| | |
|---|---|
| Title | "The death of Richard Montgomery" (1) |
| Sub Title | |
| Author | 松本, 典久(Matsumoto, Fumihisa) |
| Publisher | 慶應義塾大学藝文学会 |
| Publication year | 1982 |
| Jtitle | 藝文研究 (The geibun-kenkyu : journal of arts and letters). Vol.43, (1982. 12) ,p.185(18)- 202(1) |
| JaLC DOI | |
| Abstract | |
| Notes | 塚越敏教授退任記念論文集 |
| Genre | Journal Article |
| URL | https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00072643-00430001-0202 |

# "The Death of Richard Montgomery"—(I)

Fumihisa Matsumoto

Among a number of paintings exhibited in the Trumbull Gallery at Yale, there is one entitled *The Death of General Montgomery in the Attack on Quebec, December 31, 1775* (oil on canvas; 24 3/8× 37"). Anyone looking at this picture would be embarrassed at first at the seeming disorderliness and confusion in which the scene is presented. Despite the fact that a few figures are fallen or falling, there is no overt action taking place in the picture plane; the gestures of each figure are incoherent; the costumes are different; and the directions of gaze seem diverse. What is happening?—would be the first question that occurs to the mind. But, first of all, let us look at the picture more closely.

On a snow-covered little hill we see three groups of people apparently in their fighting uniforms: one on the hilltop in the center, another in the left foreground down the hill, and a third near the top of the hill on the right. In the central group, slightly to the right from the center line, a person is falling backward into the arms of another, his body half collapsed on his knees and his arms lifelessly thrown out. He is in a (very dark) blue and buff uniform with a ribband across his shoulder but his coat is unbuttoned. His body is so inclined to his left that the person behind him has to support him, with his knee under the armpit and holding with both his hands a dangling arm and the collapsing body.

Just in front of him, slightly down the hill, two figures are lying crosswise upon the snow. They are in the same blue and buff uniform with a ribband across the shoulder but their coats are

likewise unbuttoned. One of them has half twisted his body to his right and the other to his left, so that the arm of the one is placed around the neck of the other, and the head and hands of the other (in one of which the blade of a sword is held) are rested on the waist of the one.

The two figures supporting the falling figure (one of them by the thrown-out arm) are in red uniforms and red fur caps; and one of them, who has a thin pinkish flag in hand, is looking toward the bright area to his right, with one of his legs thrust forward. The Indian to their right and the figure to their left (who is also in a blue and buff uniform) are looking in the same direction, but while the Indian is holding up a tomahawk as if in helpless defiance, the latter seems to back away from the place, holding out his arm as in self-defense. Another figure holding a (thin yellowish) flag behind them looks worriedly over their shoulders into the face of the falling figure; a tricorn hat is on his head. The expressions on these faces are anger for the red uniform, bewilderment for the Indian, terror or consternation for the blue and buff, and deep sorrow for the ensign.

The three figures in the left foreground, whose bodies are turned toward the central group, are also looking in two directions, the two on the sides toward the falling figure and the one in the middle toward the bright area to his left. The first two, one in a red uniform and a red fur cap and the other in an ochre hunting frock and a red fur cap, slant their bodies backward (one of them with an extended arm), while the third, who is in a green hunting frock and a green fur cap, puts his weight on his stepped-out leg and calmly extends his arm toward the two other groups.

Those on the right, of whom three faces are clearly seen, are all looking toward the falling figure. The one at the head, especially, who is in a brown uniform with epaulets and carries a sword, plants one of his legs uphill and surveys the situation, cautiously holding out his hand. His sharp gaze under the tricorn hat reveals sorrow as well as alertness.

In the foreground, across the middle, parts of a cannon are seen half buried in the snow; and on top of the hill, just behind the central group, stands an old tree, stripped of its foliage and slanting in the same direction as the falling fiigure — bits of snow are visible on its branches. Over the hill, on both sides of the central group, a number of figures in red and green uniforms are marching from right to left, most of them with bayonets but some with scaling ladders; they do not seem to be aware of what is happening on the hill. Through the mass of smoke drifting from left to right, part of the fortress seems to be visible, but one cannot be quite sure; and far in the distance, over the river, another mass of smoke is visible against the clear-cut mountains. The sky is dark except where the smoke is seen, and the flags are twirling around the staffs.

The source of light, though it is hard to say what, exists somewhere to the left of the picture plane — presumably where the smoke comes from and where some of the heads are turned to. Coming almost horizontally from the left, the light picks up the yellow in the center (the falling figure and the two fallen figures), the white

around it (the snow), and the bits of red and ochre above it (the two figures holding the falling figure and three others behind them). It also picks up the white of the smoke on the left and reaches the lapels and breeches of those on the right. Although the three figures in the left foreground are put in the shadow covering just that area, their bodies are half illuminated by reflection or some weaker light.

Compositionally the falling figure is no doubt the focal point. He is, first of all, placed on the hilltop in the center, and the three strong diagonals along the hillsides and along the old tree converge at his feet. Two complementary diagonals that run along the heads of those on the right and along the river in the distance and the waist line of those on the left, also seem to converge at his feet. Moreover, the lines of the flagstaffs, the old tree, and the sprawled bodies of the fallen figures all point to the falling figure, whose curving body almost forms a circle.

Those standing in the central group are compositionally put in a parallelogram slanting to the right, and the three on the left, in another parallelogram slanting to the left. The two lying figures form an obtuse triangle by themselves, and those on the right, an acute triangle somewhat larger. The sword, bayonets, and flags are arranged in disorder, and the clear diagonal running along the shadow in the left foreground and leading to the broken cannon is incomplete like the cannon itself. There are, however, other arrangements that suggest mutuality: the falling figure supported by two other figures; the fallen figures resting part of their bodies on each other; and the four extended arms (though they also suggest confusion or embarrassment) reciprocating to one another with an expression not of hostility but something more congenial. The rightward movement of the central group is counterbalanced by the leftward movement of the trio on the right, and the movement of the smoke is opposed by that of the troops marching beyond the hill.

From these observations it may be deduced that, despite the difference of uniforms and the incoherence of gestures, the figures

depicted here are not enemies but belong to one army, and that the central group on top of the hill is its core. The diverse directions of the eyes, which are in fact either toward the falling figure or the bright area to the left, suggests that the life of the falling figure is a matter of great concern to all of them, and that something related to this incident occurred in the bright area. Judging from the mass of smoke which is coming from that direction, what happened there was a fire, by which the three figures had been hit. If the cannon lying in the foreground did not belong to the enemy (who destroyed it when they retreated lest it should be used against them) but was broken by the fire, it follows that the fire was not from musketry, but from artillery. The postures of the standing figures — they are not prepared to fire back—seem to confirm this.

The falling figure, in all probability, is the general who directed the attack on the fortress vaguely seen on the left. Just when he made the top of the hill, he received the discharge of a cannon and is falling into the arms of one of his officers. He must have been mortally wounded, for some of the faces express sorrow, grief, and even anger. The two figures lying before him are his adjutants (they are in the same blue and buff uniform) and have received the same discharge, one of them not even ready to hold his sword properly. The way they are lying — at the feet of the general and resting part of their bodies on each other — suggests that, as soldiers, they were loyal to the general to the last moment, and, as friends, they were intimate with each other. Other figures, the two supporting the general and the ensign behind them, are also loyal soldiers; they show a great concern to what happened to their general. The Indian, too, is a faithful warrior, for, though at a loss what to do even with his musket, he instinctively holds up his tomahawk and tries to take revenge on the enemy that is invisible. Another figure in blue and buff, however, who must be trusted with great responsibility, is not acting accordingly; he neither mourns nor fights back, but seems to back away, thinking only about himself;

he is a coward.

The three figures on the left must be the scouts or the van guard; for two of them are in hunting frocks and one carries a powder horn. Hearing the noise behind them, they have just turned around to find their general falling, but the two not as quickly, or with as much presence of mind, as the third, who in a moment has grasped the meaning of the occurrence and, sensing the danger of further attacks, is giving a warning to the rest. The figure on the right, who must be the officer leading the troops behind him, also had time to see what was happening and give an order to his men to stop and be on the alert.

The time is apparently night, and the season winter. There must have been a snowfall a short while ago, leaving an impression on the bare branches, but not on the cannon and men's clothes. The wind is from left to right, whirling, perhaps, on the hilltop, where the flags are coiled around the staffs. The atmosphere is tense; no one seems to utter a word; except for the footsteps over the hill and the roaring of the wind, nothing would be heard. The coldness there, too, must be intense, but, like the Indian whose arm is bared, they would not feel it. But surely they could smell the smoke and might even see the cannon to their right.

By now it must be clear that what seemed at first a disorderly battle scene is really a carefully rendered historical scene: the death of a general in the action (or even before the action began) and the subsequent confusion of the officers. Every act and expression is intended to convey this meaning, and every detail — including the costumes, weapons, and other accouterments — is treated with such precision that the figures are alive and the scene is authentic. Colors, too, are very successfull: yellow, which is the most conspicuous, clearly marking the central figures; the white of the snow and the smoke suggesting the places of central action; and red, green, ochre, and brown (vivid but moderately subdued) illuminating the secondary figures and yet putting them in the periphery. Visually our eyes, falling first on the central figure, are directed

by the gaze of some toward the bright area to the left, and being redirected along the smoke and flagstaffs, are riveted on the circle formed by the exquisitely curved body of the falling figure. The tree slanting in the same direction as the falling figure suggests their common fate, impending death; and the figures lying before them, their end, death.

What is most successful, however, would be the dramatic effects created by the closed setting and the distinct movements of each character. The background is mostly shut off from our view; the figures are placed on an elevated platform, as it were; and the spotlight falls brightly on the central characters. No gesture, no expression is wasted; none is a mere bystander, but an actor playing his own role. The costumes and weapons are very graphic; the snow, the tree, the broken cannon, and the smoke look like scenery on the stage. The effect resulting from all this is dramatic suspense (we have to infer what is actually happening) and compensating satisfaction that what we are looking at is after all a dramatic climax. Since we are looking almost level (perhaps a little downward) at the heads of the three on the left, our eyes are at the height of general's head or a little lower; but instead of deciding that we are standing out there on the hillside, we are inclined to think that we are in a theater, sitting in one of its central seats. Such is the effect of this picture, in which, as in a photograph, the characters are transfixed in an eternal moment.

It can be said, on the other hand (to the detriment of the artist), that the knee placed under general's armpit looks unnatural; that the extended arm of the figure behind him is too long; that the hands holding the yellowish flag are not in a straight line; that the legs between the legs of the leading figure on the right are inexplicable; and that the wheel of the broken cannon is not in proper perspective (it should be flatter). But the merits of the picture are so great that they more than compensate for these weaknesses, making the picture perhaps one of the artist's best.

But what exactly is the event depicted here? Who is the

general? Who are the others? Is this a real battle scene, or a fictitious one? In order to answer these questions, we have to turn to some external evidence.

In a broadside, which was probably published with the prints and keys of *Bunker's Hill* and *Quebec* in 1798, Trumbull tells us about the subject of this picture: "That Part of the Scene is chosen where General *Montgomery* commanded in Person; — and that Moment, when by his unfortunate Death, the Plan of Attack was entirely disconcerted, and the consequent Retreat of his Column decided at once the Fate of the Place, and of such of the Assailants as had already entered at another Point." The "Attack" Trumbull refers to here is of course the ill-fated storming on the fortress of Quebec which resulted in the death of a Continental general and the complete defeat of his army. Many more "facts" about the picture are disclosed in this broadside: the two figures fallen before Montgomery are his "Aids de Camp, Major *M'Pherson* and Capt. *Cheesman*" — they have received the same "Discharge of Grape Shot, from the Cannon of the Place"; the person in a blue and buff uniform and backing away is "Colonel *Campbell*, on whom the command devolved, and by whose Order a Retreat was immediately begun"; and the vague mass on the lefthand side is "a Part of the Works of the Town." Trumbull, however, was not able to "procure real Portraits of many of the brave Men," and had to take "the Liberty, in the Plate of Reference which accompanies each Print to give to several of the Figures, the Names of those who were killed or wounded," intending this as "a justifiable, though imperfect tribute to their Memory."[1)]

So (in addition to a partial account of the "Attack") we have four names for all of those in blue and buff — the "Uniform of the Staff" — and the affirmation of the artist himself that many other names were used just for commemoration. In the "Plate of Reference" (or the *Key*), Trumbull reaffirms that "*Those which are marked with a Star*" — Montgomery and his two aids — "*are the only real likenesses*," and that the others are "*Mere memorandums of Men who*

*were either distinguished or killed, or wounded in the Action.*" Col. Campbell here is "Col. Donald Campbell, Quarter Master Gen. & second in Command — N. York"; Capt. Cheesman is "Major" Cheesman; and the Indian is given the name of "Col. Louis," though the name of his tribe is not specified. To the others Trumbull has given the following names: Lieut. Humphries, Lieut. Ogden, and Lieut. Cooper for those standing behind Montgomery (from left to right); Major Meigs, of Connecticut, Capt. Ward, and Capt. Hendricks, Riflemen of Virginia, for those on the left; and Col. Thompson, of Pennsylvania for the one on the right.[2] The notes on the pencil sketches done for Montgomery, his staff, and the Indian mostly accord with this account (Cheesman here is "major"), though, interesting enough, the name of the Indian is cut off from the sheet (presumably by the artist himself), thus leaving us "an indian Chief known by the name of Col. ——."[3]

With the aid of *Historical Register of Officers of the Continental Army during the War of the Revolution*, the identity of the four main figures is easily established: Major General Richard Montgomery who directed the attack on Quebec on December 31, 1775, and was killed in the action; "Captain" Jacob Cheesman, aid-de-camp to Montgomery, killed at Quebec; "Captain" John Macpherson, also aid-de-camp to Montgomery killed at Quebec; and Col. Donald Campbell, Deputy Quartermaster General (his information on Quebec is missing), who enlisted on July 17, 1775, and served to June 2, 1784. Nor is there any question about the identity of Lieut. Ogden, or more exactly "Brigade Major" Matthias Ogden, wounded at Quebec; Lieut. Samuel Cooper, killed at Quebec; Major Return Jonathan Meigs of Connecticut, taken prisoner at Quebec; Capt. Samuel Ward, Jr., taken prisoner at Quebec; and Capt. William Hendricks of "Thompson's Pennsylvania Rifle Battalion," killed at Quebec. There are, however, two candidates for Lieut. Humphries: Lieut. John Humphries of Morgan's Virginia Riflemen, killed at Quebec, and Lieut. William Humphrey of Rhode Island, taken prisoner at Quebec. And then there is no candidate for Col. Thompson of Pennsylvania; for

although there are some sixty Thompsons listed here, of whom eleven had enlisted in 1775, there are none who were at Quebec in December, 1775. The only Col. (William) Thompson of Pennsylvania who enlisted in 1775 was in Boston at that time and did not start for Canada until March, 1776.[4] Consequently, R. W. James R. Case's assumption that Thompson is represented here "by artistic license" seems reasonable. There is no enlistment of an Indian named Col. Louis, or for that matter, "Colonel Joseph Lewis," as Theodore Sizer identified him.[5] As in the case of Col. Thompson, it may be that Trumbull depicted him by artistic license or even invented him (for he does not seem to have known the name himself). But since we do not have much evidence to argue either way, let us put this question aside for a while and consider another question, that is, whether some of these figures — Ogden, Cooper, Meigs, Ward, Hendricks, and Humphries, whose names Trumbull used as "mere memorandums" — were there with Montgomery.

According to Case, all of these people, except Ward (on whom the information is lacking), participated in the northern campaign not with Montgomery but with Col. Benedict Arnold.[6] Since there were two parties participating in the attack, it seems very likely that one of them, the one that "entered at another Point," was under the direction of Col. Arnold. If Arnold was directing his own division, it follows that these six persons were most probably with Arnold, not with Montgomery. But how could we ascertain such a conjecture when most of them were killed or taken prisoner in the action, and that so long ago? Luckily, we have some journals kept by the participants of this battle, among which are those of Ogden and Meigs.

Ogden's journal, detailed though it is, is of limited usefulness to our inquiry; for it ends on November 15, a month and a half before the attack. The only accounts that are of interest would be that Ward was among them, that they were almost destitute during the march through the wilderness of Maine, and that, after arriving at Quebec in early November, he was the one who was chosen to

carry Arnold's letter to the town, but, instead of being admitted inside, he "was saluted with a[n] eighteen-pound shot from the wall." Meigs' journal, on the other hand, is far more helpful, giving perhaps more information than we could hope for. It covers from his departure from Cambridge in the middle of September to his capture at Quebec on December 31, 1775.[7] On the basis of his entries around the 31st, let us try to reconstruct what happened at Quebec on that fateful day.

It was two in the morning, Meigs tells us, that the troops were called out from their quarters, and as had been arranged beforehand, "those that were to make the attack by way of Cape Diamond assembled at the general's quarters upon the heights of Abraham, and were headed by general Montgomery," and "those that were to make the attack through the suburbs of St. Roch, assembled at [their] guard house in St. Roch, and were headed by Col. Arnold; which were two battalions that were detached from the army at Cambridge and Roxbury." They started "exactly at 5 o'clock," Montgomery along the south wall of the town and Arnold along the north wall, intending to achieve a union at the Lower Town and then surge uptown together. (As far as Arnold's party was concerned) the snow was deep and the roads were "dark and intricate, among stores, houses, boats, and wharves," so that some went astray and the piece of artillery which had been carried on a sled had to be discarded. After losing many men for the "constant fire of the enemy from the walls," they did manage to take the first battery and were ready to move on toward the Upper Town. But although they waited at a designated point, neither Montgomery nor his party arrived, and, having meanwhile their way of retreat blocked by a contingent which had been sent out of another gate, they were "at last obliged to surrender prisoners of war." The action continued "from half past five till about ten o'clock, A.M." and the casualties among the officers were "one captain and two lieutenants" (killed) and "Colonel Arnold, capt. Hubbard, capt. Lamb, lieutenant Steel, lieut. Tisdale, brigade major Ogden" (wounded).[8]

Four other journals kept by Continental officers and soldiers (Capt. Dearborn, Capt. Thayer, John Joseph Henry, and Ebenezer Wild, who were also taken prisoner) give the names of the three officers (killed) as Capt. Hendricks, Lieut. Humphreys, and Lieut. Cooper. Three of these journals add some thirty names (including Major Meigs, Capt. Ward, and Lieut. Humphrys of Rhode Island) as officers taken prisoner; and two of them affirm that on January 2, two days after the battle, Meigs was allowed to go out on parole and get their baggage from their quarters.[9]

We now know, therefore, not only that the six persons in question were in Arnold's party but that three of them were killed at the entrance of the Lower Town "immediately after entering the [first] Barrier," two of them (not counting Lieut. Humphrys of Rhode Island) were taken prisoner, and one of them (Ogden) was wounded in the action. The whereabouts of Ogden is easily ascertained by resorting to another journal kept by Dr. Isaac Senter, the army surgeon. When he was treating Col. Arnold — the doctor tells us — who had been brought in earlier in the engagement "with a piece of musket ball" in the leg, "Major Ogden came in wounded in the left shoulder, which proved only a flesh wound." It was soon afterward that an express came from Montgomery's party, "informing of the fatal death, and that the remainder of his division had retreated precipitately back to Head-Quarters." They did not know at that moment the fate of their own division (426 out of some 600 were to be captured), but it was clear that the attack was going to be a complete failure. Two days later, when Meigs was sent out on parole, everything was disclosed.[10]

But the questions are how much Trumbull knew of these facts, and how he got these names at all. Was there any reason that he picked up Meigs and Ward (and Humphrys) out of more than thirty officers that were captured; only Ogden out of half a dozen officers that were wounded?

Part of these questions may be answered by the two letters which Col. Arnold wrote General Wooster in Montreal, asking to

have one of their copies transmitted to "the honourable Continental Congress, and another to his Excellency General Washington." The first letter, which is really a request for a reinforcement, was written immediately after Montgomery's death was reported. After explaining the development of the attack plan — they were to "have attacked the upper and lower town at the same time" a few days earlier, but since there were some deserters then, Montgomery "was induced to alter his plan," thinking it best "to make two different attacks upon the lower town" — he tells about his wound, the fact that Montgomery was killed with Macpherson and "Cheeseman," his (temporary) intention "to give up the command to Colonel Campbell," and the courage of Major Ogden who, though wounded, "behaved extremely well." In the second letter (dated January 2, 1776), which is also a request for a reinforcement of not "less than eight or ten thousand men," he writes about the casualties of his own division, giving the names of "Captain Hendricks, Lieutenant Humphreys, of the Riflemen, and Lieutenant Cooper, who were killed in the action" and Major Meigs who, on parole, had brought him the news.[11]

About two weeks later, "on January 18th," the news reached General Washington "in a melancholy letter from Philip Schuyler," the original commander in the Canadian campaign, who in turn "had received word from Arnold by way of General Wooster at Montreal."[12] If either Arnold's letters or Schuyler's "melancholy letter" had been published in newspapers, as was quite likely in those days, it might be that the information Trumbull had on the attack on Quebec had its source in Arnold's letters or thereabouts, in which at least five out of six persons are mentioned. Trumbull's Lieut. Humphries then is the Lieut. Humphreys who was killed, not the Lieut. Humphrys who was captured. But then, what about Capt. Ward, who was captured but not mentioned in these letters? Was there another source, or by any chance the artist's own contact, which might have taken place at one point of his career or another?

There certainly was, for the lives of Ward and Trumbull inter-

sect around August, 1778, in the campaign for recapturing Rhode Island. Trumbull, who had retired from the military service in the previous year for some not fully clarified reasons, again found an opportunity to "gratify [his] slumbering love of military life" and offered his service as a volunteer aid-de-camp to General Sullivan, under whom Capt. Ward (now Major) was also serving, commanding a new regiment which he had helped to raise to save his home state. Is it too much to suppose that these two young officers (of an age) who both had a Governor as their father and had a college education (Trumbull from Harvard and Ward from Brown, then Rhode Island College)[13] talked nightly about their military experiences or even about their families, since they might have known each other? At least it would have been difficult if Trumbull tried not to hear about the captivity which his fellow officer had so bravely endured.

Another question concerning the attack on Quebec is where exactly Montgomery was killed and how. We have seen in Meigs' journal that Montgomery had started from the heights of Abraham and was to proceed along the south wall by way of (Wolfe's Cove and) Cape Diamond. Arnold's troops waited at the designated point of rendezvous, but he did not appear, obliging them to surrender in the end. Although no journals, if any, that were kept by those present at the scene of Montgomery's death have been found, it would not be unreasonable to infer from this account (and some others) that Montgomery was killed under Cape Diamond (at Pres de Ville, to be exact), where the only barrier had been raised.[14] To support this inference, we have some secondhand information provided by the very journals we have referred to. Meigs', for one, tells us that Montgomery was with a number of carpenters at the head of his troops, helped them cut down the pickets of the barrier, and, moving toward the guard house, fell from "a discharge of grape shot ... and of small arms at the same time." John Joseph Henry, another captive, confirms (in his reminiscences) that he had seen, in the tour of the citadel on the occasion of his release, "four posts ... sawed and thrown

aside, so as to admit four men abreast." There were two palisades, he also tells us, that were "of strong posts, fifteen or twenty feet high, knit together by a stout railing, at bottom and top with pin," and some fifty yards from there, "there stood a block house," with loop holes in the lower story and "four or more port holes for cannon" in the upper story. While Meigs' account is apparently influenced by British officers — one of them insists that those in the block house were ready for the attack and that the "musketry & guns continued to sweep the avenue leading to the battery for some minutes" — Henry's is a hearsay from his guard (some of whom were allegedly in the block house), who told him that Montgomery was killed by a "single discharge" that was touched off by a drunken sailor who refused to leave the place.[15]

It was not until January 2 that the bodies of Montgomery and twelve others were dragged out of the snow "very near [the] work at Pres de Ville" and were shown to the "Prisoners" for identification. Meigs saw (or heard) that Montgomery "was shot through both his thighs, and through his head," which James Thompson, "Overseer of Works for the garrison of Quebec," confirms by saying that a piece of grapeshot "had entered the head through the chin, one was in the groin, and a third had shattered the thigh bone." While Henry says that he saw the funeral of Montgomery, the coffin "covered with a pall, surmounted by transverse swords," Thomas Ainslie, a British officer, objects that it was "Capt. Anderson's body" — the only British officer killed in the action — that "was interr'd with all the honours of War" and that "Mr. Montgomery's was privately buried at night."[16]

Despite Irma B. Jaffe's comment to the contrary, therefore, there is little doubt as to "the actual site of Montgomery's death." Nor is there any reason to believe "that Montgomery's group had entered the town." (A careful reading of John Starke's memorial, the source of Jaffe's misjudgment, would assure you that his is a mixed account of two actions — Montgomery was not with "General" Arnold — and that the Town he mentions is the outer area along the wall,

cluttered with stores and warehouses.) Still less is her criticism valid that "to be accurate the men [Trumbull depicted] should have been descending, not climbing"; for they were neither descending nor climbing, but advancing along the shore of the St. Lawrence River, where rough crags towered overhead (to their left) and the trail was almost obliterated in deep snow and choked with lumps of ice which the tide had pushed up.[17] Benjamin Silliman, the artist's nephew, visited Quebec in 1819 and found the following: "The place is immediately under Cape Diamond, and was, at that time, as it is now, a very narrow pass, between the foot of the impending precipice and the shore." Approaching from another direction, he adds: "The battery stood on the first gentle declivity ... and the deaths happened on the level ground, about forty yards still further on." High on the rocks, it is said, "Alfred Hawkins, Esq., of Quebec" had placed a board, whose inscription read: "HERE MAJOR-GENERAL MONTGOMERY FELL, DECEMBER 31st, 1775."[18]

This brings us back to the question how much Trumbull knew about these facts, or whether they were important at all. Since in the *Catalogue*, published nearly fifty years after the picture was painted, he gives a minute and fairly accurate account of the expedition and the storming itself (including the fact that Arnold was "wounded and carried off the field" and that "many gallant officers and men remained prisoners of war"), it seems probable that, by that time, he knew almost everything about Quebec. But even then he did not know that the two parties were to attack the same place (he thought that Montgomery "attempted the lower town" and Arnold "the upper")[19] and, besides, these accounts were added years later to what he had said in the broadside, so that it may be safe to say that Trumbull at least knew when he painted *Quebec* that there were two parties participating in the attack, that Montgomery and his staff (except Col. Campbell) were killed in the action, and (perhaps) that Hendricks, Humphries, Cooper, Meigs, Ogden, and Ward were among the casualties.

## NOTES

1) John Trumbull, "Explanation of the Two Prints Representing the Battle of Bunker's Hill and the Attack of Quebec," (a broadside), London? 1798?
2) John Trumbull, *Key* (to *Quebec*), London, A.C. de Poggi, 1798.
3) Pencil sketches for Montgomery, Cheesman, Macpherson, Campbell, and Col. Louis, done in London in 1785 or 1786 (Yale University Art Gallery: 1952. 3. 1 b; 1952. 3. 2 a; 1952. 3. 2 b; 1952. 3. 4).
4) Francis B. Heitman, *Historical Register of Officers of the Continental Army during the War of the Revolution*, Washington, Nichols, Killam & Maffitt, 1893, pp. 141, 152, 170, 285, 308-9, 375, 388, 397, 418, 539-42, 568.
5) R. W. James R. Case, *Freemasons Depicted in the National Series of Colonel John Trumbull's Paintings*, Washington, The Masonic Service Association, 1959, p. 40; Theodore Sizer, *The Works of Colonel John Trumbull*, Yale University Press, 1950, figure 153.
6) Case, *op. cit.*, pp. 24, 28, 29, 33, 35, 41.
7) Matthias Ogden, "Journal of Major Matthias Ogden, 1775," *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society*, New Series, vol. XIII, 1928, pp. 17-30; Return Jonathan Meigs, "A Journal of Occurrences," *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Second Series, vol. I, 1814, pp. 227-47, also in Kenneth Lewis Roberts (ed.), *March to Quebec*, New York, Doubleday, Doran & Company, 1938, pp. 169-92.
8) Meigs, *op. cit.*, pp. 239-47. Meigs was a most accurate timekeeper; he recorded the following, for example: "Memo. The sun sets on the 21st day of December at 4 hours, 13 minutes, 21 seconds, and rises at 7 hours, 46 minutes, 41 seconds. The shortest day is 8 hours, 27 minutes, 38 seconds."
9) Henry Dearborn, "Journal of the Quebec Expedition," in Roberts, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-68; Simeon Thayer, "Journal of Capt. Simeon Thayer's March through the Wilderness to Quebec," *ibid.*, pp. 295-429; Ebenezer Wild, "Journal of Ebenezer Wild during the Expedition to Quebec," *Massachusetts Historical Society, Proceedings, 1885-1886*, Second Series, vol. II, 1886, pp. 267-75.
10) Issac Senter, "Journal of Dr. Issac Senter," in Roberts, *op. cit.*, pp. 193-241; the figures are from Sheldon S. Cohen (ed.), *Canada Preserved: The Journal of Captain Thomas Ainslie*, New York University Press, 1968, p. 37.
11) Benedict Arnold, "Col. Arnold's Letters Written during the Expedition to Quebec," in Roberts, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-123.
12) A.L. Todd, *Richard Montgomery*, New York, David McKay Company, 1966, p. 199.
13) John Trumbull, *Autobiography, Reminiscences and Letters of John Trumbull from 1756 to 1841*, New York & London: Wiley and Putnam; New Haven: B.L. Hamlen, 1841, p. 51; James Grant Wilson and John

Fiske (eds.), *Appletons' Cyclopaedia of American Biography* (*Appletons'* hereafter), vol. VI, New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1888, p. 354.

14) See especially the map and pictures in Harrison Bird, *Attack on Quebec*, Oxford University Press, 1968, p. 134; Alfred Leroy Burt, *The Old Province of Quebec*, The University of Minnesota Press, 1933, frontispiece; and Benson J. Lossing, *A Pictorial Field Book of the Revolution*, vol. I, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1869, p. 198.

15) Meigs, *op. cit.*, pp. 385-7; Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 36. The account of Abner Stocking, another captive (in "An Interesting Journal of Abner Stocking of Chatham, Connecticut," *The Magazine of History*, vol. 19, no. 75, 1921, pp. 133-62) is very similar to Henry's: "One or two persons had now ventured to return to the battery; and, seizing a slow-match standing by one of the guns, discharged the piece, when the American front was within forty paces of it."

16) Bird, *op. cit.*, p. 219; Meigs, *op. cit.*, p. 246; Henry, *op. cit.*, p. 389; Cohen *op. cit.*, pp. 39-40.

17) Irma B. Jaffe, *John Trumbull, Patriot-Artist of the American Revolution*, Boston, New York Graphic Society, 1975, p. 94; Sheldon S. Cohen, "Lieutenant John Starke and the Defense of Quebec," *The Dalhousie Review*, vol. 47, no. 1 (Spring, 1967), pp. 57-64. The part in question reads: "The Enemy surprised an outpost of a Captain's Guard, and had entered the Town before the alarm was communicated, and had passed the first Barrier. On their attempting to storm the second Barrier, an action took place, in which they were repulsed with great loss — Some guns judiciously placed in a house formed a kind of masked Battery, which raked the street which the Rebels occupied, and being loaded with grapeshot, they did effectual execution; many of them were killed and wounded; among the former was their General Montgomery, and among the latter was General Arnold."

18) Benjamin Silliman, *A Tour to Quebec in the Autumn of 1819*, London, Sir Richard Phillips and Co., 1822, pp. 103-4; Benson J. Lossing, *op. cit.*, p. 198.

19) John Trumbull, *Catalogue of Paintings by Colonel Trumbull, including Nine Subjects of the American Revolution*, New York, American Academy of the Fine Arts, 1831, pp. 12-15.