

C. Spencer, then Secretary of State, were among its frequent contributors. Mr. Loveridge, invited to Albany from Troy by the Governor with the promise of being surrogate of the county, wrote regularly for the *Journal*. He was a man of fine genius, a ready and very forcible writer, and his editorial contributions were much admired. Mr. Weed, a very forcible and admirable paragraphist, more distinguished as a party manager than as a newspaper writer, but quite equal to the popular requirements of that day, wrote short, stirring articles that were much admired all over the country. His style was terse, compact; he was aggressive and dictatorial; he made his assertions positively and dogmatically, rarely attempted to argue a question, and never wasted his time in defending an untenable position. What passed for capital newspaper writing at that time would make no impression on the public mind to-day.

Journalism thirty or forty years ago was a feeble instrumentality compared with the great, comprehensive, and ably written newspapers of the present day. Here and there the rival parties had an organ of great power and corresponding influence. In fact, it may be doubted whether the authority of individual journals such as the *Washington Globe*, Albany *Argus*, Richmond *Enquirer*, Charleston *Mercury*, Isaac Hill's *New Hampshire Patriot*, and the *Courier and Enquirer* was not greater than that exercised by an equal number of newspapers scattered over the country at the present day. What I mean to say is, that the newspaper press of 1873, considered in the aggregate, controls public opinion, influences the action of Congress, and checks legislative and municipal rascality to an extent of which the last generation had no conception. The amount and variety of mental labor bestowed upon a daily issue of one of the great metropolitan papers would have served the average newspaper of forty years ago for a month. In our large Western towns newspaper establishments have grown up rivaling in the completeness of their appointments, the ability with which they are conducted, the extent and variety of resources, and the amount of receipts the average of the journals of the great Atlantic cities. Probably the country press generally has less weight and consideration now than then. The general tendency is to centralization. Railroads and telegraphs have increased the importance of the great centres, politically and otherwise, while the consequence of interior localities has been proportionally diminished.

Probably there was no more effective provincial political instrumentality in the country than the *Evening Journal*; but the paper was a means rather than an end with Mr. Weed. He was an ambitious, aspiring man, and he prided himself more upon his position

as a leader in the party than as the head of a great newspaper. But he was often baffled by the stronger will of his political associates. Lewis Benedict was one of the controlling spirits of the Whig party. He insisted that his son should have the office of surrogate; and such was the force of his will and determination that he defeated Weed, overawed the Governor, and constrained him to forfeit his voluntary pledge to Loveridge. This controversy led to a quarrel between Weed and Benedict, the retirement of Loveridge, and the necessity for the services of Greeley on the *Journal*. He was not a good reporter, for he preferred to state what ought to have been said by Senators rather than to give their own language, and this course gave great offense. General Root, Mark Sibley, and other prominent men in the body were annoyed at Greeley's methods, and remonstrated with much earnestness both with Weed and Greeley himself. Greeley was no more amenable to criticism or advice a third of a century ago than during his maturer years; so he threw up his engagement in a paroxysm made up of indignation and disgust, and returned to New York.

Greeley wrote at that time with the same ease and fluency which marked his productions at a more mature age. Perhaps there was less compactness and simplicity then, and the severe conciseness of style which he attained in his later years was not noticeable in his earlier days. His diction resembled closely that of Cobbett, although it was not so deformed by the coarseness which offended readers of refined and cultivated taste in the writings of the sturdy old Englishman. Greeley was always perspicuous and forcible, rarely used a superfluous or inaccurate word, and his services with the pen were highly estimated by the Whig leaders. But his feelings were deeply wounded by the criticisms to which his conduct as reporter in the Senate was subjected by Senators and others, and as no concessions were made to assuage his griefs, a renewal of his relations with the Whig leaders at Albany was not practicable.

IN ABSENCE.

Though spices lure me, and the rose-tree throws
Its heart of fragrance to beguile the sense—
Though warm airs woo me, and the beauty grows
Intense—

Though sunsets ravish with their blue and gold,
And amber moons enchant the tropic zone,
Love grows a-weary, and my heart a-cold,
Alone!

Then come, my darling, come again to me,
Nor linger longer on the far-off shore;
Between us there shall roll the cruel sea
No more.

I long to clasp you in a fond embrace,
And tell you, tell you with my every breath,
I ne'er again will miss your loving face
Till death.

SIGNERS OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

By BENSON J. LOSSING.

[First Paper.]

WE are all familiar with the *signatures* of the men who subscribed their names to the Declaration of Independence, but few of us know how they wrote in the text of letters or other writings, or their methods of expression in epistles. To reveal their styles of penmanship, and modes of some of them in the expression of their thoughts in letters, is the chief object of these papers.

The materials for such revelations have been drawn from the full treasury of autographic and pictorial wealth of Thomas Ad-dis Emmet, M.D., of the city of New York. He kindly gave the freedom of its range to the writer, who has already, in a preceding number of this Magazine, spoken of Dr. Emmet's rare collections and his generous use of them. He owns autograph letters of every signer of the Declaration of Independence excepting Button Gwinnett, of Georgia, from whose hand, it is believed, none exists in this country—only his signature to letters—and John Hart. Dr. Emmet also owns a large number of autograph letters of persons of eminence who corresponded with the Signers, or with others, upon topics connected with the earlier history of our republic, together with valuable manuscript documents, contemporary newspapers, political broadside publications, and thousands of pictures, such as portraits of men and women, buildings and scenery, in America, and illustrations of remarkable events in our history. These he has used in illustrating, in the peculiar manner known as "laying down," on fine drawing paper, a *Biography of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence*, written by John Sanderson, Robert Wain, Jun., and others, and published originally in Philadelphia, in seven volumes.

By the mode of illustrating above alluded to an edition of *nine* octavo volumes has, under the hand of Dr. Emmet, expanded into *nineteen* folio ones, with a title-page for each, and a printed index for the whole. There are in the whole work, so enlarged, almost 3000 illustrations, of which there are 1396 portraits (80 of them in water-color), 935 views of places, things, and events, 324 autograph letters and documents, and 136 head and tail pieces on India paper, and exquisitely engraved. Among the water-color sketches are portraits of fifty-one of the fifty-six Signers. In the introduction are portraits and autographs of Charles the Second and the first three Georges, of Louis XIV., William Penn, the Duke of Marlborough, Oglethorpe, John Hampden, and others, with those of Napoleon the First. Dr. Emmet

has illustrated the lives of the generals of the Revolution in the same way.

From these superb, nay, wonderful volumes, illustrative of the lives of the Signers, have been drawn the chief materials for the construction of these papers. The illustrations consist of an engraved fac-simile of a sentence in a letter, by which the style of the handwriting of each Signer is shown, with that of his signature to such letter. Full copies, or extracts, or a synopsis of the contents of these letters are given, with notes explanatory of facts and allusions contained in them, with brief sketches of the writers. The names of the Signers so treated are here presented in alphabetical order. The following preliminary observations are made in elucidation of the subject:

Early in June, 1776, Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, offered a resolution in the Continental Congress, then sitting in the State-house at Philadelphia, "That these united colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states; and that all political connection between us and the state of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved." Further action on this resolution was postponed till the 1st of July following. Meanwhile a committee of five, of which Thomas Jefferson was chairman, were appointed to prepare a Declaration of Independence, that no time might be lost in the event of the passage of Lee's resolution. To the ready pen of Jefferson was assigned the task of writing it; and after several amendments made by others of the committee had been agreed to, a copy, in the chairman's small round hand, was reported with the resolution. On the 2d of July that resolution was passed, but debates on the form of the Declaration continued until the 4th, when it, too, was adopted, at about the hour of two o'clock in the afternoon. It was signed on that day by John Hancock, the President of Congress, only. It was ordered to be engrossed on parchment, and the copy so prepared to be signed by all the delegates who had voted in the affirmative. That important act was performed on the second day of August following, when the names of the fifty-four delegates then present were affixed to the document. It was afterward signed by two others—Thomas M'Kean, of Delaware, and Matthew Thornton, of New Hampshire. The former was absent in August with a regiment of *City Associators* of Philadelphia, and the latter was not a member of Congress until the succeeding autumn, when he obtained permission to sign it.