} Perhaps Gaine was let off easy with
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a scolding. Now competing with Gaine, Parker and Weyman had officially gone into partnership in March, 1753 and renamed their paper the New York Weekly Gazette; or, the Weekly Post Boy. Gaine had a few more minor disputes with the city council and assembly, some of which led to official printing contracts being awarded to Parker instead of Gaine; however, Gaine took pains to distance himself from their printing offices. Moving several times between 1754 and 1759, he held offices further down Hunter's Key, at the Old-Slip, and next door to Robert G. Livingston “in Queen Street, between fly and meal markets,” all while continuing to publish the Mercury. In 1757, Gaine finally moved to Hanover Square proper, to the “house next door to Doctor William Brownjohn's, in Hanover Square, near the meal market.” It was at this location that he established the “Bible and Crown,” for which he was known for the remainder of his printing career, with the exception of a few additional and short lived moves between 1759 and 1763.

While the directions “at the Bible and Crown,” and “next door to Dr. William Brownejohn (spellings differ)” may have been sufficient for individuals of the period to locate Gaine's press, they do little for the modern reader. Referring to Appendix B, “Reconstruction of Hanover Square ca. 1755-1785,” the office and residence of Dr. Brownejohn can be roughly placed at around 21 Hanover Square, or 147 Pearl (Queen) Street. Since no geographic directions exist for determining if Gaine was north or south of Brownejohn's, other factors must be taken into account for an “accurate” placement. A wealth of data exists for the northern lot, 22 Hanover Square, located at the north-west
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corner of Wall and Pearl Streets, and it appears that several merchants occupied that location at the same time and that turnover was frequent. This information is not sufficient to place Gaine on the south of Brownejohn's; however, an advertisement for public notary John Kelly from 1779 lists his residence at “no. 843 Hanover Square, three doors west of Mr. Gaine's.” Since no. 843 Hanover Square is also 17 Hanover Square, Hugh Gaine's printing office must be located three doors east (north) of John Kelly, or at 20 Hanover Square.

Notable “signs” were a common occurrence in New York and were particularly useful for distinguishing a particular merchant or business. They also served as an indicator of the type of business or of the inclinations of the merchants. During the 1750s an increasing number of businesses were adorned with these signs, such as: “Sign of the Unicorn and Mortar, in Hanover Square;” “Sign of the Gilt Dish, in Dock Street;” “Sign of the Indian King and Cross Guns, in the Fly;” “the Hand and Shears;” “Sign of the Stocking-Weaver's loom;” and, “the sign of the Golden Key, in Hanover Square.” The latter of these, at the Golden Key, was Peter Goelet, blacksmith and goldsmith, who occupied a unique lot at 48 Hanover Square at the edge of the triangular block that was situated in the middle of the “square” portion of Hanover Square. Goelet was one of the few merchants to start his business prior to the revolution and continue at the same location throughout the British occupation and after. He also served as a member of the Chamber of Commerce, corresponded with the Committee of Fifty-one, and was, after

128. Appendix B, “Reconstruction of Hanover Square...” and; Appendix C, “Residents of Hanover Square, 1750-1790.”
Lexington and Concord, one of the first to enroll his name as an “asserter of rights in the city” and to place the “affairs of the city in the hands of a committee of 100.”  

In his early years of printing from 1752 to 1759, Gaine was primarily in competition with Parker and Weyman, as well as De Foreest, but after the dissolution of the Post-Boy and with it Parker and Weyman, Gaine solidified himself as one of the most reliable and circulated papers. His next real competitor was James Rivington, and although Rivington opened his first shop in 1760, he did not begin printing a regular newspaper for another decade. 

James Rivington was born in London on August 17, 1724 and was the sixth son of Charles and Eleanor Rivington. In his youth, Charles Rivington had been apprenticed to Richard Chiswell who was a bookseller and publisher at the “Sign of the Rose and Crown.”  

As a journeyman printer in 1711, Charles bought Chiswell's business and changed the name to a common one of the time: the Bible and Crown. It was here at his fathers press that James and his brother John learned the trade of printing and after Charles' death in 1742 they went into partnership. James and John – 18 and 20 years old respectively, in 1742 – were too young to hold a majority in a publishing company so a family friend and designated guardian, Samuel Richardson, was appointed supervisor until 1746.  

It is evident from entries in the business ledger that James and John both had a proclivity for gambling as several times they recorded losses for lottery tickets purchased in the name of the firm.  
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dissolution of the partnership of James and John, but in 1756 they announced that under mutual consent they were calling in all outstanding balances and dissolving their partnership.

After 1756, James Rivington joined the printing house of James Fletcher, who was also the son of an established London bookseller, and for a time they were both very successful. They notably published the first run of the hugely popular *History of England*, by John Smollett, which brought them an estimated profit of more than 10,000 pounds.\(^{134}\) This was supposedly the largest amount made on a single publication run up to that time.

First published in 1758, Smollett's *History* sold more than 62,000 copies in its first year and was reprinted by Rivington and Fletcher the following year and extended to eleven volumes from four, with an even greater print run.\(^{135}\) It appears that James continued to gamble and live an extravagant life and no doubt such a sudden profit and fame played a significant part in his personal decisions. As the Rivington family historian Septimus Rivington attests: “He [James] had been very successful in England for a time, but he took to horse-racing and gambling and soon got through his money.”\(^{136}\) As a result of his gambling debts, the firm of Rivington, Fletcher and Co. went bankrupt in 1760.

They had also become known for piracy, printing out of authority, and cost cutting, such that by 1760 they had a number of outstanding lawsuits against the firm.\(^{137}\) Rivington had seen the great number of sales that Smollett's *History* had gained in the colonies, and in conjunction with the weight of his personal and business debts in England, he decided to move to Philadelphia. In September of 1760, Rivington arrived in
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Philadelphia with his wife, Elizabeth, and he set up his bookstore on Front Street. At about the same time he also opened a printing office in New York City, in Hanover Square, and Gaine's Mercury announced the opening: “James Rivington, Bookseller, from London, has this day opened a store at the house of the late Dr. Ascough in Hanover Sq. … He has brought with him a large quantity of books in most languages, arts and sciences....” Rivington had been able to bring with him books from London, valued at 3,000 pounds, on credit from his wife's annuity of three hundred pounds.

It is easier to geographically place Rivington's press after 1768 than it is during Rivington's early years of printing from 1760-68, because few relative directions exist for his early press. From available sources, Rivington's early press was either at the lower end of Wall Street, “on Hanover Square,” or at the “house of the late Dr. Ascough,” as per the description in Gaine's Mercury. This description is the most useful, although it is not particularly specific. “Dr. Ascough,” refers to Doctor Richard Ayscough (disambiguation) who, according to his will, left to his wife Anne “all that my house and lot of land where I now live in Hanover Square, in New York, in the East Ward....” This too would prove geographically useless if not for a note at the bottom of the page in the NYHS, Wills Abstracts, that states: “Note – The house of Doctor Ayscough is now 118 Pearl Street, on Hanover Square.” By referring to other archival maps showing the renumbering of Hanover Square as part of Pearl Street, it is possible to determine that 118 Pearl Street
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was also 40 Hanover Square.\textsuperscript{143} It was here that James Rivington operated his first bookstore and press in New York City from September 1760 to November of 1768. After 1768 Rivington moved his press further down Queen Street, still within Hanover Square, and by 1773 he was “firmly established on the northeast corner of Wall and Queen streets.”\textsuperscript{144} Taking this direction verbatim would technically place Rivington's press across Wall Street and out of the geographic boundary of Hanover Square; however, because Rivington's \textit{Gazette} and all descriptions of his press and shop firmly state that he was “on Hanover Square,” and because his press also faced the “coffee-house bridge” it is possible to determine that his press of this period was at 152 Pearl Street or 23 Hanover Square.\textsuperscript{145} As Leroy Hewlett states, the “Coffee-House Bridge” was a “long wooden platform which ran from Queen Street to Water street, where the local merchants and auctioneers cried their wares.”\textsuperscript{146}
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VII. Hanover Square in the pre-Revolutionary Era: 1750-1770

Along with the establishment of the second generation of printers of Hanover Square; Gaine and Rivington, Hanover Square continued to develop as a center of trade and the next “generation” of merchants began as well. During the pre-Revolutionary era, from roughly the 1750s through the early 1770s, several notable merchants emerged who emulated the early wealthy merchants like Loockermans and Van Brugh. Two such individuals were Theophylact Bache and Jacob Walton, who were both involved with the Chamber of Commerce that was formed in 1768. Bache and Walton sat at opposite ends of the political spectrum, and these political divisions and tensions were exacerbated during the Stamp Act and Townshend Crises in the mid 1760s and after during the period of non-importation and correspondence in 1774-75.

Theophylact Bache was born on the 17th of January, 1734 at Settle, in the West Riding of Yorkshire, England into a family of eighteen. Son of William Bache, the Excise collector in Settle, Theophylact likely learned business from his father, and although no official record has come to light of his apprenticeship, he arrived in New York ready to partner in business. 147 Bache came to New York in September, 1751 and into the business of a family friend, Paul Richard, who was the former Mayor of the City of New York from 1735-39 and a successful merchant. Bache worked for Richard from his arrival until Richard's death in 1756, and he must have been a good hand as he was bequeathed 300 pounds currency from his will and appointed an executor of his estate. 148
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Bache formed his own shop at the house of the late Paul Richard and sold “choice parcel of Madiera Wine, Cheshire Cheese, Sperma-ceti candles, with sundry sorts of European goods.”

Bache gained a reputation for selling very high quality and expensive goods for the time, such as: velvets, thicksets, fustians, pillows and assorted cottons as well as a typical assortment of European goods. Bache moved his store several times between 1757-60 from the house of Paul Richard, to a few locations on Hunter's Quay and finally to Hanover Square in 1760. He resided and did business at 122 Pearl Street, or 38 Hanover Square for much of the time between 1758 and his death in 1807, with the exception of a period during the British occupation. Additionally, Bache helped to form New York's first Chamber of Commerce in 1768, and he was of that body Treasurer 1770, Vice President 1771, and President 1773-74.

Bache was a member of the Committee of Fifty-one and a promoter of the first Continental Congress, but he did not particularly seek political office other than his representation in the chamber of commerce. The chamber's biographical sketches describe Bache as “his disposition was genial, his qualities domestic: to an open-handed hospitality he added a great love of field-sports, and his dog and gun were the constant companions of his ours of leisure.” The choice of sides after Lexington and Concord appears to have been particularly difficult for Theophylact, as he had strong ties to England and a family divided in opinion.

---
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A contemporary of Bache, Jacob Walton, also became a notable individual in New York City and as a resident of Hanover Square. Jacob came from the distinguished family of Walton, who were notable merchants in New York and England for more than 100 years, and who were established in Hanover Square as early as the 1720s. The “Walton house” was built by a relative of Jacob, William Walton, in 1738 and was located at the site of present day 326-28 Pearl Street. William Walton's house became famous as an elegant mansion of the city and although he identified with merchants in Hanover Square, his home was far outside the geographic boundaries of the square. The house was described as:

A noble specimen of English architecture a century ago. It is a brick edifice, fifty feet in front, and three stories high, built with Holland bricks relieved by brown stone water-tables, lentils and jams, with walls as substantial as many modern churches … the superb staircase in its ample hall, with mahogany handrails and bannisters, by age as dark as ebony, would not disgrace a nobleman's palace.

The Walton house was still standing as late as the 1870s and was a fine representation of the wealth of the Walton family. Jacob, however, lived at a residence somewhat less grand that was located in Hanover Square proper.

Jacob was a member of the firm of William and Jacob Walton, and upon the death of his uncle William, he received a share of his estate. In March 1760 he married Miss Polly Cruger, who was the daughter of another wealthy merchant, Henry Cruger, and he continued in business in Hanover Square. Unlike Theophylact, Jacob sought political office and in 1769 he was elected to the General Assembly. He was also Vice President of
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the Chamber of Commerce from 1781 to 1783. Jacob lived and did business at 128 Pearl
Street or 35 Hanover Square from 1772 until at least the early 1780s.\textsuperscript{157} Although he did
business with Bache, he appears to have shifted his loyalty towards the crown after 1775.

As members of the Chamber of Commerce, both Walton and Bache were
embroiled in the controversy over the non-importation agreements in 1774 and along
with many other merchants, they were branded as loyalists when they put business before
politics. In a letter to the Committee of Correspondence of Connecticut from the
Committee at New York – of which Jacob Walton was a member – they expressed their
support for a general congress of the several colonies comprised of men of “coolness,
prudence, and understanding,” but that they themselves could not order or appoint
deleagtes to such a body.\textsuperscript{158} Walton stated that they were a committee of correspondence
only and could not “consistently with good order and propriety interfere in a matter of
such importance.”\textsuperscript{159} The letter ended with a call for additional correspondence in order to
judge “what plan will be most likely to procure a redress of our present grievances, and
promote the union and prosperity of the mother country and the colonies.” While this
rhetoric can be interpreted as loyal in nature, it was in reality derived more from practical
concerns and restrained discourse that was seen as the most expedient way of gaining
redress for grievances without penalty from Britain. With concerns for their relations with
Britain as a primary concern, the committee and its members were accused of pandering,
inaction and loyalty to the crown rather than as a body with the general welfare of New
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York in mind. It was the case that several of the committee, including Jacob Walton, declared their loyalty to England, but at such an early stage in the conflict the lines were not as clearly drawn.

The non-importation agreement also served to sort out merchants' loyalties, especially those of Jacob Walton and John Cruger, and they wrote a letter to the Committee of Fifty-one in 1775 outlining their reasons for not signing the agreement. They jointly expressed trust in the parliament of Great Britain to address and redress any and all problems that the colonies may have and that to submit to the power or directive of any other body would “be deserting that trust; but to engage implicitly to approve and carry into execution the regulations of and other body would justly expose us to the reproach of our own conscience....”160 They continued to explain that their efforts would be most beneficial with their current level of representation in British colonial government, and that signing the association would “in effect be to deprive ourselves of our legislative powers,” rendering them useless.161

Despite his genial character and his lack of involvement in colonial politics, Theophylact Bache was branded by the Provincial Congress of New York as a person “whose conduct has been represented to this Congress as inimical with that of the former [the residents of Westchester],” and that he was an individual who should appear before the congress to account for his actions. For the holding of an office from the King of Great Britain, Jacob Walton was deemed to be an individual “having neglected or refused to associate with their fellow citizens for the defense of their common rights, from their
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having never manifested by their conduct a zeal for and attachment to the American cause, or from having maintained an equivocal neutrality...”\textsuperscript{162} In the eyes of the Congress maintaining neutrality was equivalent to loyalty, even when that neutrality was out of serious concern for the general welfare of New York.

As 1774 wore on and the impending conflict edged closer, Hanover Square and the residents and merchants there were tied inextricably to the resolutions of the various congresses and subject to the political divisions growing within the city. The next crisis that ran afoul of Hanover Square was the case against James Rivington for his loyalist publications in the spring and fall of 1774.

\textsuperscript{162} New York Provincial Congress, \textit{A. A.}, ser. IV, VI, 1365.
VIII. The Case of James Rivington and the Establishment of a Free Press

One of the most contested issues during the American Revolution was the concept of freedom of speech and the right to a free press. Of the grievances by the colonies penned to Britain in 1776, the abjuration of the right of freedom of speech and the press was among the most prominent. The idea of freedom of information and the unrestricted flow of ideas, arguments and critiques were inseparable from the Colonies' cause for independence. While it is well known that freedom of speech and freedom of the press were issues that had legal precedent in English law and tradition, it is less well known that prior to the Declaration of Independence, the Provincial Congress of the State of New York, as well as other individuals, town and county meetings, decried, yet ultimately upheld freedom of the press and free speech between 1774 and 1776 in respect to James Rivington, printer, of New York City.

History will remember James Rivington as a conflicted individual. Aside from claims of his double life as a printer, spy and loyalist, it is evident through the content that Rivington published, and the reaction of anonymous critics, that he was at best conflicted when it came to independence. Generally, his published content criticized the methods and lack of resolution of the colonists, rather than independence itself, however; the vitriolic and fierce reaction of many Provincial Congresses and individuals to certain publications from December 1774 through January 1776, lends credence to the theory that Rivington was at heart loyal to Britain. It is possible to see the case against James Rivington as one of the first examples of exultation of the right to freedom of the press
and freedom of speech. Important individuals such as John Jay, Gouverneur Morris, Richard Henry Lee, and Philip Livingston weighed in on the content of Rivington's Gazette and its respect and position vis-a-vis the Provincial Congress of New York and the Continental Congress.

Their comments and conclusions shed light on the official reactions to loyalist press prior to 1776. The anonymous, pseudonym laden letters to James Rivington and his Gazette extol the full spectrum of public reactions to loyalist attitudes and printing during the revolution. It is through a combination of the letters to Rivington, official reactions of Provincial Congresses and the words of a few important individuals, that it is possible to see the importance placed on freedom of the press and free speech before and during the Revolution. The entire affair can be seen as an example of the emerging American Democratic system prior to the Declaration of Independence.

The first issue of Rivington's infamous paper was titled “The New York Gazetteeer; or the Connecticut, New Jersey, Hudson's River and Quebec, Weekly Advertiser,” and came out on Thursday, April 22, 1773. Rivington had moved his printing office after 1768 from 40 Hanover Square to 23 Hanover Square at the corner of Queen and Wall Streets and facing the coffee house bridge. From there he operated a bookstore and his press on the first floor, and his living quarters on the second. Rivington claimed that his paper was “open and uninfluenced,” but he was quickly branded a Tory printer for publishing pieces that supported both sides of arguments including the unpopular tax on tea. His stance of neutrality became untenable after he began publishing scathing reports of patriots, the Sons of Liberty, and mocked Benjamin Franklin's snake metaphor for
unity as a “Snake in the Grass.”

By May of 1775 the incendiary publications in James Rivington's New York Gazette had been decried and denounced by dozens of townships, committee meetings and Provincial delegations. More often than not, the rhetoric used to describe Rivington and his publications was laced with the utmost contempt and conveyed with vitriolic language. Initially, Rivington was accused of propagating dubious information, or hearsay, not specific to the cause of independence, but potentially incongruent with the overall cause of liberty. As word spread and additional publications were examined, the criticism of Rivington went from illicit publisher, to all out enemy of the state, of freedom, and as a printer in active employ of the British attempting to undermine the beginnings of Independence in America. In October of 1774, at the same time that the Massachusetts Provincial Congress was forming committees to report on a non-consumption agreement of British and Indian tea, a separate Massachusetts committee opened up inquiry into the publication of Rivington's newspapers. The committee was instructed to look over copies of papers that the President of the Massachusetts Provincial Congress had in his possession to determine if, “any thing therein should appear to have been written with a design to injure this province...,” and to make a report to the congress. Similar inquiries and reports were also initiated in townships in New York, New Jersey and Connecticut.

In December of 1774, the Committee of Observation of Newark, New Jersey opened up inquiries into James Rivington's paper and whether it was inimical to the cause

of the colonies. The Newark committee concluded that a Press that was “replete with the most bitter invectives, scandalous and criminal reflections upon that reputable body, the Continental Congress...,” and; “with a manifest design to blind the eyes of the less judicious” run by a man who was, in their opinion, a Ministerial Hireling that was “endeavoring to sacrifice his country to his own private interest,” constituted an enemy to not only the Colony of New Jersey, but the country and all who are friends of liberty.\textsuperscript{165} It was resolved that “the above character is exactly fitted to J. Rivington,”\textsuperscript{166} and that the Newark Committee would have nothing more to do with James Rivington or his paper. They advised that their constituents take the matter seriously and treat Mr. Rivington with “corresponding conduct.”

The Committee of Observation of Elizabethtown, New Jersey followed suit two weeks later, on December 19\textsuperscript{th}, and issued a unanimous resolution relative to Rivington's Gazette. They too concluded that his pamphlets and publications were “inimical to the liberties of America;” and that he was a “vile Ministerial Hireling, employed to disunite the Colonies.”\textsuperscript{167} As such the committee declared that they would have no more dealings with Mr. Rivington, or have any advertisements inserted in his papers, and they recommended to their constituents “to observe the same conduct towards said Rivington, or any other Printer who shall publish or print any pieces or pamphlets tending to break the happy union now subsisting throughout the American Colonies.”\textsuperscript{168}

Word traveled quickly, and in January of 1775, the Freeholders of Morris County,
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New Jersey\textsuperscript{169} also issued a declaration against James Rivington and his paper. Unique to this declaration was a condemnation of a specific publication in \textit{Rivington's Gazette}: the first in the later infamous series of pamphlets authored by "\textit{A.W. Farmer.}\textsuperscript{170} The committees of Newark and Elizabethtown did not single out specific instances of transgressive publications of Rivington, choosing instead to typify \textit{Rivington's Gazette} as a paper that was overall insidious and false. The Freeholders of Morris County declared that the recent publications in \textit{Rivington's Gazette} were "all containing many falsehoods, wickedly calculated to divide the Colonies-to deceive the ignorant, and to cause a base submission to the unconstitutional measures of the \textit{British} Parliament for enslaving the Colonies...."\textsuperscript{171} The meeting unanimously concluded that James Rivington was "an enemy to his country," and that "by all lawful means in their power, they will discourage the circulation of his Papers in this [Morris] County."\textsuperscript{172} Thus, they too would have no further dealings or commerce with James Rivington.

Soon after this resolution, the Committee of Observation for the Township of Hanover, Morris County, New Jersey, also adopted a unanimous resolution against James Rivington, citing from specific pamphlets and publications "printed by James Rivington...we esteem him as an incendiary employed by a wicked Ministry to disunite and divide us" and that not only would they have no further connection to Rivington, they would "discouragement" any rider or postal person bringing Rivington's pamphlets into
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Morris County. The particular publication that the Morris County Freeholders denounced was also critiqued by “The Sons of Liberty” in New York, three days later on January 12th 1775. After introducing and reading a few pages of said publication, the company agreed unanimously to “commit it to the flames, without the benefit of clergy.” This would not be the only time that such pamphlets and publications would be burned or otherwise publicly destroyed.

Further South in Freehold, New Jersey, in March of 1775, the Monmouth County Committee of Observation and Inspection decried the publication of the pamphlet “Free Thoughts on the Resolves of the Congress” by A.W. Farmer, in Rivington's Gazette. After a careful reading and discussion of the pamphlet, the committee unanimously declared it to be “a performance of the most pernicious and malignant tendency; replete with the most specious sophistry, but void of any rational argument; calculated to deceive and mislead the unwary, the ignorant, and the credulous; and designed, no doubt, by the detestable; author, to damp that noble spirit of union.” In addition to this vivid condemnation, the committee publicly returned the pamphlet back to the people, who “immediately bestowed upon it a suit of tar and turkey-buzzard's feathers; one of the persons concerned in the operation justly observing that although the feathers were plucked from the most stinking foul in creation, he thought they fell far short of being a proper emblem of the author's odiousness to every advocate of true freedom.” The pamphlet was then nailed to a pillory post to be a constant reminder to all loyalists that
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distribution of such materials was to be abhorred.

Yet again a unanimous resolution was adopted that James Rivington was a “base and malignant enemy to the liberties of this Country,” and that the Monmouth Committee would no longer have a connection with Rivington, and that they “hold him in the utmost contempt, as a noxious exotick plant, incapable of either cultivation or improvement in this soil of freedom.” Such vitriolic and descriptive language to describe James Rivington and his intentions became the norm in anti-loyalist rhetoric. The language and tenor of the case against James Rivington evolved exponentially from the first public resolutions of December, 1774.

Aside from the public denunciations and committee resolutions, James Rivington received a good deal of support both from anonymous letters, and organizations favorable to loyalist views. Among the documents favorable to Rivington's cause was a list of 142 subscribers to the “Reading Association,” a group dedicated to the perusal and consumption of both Rivington's Gazette and Mr. Gaine's paper, another loyalist press in New York. A Mr. John Lyon asked Rivington to insert into his paper on the 23rd of February 1775, the list of subscribers who were described as “staunch friends to the King and Constitution,” and that none of the signers were under the age of twenty-one. It is possible that some of the anonymous letters written to Rivington were from members of either the Reading Association or similar groups.

Earlier in February, Rivington had received an anonymous letter from Philadelphia commenting on the affairs of the Continental Congress. The author stated
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that although he was initially favorable to such a committee, after hearing of the discussions and resolutions of said Congress he was “well convinced they aimed at a general revolution, and were promoting every measure to overthrow our excellent Constitution; -- drunk with power they had usurped.”179 The author also accused the representatives to the Congress of political posturing and malicious intent to become wealthy and aristocratic, through the position that “nothing would give them more real concern than a speedy accommodation and reconciliation between the parent state and the Colonies; they have nothing to lose in a general havock, but all to gain from a scramble.”180

Until March of 1775, the inquiries into James Rivington and his Gazette focused on the character of Rivington himself, and on his paper as an insidious puppet of the British. The implied message of the Gazette was to deter colonists from seeking independence through accounts, letters and other publications that supported a redress of grievances with Britain, ultimately leading to a reconciliation between the parent state and the colonies. Neither the Massachusetts Provincial Congress nor the County and Township meetings and councils in New Jersey had seriously taken into account whether or not James Rivington had the right to publish loyalist letters and counter-revolutionary pieces, either under de-facto British Law, or under existing Colony and City laws. The discourse of free speech was simply between revolutionary and pro-independence groups and councils. The Committee of Inspection for Newport, Rhode Island was one of the first to broach the issue of the true right of freedom of speech and freedom of the press in
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a civil society in respect to James Rivington.

The Newport Committee of inspection undertook deliberations on the right of a free press and the position of current presses, including Rivington's, on March 1, 1775. The outlandish tone of the Chair, Mr. John Tanner, is evident from the initial wording and subsequent conclusions of the committee resolutions. Mr. Tanner and the committee concluded that freedom of the press was of the utmost importance in a “civil society,” yet that presses should be employed for the good of public liberty and that those presses that deviated from such aims should not be encouraged as their aims are not beneficial to society.\footnote{181} Mr. Tanner accused Rivington's press of being “incessantly employed and prostituted, to the vilest uses; in publishing the most infamous falsehoods; in partial or false representations of facts; in fomenting jealousies, and exciting discord and disunion among the people...,” and that James Rivington himself was “ impelled by the love of sordid pelf, and a haughty domineering spirit... hath, endeavored to pervert truth, and to deceive and mislead the incautious into wrong conceptions of facts reported.”\footnote{182} Once again, James Rivington was denounced as an infamous parasite to the cause of liberty, truth and justice, and the committee advised that his \textit{Gazette} be dropped immediately upon picking it up in the Colony of Rhode Island.

The specific examples of Rivington's “falsehoods” and misrepresentation of facts are difficult to verify and are only occasionally mentioned in committee meetings and resolutions, with the exception of the series of pamphlets by “A.W. Farmer.” A particularly interesting example of another New York press excoriating James Rivington
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for his falsehoods occurred a few days after the Newport and Freehold resolutions, between March 9th and 10th, 1775. The affair, which became known as the “Hill and Cunningham” incident, took place in New York near the North River and the liberty pole nearby. The report in Rivington's Gazette stated that when William Cunningham and John Hill stopped near the liberty-pole to see a boxing match, Cunningham was “struck at by Smith Richards, James Vandyke, and several others; called Tory, and used in a most cruel manner by a mob of above two hundred men.”183 The report went on to state that when Mr. Hill came to assist he was also beaten and abused, and that both Cunningham and Hill were dragged through a nearby green and forced to get down on their knees and damn their “Popish king George.” Cunningham refused to do so, and declared “God Bless King George.” Hill reacted similarly and both men were stripped of their clothes and if not for some of the “peace officers” who came to assist they “would inevitably have been murdered.”184 Such a sensational story of abuse and unprovoked violence would have undoubtedly garnered significant attention from readers. The story also gained the attention of another New York press, Holt's Journal, and a rebuttal was published the following day.

The account in Holt's Journal portrayed the incident in an entirely different light. Holt's rebuttal included a description of why so many people were gathered at the liberty-pole: there was no literal “boxing match” that occurred there, but rather a gathering at the New York Exchange to determine if and who to send to the next meeting of the Continental Congress. Opposing parties gathered at the Exchange, although they were all
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described as being “friends of freedom,” they differed in method and reason. They
decided, in public forum, to form a body on “the twentieth of April next” with the sole
purpose of of appointing delegates to the next Congress. Eleven deputies were nominated
to such a body, including John Jay, Philip Livingston and Isaac Low, and then the crowd
“dispersed in the most quiet and orderly manner.” The Hill and Cunningham incident
appeared to have been almost entirely concocted, and if any such transgressions did
occur, it was almost certain that Hill and Cunningham were the aggressors.

Holt described the incident as such: “Messrs. Hill and Cunningham appeared and
made part of the minority at the Exchange on the sixth. Their business was to prevent the
execution of the measures recommended by the Continental Congress for the
preservation of our constitutional rights and liberties, and consequently to promote the
designs of the British Ministry, in subjecting America and all the British empire to a
despotic government.” The rebuttal went on to state that the report in Rivington's
Gazettee had the audacity to portray Hill and Cunningham as loyal to the King and that in
fact, they were entirely opposed to such a position. Holt speculated that the incident was
entirely fabricated as a publicity stunt and that Cunningham may have declared that “he
should not have published the account, if he had not been urged to it by one or more
gentlemen of the minor party.”

Holt's portrayal was not fully accurate either, as William Cunningham was most
certainly loyal to the crown as he became the British Provost Marshall of the Jail of the
Fields after 1776. Other accounts of the incident hold closer to Holt's description of the
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intentions of both Hill and Cunningham in that they were the aggressors who were present at the exchange in order to disrupt the proceedings. In one such recollection “William Cunningham...approached the Liberty Pole in company with John Hill and made an assault on the patriots gathered about it; although the royalist papers asserted that the people first attached Cunningham and Hill and tried to persuade them to abjure the King.” At any rate, both Cunningham and Hill were briefly committed to jail for the incident. Whether or not the report was in part or fully concocted is irrelevant; however Rivington's complete dismissal of the few verifiable facts suggests that he had a significant bias and promoted a loyalist agenda through his publications.

March, 1775 was an eventful month concerning James Rivington and freedom of the press. A few days after the Hill and Cunningham affair, the New-York Committee, as part of the New York Provincial Congress, met to begin inquiry into “Mr. Rivington” and the quality and veracity of his reports in previous months. The committee ordered that Philip Livingston and John Jay be appointed to a separate committee to determine by “whose information, or by what authority, he published the following paragraph in his Gazeteer on 2d March, 1775:

Last Monday the Committee of Observation met. It was proposed that they should nominate Delegates to the Continental Congress, for the approbation of this City and County; but being opposed, the final determination of the Committee was deferred until their next meetings.189

The NY Committee resolution declared that said paragraph was “entirely and wholly false and groundless,” and that they desired Mr. Rivington to correct such factual

falsehoods in his next paper. Mr. Jay and Mr. Livingston were to report at the next meeting of the New York Provincial Congress.

On March 13, Jay and Livingston made their report to the New-York Committee. They had met with Mr. Rivington and he had told them that the publication was made on common rumor, and that he was willing to contradict it. Rivington said that he would be more careful in the future. A terse response to an even shorter inquiry that lacked the vitriol and outrage of numerous other Committees. In response, Mr. Rivington published in his paper three days later the complete account of his meeting with the Committee of Jay and Livingston. Rivington stated that in addition to his admission that he published the story on common rumor, and that he would contradict it, he added “that what was related in my paper was credited; yet if they would furnish me with accounts of their Proceedings, I might be able, to print them without error.” Rivington also expressed outrage at such a “formal and publick reprehension,” and one that in his opinion was “seemingly calculated to aggrandize the power of the accusers, and to disparage the political reputation of a persecuted, and, to the everlasting disgrace of many County Committees, a proscribed printer.” Clearly, Rivington had not been privy to the County Committee resolutions in New Jersey or Massachusetts, otherwise he might not have been so frank in saying that the public reprehension of the New York committee was a “disgrace.” In fact, it was far more tempered in language and in conclusion – request of admission of error versus possibly trial for treason and promoting disunion, which would likely have been the conclusion of official inquiries by New Jersey committees.
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The question still remained: did James Rivington have the right or authority to publish his loyalist paper? A anonymous letter to Mr. Holt's Journal, from an unnamed member of the Connecticut Lower House of Assembly, pertaining to the case against James Rivington, outlined several additional falsehoods that had been published by Rivington about the Connecticut Assembly proceedings. These charges included: various costs associated with public reprehensions of Rivingtons' paper and the inquiries; the necessity and command of the Connecticut Assembly to raise an army immediately; and an open want for a declaration of Independence for the Colony of Connecticut. As the anonymous Assemblyman attested to all of these accusations were not true and “no such thing was proposed in the Assembly (I am very certain) through the whole session.”

The author concluded that although freedom of the press was an important pillar of a civilized society, Mr. Rivington had taken too many liberties with facts and that the promotion of disunion among the colonies was unacceptable.

Another anonymous contributor using the pseudonym “Anti-Tyrannicus,” wrote a letter to the Committee of Inspection for the City and County of New York, in which he defended Rivington and despite having little factual basis to refute the claims against Rivington, he brought up several pertinent points about freedom of the press. Anti-Tyrannicus outlined a very clear and cogent argument for the promotion of a free press:

The liberty of the Press is a sacred privilege; it is the only means in the hands of the people, that can be safely used to check the growth of arbitrary power. Should those who have fixed themselves as sentinels upon the watchtower of liberty, to give notice of all invaders, be the first to curtail this darling immunity, will it not give the people cause to suspect that they themselves are about to establish a power more arbitrary and tyrannical than any thing we have hitherto complained of? \(^{195}\)

Anti-Tyrannicus' language suggests that the public inquiries and reprehension's of Mr. Rivington were contradictory to the overall cause of liberty because they were headed by representatives concerned with freedom and liberty. Is it not a contradiction for one seeking liberty to curtail the liberty of another at the same time? The conclusion that can be drawn from such letters is that a particular subset of the population of, at least, New York, did in fact see some of the persecution of James Rivington as hypocritical. The fact remains that many of Rivington's publications did distort facts outright, but for an undeclared purpose.

The case against James Rivington came to a head in May of 1775, when the Committee of Correspondence for the City of New York made a report to the Continental Congress on the state of affairs in New York City. No decision had yet been reached by the committee on whether or not to officially bar or press charges against Mr. Rivington for abuse of his position as a printer, yet when James Rivington caught word that the Continental Congress could be weighing a decision, he wrote a letter explaining his position. Despite the rhetoric in several of his pamphlets and publications decrying those who formed the Congress in Philadelphia and their wanton disregard for English
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principles and “haughty” pursuit of aristocratic power, James Rivington had only positive things to say in his letter to the “Honourable Delegates at the Continental Congress.” He was quite sure that whatever verdict that they rendered would be unbiased and true, because the men who made up the Congress were “gentlemen of eminent rank and distinction in the Colonies.”

A far cry from individuals “drunk with power that they had usurped.”

Rivington went on to declare that he was a man of “honor and veracity” and that even though he may have been wrong in previous opinions, that he “always meant honestly and openly to do his duty as a servant of the publick.”

Rivington defined freedom of the press as an English liberty for more than a century and that the purpose of his press was the free exchange of ideas. Even though he had published several rumors, he had apologized and assured the public that he would be more cautious in the future. Above all, Rivington desired to be a useful member of society and although he was an “Englishman by birth,” he was an “American by choice.”

Appearing as humble as possible, Rivington thus submitted his case to the “honourable gentlemen now assembled in the Continental Congress,” and hoped that their determination would render him free and safe to conduct his business as a printer.

By June second, 1775, the Continental Congress decided that the case was not wholly fit for their ruling and had referred authority for determination on James Rivington back to the New York City Congress. Two letters crossed paths on June second; one frantically from James Rivington to the New York City Provincial Congress,
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the other from that body in reply to and consideration for the ruling of the Continental Congress. At 10 o'clock Friday morning, June second, James Rivington penciled off a note to the New York Congress in which he explained that he had little time to mount a defense or even to copy his letter sent to the Continental Congress. Rivington managed to enclose a copy of said letter and added that he would insert an address to the public declaring his position on his case. With less padding and pomp, Rivington concluded the short letter with “Your continuance of my suit, and your friendly mediation on this occasion, will everlasting oblige....”

Later that day the Committee at New York sent a concerned letter to the Continental Congress on the deferral of decision, citing that although Rivington’s offenses had been committed in New York City, they “were against the whole continent.” The New York Congress was also concerned that they did not have proper authority, vested in them by either the Continental Congress or by the will of the people of New York, to make a decision. Thus, they were “concerned that nothing less than a determination of the General Congress will give full satisfaction on that head.”

The following day, June third, the letter from James Rivington and the copy of his letter to the Continental Congress, were read in session of the New York Congress and the subject matter was taken into consideration. The decision was deferred to a later date.

Gouverneur Morris, as a member of the New York Provincial Congress, wrote a letter a few days before the decision on the case of James Rivington to his fellow statesman Richard Henry Lee, a representative at the Continental Congress. Morris was

---

candid in his support of the Congresses deferral of decision to the Colony of New York and the Committee of the City, as the first step in granting more power to both the Continental Congress – as a body with authority to delegate – and to the Provincial Congresses of the Colonies. In its current configuration the Provincial Congress had a Legislative basis, but the pending decision in the case of Mr. Rivington “now tenders them Judicial supremacy.”

Morris also affirmed that the consequences of the decision in Mr. Rivington's case would impact a future government:

The power of Government, as of man, is to be collected from small instances; great affairs are more the objects of reflection and policy. Here both join. A mild and favourable sentence will conciliate the opinions of mankind; and what is the force of opinion, a gentleman who has made it his study to investigate the nature of Government, need not be told.

Morris concluded that a mild sentence for Rivington would be agreeable to most of the New York Congress and that Rivington was, if only, misguided and biased, not inimical to the cause of liberty.

His [Rivington's] company, his acquaintances, his friends, were warm advocates for the power of Government; indifferently wise, his mind took a wrong bias from interest, deference for the sentiments of others, and opposition. A tool in prosperity, a cast-off in adversity, he solicits the assistance of that body which his press has aspersed, Magnanimity will dictate to that body the true line of conduct.

The implication of Morris' prosaic tone was that above all mercy and forgiveness were necessary and due products of both civil Government and society. Rivington had, in essence, committed only the crime of libel, and of propagating hearsay and rumor. The only violence that ensued as a result of his publications was either almost entirely

---
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fabricated, as in the case of Hill and Cunningham, or it was theatrical, as in the public tar-and-feathering of Rivington's Gazette in Freehold, New Jersey. Verbose, vitriolic, hateful, and poignant language had typified Rivington's publications, and perhaps rightfully so, for his distortion of fact and bold statements; however, a truly free press, meant that dissenting opinion was as legal and moral as supportive argument – so long as it was held within standards of decorum and based in fact. Richard Henry Lee, although more candid in his distaste for James Rivington and his press, agreed that a favorable sentence was indeed just for Mr. Rivington and that it was not too late for him to “exert his powers in defense of the liberty and just rights of a much injured Country.”

In session on June the seventh, 1775, the New York Congress, at the request of the City Congress of New York, after much deliberation, made a decision in the case of Mr. Rivington.

Whereas, James Rivington, of this City, Printer, hath signed the General Association, and has lately published a handbill declaring his intention rigidly to adhere to the said Association; and also asked the pardon of the publick, who have been offended by his ill-judged publications: Resolved, therefore, That the said James Rivington be permitted to return to his house and family; and that this Congress doth recommend it to the inhabitants of this Colony not to molest him in person or property.

In accordance with the proclamation, James Rivington signed the General Association and promised to adhere to the established standards of publication, bias, and decorum. Perhaps, much to the chagrin of the County Committees in New Jersey, James Rivington had essentially been acquitted of wrongdoing, with the promise of a tempered
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future tone. The case against James Rivington had upheld principles of freedom of
speech, freedom of the press, and delegated Governmental powers separately to Central
and State Governmental bodies, prior to the Declaration of Independence. Such concepts
and rights would, after the Revolution, be woven into the fabric of the Constitution of the
United States – demonstratively, through the First Amendment.

Mr. Rivington's case does little to clear up the ambiguities surrounding James
Rivington as a person, but it does attest to his character as a printer, and the character of
those who ruled on and contributed to the case. Rivington may have been conflicted in
his support of the British cause in the Colonies, but he also affirmed that he made the
decision to become and remain American. For at least the remainder of 1775, James
Rivington published articles with a more tempered tone, and one week after the New
York Congress's decision he published an article describing the exercises of three
battalions of the city of Philadelphia. Subdued in tenor, Rivington stated that although the
show was grand, they needed more practice for they lacked great dexterity. The show was
in the presence of the “honorable members of the Continental Congress,” and thousands
of spectators among whom “were a great number of the most respectable inhabitants of
this city [New York].”

The case against James Rivington is a demonstrative example of the right of
freedom of the press in accordance with both English tradition and the emerging
American Republic. Unlike the Zenger trial, the Rivington “trial” was not handled within
the confines of the established colonial or royal government. His incendiary publications
were brought to the attention of local and regional committees by concerned citizens and

in turn progressed to higher committees such as the New York and Massachusetts Provincial Congresses. From there it went on to the Continental Congress who deferred the decision back to the New York City Congress. This process was a rudimentary representation of the development of certain aspects of the American legal system and hierarchy of representative courts.

Despite differences in opinion, loyal sentiments, and *just* cause, the New York Congress upheld James Rivington's right to publish in the face of dozens of resolutions that condemned him. Magnanimity, and mercy were the order of the day and helped to form the framework for the forum of civil discourse whose product was the American Constitution and, subsequently, a central belief and right of the American people: freedom of speech.

While the New York Provincial Congress, and by extension the Continental Congress, upheld the right to a free press, the Sons of Liberty – led by the staunch patriot Isaac Sears – came to a very different conclusion. Although Rivington had issued a public apology for his transgressions, he was still branded as a loyalist who was inimical to the cause of freedom by the Sons of Liberty. Rivington and Sears had previously corresponded over the right to a free press, and Rivington had published their letters in September of 1774.

In their correspondence, Sears questioned a letter printed by Rivington on the 18th of August, 1774, from which Sears was “greatly surprised at the illiberal and unprovoked abuse...” that was directed at him.208 Sears was more concerned with the statements that were made against his character, as a patriot, and he affirmed that “the true and salutary

---

liberty of the press is not concerned.” Rivington's reply skirted the issue of the statements made against Sears, instead he chose to affirm his belief in a free press: “after having been concerned so many years in conducting a newspaper, it is not necessary that I should now be told what belongs to the liberty of the press.” Rivington continued to deny that he had done anything that was not “warranted by his profession” and that he was “ready to defend the freedom of the press, whenever attached in my person.” Sears's response accused Rivington of promoting mischief, evil and being a public nuisance, and that “as a test, you may publish this letter in your paper and vindicate yourself, if you can.” Rivington did just that.

After Rivington's “acquittal” at the hands of the Provincial Congress, Sears and the Sons of Liberty were livid and decided to take matters into their own hands. On the 23rd of November 1775, a band of men led by Sears crossed over to New York from Connecticut and “burned a sloop at Mamaroneck, arrested Judge Johnathan Fowler in Eastchester, the Rev. Dr. Samuel Seabury in Westchester, and Nathaniel Underhill, mayor of Westchester.” They then went south into New York City and destroyed Rivington's press and carried off his types. Luckily, Rivington was not at his printing office at the time.

This raid caused a significant upheaval in New York and it brought back together the general committee for the City and County of New York to deliberate on the consequences of the actions of Sears and the “banditti” from Connecticut. The committee declared that such an act was considered “a breach of the association,” and that “Isaac
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Sears, Samuel Broome, and John Woodward, be cited to appear before this board, in answer for their conduct in entering the city this day, with a number of horse, in a hostile manner.”^213 Three days later, on November 26th, John Jay wrote a letter from Philadelphia where he was a delegate to the Continental Congress, in which he expressed his disapproval of the actions of Sears: “some [delegates] consider it as an ill compliment to the Government of the Provence … for my own part, I don't approve of the feat, and I think it neither argues much wisdom or much bravery....”^214

After some deliberation the New York Committee wrote a petition to the New York Provincial Congress condemning the actions of Sears and expressing the concern of the citizens of New York City for their general safety. The committee additionally expressed their concern for the breach of relations between the colonies of New York and Connecticut and that each colony and congress should be responsible for securing general peace and harmony and the “maintenance of the general union of the Continent, now happily subsisting....”^215 The New York Committee asked the Provincial Congress to take into consideration some method or directive to: “prevent, for the future, the inhabitants of any of the neighboring Colonies coming into this, to direct the publick affairs of it, or to destroy the property or invade the liberty of its inhabitants....”^216 A very real and prescient concern considering the actions of Sears and his band from Connecticut.

Three days after this petition from the Committee, on December 8th, 1775 the New York Congress took into deliberation the concerns evinced within, and after some debate appointed a committee of Mr. Scott, Mr. Hobart, Mr. Thomas Smith, Mr. Gansevoort, and

^213. Stokes, Iconography, IV, 906.
^216. Ibid., 186.
Mr. Brasher, to look into the circumstances of the raid and the motivations for it. This sub-committee penned a letter to Governor Johnathan Trumbull of Connecticut the following week in stern prose to inquire into the circumstances around Sears raid and from what authority, if any, he derived his power. They did not believe that Governor Trumbull or the Colony of Connecticut had authorized the raid and they were prepared to “attribute it to an imprudent, though well intended, zeal for the public cause;” however, the committee desired to “prevent any of the people of you Colony from entering into this for the like purposes, unless invited..., as we cannot but consider such intrusions as an invasion of our essential rights as a distinct Colony.” They also requested that Rivington's types be returned to the committee at New York.

The letter and resolution were then put to a vote by the Provincial Congress and passed, 15 for and 4 against, for submission to Governor Trumbull. Those dissenting were from Tyron and Westchester counties, two apiece, including Colonel Graham, Colonel McDougall, and Mr. Sands. As part of the resolution, the Provincial Congress also petitioned the Continental Congress for a general policy to regulate what should be done in respect to incursions from one Colony into another. The Continental Congress could not take into consideration the requests until January 1776, and on the eleventh they resolved that:
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An interposition so rash; officious, and violent, gave us great anxiety as it was not only a high insult to your authority, but had a direct tendency to confirm that fatal spirit of jealousy and distrust of our Eastern brethren, which has done so much injury to our cause, and which every wise and virtuous patriot should study to suppress.²²⁰

They were also certain that the Colony of Connecticut would “do the justice which you have required,” and restrain, if possible, their citizens from pursuing such an endeavor in the future.

Governor Trumbull wrote a lengthy response to both the resolutions of the New York Committee and the Continental Congress, but he refrained from sending them until he had support of the General Assembly of Connecticut, which took several months. In June 1776, after the General Assembly had approved the measure, the letter was sent to the New York Congress. Governor Trumbull assured the Congress that he nor the Colony of Connecticut in any way approved of the actions of Sears or the mob and that he hoped that the incident would not damage relations between the two Colonies. He did, however, make very clear that the head of the mob and the assumed mastermind, Isaac Sears, was a resident of New York City and that:

the leader of the whole transaction was a respectable member of your City and Congress, whom we consider as the proper person to whom the whole transaction is imputable, and who belongs and is amenable to your jurisdiction alone, and therefore the affair cannot be considered as an intrusion of our people into your Provence, but as a violence or disorder happening among yourselves...²²¹

Nevertheless, Trumbull concluded that he and the Colony of Connecticut would “endeavor to prevent any such like incursions,” from happening in the future, if at all possible, and that the future discourse between New York and Connecticut would be of the “most friendly harmony and intercourse....”

The case against James Rivington and the subsequent disputes over the raid of Isaac Sears are evidence of the tensions and divisions exacerbated by the state of affairs in the Colonies between 1774 and the beginning of 1776. These tensions would be strained further after the Declaration of Independence in July, 1776 and the effects on New York and in turn, Hanover Square, were evident almost immediately.
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IX. The British Occupation of New York City: Hanover Square and Commerce

Aside from Lexington and Concord and the Siege of Boston, the Battle of Brooklyn and Washington's retreat from New York City are remembered as two pivotal points in the early stages of the American Revolution. In the early hours of August 27, 1776 the American troops under Israel Putnam at Brooklyn were warned of the British attacking through the Gowanus Pass, and Putnam lit signals to notify Washington at Manhattan. Washington arrived at Brooklyn Heights by 9:00 am and oversaw much of the ensuing battle from the Heights near Cobble Hill. By the 29\textsuperscript{th}, and after the valiant stand of the Maryland 400, Washington was surrounded at Brooklyn. He conferred with his generals and it was decided that a retreat to Manhattan was the best course of action and that General Mifflin would hold the line until much of the Army had crossed over to Manhattan. That night a fog famously descended on New York concealing the retreat across the East River that left the baffled British digging trenches on the lines at Brooklyn while Washington and his 9,000 men landed safely in New York.

Although the battle itself did not take place near Hanover Square, nor did many of the ensuing fortifications, the landing site for many of Washington's troops was the terminus of the Brooklyn ferry – moved not far from its original point of 1642 – at the end of Wall Street at the shore. From there many of the troops, if not Washington himself, must have passed down Queen Street or up Wall Street towards Broadway and the Fort. They didn't remain in Manhattan for long, and by the third week of September had been dislodged from New York City, first to Harlem and then to White Plains, and eventually
across into New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

The British Military occupation brought with it the problems of restricted trade, a population under duress, increased transitory presence of soldiers, and inflation. Conversely, the occupation was actually beneficial to many established merchants who decided to remain in the city. They had a captive audience and a population that swelled with both troops and refugees, and until military price regulation in 1780, prices and presumably profits, ballooned. During the war many merchants were accused of profiteering, and that there was “‘speculation in every profitable branch of the service,' particularly in groceries.” Illicit trade across military lines was also common.

The problem of refugees was also an acute one. Both loyalists and patriots alike had personal connections inside and outside of New York City, and the lines around New York were permeable. New Yorkers such as John Jay and Gouverneur Morris managed contact with their estranged relatives in the city, and it was common for women to be able to cross the military lines. For example Mrs. Frederick Jay, John Jay's sister in law, was able to visit New York for pleasure and was even advised to stay there if her health required it. William Boerum, a member of the New York Assembly, was able to travel with his wife to Paulus Hook, a British post in July of 1780. And in February 1781, Gouverneur Morris was able to obtain a pass for his sister to visit their ailing mother behind British lines in New York.

Refugees came to New York “whenever the British army withdrew its protection from an area: New Jersey in 1777; Philadelphia in 1778; Rhode Island in 1779...,” and

few if any of them arrived with provisions.\footnote{Ibid., 26.} As a British stronghold for the entire war, New York City became the logical destination for both refugees and displaced loyalists. After the campaigns of 1779 and the intensification of the war in the south, loyalists from as far away as South Carolina and Virginia began to arrive in New York.

Paired with the diversity of the swelling population of New York, the number and tenure of merchants changed as well. The image and descriptions of Hanover Square and the merchants who did business there undoubtedly reflect the fluid and transitory nature of business in 18th century New York, especially during a military occupation. It is difficult to gauge snapshots of Hanover Square for individual years with the exception of periods of transition – January 1777 and November 1783 – yet there are many pieces that remain constant throughout the occupation. Newspapers such as Rivington's \textit{Gazette} and Gaine's \textit{Mercury}; merchants like Theophylact Bache, Peter Goelet, Henry Remsen, and Andrew Hammersly; and notable individuals and their residences such as Jacob Walton and Gerard William Beekman.\footnote{Appendix B, “Reconstruction of Hanover Square...”}

In a way, like Washington months later, James Rivington had retreated from New York as well after his press was attacked and destroyed by Sears and the mob from Connecticut. Rivington had sought refuge aboard a British ship in New York harbor, possibly the \textit{Asia}, and then sailed for England on January 10th, 1776 aboard the ship \textit{Samson}.\footnote{Scott, \textit{Excerpts}, 16-17.} Rivington's plan was to secure new types and support, and then to return to New York to continue in his printing business. The British occupation of New York, that began in earnest in 1777, provided the perfect opportunity for Rivington to triumphantly
make his return to New York City. As Hugh Gaine recalled on October 4th, 1777 the resumption of the printing of Rivington's paper “surprised almost everybody.”\(^{228}\) Gaine reported in his *Mercury* on September 29th that: “On thursday evening last the house of Loosely and Elms, King's Head Tavern, was elegantly illuminated, to testify the joy the true Sons of Freedom had on the arrival of Mr. Rivington, from England.”\(^ {229}\) Rivington was extolled as a printer falsely persecuted and one who always firmly adhered to Liberty and “Licentiousness from his Soul he ever detested.”\(^ {230}\) On October 8th, 1777 James Rivington assumed his official role as “Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty,” and he resumed printing at the location of his former press at the corner of Hanover Square and Wall Street.\(^ {231}\)

Rivington's *Royal Gazette* and Gaine's *Mercury* were the only two newspapers that ran for the duration of the British occupation and as such they reflect the conditions faced by merchants and businesses. An analysis of the types of goods offered for sale in advertisements, the price of common goods, and the record of shipping and receiving reveals much about the internal market conditions of New York City from 1777-82.

---
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Figure 3: Average Number of Advertisements for Merchants, per issue, 1773-83
Gaine's *Mercury* vs. Rivington's *Gazette* \(^{232}\)

---

\(^{232}\) Data compiled by counting the number of unique advertisements included in the same months of issues of the *Mercury* and *Royal Gazette* from 1773-83, then averaged to represent the year. This is a general approximation at best, but merchants frequently placed ads for months at a time, repeating from issue to issue. Rivington had no publications in 1776 as his press was destroyed in 1775 and he did not resume printing until 1777.
Prior to the occupation, Gaine and Rivington had divergent advertising trends that could have represented the difference between an established paper, the Mercury, versus a new paper, Rivington's Gazette. Rivington had boasted that by the beginning of 1774 he had over 3,600 subscribers, but this is almost certainly an inflated number. The controversy over Rivington's publications in the fall of 1774 and into 1775 undoubtedly affected the advertising content of his papers as well. Due to the high volume of correspondence published by Rivington during this period, it is also possible that there was less room available for placing advertisements. Gaining subscribers and readers through controversial content was surely more profitable than courting advertisements from local merchants. After the British occupation began, the advertising trends of Gaine and Rivington followed a similar curve, indicating a general reflection of the state of business in New York City at the time.

By 1778 almost all advertisements of goods for sale had switched from “cash or credit” to “cash only” or “cash or bills of exchange only.” Credit was difficult to come by in occupied New York. Many studies depict occupied New York as half-starved, rent of dry goods, and that rationing was common. Based on the number of advertisements for businesses that had received shipments or had goods available, business was doing quite well, even in 1779. More advertisements appear in both Gaines Mercury and Rivington's Gazette for businesses in Hanover Square after 1777 than before. Many times these advertisements were paired with the cargo of the ship that the merchants had just received or had contracted with for shipment in the near future.
Table IV: Sample Advertisements from the *Mercury* and *Royal Gazette*[^1]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Advertisement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Mercury</em></td>
<td>March 14, 1774</td>
<td>To be sold by Gerard Wm. Beekman at his store in Hanover Square. The French point and half, two and three point blankets, pins 4 1/2, Taffeties, Persians and a good assortment of other dry goods, the best assortment in town, suitable for country or city. Also Madiera wine, jamaica spirits...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mercury</em></td>
<td>December 14, 1778</td>
<td>Emanuel Walker. At his store no. 839 Hanover Square, has for sale on the most reasonable terms for Cash: dry goods, shoes, cutlery, gold and silver lace, silk stockings, also Irish mess beef in barrels and candles. [Has a ship] departing for Glasgow the Brigantine Jeanine, James Cochran Master. Apply for freight or passage to Emanuel Walker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mercury</em></td>
<td>January 19, 1778</td>
<td>William Tongue, in Hanover Square. Sells from London, port wine by the dozen bottles, porter, glouster and chester cheese, yorkshire hams, libson, tenriffe and madiera wines, biscuits. Also has a schooner to dispose of at private sale, well sound, burden about 70 tons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gazette</em></td>
<td>June 3, 1774</td>
<td>Hunt and Muffet, Saddlers and Harness Manufacturers, from London, next door to the Printing Office Lately Mr. James Rivington's Dwelling House. Have...on the Lowest terms, for cash or credit: Hog Skin Seat Saddles, Leather cloak bags, portmanteaus, dog collars, boot strappings, and an assortment of very good boots and shoes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gazette</em></td>
<td>October 13, 1774</td>
<td>Henry Remsen has received by the last ships, an assortment of seasonable goods, which are to sold on reasonable terms at his store in Hanover Square: Rose blankets, superfine swan-skin Blankets, India twilled coatings [various colors], pins, needles, hosiery, Dutch lace, hats...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^1]: Transcribed from the *Mercury* and *Gazette* of the above listed dates. These advertisements illustrate some of the variety of goods offered for sale on Hanover Square both before, and during, the British occupation. Often dry goods merchants had very long lists of available goods that included each individual color of silks and cloths. New shipments and arrivals of goods were often paired with advertisements.
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Gaine's Mercury had approximately 30 separate advertisements per paper for an array of goods in 1779. By comparison, the Mercury ran only about 15 similar advertisements per paper in the same month in 1773. The trend for Rivington's Gazette is similar: fewer advertisements on average in 1774 than in 1778. Is this an indicator that business was better during the British occupation?

As a direct comparison, more advertisements comprising a greater number of individual or partner merchants could indicate that the market for sale was better in 1779 than in 1773; however, it is more likely that advertising was more necessary or profitable in 1779 than it was in 1773. It is possible that advertising in a weekly paper was less advantageous and less necessary in 1773 because there was little scarcity of goods and services. In 1779, after almost three years of occupation, advertising may have been the most advantageous way of demonstrating both the quality and availability of goods for individual merchants. Concurrent with a trend towards more advertising would have been the rising cost of placing advertisements as the price of the paper and ink used to print weekly and twice-weekly papers like Rivington's and Gaine's would have increased as well. It can be taken as a general indicator that because of the greater number of advertisements in 1779 the additional or increased cost of printing them still rendered paper advertising useful.

Selling goods as quick as possible for cash or bills or exchange would have allowed wealthier merchants such as Emanuel Walker, and the partners Gilmour and Walsh, to send for their next shipment of goods from Glasgow, Scotland. The transportation cost must have increased as well by 1779, and would probably have been
out of reach for smaller merchants to import entire shipments on their own through credit alone. Upfront payments would have been common.

Increased advertising and cost of business alone does not account for the variety and quantity of goods that were still available to the general public in New York in 1779. Prices had skyrocketed, but the same goods were still available.

Table V: Price Comparison of Goods (in pounds) in New York,

Gaine's *Mercury*, 1773-82

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Wheat</th>
<th>Flour</th>
<th>Bread</th>
<th>Rum</th>
<th>Beef</th>
<th>Pork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1773</td>
<td>8s</td>
<td>24s</td>
<td>22s</td>
<td>4s, 4d</td>
<td>55s</td>
<td>100s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1774</td>
<td>7s, 8d</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>17s, 6d</td>
<td>3s, 9d</td>
<td>48s</td>
<td>75s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1775</td>
<td>7s</td>
<td>19s, 6d</td>
<td>13s</td>
<td>3s, 4d</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>63s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1776</td>
<td>5s, 9d</td>
<td>18s, 6d</td>
<td>15s</td>
<td>4s, 6d</td>
<td>60s</td>
<td>65s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1777</td>
<td>9s</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>25s</td>
<td>8s</td>
<td>90s</td>
<td>5L, 20s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1778</td>
<td>12s</td>
<td>35s</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>6s, 5d</td>
<td>90s</td>
<td>5L, 10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1779</td>
<td>12s</td>
<td>35s</td>
<td>60s</td>
<td>5s, 6d</td>
<td>8L</td>
<td>8L, 10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1780</td>
<td>26s</td>
<td>80s</td>
<td>95s</td>
<td>5s, 6d</td>
<td>8L</td>
<td>8L, 10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1781</td>
<td>28s</td>
<td>70s</td>
<td>70s</td>
<td>5s, 6d</td>
<td>8L</td>
<td>8L, 10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1782</td>
<td>26s</td>
<td>70s</td>
<td>70s</td>
<td>5s, 6d</td>
<td>8L</td>
<td>8L, 10s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After 1780, the British Army put into place price regulation that stabilized the costs of particular goods such as Beef and Pork, by the barrel, and the price of flour and brown bread. A liter of Rum remained fairly constant at around 4-5 shillings with the exception of a brief spike in 1777, possibly due to increased demand for liquor from the newly arrived British troops. Flour and bread nearly tripled in price from 1773 to 1782; wheat tripled; beef almost quadrupled from close to three pounds to eight; and pork

---

234. Compiled from headline price index of *Mercury* issues 1109, 1160, 1214, 1205, 1319, 1369, 1420, 1447, 1527, 1578 from January 1773 to January 1782. The numbers are recorded in the table exactly as they were printed in the *Mercury*, and it is not immediately clear why amounts were not delineated into their lowest common denominators. i.e., 1L is 20s (1 pound equals 20 shillings), but amounts significantly over 20s were printed frequently.

235. February 1777 was used because no prices were printed by Gaine in January of 1777 due to the beginning of the British occupation.
roughly doubled. Overall, the cost of common goods increased greatly beginning with the British occupation in 1777. The increased cost cannot only be attributed to scarcity, as advertisements during this period appear to have the same, if not better, quality goods available for purchase.

Until the occupation, Hanover Square had a history of high turnover of individual businesses and merchants. Although few, if any, accurate drawings, sketches or paintings of the typical buildings on Hanover-Square exist, some descriptions survive in advertisements sale or for rent. It is likely that the buildings that had the most number of documented merchants were divided to accommodate several businesses at once, whereas buildings with fewer documented residents or merchants were largely single residences or sole store fronts. For example, a building on Hanover Square that was advertised for rent as either a residence or businesses in 1774 was described as:

To be let: The house in which Miss. Hannah Lewis now lives in Hanover Square, adjoining Mr. Hendrick Qudensides and directly opposite the store of Messrs. Hallet and Hazard. The house is extremely convenient for business, having two large rooms in front for stores, eight other rooms, a cellar, and cellar kitchen, a large yard, in which is a well and cistern, also stable for one horse, a large and neat garden, with a grass plot and summer house.

This description was of 141 Pearl Street or 18 Hanover Square, and the name “Qudensides” is a misspelling of Marinus Oudenaarde, who was a merchant next door at 19 Hanover Square from at least 1774 to 1786. Marinus and his son Henry, also occupied one of the storefronts at 18 Hanover Square in 1791, but there only appears to
d

236. See Dunshee, As You Pass By, 51-53, for several charcoal sketches of Engine 11 and the area around the triangular block on Hanover Square circa 1811.
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be data for one additional merchant at this location in the 1770s; Jeremiah Andrews, a
Jeweler. The eight “other” rooms described in the advertisement were probably not as
well suited to business and may have been occupied by tenants.

In contrast to 18 Hanover Square, at the building across the street from James
Rivington, 22 Hanover Square, data exists for more than five merchants who occupied
storefronts during the 1770s. No description of the building is available, but it can be
inferred from the greater number of merchants that it contained more storefronts than
personal rooms. Turnover of merchants was highest during periods of transition, such as
in 1777 and 1783.

To add to the complexity of the picture of Hanover Square during this “era,” there
was not one consistent set of numbers for the buildings and lots on the square. Between
1750 and 1790 Hanover Square had at least four different numbering systems: the old
Hanover Square numbers, the Pearl (or Queen) Street numbers, Stone Street numbers,
and two semi-utilized numbering systems used by the British between 1777-1783. The
British numbering for Hanover Square used one of two progressions: either 820s through
870s, or 500-550s. Both systems only appear during the British occupation and the
former – the 800s – was referred to more frequently than the 500s.

Pinpointing exact locations of merchants and individuals on Hanover Square
during the occupation proves to be a useful exercise, and is directly relevant to the second
“case” against James Rivington: his role as a spy.
X. The Printer and the Spy: James Rivington and Robert Townsend

Both the British and the Americans had extensive intelligence networks deep within enemy territory during the Revolution and there are several notable examples of spies and espionage. Perhaps the most famous of these was the treason of Benedict Arnold and his involvement with Major Andre. Countless books and articles have examined every aspect of the Arnold-Andre affair, espionage in New York City, and the Culper Spy Ring, and many of the same sources make an offhand mention of another “infamous” spy: James Rivington.239 As the King's Royal Printer in America, James Rivington was the most unlikely of spies, and it is perhaps because of this and a few pieces of tantalizing evidence that the story of Rivington's espionage has persisted.

The claims against James Rivington became far more credible after Catherine Snell Crary's 1959 article “The Tory and the Spy: The Double Life of James Rivington” and the new evidence that was brought to light by her research.240 Crary discovered two documents in the papers of Captain Allan McLane – an agent and solider who was affiliated with Washington's intelligence network – that purported to name James Rivington as a source of information for the Americans in New York City. The claim that James Rivington was a secret member or informant for Washington's Culper Spy Ring was nothing new, and stories of his opportunism and willingness to play both sides of the


The historical crux of Rivington's espionage, has been an accusation, or assumption, based largely on secondary, non-contemporary evidence that Rivington had a special partnership or understanding with a known spy in New York: Samuel Culper, Jr., or Robert Townsend. A relationship or mutual understanding and intimate knowledge of each others work would be essential to this link between Rivington and Townsend. The identity of Robert Townsend as Samuel Culper, Jr. has been established beyond reasonable doubt, as have his activities within the spy ring, including his correspondence with his superiors Abraham Woodhull, Benjamin Tallmadge, and George Washington. Culper Jr.'s letters have been especially well documented and analyzed and as such they do not form a large portion of this study except when inextricable from the discourse of Townsend and Rivington.

The two critical assumptions that accompany both the accusations of Rivington's role as a spy and his link with Robert Townsend are: that James Rivington ran a coffee-house frequented by British officers who passed information to Rivington and where Townsend was a business partner; and that at some point during the Revolution Rivington knowingly and willingly switched allegiance and began to send information – through Townsend or otherwise – back through the established communication links of the Culper ring and to Washington. The first of these assumptions relies heavily on the established geography of Rivington's place of business: Hanover Square.

After 1773 Rivington was established at 23 Hanover Square, and from this location he ran both his press and a small store front where he sold dry goods, books,
paper by the ream and probably copies of his gazette. Many second hand accounts also claim that at some point after Rivington's return to New York in 1777 he also started an upscale coffee house wherein he catered to the British officers who frequented Hanover Square. It is difficult to verify the existence of this coffee house and the available records of its assumed location, next door to Rivington's printing office, yield no information that confirms whether or not it was in fact there. 24 Hanover Square appears to have had at least 5 residents between 1774-83: M. Brownejohn (1783), merchant Edward Goold (1781), merchant Samuel Cowperthwait (1774), merchants Hunt and Muffet (1774), and apothecary William Stewart (1774). 241 A non-contemporary source, Henry Wansey, attested to Rivington's ownership of a coffee house during the Revolution; however, his meeting with Rivington and his journal were written more than a decade after the end of the Revolution, in 1794. Wansey states: “During the time the British kept possession of New York, he printed a newspaper for them, and opened a kind coffee-house for the officers; his house was the great place of resort ; he made a great deal of money during that period, though many of the officers quitted it considerably in arrears to him.” 242

Catherine Crary cites from Wansey's journal as well as from Morton Pennypacker as proof that Rivington owned a coffee house, but Wansey is a non-contemporary source and Pennypacker provides no source for his information. On the other hand Leroy Hewlett in his 1958 dissertation on James Rivington's publications does not mention Rivington owning or running a coffee house. Hewletts bibliography and research on Rivington is exhaustive, and nearly comprehensive. Hewlett examined primary

241. Appendix B, “Reconstruction of Hanover Square...” and; Appendix C “Residents of Hanover Square...” for additional information about these individuals.
documents and publications of Rivington held in 23 states, Canada and Great Britain, totaling 55 document repositories, libraries, historical societies, state and national archives, and private collections through which no reference to Rivington's coffee-house, or reference significant enough to warrant mention, appears in his writings.\textsuperscript{243} It seems highly unlikely that the second-hand evidence for Rivington's coffee-house is accurate given that Rivington himself never publicized the coffee-house and that there is no primary source evidence for its existence.

While it is not impossible that James Rivington ran a coffee-house, the existence of one on Hanover Square next to, or near, Rivington's press does not appear to be recorded in any other source. It is plausible that the second hand accounts mistook another coffee house in the vicinity of Hanover Square as one run by Rivington: Merchant's Coffee House.

The earliest reference to Merchant's Coffee House comes from 1738, when Daniel Bloom purchased the house on the Northwest corner of Wall and Water Streets that had previously been a tavern. Bloom purchased this house in June, 1738 and renamed it “Merchant's Coffee House.”\textsuperscript{244} After Bloom's death the house changed hands several times, ending up in the possession of Charles Arding in 1758, who then rented it to Mrs. Mary Ferrara between 1758 and 1771.\textsuperscript{245} In 1772, Mrs. Ferrara moved across the street from the old coffee house and opened a “spacious elegant new Coffee-house.”\textsuperscript{246} This location was the site of Merchant's Coffee House after 1772, even though it was not run by Mrs. Ferrara after 1773. John Austin Stevens contends that this new location at the

\textsuperscript{243} Hewlett, \textit{James Rivington}, 227-232.
\textsuperscript{244} Stokes, \textit{Iconography}, IV, 509.
\textsuperscript{245} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{246} Ibid.
southeast corner of Wall and Water Streets was always the location of the coffee house, but the available records clearly confirm that it was moved from its first site to across the street.\(^{247}\) Either way, after 1773 Merchant's Coffee House became a thriving business that not only served as a coffee house, but also as a public auction house for at least the decade between 1773 and 1783. Countless advertisements appear in both the \textit{Mercury} and the \textit{Royal Gazette} that point to the next shipment of goods, stock of wares, or building for rent to be auctioned at “Merchant's Coffee House.” Again, no record exists that James Rivington partnered in Merchant's Coffee House; however, if he did partner in a coffee house instead of opening one, Merchant's is the prime candidate.

Robert Townsend's involvement with James Rivington is documented, but it is only in the form of articles that Townsend wrote for Rivington's Royal Gazette. Townsend's involvement with the Culper Spy Ring is also documented, as is his dual role as a merchant and spy in New York City. Robert Townsend was born near Oyster Bay, Long Island on November 25\(^{th}\), 1753 to Samuel and Sarah Townsend, the third of eight children.\(^{248}\) The Townsend's were a family of established merchants in and around New York and had been on Long Island since the 1640s. Townsend was a Quaker who was well read and educated, and in his teenage years he was apprenticed to the mercantile house of Templeton and Stewart, on the west side of Manhattan Island, near Trinity Church. During the Revolution, Townsend first partnered with Henry Oakham in a small dry goods business close to Hanover Square at 18 Smith Street, but the partnership did

not proceed on good terms and they separated in 1781. From there Townsend started his own storefront on Peck's slip, north of Hanover Square, rented from the house of Mrs. Hannah Cockle. There Townsend had both his shop and living quarters for the remainder of the Revolution. Townsend's involvement in the Culper Ring began in 1779, after he was approached by Abraham Woodhull, one of the top officers in Washington's intelligence service and the “Culper, Sr.” of the ring's correspondence.

As an established merchant in New York, and as a Quaker from a county rife with Tory's (Queen's), Townsend was an ideal agent for Washington in New York. Townsend was bestowed with the code name “Culper Jr.” and his superior, Abraham Woodhull was given “Culper Sr.” Both also had code numbers devised by Washington's spymaster Benjamin Tallmadge: 722 for Woodhull, 723 for Townsend. Curiously, Rivington was also given a code number, 726, but there are no known encoded letters that use his number. Being given a code number does not signify involvement in the ring, as Tallmadge devised a simple number substitution for letters of the alphabet, common words and phrases, and for other notable individuals in New York such as General Clinton (712) and Lord North (719). Townsend sent his correspondence, sometimes in invisible ink, as Culper Jr., and occasionally in code.

It is evident from Culper Jr.'s letters that he sought to maintain his status as a merchant, sometimes to the chagrin and frustration of Tallmadge and Woodhull who wanted Townsend to focus more on gathering information. In a letter to Tallmadge in September 1779 Washington expressed his feeling towards Townsend's employment:

249. Ibid., 153.
It is not my opinion that Culper junr. should be advised to give up his present employment. I would imagine that with a little industry, he will be able to carry on his intelligence with greater security to himself and greater advantages to us, under cover of his usual business, than if he were to dedicate himself wholly to the giving of information. It may afford him opportunities of collecting intelligence, that he could not derive so well in any other manner. It prevents also those suspicions which would become natural should he throw himself out of the line of his present employment.\footnote{John C. Fitzpatrick, ed. \textit{The Writings of Washington from the Original Manuscript Sources, 1745-1799}. 39 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1931-1944; reprint, New York: Greenwood Press, 1970), Washington to Tallmadge, September 24 1779. (Accessed online via Library of Congress at \textit{http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/gwhtml} included as part of \textit{GWP})}

Washington was of the opinion that it was less suspicious for Townsend to continue his normal business activities and that in doing so he may have had an opportunity to make contacts that otherwise would be suspect for a single man in New York. Townsend proved to be an especially valuable agent for Washington in New York, but his exact relationship with James Rivington remains cloudy. Catherine Crary asserted that Townsend and Rivington had a silent partnership, and this assumption forms a large portion of the thesis that Rivington was a spy.

Crary's thesis hinges on several key points: that Captain Allan McLane received information about the signaling of the British fleet from Rivington; that Rivington was in financial difficulty by 1779; and that this information was procured from Rivington's coffee-house, in which he and Robert Townsend were secret partners and financial backers. Crary states:
Meanwhile Rivington had also opened a coffee house, as a resort for British officers, from whom he hoped to gather information for his newspaper. It is at this point that the circumstantial evidence regarding Rivington's duplicity seems to form a pattern. By 1779, we know, Rivington was experiencing financial difficulties, and he was not receiving payment of his salary as King's printer. His coffee shop – as useful for espionage, perhaps, as for newspaper stories – was in fact financed in part by Robert Townsend, a prominent merchant, who has been identified as an American spy, the 'Culper Junior' of Washington's correspondence.  

For this information Crary directly cites four sources: Morton Pennypacker; a letter from Washington to Tallmadge; Henry Wansey's journal; and a letter from Rivington to Richard Cumberland. None of these four sources indicate the “pattern” that Crary refers to, nor do they confirm the critical facts in her assumption. First, Crary cites from Morton Pennypacker's *General Washington's Spies on Long Island and in New York*, pages 4 and 12-13. Here, Pennypacker states that as far as the coffee house was concerned: “Townsend and Rivington although silent partners, were its financial backers; and that Rivington wished to establish it in order to provide a place close by his printing office where British officers would meet and furnish him with a copy for the English Magazines and his own Royal Gazette.”  

Pennypacker provides no source for his information that Townsend and Rivington were silent partners and financial backers and Crary repeats this assertion almost verbatim. Pennypacker elaborated his views on the relationship between Rivington and Townsend, but neither Crary, nor any other source that names Rivington as a spy, 

---

includes his additional analysis of their “special relationship.” Pennypacker states:

Townsend he found apt, and most willing to run down news that made good copy; and the fact that Townsend refused to be on his pay roll or to accept money for his work did not lessen Rivington's regard for him. That James Rivington ever imagined Robert Townsend to be in the service of General Washington there is no evidence to show. In fact it is very unlikely. Rivington is not the type of man that Townsend would trust with that secret. 254 (emphasis added)

Pennypacker was convinced that Rivington was utilizing Townsend not for the purposes of espionage – as Crary attributed by adding the word “perhaps,” to her analysis – but for the express purpose of gathering information for articles for publication in his Royal Gazette. With this information in mind the question can then be posed: if James Rivington had no knowledge of Townsend's involvement with Washington's Spy Ring, then how could Rivington have possibly been a spy? Pennypacker believed that Townsend would not have trusted Rivington with a secret such as his involvement with Washington, and as he states there is no evidence to show that Rivington was ever aware of his involvement. Could Rivington have been the one who was duped? From a straight reading of Pennypacker, it could be assumed that Townsend was in fact the one playing both sides of the coin by tricking Rivington into using him as a reporter for his Royal Gazette while actually conveying some of the information he gathered at the coffee house to Washington. Again, there is no evidence to confirm that Rivington had any knowledge of the secret affairs of Robert Townsend, or of his double identity as Samuel Culper, Jr.

The apocryphal partnership between Rivington and Townsend in Rivington's coffee-house also has no primary source evidence in support. None of Robert Townsend's

254. Ibid., 13.
papers mention the existence of, or partnership in, a coffee-house at all; let alone one run
by James Rivington. The few existing papers of James Rivington also do not mention the
existence or partnership in the coffee house. What is very telling is that in his personal
and business cash books, Robert Townsend recorded payments to three notable
individuals: Austin Roe, Abraham Woodhull, and James Rivington.

In his account books from 1779-84, Robert Townsend recorded nearly all of his
financial transactions, whether or not they were related to his duties as a spy. During this
period he recorded eight transactions with Austin Roe, his courier for information to
Abraham Woodhull and Benjamin Tallmadge, and twelve transactions with Woodhull
himself. As Tables VI and VII demonstrate, Townsend was meticulous in recording the
exact amount that he either received from, or paid to Roe and Woodhull. It is possible
that several of the entries for Abraham Woodhull refer to another man of the same name
who lived near Townsend's family residence in Oyster Bay, especially the payments that
have a specific purpose attached to them. The payments to and from Austin Roe are more
difficult to explain. Roe acted as Townsend's courier for both legitimate purchases and for
conveying information to Woodhull. As several of the payments are for not insignificant
amounts, more than 15L four times, it could be assumed that these were for the more
dangerous service of shipping secret correspondence.

In his account book from 1779 to 1781, Townsend also records his transactions
with James Rivington. Twelve payments from November 1779 to July 1780 are recorded
and each transaction is accompanied by a specific good purchased from Townsend's store
at Peck's slip. Only one payment from Rivington to Townsend exceeds 2 pounds and this
was the remaining unpaid balance of Rivington's purchases at Townsend's store (it is just under 5 pounds). The frequency of purchases and the type of goods Rivington bought form a general pattern: Rivington primarily bought bread, sugar, and rum from Townsend about every other week. Whether or not they exchanged other information during these twice monthly meetings there is no evidence to show; however, Townsend did not record any additional payments from Rivington. As Pennpacker asserted, Townsend did not accept payment for his articles written or information gathered for Rivington's paper. Townsend did pay Rivington for advertisements in his paper, once, for 12 shillings. Like Townsend's other regular customers, James Rivington was recorded with a customer number, “22,” and his remaining balance each time a transaction occurred.
Table VI: Entries from the Account Books of Robert Townsend, 1773-81.

From *EHPL*, Morton Pennypacker Long Island History Collection.

**Book One, 1773-79**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Woodhull</td>
<td>August 6, 1779</td>
<td>6; 10; 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Woodhull</td>
<td>August 13, 1779</td>
<td>16; 2; 8</td>
<td>By Cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Woodhull</td>
<td>August 13, 1779</td>
<td>0; 8; 1</td>
<td>To Cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Woodhull</td>
<td>September 12, 1779</td>
<td>3; 12; 0</td>
<td>By Cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Woodhull</td>
<td>September 27, 1779</td>
<td>10; 5; 0</td>
<td>To Cloth for a Suit of Clothes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abram [sic] Woodhull</td>
<td>October 2, 1779</td>
<td>9; 8; 0</td>
<td>For Sundrys [sic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Woodhull</td>
<td>October 20, 1779</td>
<td>4; 6; 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Book Two, 1779-81**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lowe at Mr. Rivingtons</td>
<td>November 25, 1779</td>
<td>0; 3; 0</td>
<td>1 Quart Spirits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivingtons</td>
<td>November 29, 1779</td>
<td>0; 2; 0</td>
<td>1 Sugar &amp; 1 Pint Rum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivingtons Flora</td>
<td>December 3, 1779</td>
<td>0; 1; 4</td>
<td>1 Pint Rum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rivington</td>
<td>January 6, 1780</td>
<td>1; 0; 9</td>
<td>1 Loaf Sugar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rivington</td>
<td>January 15, 1780</td>
<td>1; 15; 7</td>
<td>1 Loaf Sugar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rivington</td>
<td>January 18, 1780</td>
<td>0; 2; 4</td>
<td>To 7 Riv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rivington</td>
<td>February 12, 1780</td>
<td>1; 11; 4</td>
<td>1 Loaf Sugar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rivington</td>
<td>February 23, 1780</td>
<td>1; 13; 1</td>
<td>1 Loaf Sugar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rivington</td>
<td>March 27, 1780</td>
<td>0; 4; 0</td>
<td>2 Bottles Rum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rivington</td>
<td>April 17, 1780</td>
<td>1; 10; 4</td>
<td>1 Loaf Sugar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rivington</td>
<td>July 22, 1780</td>
<td>0; 12; 0</td>
<td>For Advertisements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rivington</td>
<td>July 22, 1780</td>
<td>4; 14; 9</td>
<td>In full to Cash to Sundry Accounts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

255. *Robert Townsend, Account Book*, begun April 1, 1773, and continued to Nov. 15, 1779, East Hampton Public Library, Morton Pennypacker Long Island History Collection, MSS # 68-70. (Hereafter, Townsend Account Book One, *EHPL*, MSS #.)

256. *Robert Townsend, Account Book*, begun November 23, 1779, and continued to March 29, 1781, *EHPL*, by date of entry. This particular account book differs from the first book in that it is physically much larger and has no discernible page or manuscript numbers. Thus it is cited “by date of entry” as the account book progresses chronologically and is easily indexed in such a fashion. Names are included exactly as recorded in the account book. (Hereafter, Townsend Account Book Two, *EHPL*, date of entry)
Table VII: Entries from the Cash Book of Robert Townsend, 1781-84.

From Townsend Papers, Box 4 Miscellaneous, *NYHS.* 257

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>From/To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin Roe</td>
<td>May 21, 1781</td>
<td>0; 2; 6</td>
<td>From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Roe</td>
<td>June 8, 1781</td>
<td>22; 1; 0</td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Roe</td>
<td>August 31, 1781</td>
<td>58; 16; 9</td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Roe</td>
<td>September 8, 1781</td>
<td>1; 0; 0</td>
<td>From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Roe</td>
<td>October 2, 1781</td>
<td>18; 9; 6</td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Roe</td>
<td>November 16, 1781</td>
<td>3; 0; 0</td>
<td>From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Roe</td>
<td>November 30, 1781</td>
<td>24; 3; 6</td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Roe</td>
<td>June 12, 1782</td>
<td>8; 4; 0</td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Woodhull</td>
<td>October 24, 1782</td>
<td>7; 9; 4</td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Woodhull</td>
<td>October 24, 1782</td>
<td>7; 8; 6</td>
<td>From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Woodhull</td>
<td>October 25, 1782</td>
<td>3; 1; 4</td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Woodhull</td>
<td>October 25, 1782</td>
<td>2; 9; 0</td>
<td>From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Woodhull</td>
<td>July 19, 1782</td>
<td>0; 8; 0</td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems highly unlikely that Townsend would have recorded payments made to both Austin Roe and Abraham Woodhull in his personal Cash Book, but not payments made into another business. Evidence shows that Townsend was a businessman first and a spy second. Townsend's meticulous recording of every transaction, even those to himself for cash, from his business and the lack of entries showing payments for coffee or into another businesses partnership with James Rivington are the final nails in the coffin of the spy duo of Rivington and Townsend. It is unlikely that Townsend paid into a secret financial partnership with James Rivington, regardless of whether or not Rivington's coffee house ever existed.

It is also questionable that Rivington was in financial difficulties as early as 1779.

---

257. “Cash Book, 1781-84” *Townsend Family Papers, 1746-1864.* Box 4 Miscellaneous, New York Historical Society. (Hereafter, “Cash Book, 1781-84,” *Box 4 Miscellaneous, NYHS.*) This cash book is not listed as part of the Robert Townsend Collection, but the handwriting is identical to his and it continues from where the account books at the East Hampton Public Library leave off.
as a result of a lack of payment for his services as King's Printer. In her own citation, Crary states that: “This salary, however, was only nominal since it was to be paid out of the American quitrents which could not be collected.”

It is highly doubtful that Rivington relied on his salary as King's Printer for survival if it was an amount that was “only nominal.” Although Rivington had difficulties maintaining the wages of his workers in 1778 due to a strike, he raised the price of advertisements to defray the additional costs of paying his journeyman printers. Rivington had the most successful paper in New York City during the British occupation, by far eclipsing the publications of his two nearest competitors: Hugh Gaine and James Parker. He also had a moderately successful storefront where he sold books, reams of paper, stationary, and other miscellaneous dry goods. Rivington's financial problems prior to and after the Revolution are well documented, but less evidence exists to suggest that he had financial difficulties during the British occupation.

Leroy Hewlett contends that Rivington had numerous sources of income and that he was very well off during the Revolution. In June 1780, Rivington was appointed with the power of attorney for the estate of James DeLancey, who returned to England at the beginning of the war, and he received a large commission for parceling out the estate. Although Rivington may have been temporarily deprived of his salary as King's printer early in the war, he did receive far more than a “nominal” payment for his publication of official royal documents. After Henry Clinton was removed from command of British troops in 1782, Rivington submitted a bill for his services between December 27, 1780

259. Hewlett, James Rivington, 152.
and April 13, 1782. The bill was for “484L, 15s” and he was very quickly paid to the amount of “452L, 6s, 5d,” or about 32 pound sterling less than he had asked for.\textsuperscript{260} It also appears that Rivington had submitted periodic bills to the British Government that were paid at regular intervals between 1778 and 1782, averaging about 250L per year.\textsuperscript{261} Taking into account the unknown amount made from the DeLancey estate, his bills to the British Government, and sales from his store, it appears that Rivington was not particularly in any financial difficulty, at least during the Revolution. Thus, if Rivington attempted to pass information along for money, he did it out of greed rather than necessity.

The only evidence that specifically implicates Rivington in an act of espionage is the entry in the journal of Allan McLane. While Allan McLane was indeed in the service of Washington, and a reliable agent, he may have been mistaken as to where, exactly, he received his information as recounted in his recollections. As Crary quotes, McLane stated: “After I returned in the fall was imployed [sic] by the board of war to repair to Long Island to watch the motion of the British fleet and if possible obtain their Signals which I did threw the assistance of the noteed [sic] Rivington.”\textsuperscript{262} Linguistically, “obtaining through,” and “obtaining from,” are not equivalent statements. Crary interpreted McLane's wording of “obtain...threw” to be equivalent to “obtain...from;” however, McLane could certainly have obtained the information about the British signals \textit{from} another agent who obtained it \textit{through} Rivington. McLane would have been correct in stating that he obtained the information \textit{through} the assistance of Rivington if he in...

\textsuperscript{260} Hewlett, \textit{James Rivington}, 164.
\textsuperscript{261} Ibid., 165.
\textsuperscript{262} Crary, “The Double Life of James Rivington,” 69; and \textit{Allan McLane Papers, 1775-1821}. BV McLane, 3 vols., Microfilm, II, 56.
fact received the information from Townsend, Roe, Woodhull or another courier.

If Rivington was unaware of Townsend's role as Culper, Jr., as Pennypacker asserts, then Townsend could have obtained the information about the British signals from officers at Rivington's or Merchant's coffee house, under the guise of writing an article for the Royal Gazette, and then passed this information along to McLane or someone that McLane dealt with, unbeknownst to Rivington. The “source” here would still be Rivington, or “threw the assistance of the noted [sic] Rivington,” but no actual transfer of information occurred between Rivington and McLane directly.

Additionally in the McLane papers there exists a section written by an unknown author that purports to be “extracts of the Journal of Allan McLane,” and it is in these extracts that Crary found additional supporting evidence. This evidence is also not concrete, nor does it specifically mention James Rivington. The extract states:

On her [the ship's] return he [McLane] was stationed by the Board of War near Sandyhook to correspond with R of New York received the signals for the British fleet out of New York, delivered them to Count De Grass, acted occasionally on the Shore and with the French fleet till after Cornwallis had surrendered.263

If this is indeed an extract from a now lost journal of McLane then one possible interpretation would be that “R of New York” was Rivington; however, it is almost equally likely that “R” could have been Austin Roe, who was known to be Townsend's courier for information obtained through Rivington – specifically from the coffee-house. It is highly unlikely that Rivington was unaware of one of Washington's best spies in New York, Culper, Jr., writing for his paper, while concurrently being a spy himself and passing information to McLane.

The McLane document in question and Crary's additional supporting evidence are not concrete, nor are they entirely contemporary to the time in question. Although the initial entry from McLane's journal was possibly written in 1782, the extract was written after the Revolution and is not in his own handwriting. An additional letter from Richard Peters to McLane asking him to recall his secret mission to Sandyhook in 1781 was written in 1804, more than twenty years after the event occurred.264

Memory can be selective, and basing an entire assertion on information recalled after twenty or more years is hardly definitive. Peters letter mentions money “paid to the Person (whose Name I cannot with good Faith mention) going in to the Enemy.” Peters omits the name of the individual in question, and logically omission is not equivalent to confirmation. The person “going in to the Enemy” could have been anyone and there is no indication that it was Rivington. James Rivington died in 1802, so why would Peters or McLane not mention Rivington's name in 1804? They could do little to injure his “reputation,” as Rivington was in and out of debtors prison from the 1790s until his death and he was already detested as a printer of falsehoods and lies, and a staunch loyalist. Both Austin Roe and Robert Townsend, however, were alive in 1804 (Roe lived until 1830, Townsend until 1838) and both were still businessmen. If McLane's source was actually Austin Roe then it would make sense that Peters would not want to reveal his name as to not affect his reputation – either positively or negatively. Townsend's identity as Culper, Jr. and use of Roe as a courier was not definitively known until the 20th century.

264. Allan McLane Papers, 1775-1821, II, 27, 56,57,71. McLane's journal entry that Crary cites has no specific date; the extract also has no date, but from other margin dates in the extracts it can be assumed that they were made in the mid-19th century; Peters letter to McLane was in 1804.
Washington's response to the mission and description provided by Peters does not confirm the involvement of Rivington. Washington stated: “The particular mode you have adopted to obtain information, I think may be very usefully employed, and is a fortunate expedient; the necessity of its use to our present operations is happily at an end, if continued, it may be of importance to some future designs.” As Washington was continually looking for new ways of gathering intelligence in New York, the mode in question could have been through a different intermediary, and Washington does not confirm that the source was someone as important as Rivington. Wouldn't Washington have expressed more interest in the matter if he knew the source was directly from James Rivington, King's printer in America? Besides, Washington already had an agent working either with or alongside Rivington, probably without Rivington's knowledge: Samuel Culper, Jr.

Through questioning McLane's account, along with the apocryphal partnership between Rivington and Townsend, the omission of Rivington's name from any other correspondence, and Rivington's financial situation, the accusation of James Rivington the spy falls apart. The overwhelming weight of evidence that suggests that Rivington was none other than a Loyalist first and sycophantic opportunist second far overshadows the few pieces of evidence that suggest that Rivington was secretly a spy. Leroy Hewlett summed up the case against James Rivington's duplicity best:

The persons who could have told the truth were George Washington, Colonel Stephen Moore, Robert Morris, and Charles Thomson. Morris, as the director of Continental Finances, held the purse strings of the secret service, and Thomson was the head of the system. None of them ever revealed the secret or, even if they did, the records of their testimony have not survived. The correspondence of Richard Henry Lee, Isaiah Thomas, and even of James Rivington does not reveal anything which could be construed as concrete evidence. The only positive clue would be the discovery of secret messages to Washington or Thomson which could positively be identified as Rivington's handwriting. To search for evidence of this nature would construe a long, tedious, and frustrating task, particularly because such messages, as soon as they were received, were usually destroyed.\textsuperscript{266}

Hewlett concludes that:

\begin{quote}
The dominant feature of Rivington's personality was his extreme loyalty to the British Empire. It was this trait which was the cause of his almost fanatical contempt for the ideas and activities of those who favored the American Revolution. The unrelenting attacks upon the character of the American leaders, particularly George Washington and William Livingston, were the results of this partisanship...Until the very end of a long conflict, Rivington still held out hope for the reconciliation and reunion of the British Empire.\textsuperscript{267}
\end{quote}

If James Rivington was indeed a spy then it was a secret that he took with him to the grave, as did Robert Townsend, Abraham Woodhull, Benjamin Tallmadge, and George Washington. It is also quite telling that Rivington's paper faltered and failed after the end of the British occupation in 1783, as Rivington had nothing else to write about and had to compete with other printers returning to New York. Rivington continued to run his storefront, but it appears that he did not do very well as he was in and out of debtors prison from shortly after the Revolution until his death in 1802. He died penniless, but left an indelible mark upon the history of Hanover Square, New York in the Revolution, and the establishment of a free press in America.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{266} Hewlett, \textit{James Rivington}, 182-83.
\item \textsuperscript{267} Ibid., 206.
\end{itemize}
XI. Conclusion

The story of Hanover Square is far from complete as much of its golden age of business and development occurred in the nineteenth century. It is from the beginning of the nineteenth century onward that Hanover Square evolved into the area that it is today, albeit a shadow of its former self. With the exception of “India House” at the corner of Old Slip and Hanover Square, all of the buildings that existed prior to 1800 have been demolished to make way for modern construction. Some of the nineteenth century architecture remains, but the thriving office buildings and congested city streets bordering on the New York Stock Exchange overshadow the old Burgher's Path and Merchants Row. As it stands today, Hanover Square proper – the right triangle that it is – is now the location of the British Memorial Gardens, a fitting location considering the ties many individuals on Hanover Square had to Britain. The early period of Hanover Square represents an interesting and informative account of the development of a mercantile center and of the nature of business, landholding and public regulation in New York City.

The narrative exploits of James Rivington, Robert Townsend and others speak to the character of individuals who frequented Hanover Square and to the nature of a city under military occupation. A line can be traced from the early Dutch merchant's Loockermans and Van Brugh all the way through to Theophylact Bache and Jacob Walton. The analysis of Hanover Square acts as a lens through which the development of New York City can be viewed from the earliest Dutch settlement through the English period and into the Revolutionary era.
James Rivington is inextricable from the narrative of the history of Hanover Square, and his exploits, both real and accused, add significantly to the history of New York City and to the study of colonial printing, formation of tenets of American law, and to the development of the early American Republic. More often than not James Rivington was given fair, but not preferential, treatment by officials and committees that suggests that he was considered to be in possession of his rights as both a British and newly American citizen. At no point does the tenor or tone of these resolutions and directives suggest that James Rivington was anything other than a somewhat misguided and, for a time, loyalist printer. Combined with the lack of concrete, specific, documentary evidence from Rivington himself, Robert Townsend, Abraham Woodhull, George Washington or any other contemporaries, there can be no other conclusion but that James Rivington was in almost all certainty not a secret spy or double agent. The existing links are too tenuous; rely too heavily on conjecture and individual data points; are unsubstantiated; and generally ignore the substantial weight of primary evidence against the possibility of Rivington's duplicity. Rivington's “double life” is still remotely possible; however, until documentation in the hand of Rivington or Townsend, from the lost papers of Washington, or from another substantially trustworthy source emerges, the tale of James Rivington the spy is as fanciful as it is unlikely.

Appendices B and C represent a small contribution to the geographic history of a specific region of New York City and to the nature of business, tenancy, and the development of American cities in the colonial period.
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## Appendix C – “Residents of Hanover Square, ca. 1750-1790”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, Jeremiah</td>
<td>Next door to Mr. Qudenaard's in Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>Jeweller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asley,</td>
<td>35 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayscough, Dr. Richard</td>
<td>118 Pearl St.</td>
<td>? (at least 1755) – May 1760</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bache, Theophylact</td>
<td>122 Pearl St.</td>
<td>1758 – 1759, again after the war 1787-1807</td>
<td>Merchant, President of the Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bancker, Richard</td>
<td>Opposite The Golden Key</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Estate Sale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banker, Richard</td>
<td>12 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>died tuesday last in NYC of a purtrid fever in his 48th year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclay, Duncan</td>
<td>12 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayley, William</td>
<td>Where Messrs. Mercer and Schenck Formerly Lived</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Hardware merchant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beekman, Gerard(us)</td>
<td>121 Pearl St.</td>
<td>not during 1777-1783, unclear after</td>
<td>Wealthy Homeowner Merchant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beekman, James</td>
<td>After 1783</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Place of business in Hanover Sq. no details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennet, James</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Polydore, Slave. Age 18 ran away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blockley, Thomas</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Engraver</td>
<td>James Wright ran away from him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowman and Codner</td>
<td>Office in Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>English Dry Goods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowman,</td>
<td>521 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownejohn, M</td>
<td>24 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>James, Negro, ran away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownejohn, Thomas (or William?)</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>English Dry Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownjohn, Samuel</td>
<td>838 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>farm upstate for sale, apply to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton, Sir Henry</td>
<td>Beekman House</td>
<td>1779 to 1781</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clopper, Cornelius</td>
<td>Next door to Garret and Wynat Ketteltas</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codner,</td>
<td>521 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
<td>Occupation(s)</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coley, William</td>
<td>15 Hanover SQ</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td></td>
<td>has taken over the house no. 15 hanover sq (formerly occupied by Thomas Gordon?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin's, Messrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colvell, Elizabeth</td>
<td>at the house of Mr. Clopper</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corre, Joseph</td>
<td>17 Hanover Sq</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruger, John Harris</td>
<td>7 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>?1777-1783</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>Returned to England after June 5th 1783.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumpston, Thomas</td>
<td>517 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Assorted Dry Goods, Cloth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digby, Admiral</td>
<td>10 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td></td>
<td>(His secretary was at 17 Hanover Sq. see Barek Appendix D, 248.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erskine, Thomas</td>
<td>at Mrs. Smyth's</td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>reward paid for return of Cudjoe, negro boy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td></td>
<td>offers for sale a picture of Christopher Columbus and some very ancient gold and silver medals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer, Mrs. Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td>1783</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaine, Hugh</td>
<td>Bible and Crown, 20 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>August 1752 – October 1783</td>
<td>Printer Bookseller Stationer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gault, Robert</td>
<td>20 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>Cloth, Wine, Silks for Sale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geddes, Charles</td>
<td>21 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>Watchmaker</td>
<td>intends to leave NYC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geyer, Frederick William</td>
<td>Sloat Lane facing Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>who intends for England, wished to settle his accounts and sell his stock of European and India goods at his store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilmour and Walsh</td>
<td>853 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Dry Goods Merchant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godby's, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>choice parcel of skins is offered for sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goelet, Peter</td>
<td>48 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1760s-1784</td>
<td>Blacksmith, Goldsmith.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goold, Edward</td>
<td>34 Hanover Sq., 24 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>daughter Miss Sarah Goold, died wed last (1783)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon, Thomas</td>
<td>15 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>will pay reward for the recovery of a silver skeleton dropped near the four mile stone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham, Ennis</td>
<td>853 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td></td>
<td>could be Ennis Graham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham, Ennis</td>
<td>Corner of Wall St. facing Mr. Rivington's printing office</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>Merchant, Tailor, Cloth Store, a grand assortment of cloth, patterns, silk, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersly, Andrew</td>
<td>46 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>Ironmonger and Dry Goods Merchant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison, _____</td>
<td>Hanover Sq and 35 Water St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartley, Thomas</td>
<td>Corner of Hanover Sq. and Old Slip</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Stay-maker, seeks a journeyman stay-maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks, Mrs. Hester</td>
<td></td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Wife of Uriah Hendricks Ironmonger, died saturday last in NYC, leaving her husband and eight small children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks, Uriah</td>
<td>43 Hanover Sq. or 858 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>Ironmonger and Dry Goods Merchant, intends for england, wishes to settle all accounts and sell the goods in his store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepburn, Mr.</td>
<td>481 Hanover Sq. Next to Mr. Gaines</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Lawyer, admitted to NY courts (1/6/79), he moved his office from no. 151 Queen St to HSQ next to Mr. Gaines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoake(l?), Robert</td>
<td>7 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>has for sale a house, No. 16 Great Dock St. (occupied by James Dole) and a house, No. 52 Wall St. (occupied by Mr. Kearney, notary public)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgward, William</td>
<td>38 Hanover Sq. (122 Pearl St.) Also 853 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>Merchant, Mainly provisions from Cork, of the house Hodgward &amp; Ludlow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosmer, Mr.</td>
<td>971 Water St. almost facing Beekmans slip</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>part of a house in HSQ for rent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulick, Peter</td>
<td>nearly opposite Jacob Walton</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>Stay-maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, John</td>
<td></td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>Dry Goods Merchant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson, _____</td>
<td>35 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inman, John and George</td>
<td></td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>Boots, Shoes, Jewelery, Perfume for Sale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jem, Slave</td>
<td>843 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Slave</td>
<td>runaway from John Porteous &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly, John</td>
<td>next door to messrs. Mercer and schenck, and directly opposite Jacob Waltons.</td>
<td>1779 and 1782</td>
<td>Notary Public</td>
<td>into the house now occupied by Mrs. Ann Grant. House then to be let 4/14/74, described as an “excellent stand for any sort of business, but more particularly adapted for a dry goods store, ...opposite Jacob Walton's”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keteltas, Garret and Wynandt</td>
<td>22 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1777-74</td>
<td>Dry Goods Merchants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kollock, Shepard</td>
<td>22 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Cato, Slave. Reward offered for his return to Capt Laird.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leanard, John</td>
<td>Opposite Mr. Jacob Walton</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>Furrier from London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leckie, Alexander</td>
<td>22 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1777-73</td>
<td>Merchant, English and Scotch Goods</td>
<td>Name disappears after the war, he probably retired with the British.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenzi, Philip</td>
<td>517 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>Confectioner</td>
<td>Bet, Negro Slave ran away. He owned an Icehouse on the North River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Hannah</td>
<td>Adjoining Mr. Hendrick Qudensides</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lott, Abraham and Isaac Low</td>
<td>At Lewis Morris residence</td>
<td>1764-1766</td>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>Partnership broken up in 1766, Lott there briefly after.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon, William</td>
<td>14 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>Linen Store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M'Lean, Peter</td>
<td>16 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td></td>
<td>asks that several letters be brought back to him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McEvers, Charles and James</td>
<td>Hanover Sq, possibly 122 Pearl St.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>Merchant, Importer of European and India Goods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer and Schenck</td>
<td>in Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>Dry Goods Merchants</td>
<td>also food and bakery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minshull's Looking Glass Store</td>
<td>Opposite Mr. Goelet's</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Looking glass store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, Thomas Wm</td>
<td>House opposite Charles M'Evers</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>Auctioneer and landlord</td>
<td>The house and lot of ground now in the possession of Thomas Wm Moore....to be sold at Merchants Coffee house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, Lewis</td>
<td>Next Door to Mr. Walton's (128 Pearl St.)</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Directly opposite to Mr. Grants and Desbrosses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel and Hazard</td>
<td></td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>Booksellers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearsall, Joseph</td>
<td>Opposite Hugh Gaine's</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Watchmaker</td>
<td>All kinds of clocks made cleaned and repaired by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson, William</td>
<td>at the Dial in Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>Clock and Watch maker</td>
<td>Barck: “Henry Remson in Hanover Sq. 37 10s” Rent (See Barck, Appendix D, 248: rented at Henry Remsens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porteous, John</td>
<td>Next Door to “Admirals” in Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Hatter Milliner</td>
<td>Went back to Europe with British Troops, April 9th 1781. Intends to embark with the first convoy to Europe, has for sale his house No. 35 HSQ and his store house at 10 Water st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramadge, Smith</td>
<td>35 Hanover Sq. (128 Pearl St.)</td>
<td>1776-1781</td>
<td>Tenant Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall, Thomas</td>
<td>10 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>Merchant at Randall, Son &amp; Stewarts</td>
<td>Worked at firm, lived at 28 White Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remsen and Seabury</td>
<td>three doors from the corner of the old slip and directly opposite the sign of the famous Golden Key.</td>
<td>1773-74</td>
<td>European Goods Merchants</td>
<td>Partnership dissolved April 1774. House then occupied by just David Seabury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remsen, Henry and Co.</td>
<td>in Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>Hardware Merchant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riddell, Alexander</td>
<td>523 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivington, James</td>
<td>118 Pearl Street</td>
<td>September 1760- Nov 1768</td>
<td>Bookseller Printer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 Hanover Square</td>
<td>1773-1790</td>
<td>Printer of the <em>Royal Gazette</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel and Levy, Messrs.</td>
<td>856 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Willman absconded from the 17th light dragoons, reward for his recapture to be paid by Messrs Samuel and Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuyler, Adonujah</td>
<td>120 Pearl St.</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuyler, Peter</td>
<td>116 Pearl St.</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuyler, Philip</td>
<td>45 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>has to let a large house at Whitehall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seabury, David</td>
<td>in the house lately occupied by Remsen and Seabury (1773-4) directly opposite the Golden Key, Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1773-1775</td>
<td>Merchant to let the house of Mrs. Lyne in Smith St. now occupied by John Tanner. (75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semple, Robert</td>
<td>in Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>English and India Goods Merchant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton, William</td>
<td>Banking House, Hanover Sq. Possibly 125-127 Pearl St.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shutter, James</td>
<td>City Guard House</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>City Guard House in HSQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sickels, Ethan</td>
<td>opposite Rivington's printing office</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>Leather dresser and breeches maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siemon, John</td>
<td>corner of Hanover Sq. and Old Slip</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>Furrier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silby and Thomson</td>
<td>opposite Rivington's printing office</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Saddlery Store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>is empowered to receive payments by persons indebted to the estates of Smith, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snodgrass, Andrew</td>
<td>14 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate, Wright</td>
<td>856 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>European and East India Goods For sale for Cash Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton, John</td>
<td>512 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Grocery Store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart, William</td>
<td></td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>Intends for Europe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, John</td>
<td>at the house of William Thorne</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Watchmaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorne, William</td>
<td></td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongue, William</td>
<td>near the City Guard House</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>had seven firkins of butter marked S. Banks, Belfast, have been stolen from his house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker, Emanuel</td>
<td>839 Hanover Sq.</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Dry Goods Merchant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton, Jacob</td>
<td>128 Pearl St.</td>
<td>1772-?</td>
<td>Merchant, Wealthy individual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuntz, Alexander</td>
<td>41 Hanover Sq</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>wishes to settle all his accounts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>