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BUILDINGS OF VERMONT

To the Editor:

I write to correct a major error that was published in last issue’s review of *The Buildings of Vermont* [Vermont History 82 (Summer/Fall, 2014): 149-151]. I am not the sole author. Rather, historian Curtis Johnson and I worked on the book for some twenty years as co-authors. Unlike the case with many of the books in the *Buildings of the United States* series, we decided at the outset to limit the size of the necessary collaborative team in order to be able to exercise control over concept, content, and style. Curtis and I worked closely and complementarily in the planning, funding, building selection, writing, and editing of this volume, drawing on our varied specializations and background experiences to jointly write a text that covered a complete range of building genres and a synthesized overview of the state’s building history. Beyond his additional contribution of all of the photography for the book and as noted in all the information in and on the volume, he stands fully and indispensably as co-author.

Glenn Andres

To the Editor:

We write regarding John Duffy’s review of our book, *Col. William Marsh, Vermont Patriot and Loyalist*, in Vermont History 82 (Summer/Fall 2014): 156-159. We were surprised and disappointed […] by some factual misrepresentations.

For example, the review states that “Marsh’s colonelcy in the book’s title seems to have been awarded posthumously by nineteenth-century historians” (p. 157). Yet as our book notes on pp. 90, 111, 118, and 119, the records of the committees of safety and the conventions leading to the formation of Vermont in the 1770s all consistently gave him the title of colonel; if Vermonters invented it in any sense, its usage was established and accepted as of 1775, as well as carved on his gravestone in 1816. Duffy also describes Marsh as being “town pound keeper” in early Manchester, but our sources also list him in important positions such as moderator, clerk, and town representative (*Marsh*, pp. 58-59).

Col. William Marsh
On p. 158, Duffy states that after Burgoyne’s defeat at Saratoga in 1777, Marsh made “a surreptitious visit in Manchester” before going on to Canada. The visit to his family was, however, allowed under the terms of his parole; and it was made not to Manchester but to Dorset, where the family had taken up residence some time before (Marsh, p. 151 and note 58).

In the next paragraph, Duffy writes that after the war, Marsh “explored and promoted settlement of loyalists down the St. Lawrence River on the Bay of Chaleurs and upstream around the Bay of Quinte on Lake Ontario.” This is a misreading. The Bay of Chaleur is on the Gulf of St Lawrence, and Marsh was never there or a promoter of that locale. Also he was not involved in or an advocate for founding loyalist settlements at the Bay of Quinte; rather, he was a critic of the British choosing of that distant locale. His proposal for loyalist resettlement was entirely focused on Memphremagog near the Quebec-Vermont border, as we detailed in Marsh, pp. 213-15; 231-33, and 243. After its complete rejection, he and his family later necessarily turned to seeking grants of land at the Bay of Quinte.

On p. 159, Duffy states that “Governor Thomas Chittenden supported Marsh’s unsuccessful claim for restoration of his confiscated Manchester land.” We found no evidence for any such support, though Marsh retained faint hopes that some land might be restored. In fact, Chittenden certified that Marsh’s land “Has been Legally confiscated and the principal part thereof Sold, for the use and Benefits of this state, on account of his Enimical Conduct in adhering to the cause of Great Britain”—a document (quoted in Marsh, p. 356) that actually helped to reinforce Marsh’s successful loyalist land claims in Canada (and of course sold lands could not be restored).

The review disparages our use of speculation at times and “lack of evidence” on various points. In fact, controlled speculation based on whatever strands of evidence can be gathered is key to any historical detective work [ . . . ]. Our footnotes compile all the sources and data on which we base our findings and inferences, and we duly qualify our statements where appropriate. Family histories and genealogy, dismissed in this review, offer intriguing pieces of evidence about the Marsh family’s origins, background, choices, and motivations, and have a place in an in-depth biography. The “speculative mare’s nest” of which Duffy complains (p. 156) occupies only three pages (6-8) assessing enduring family stories about an ancestral Marsh killed in the English Civil War; this royalist ancestor was surely real enough, though at one more generational remove than fits known information. The stories persisted for reasons that merit attention and interpretation. [ . . . ]

Jennifer S. H. Brown
Wilson B. Brown