

# The Talcott Family Connection

Volume 5, Number 1

Winter 2020



## **National reunion —**

Members of The Talcott Family Association present at the 5th National Talcott Family Reunion in Mentor, OH, voted to hold the 6th National Reunion in the Hartford, CT area in 2021.

The officers of the Talcott Family Association are: Whitney Talcott - Old Lyme, CT; Charles Huffer - Thousand Oaks, CA; Amanda Tallcot - Auburn, NY; and Dexter Talcott - Springfield, OH.

At the present time there is no information on hotel accommodations or other reunion activities. As soon as information is available, it will be published in the next newsletter. FYI: The newsletter is mailed only once a year near the beginning of the new year to those family members not on the email list. All other issues are sent by email and are available on the [talcottfamily.org](http://talcottfamily.org) website.

## **Coming to America and Hartford —**

John and Dorothy (Mott) Talcott of Braintree, England were married about 1624. They came to America in 1632 with two children, John and Mary, born in Braintree. John Talcott and his family settled in Newtown, which today is known as Cambridge, Massachusetts.

John and Mary Talcott were very young children at the time of the crossing. We are not certain of their ages since there is no record of their birth dates. Mary was probably older since S.V. Talcott lists her first in his genealogy and then John. We believe Mary was born about 1626 which would make her five/six years old at the time of the crossing. She married Rev. John Russel on June 28, 1649 and died between 1655-1660. Rev. Russel was a 1645 graduate of Harvard College. John Talcott married Helena Wakeman on October 29, 1650.

John and Dorothy had a son born in Cambridge in 1635. Samuel was the first Talcott born in America.

Because there are so many John Talcotts in succession in the family genealogy, it is confusing. So, let's stop for a moment to get unconfused. John (1), the first known John Talcott lived in Colchester, England. He died about November 1, 1606. He had a son, John (2) who was probably born in Colchester previous to 1558 and moved to Braintree where he died in early 1604. John (2) had a son John (3) who was born in Braintree about 1594, and he emigrated to America with his family in 1632. John (3) had a son John (4) also born in Braintree and was probably two years old when the family arrived in America. John (4) had

two sons named John. The first John lived about two years and died. The second John lived and married; but, they had no children.

Let us return to **John (3) Talcott** who came to America and "was admitted a freeman by the General Court at Boston, November 6, 1632."<sup>1</sup> What is a freeman? "In the Massachusetts Bay Colony, a freeman had to be a member of the (Puritan) Church. A freeman was said to be free of all debt, owing nothing to anyone except God himself."<sup>2</sup> In the "Plymouth Colony, a man did not need to be a member of the Church, but he had to be elected to this privilege by the General Court. Being a freeman carried with it the right to vote, and in Plymouth only freemen could vote by 1632."<sup>3</sup>

John Talcott was active in community and church affairs when he lived in Braintree. He continued to be a civic and church leader shortly after he arrived in Newtown and until he died. On February 4, 1634, at a general meeting of the entire town of Newtown, John and six others were chosen Select men. They were to conduct the business of the town. From May 14, 1634 until 1636, John was Deputy to the Massachusetts Bay General Court.

John Talcott was the fifth largest owner of property in Newtown. According to S.V. Talcott, he owned four houses and a total of 178.75 acres of land. Someone said he may have owned land on which Harvard is located. Undoubtedly, John Talcott had wealth and at today's real estate values in Cambridge, he would be a very wealthy man.

When Rev. Thomas Hooker, the leader of the Braintree Company, arrived in Newtown in 1633, he was not pleased with the land as it was not suited for agriculture. Rev. Hooker petitioned the General Court in Boston to relocate to the Connecticut River. After repeated attempts and much difficulty, permission was granted.

Since John Talcott was a follower of the Puritan preacher, Rev. Hooker, that meant they were moving. In October 1635 an "Adventurers Party" of twenty-five men led by John Steele went to explore the Connecticut River Valley for a suitable area to settle. John Talcott was among the group of Adventurers. The area selected would become known as Hartford, Connecticut.

<sup>1</sup> S.V. Talcott: Talcott Pedigree in England and America from 1558 to 1676; Weed, Parsons & Company; Albany, NY 1876; p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> <https://socratic.org/questions/in-early-17th-century-massachusetts-who-was-granted-freeman-status#476773>; accessed 1/25/2020.

<sup>3</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freeman\\_\(Colonial\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freeman_(Colonial)); accessed 1/25/2020

John contracted at that time with a carpenter, Nicholas Clark, to build a house. It was the first house built in Hartford, and was located where the Hartford Community College is today at Main and Talcott Streets.

On May 1, 1636, John sold all his property in Newtown to Nicholas Danforth. In June 1636, Rev. Hooker and his followers departed Newtown, and they traveled by foot through the wilderness to Hartford.

As in Newtown, John was active in the affairs of the church, community and government. "He was Deputy to the Connecticut General Court from Hartford in 1637 to 1653; Treasurer of the Colony 1652, 1654, 1655, 1656, and 1659; was Assistant from 1654 to 1659; and Commissioner of the United Colonies 1656 to 1658."<sup>1</sup> He was called or honored with the title, "The Worshipful Mr. John Talcott," which meant he was highly respected in his opinions, trustworthy in carrying out his duties as an official, and his dedication to God and church.

In a land inventory of February 1639/40, John owned nine parcels originally granted to him which totaled 136 plus acres. He later gained by acquisition an additional twenty-five parcels of land.

John Talcott died March 1660 at his Mansion. He is buried in the Hartford Ancient Burying Ground where a monument has been erected in memory of the founders of the Colony of Connecticut and his name is inscribed on the monument. In his will, John left his property to his wife, two sons, and grandchildren; his daughter had died before him.

"It was the custom in those days for each head of a family to keep a parchment covered account book and besides the accounts kept in it, all important events that occurred, births, marriages, and deaths of parents and children, state of the weather, crops, etc. were entered in it."<sup>2</sup> **John (4) Talcott** kept such an account book with entries beginning in 1635-1742. He included family history and copies of legal documents (Laws of Massachusetts Territory 1687 and several proclamations by King Charles). It gives us a historical view into the life and events of that era.



John's priceless book (pictured above) has been preserved by the Connecticut Historical Society and made available online. It can be viewed at <https://www.ctdigitalarchive.org/islandora/object/40002%3A22614#page/1/mode/2up>. The preservation was made possible through donations of several Talcott family members. You can read the restoration

The Talcott Family Connection is published by The Talcott Family Association, Inc. It is published the first quarter of the year and mailed by USPS or by email to all Talcott family members in the mailing address data. Other times throughout the year, it is sent via email to all Talcott family members in the Talcott email list. It is edited by Gahrad Harvey at 34 Harvey RD - Shickshinny, PA 18655 — [talcott@hughes.net](mailto:talcott@hughes.net). Talcott family stories, historical information and articles of interest may be submitted to the editor. Inclusion in future issues is subject to space available.

story in the 2015 Fall edition of *The Talcott Family Connection* available at [talcottfamily.org](http://talcottfamily.org) under "Newsletters."

Some of John Talcott's historical entries:

"The kitchen that now stands on the north side of the house that I live in, that was the first house that my father built in Hartford, in Connecticut Colony, and was done by Nicholas Clark the first winter that any Englishmen rought or built in Hartford, which was in the year 1635. My father and mother and his family came to Hartford in the year 1636, and lived first in said kitchen, which was first on the west side of the chimney.

"The great barn was built in the year 1636, and underpinned in the year 1637, and was the first barn that was raised in this colony.

"The east end of this house that we live in, and was my father Talcott's, deceased, was built with the porch that is, in the year 1638, and the chimney was built in 1638.

"The cowhouse on the north side of the cow yard, now part improved for a corn house, was finished and built in the year 1640.

"The house and barn that was in partnership between my father and my Oncle Wadsworth, at Farmington, was finished in the year 1642.

"The hay barn standing on the north end of the great barn next Capt. Allyn's garden, was built in the year 1644.

"The west end of that house we live in, which was belonging to my Honoured Deceased Father Talcott, was built in the year 1645.

"The prison house or common Gaol for the Colony, was built in Hartford in the year 1641.

"The meeting house or first church was built in Hartford, was in the year 1638.

"The Pequot war was in the year 1637, at the Englishe's almost first coming to Connecticut."<sup>3</sup>

John's son-in-law, Joseph Wadsworth, inherited the account book and he made several entries of Wadsworth family records into the book.

John (4) Talcott married Helena Wakeman on October 29, 1650, the daughter of John Wakeman who was the Treassurer of the Colony of Connecticut. They had nine children. Their daughter Helena was born on Sunday, June 17, 1674 as Helena, his wife, died on June 21 from giving birth. He married Mary Cook on November 9, 1676 and they had five children.

In 1650, John was made an ensign in the militia and in 1660 was made a captain. When the Phillip War broke out in 1676, he was appointed to command the army with the rank of major. John was always victorious on the battlefield and gained great renown as a fighter. He was shortly promoted to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel.

John was elected a deputy (assistant magistrate) of the Colony of Connecticut before it was joined to New Haven on May 18, 1654. He succeeded his father to the of-

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.foundersofhartford.org/the-founders/john-talcott/>; accessed 1/27/2020.

<sup>2</sup> S.V. Talcott: Talcott Pedigree in England and America from 1558 to 1676; Weed, Parsons & Company; Albany, NY 1876; p. 33.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid; p. 34.

fice of Treasurer on May 17, 1660 and held the office until 1676 when he resigned the position due to the Phillip War.

## **Protecting the Charter –**

*The Hiding of the Charter* by Cyrus Sherwood Bradley, Esq. was presented to the Society of Colonial Wars in the State of Connecticut on May 6, 1896. Esq. Bradley's presentation can be read in full at [ctdigitalarchives.org](http://ctdigitalarchives.org). He conducted extensive research of colonial records in documenting the events surrounding the Royal Charter from the time it arrived in the Connecticut Colony in 1662 until the night of October 31, 1687 when it mysteriously disappeared. As Esq. Bradley points out in his opening remarks, there was a difference in telling the story then and even to today. So, let's follow Esq. Bradley's presentation.

**John Talcott** was named one of the patentees in the Royal Charter granted to the Connecticut Colony by Charles II on April 20, 1662. The charter was the most remarkable ever issued under the broad seal of England or any other land. It was received with joy and thanksgiving by the General Assembly of Connecticut on October 9, 1662. After the charter was read into the record of the General Assembly, **Samuel Willys, John Talcott** and **John Allyn** were chosen to take the documents into their custody for safekeeping. They were sworn under oath "for discharge of the trust committed to them."<sup>1</sup> *Editor's note: the record says "documents into their custody." There was an original and a duplicate. Several times in the record it will refer to "document." Although there were two Charters, one was the original and the other was a copy, both were written by hand. Remember, copying machines had not been invented yet. An explanation will follow why there were two.*

Samuel Willys and John Talcott's names were on the "broad face of the charter as third and eleventh patentees, and first and eight of the twelve assistants of his Majesty's colony. Lieutenant Allyn was also an assistant, then serving his first term, as was Captain Talcott, but the latter had been since the death of his father, in March 1660, Treasurer of the Colony. All three, it might have been said, had won their laurels, yet all three by ability and faithfulness in the days of trial to come were to write their names in indelible characters on glorious pages of the history of Connecticut. We shall take note of their deeds hereafter; at the present time we may only concern ourselves with the question of whether or not they became responsible for the charter."<sup>2</sup>

Esq. Bradley states "that Samuel Wylls (Willys) was engaged in the West India trade, and his business interests compelled him to be absent from the colony much of the time, he dropped out of the government and thereafter could not have taken an active interest in the protection of the charter, however much he may have desired to do so."<sup>3</sup> His name is absent from the records of the colony from 1685 until he reappears in 1689 long after the charter disappeared.

In May 1663, Lt. John Allyn became Secretary of the Colony, and in the first business by the General Assembly on August 19, 1663 recorded the following: "This court doth desire that those Friends appoynted to keepe the Charter do also receiue the Duplicate into their custody, and keep it in behalf of the Freemen of this Corporation; and the Worship

full Gouenour is desired to deliuer the said Duplicate to the said Friends, or either of them."<sup>4</sup>

This is the first time in the record a "duplicate" charter is noted to be protected. The original charter arrived in 1662 and the duplicate followed on another ship in 1663. Had the ship carrying the original been lost at sea, the duplicate was safe in England. Another duplicate could have been made to replace the lost charter. Once both documents were in the colony, they were kept at different locations in the event one was lost or destroyed, the other would survive. This record shows how determined the General Assembly was in protecting the charters.

Everything was quiet until 1687 when Governor Andros of Massachusetts and Governor Dongan of New York began making moves in England to annex the Connecticut colony to their colonies. The leaders of Connecticut Colony were almost in despair, "yet the majority with unconquerable spirits were resolved to stand firmly upon their rights in law and justice and to defend the charter of their freedom by every means within their power save armed resistance to royal authority."<sup>5</sup> This led to a request by the "Sundry of the Court" to see the Charter.

The record reveals on June 15, 1687 at the General Assembly that the "desiring of the Patent or Charter might be brought into court, the Secretary (John Allyn) sent for it, and informed the Governor and Court that he had the Charter, and shewed it to the Court, and the Governor bid him put it into the box againe and lay it on the table, and leave the key in the box, which he did forthwith."<sup>6</sup> It is apparent there was suspicion among members of the General Assembly that one of the guardians of the Charter had consented to its surrender. By producing the Charter, those suspicions were laid to rest.

What were the events prior to the June meeting of the General Assembly that created the suspicion the Charter was in danger? Two writs of *quo warranto* had been served upon the Colony; however, their times of return had expired before they reached the shores; therefore, rendering them powerless.

Edward Randolph suddenly appears on the scene. Esq. Bradley does not reveal Randolph's official capacity; only that he arrived in May 1686. We are led to believe he was representing the king and probably stayed in Boston. It was clear he was on a mission to retrieve the Charter because he sent letters to the leaders of the Colony to frighten them into submitting the Charter. When that failed, Randolph chose another method of terrorization. On July 20, 1686 at midnight, he showed up at John Talcott's and John Allyn's homes attempting to serve the expired writs. He was hoping the guardians would surrender the documents. He failed and was never heard from again.

The next attempt was a thrid writ served by Sir Edmund Andros, the Governor of the Massachussets Colony, on Governor Treat of the Connecticut Colony on Dec-

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.ctdigitalarchive.org/islandora/object/30002%3A21937812#page/10/mode/2up>; (Colonial Records of Conn., Vol.1, p. 384) accessed 1/28/2020.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid

<sup>3</sup> Ibid; p. 12

<sup>4</sup> Ibid; p. 12

<sup>5</sup> Ibid; p. 14

<sup>6</sup> Ibid; p. 14

ember 28, 1686. Andros wrote that he was commanded and authorized by the king upon his arrival in Hartford be given the Charter “and take you into my present care and charge.”<sup>1</sup> Andros was going to govern the colony once he had secured the Charter into his hands.

The General Assembly immediately wrote a letter on January 26, 1687 to the Earle of Sunderland, Secretary of State, explaining they could not appear because of their “remoteness” and “sharpness of winter.” They requested William Whiting be “empowered” to represent the colony in the English court. There was wording in the letter that indicated the colony would surrender the Charter and join with the New England colonies. The Hampton Court on June 18, 1687 made that recommendation to the king.

Whiting wrote to the colony on June 11, 1687 that Andros had the (third) *Quo Warrento* and he expected the colony to surrender the Charter. The Court was expecting the Charter to arrive in London on the next ship. In three letters following, Whiting indicated the colony was expected to appear in court and judgment would be against them; however, the hearings were continually postponed.

Meanwhile, Andros had sent two agents, Palmer and Graham, to the Connecticut Colony to influence leading people and deputies to surrender unto his Majesty. In a letter, they reported there was an agreement among the leaders to annex to New York if the King wished; but, they were “fond of their charter” which they would not surrender until it was “made void.” However, some of the clergy learned of the agent’s exploits. The clergy told the leaders whatever government they joined, it would “a greivous affliction” and to “expect utter desolation” (ruined, lonely, wasted and forgotten). They would be giving up the freedoms and government they had in the Charter.

At the March 30, 1687 meeting of the General Assembly, a letter was presented and signed by John Talcott, John Allyn and Samuel Talcott recommending surrender of the Charter; for which, there was no support. On the contrary, as “the clergy had taken the matter into their hands there was no course open to the Assembly save that what they recommended, and there is no indication of a change of sentiment during the summer and autumn.”<sup>2</sup> These events all led to the request for the Charters to be presented at the June 15, 1687 meeting of the General Assembly.

A letter written on October 4, 1687 by Governor Dongan of New York to the General Assembly and received by John Allyn, Secretary, related he had a letter from the Court in Whitehall that the Connecticut Colony would be added to Boston under Sir Edmond Andros. The secret was out at the eleventh hour.

A ship from England arrived at Boston on October 17th. It brought orders of the King and his councilors to Sir Edmond Andros; orders agreed upon on June 18th. The Council at Boston met on the 22nd at which Andros to acquainted the Council with the orders from the King to annex Connecticut to the government in Boston. Andros was to leave the following week with any “Council, other persons, Guards, and attendees as he saw fit.”<sup>3</sup> Andros then penned a letter to Governor Treat that he had received

orders and commands from His Majesty to annex Connecticut to Massachusetts. He announced his arrival in Hartford at the end of the following week and would meet with those Governor Treat desired to be present.

Governor Sir Edmund Andros summoned a meeting of the general court in Hartford on October 31, 1687. Samuel Sewell described the entourage that arrived from Boston; “His Excellency with sundry of the Council’ — their portly forms resplendent in gold-lace; the guard outside — ‘four Blew-Coats, two Trumpeters and ‘15 or 20 Red-Coats with short lances in the Tops of them,’ . . . And the people of the colonial capital thronging around the doors.”<sup>4</sup> Inside the Meeting House were thirty-five members of the Assembly, eight Councilors who came with Andros, and Governor Andros. This was a “secret meeting” because the public was not allowed to attend. The record does not reveal when the meeting began; but, Roger Wolcott said, “The Assembly met and sate late at night.” If the Assembly had been willing to surrender to the demands of Andros, the meeting would not have lasted into the late hours of the night.

It is apparent that Andros demanded the government of the colony be surrendered to him, which meant the Assembly would vote to be governed by him and the Charter surrendered also. It then became the duty of Governor Treat to present a response to the demand by expressing “the great expense and hardships of the colonialist in planting the country, the blood and treasure they had expended in defending it, . . . to what hardships and dangers he himself had been exposed for that purpose, and that it was like giving up his life now to surrender the patent and privileges so dearly bought and so long enjoyed.”<sup>5</sup> The speech was deliberately long. Today, we would call it filibustering.

Esq. Bradley quotes Mr. J. Hammond Trumbull about the next event of the evening. Trumbull’s description agreed with Roger Wolcott’s account. “The Assembly with their usual caution, were ‘extremely reluctant and slow with respect to any resolve to surrender the charter, or with respect to any motion to bring it forth; That, the important affair was debated and kept in suspense until the evening; that, at last, at the suggestion of Allyn or Talcott, they ordered the charters to be brought and placed upon the table; that as they were about to vote upon the question of surrender, several excited individuals attempted all at once to snuff the candles with the natural result of leaving the Assembly suddenly in darkness; that during the confusion of ‘officiously’ relighting them the charter disappeared; that the Assembly appeared ‘peaceable and orderly;’ that no discovery could be made of the charters or the persons who had conveyed them away.”<sup>6</sup>

It is important to stop and note the charters were placed on the table before Andros and the next action to be taken by the General Assembly was “to vote upon the question of surrender.” It was at that moment when by a prearranged signal certain chosen individuals acted to snuff out

<sup>1</sup><https://www.ctdigitalarchive.org/islandora/object/30002%3A21937812#page/18/mode/2up>, accessed 2/5/2020.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, p.32.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, p.26.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, p. 36

<sup>5</sup> Ibid

<sup>6</sup> Ibid

the candles. Simultaneously, others played their part in extracting the charters from the room to safety.

Because the meeting the night before was a “secret meeting,” Governor Andros held a public meeting the following day. The court-chamber was filled to capacity with people. Andros officially closed the meeting and returned to Boston. He failed to secure the surrender of the Connecticut Colony government and charter.

### **John Talcott and others involved –**

Who participated in taking and hiding the charters? That is a question which cannot be fully answered because documentation is lacking; however, there are some excellent clues which reveal a few of the characters. We find them recorded in the Colonial Records of Connecticut, letters, memoirs, and in an interview.

Esq. Bradley turns to Roger Wolcott as one source of proof. Roger was born in Windsor in January 1679. As a young lad growing up, he heard about hiding the charters. He became a lawyer and served forty years of judicial service; Justice of the Peace, Chief Judge of the Superior Courts of the Colony, in the Council as Governor, and as Major-General in the militia. He served these years as a distinguished servant of the colony, Roger Wolcott knew the true story and lived well into the second half of the 1700s. At eighty years of age with “strength of memory” and “undimmed ability” he wrote *Memoir for the History of Connecticut*. President Stiles recorded in his *Itinerary* a statement Wolcott made on Monday, May 28, 1764 at Windsor, “Nathl Stanly . . . took one of the Connectc Charters, and Mr. Talcott, late Govr. Talcott’s Father, took the other fr- Edm Andros in Hartford Mg house – the Lights blown out.”<sup>1</sup> Esq. Bradley added a footnote that “the other” did not mean “the duplicate.” John Talcott was responsible for removing the original charter from the table and Stanly removed the duplicate.

From that interview we know who the principal actors were in “taking” the charters and from the Colonial Records of Connecticut we know who were present inside the Meeting House, only members of the General Assembly and those who came “clothed with authority to demand the surrender of the government” were allowed entrance. The record reveals Samuel Talcott was absent that night. John Allyn’s position was at the table next to Gov. Andros and his Councilors which would have prevented him from removing the documents from the table. Two others involved were Andrew Leete and Cyprian Nichols. Tradition is probably correct in stating Nichols was involved in snuffing the candles, but Leete had a much greater roll to play which we will learn shortly.

Esq. Bradley’s research brings to a conclusion “what could have been more natural than John Talcott, who loved, as Allyn wrote to Andros, ‘to act his matters by himselfe,’ should from his place at the council-table have reached out his hand in the darkness, seized the original charter and quickly delivered it to some trusty and now unknown messenger to be borne away to safety, while his assistant, Nathaniel Stanly, whose name heads the list of deputies present at that session, passed the duplicate to Captain

Wadsworth, standing at the door. Talcott would not have concerned himself with the duplicate, leaving the original to other less responsible hands, and Wadsworth could not have had the original, for the charter he ‘secured’ is invariably described in the records as a duplicate.”<sup>2</sup>

Captain Joseph Wadsworth was John Talcott’s son-in-law. The scenario above places him outside the Meeting House because he was not a member of the Assembly; however, it does state he was involved in moving the duplicate charter to a safe location. Twenty-seven years later (in 1714) Captain Wadsworth turned over the duplicate charter to Roger Wolcott and two other gentlemen serving as a committee of conference, paying him a stipend for “his ‘faithfulness and good service’ in securing the duplicate.”<sup>3</sup> The duplicate is the only survivor of two documents.

What happened to the original charter? There was a supposition about Captain Andrew Leete of Guilford that Esq. Bradley found reasonably true. “Through the gray dawn of the first morning in November he (Andrew Leete) rode silently through the dim woods, bearing the most precious document— the original charter— to a far away haven of safety where the blue waves of the Sound were curling on the shores of the island that bore his name. ‘In his house,’ says (Rev. Thomas) Ruggles, ‘it found a safe retirement until better times.’”<sup>4</sup> Rev. Ruggles served as the pastor of the church in Guilford. His father was ordained in 1694 and served the Guilford church until 1729. Thomas succeeded his father as the pastor and wrote about the charter in 1769 as recorded in the History of Guilford and quoted in the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society.

### **Important historical notations –**

**First:** “In 1684, the charters of Massachusetts Bay and Plymouth were taken away in consequence of *quo warrantos* which had been issued against them. The charter of Connecticut would have shared the same fate.”<sup>5</sup> This was in a footnote by Esq. Bradley.

**Second:** The first mention of a charter oak is in Jedediah Morse’s first edition of *Geography* published in 1789. Morse wrote that Wadsworth received the charter, buried it under an oak tree in Hartford until danger had passed, then dug it up so it could be returned to its official use. Esq. Bradley relates that information on the same page and in a footnote as in the First notation above.

**Third:** There is no positive evidence to show where the charters were hidden according to Bradley’s research and Wolcott’s *Memoir*. The consequence of the hiding place is irrelevant; it was the “taking” that is important.

**Fourth:** John Talcott and John Allyn, as guardians of the charter, took seriously the oath they made on October 9, 1662. They were conscientious men. They loved and served the Colony with unflinching loyalty, and in the dark hours of peril, they proved not to falter in council or in field. They believed, as their fathers, they were “the chosen of the

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.ctdigitalarchive.org/islandora/object/30002%3A21937812#page/46/mode/2up>; accessed 2/15/2020.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, p. 48

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, p. 44.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, p. 50

<sup>5</sup> Ibid, p. 50.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, p. 48

Lord' to guide 'His people, Israel.'" <sup>1</sup> They remained committed to their oath to protect the charter in the presence of the King's representative and his show of force.

**Fifth:** This was the first time in the history of the colonies that an order of the King (James II) had been refused. It was a well planned and orchestrated incident by John Talcott and those few who have gone down in history as "the hiding of the charters." It was a peaceful resistance that should be recorded as the beginning of the American Revolution (authors opinion).

In tribute to the participants in the "taking" and "hiding," Esq. Bradley states, "Far be it from us to belittle the work of any of those noble men who reared for us the splendid fabric of our commonwealth, but if we gently and reverently lift from honored brows the unmerited laurels which their owners living would have scorned to wear we do admirable service to history and truth." <sup>2</sup>

## **Halloween**

Do you remember the day of the year the incident occurred? It was October 31, Halloween night. It was coincidental that Gov. Andros arrived and held the meeting on 31st; the night when superstitious people of the age believed invisible spirits of evil were most active and meddled in human affairs.

"Furthermore, the Episcopalian Andros was almost universally regarded in Congregational New England as an emissary of Satan, sent to vex and afflict the keepers of that vineyard in the wilderness. . . . but the charter had protected the Congregationalism of the Colony and it was believed that its enemies could only be inspired by satanic influences." <sup>3</sup>

## **Serving the family today –**

A descendant of John Talcott serving as Secretary of The Talcott Family Association and her ancestors are:

**Amanda Jane Tallcot** (b. Sept. 10, 1984 - ) daughter of **Richard Emerson Tallcot** (b. July 19, 1947 - ) m. July 20, 1974 to Patricia Anne Longley; son of **George Callender Tallcot** (b. Aug. 30, 1911 - d. June 8, 1972) m. Oct. 4, 1935 to Alice Cora Emerson; son of **Richard Platt Tallcot** (b. Mar. 28, 1886 - d. May 24, 1964 at Skaneateles, NY) m. Sep. 21, 1910 to Flora Mae Callender; son of **Joseph Morrison Tallcot** (b. Apr. 3, 1860 - d. Mar. 21, 1944) m. Feb. 20, 1884 to Almira Platt; son of **Joseph R. Tallcot** (b. June 23, 1821 in Scio, NY - d. Aug. 28, 1905 in Skaneateles, NY) m. Jan. 16, 1848 to Maria Tallmadge Morrison; son of **Richard Tallcot** (b. July 9, 1791 in Washington, NY - d. July 17, 1876 in Skaneateles, NY) m. May 5, 1815 to Mary Valentine; son of **Joseph Tallcot** (b. June 12, 1768 in New Milford, CT - d. Aug. 20, 1858 in NY) m. Aug. 1789 to Sarah Hawxhurst (b. Oct. 27, 1769 - d. 1864); son of **Gaius Talcott** (b. New Milford, CT) m. Sep. 13, 1766 to Sarah Caustin; son of **Nathaniel Talcott** (b. Nov. 26, 1702 in Hartford, CT) m. Hannah Ferris of Wilmington, DE; son of **Gov. Joseph Talcott** (b. Nov. 16, 1669 in Hartford - d. Oct. 11, 1741 in Hartford, CT) m. 1693 to Abigail Clark of Milford, CT; son of **Lt. Col. John Talcott** (b. 1632 in Braintree, Essex Co., England - d. July 23, 1688 in Hartford, CT) m. Oct. 29, 1650 to Helena Wakeman (b. Dec. 23, 1632 in Bewdley, Worchester Co.,

England - d. June 21, 1674 in Hartford, CT); son of **The Worshipful John Talcott** (b. abt. 1594 in Braintree, Essex Co., England - d. Mar. 1660 in Hartford, CT) m. abr. 1624 to Dorothy Mott (b. abt. 1602 in Braintree, Essex Co., England - d. Feb. 1670).

*Thirteen generations of Talcotts in that line since John & Dorothy Talcott came to America in 1632.*

## **Talcott houses –**

When going through the *people you may know* on Facebook, a fellow from Glastonbury, CT was on the list who works for Glastonbury Restoration Co. Since my Talcott line comes from Glastonbury, I thought I will *Friend* him. He accepted me and we began chatting on Messenger. His name is Steve Bielitz. Here is a message he sent me:

"I have saved many endangered houses from demolition. One was the 1788 Frary Talcott House from the center of South Glastonbury that was rebuilt in Central Pennsylvania. FrRy was his first name, but is usually a surname. Very nice 2 1/2 story center chimney house with nice raised paneling throughout the first floor and sliding shutters on the chair rail moldings. Was going to be demolished for a gas station, but I worked out an arrangement to save the entire building.

"Another was the Joseph Talcott, Jr. House, a Center chimney cottage (or "cape" as sometimes called) with a two room ell also with a chimney, built in 1803 in Coventry, CT. We moved that to Avondale, Rhode Island ( part of Westerly right near the Connecticut line) where it is still in storage. Loads of beaded sheathing and beautiful Federal Mantels in the front two rooms. Found the most amazing mile marker with carved hands and a pinwheel design between them within the arch at top in two pieces when dismantling the house. Recycled as a hearthstone in the ell and the arch found as debris in the chimney stack. It was built in the 1770's by Ensign Stephen Richardson ( who responded to the alarm in Lexington). Ironically he was from Westerly, RI, but he moved to Coventry, CT, we believe about 1770."

## **Trip to England –**

Would you be interested in a trip to England to visit Braintree, Colchester and Warwickshire where our Talcott ancestry originated? In 2014, we met a couple from Braintree who were on "holiday" to see Niagara Falls and the New England area. Rod Davey and I have keep in contact. He is very much interested in history and would welcome us to Braintree. This will be a tailor-made tour and include other points of interest in England.

Tentatively, the tour will be after the Hartford reunion in 2021. More information will follow in future newsletters. After the announcement in the Fall 2019 newsletter that was sent via email, eleven people have shown an interest.

In order to plan the tour, it would be helpful to have a count of those interested. If you are interested, please send an email to Gahrad Harvey – talcott@hughes.net.

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.ctdigitalarchive.org/islandora/object/30002%3A21937812#page/38/mode/2up>

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, p. 48

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, p. 42