FORT LIGONIER: ADDITIONAL LIGHT FROM UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS

ALFRED P. JAMES

To make an historical address on old Fort Ligonier is no light responsibility. So many writers from the eighteenth century to the present decade have written on this subject that a restatement of the old story may seem unnecessary. But as another old story in the old school reader asserts, "Circumstances alter cases."

One of the altering circumstances in this case is the fact that this third annual historical tour has chosen Ligonier as one of its stopping places and has thus created an opportunity for many persons who have not had the occasion to read deeply into the history of the place to hear some account of its early life. Another altering circumstance is the existence of a vast amount of original documentary material connected more or less directly with old Fort Ligonier, of which, it seems safe to hazard, more than two-thirds has never been published. It is natural to suppose that extensive and intensive consultation of the original materials, on which the history of any locality finally rests, and particularly of unpublished documents, would make it possible to add somewhat to the dramatic story of Fort Ligonier. It is the purpose of the writer, therefore, to present a sketch of the history of the fort and the surrounding region from 1758 to 1765, with especial emphasis on matters on which these original materials, recently consulted, have thrown new light. Were there no such materials, however, there is sufficient justification for the writing of

1 Read at Ligonier on July 14, 1934, in connection with the third annual historical tour under the auspices of the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania and the summer session of the University of Pittsburgh. Dr. James is professor of history in the University of Pittsburgh. Ed.

2 A general description of this material is in Alfred P. James, "Opportunities for Research in Early Western Pennsylvania History," ante, 16: 125-137.
this article in the very significance of the history of Fort Ligonier during the period. That which is important in the past well deserves repeated consideration.

Brief mention of elements of importance to the region before 1758 may prove of value to an understanding of later events. Loyalhanning of the days before 1759, Fort Ligonier in its day, and Ligonier of later times alike have owed their importance primarily to their topographical surroundings. The locations of the Raystown Branch of the Juniata River and of Loyalhanna Creek are facts of prior significance in the history of Fort Ligonier. Other elements of importance in the early development of this region are: first, the existence, in the second quarter of the eighteenth century, of a path to the West that, used first by the Indians of eastern and central Pennsylvania who migrated west about the end of the first quarter of the century and later by the fur traders, followed naturally the courses of the Juniata and the Loyalhanna; secondly, the rivalry of the Pennsylvania traders with the traders of the Potomac River region, which involved the formation of the Ohio Company of Virginia, the journeys of Christopher Gist, William Trent, and Washington, and Washington's campaign of 1754; and thirdly, Braddock's expedition in 1755, which occasioned the opening of a road from Carlisle by way of Raystown (Bedford) to the crest of the Allegheny Hill, over which food supplies from eastern Pennsylvania could be transported for the support of military forces west of the Allegheny Ridge. The first extended comment on old Loyalhanning comes from James Smith, a young lad who was captured while engaged in the construction of this route across Pennsylvania. While taking him west in captivity his party late one afternoon found an Indian encampment "near where Ligoneer now stands." In his own language, "When we came to this camp, we found they had plenty of turkeys and other meat there; and though I never before eat venison without bread or salt, yet as I was hungry, it relished very well. There we lay that night."

The decision of the British government, under the leadership of William Pitt, to make Philadelphia the starting-point of the campaign

3 James Smith, An Account of the Remarkable Occurrences in the Life and Travels of Colonel James Smith... during His Captivity with the Indians, in the Years 1755, '56, '57, '58 & '59, 15 (Philadelphia, 1834).
against Fort Duquesne was the first circumstance to affect the region about Loyalhanning in 1758. Similarly important was the decision to march west, not by way of Frederick, Maryland, and Braddock's route, but by way of the old Glade Road, cut by James Burd in 1755, to Raystown, which was to be a base of operations and supplies. But the determining factors in the history of the region from 1758 to 1765 were the decision to proceed west from Raystown over a new road to be cut across the mountains and the subsequent selection of Loyalhanning as a military base. About the middle of June, 1758, Bouquet suggested to Forbes that the possibilities of a route west from Raystown be examined. The decision to cut a new road was not made easily. Much historical interest has centered on the opposition of the Virginians, headed by George Washington and William Byrd III, who advocated the use of Braddock's road from Cumberland. The neutral political position and purely military point of view of Forbes and Bouquet in advocating the Pennsylvania route are fully revealed only in their hitherto unpublished correspondence. The relative absence of any evidence of promotion of a Pennsylvania road by those in high political circles at Philadelphia and the disagreements between Forbes and the governing officials lead to the assumption that official promotion was almost non-existent. Promotion probably came from Pennsylvania fur traders and frontiersmen in Lancaster, Carlisle, and elsewhere—men like Edward Shippen, John Arm-

4 This decision was only a new feature of an old plan. The general North American programs of Braddock in 1755, Shirley in 1756, Loudoun in 1757, and Pitt in 1758 were much alike. From the correspondence of 1758, as well as from a survey of documents connected with Braddock's campaign, it is a fair inference that this decision was based on the disastrous outcome of the earlier expedition. Bouquet in a letter to Forbes, June 11, 1758, attributed Braddock's defeat to lack of supplies for his horses. A copy of this letter is in the Bouquet Papers in the British Museum, Additional Manuscripts, 21652:35–39. The Bouquet Papers, Additional Manuscripts, 21631–21659, deposited by the Haldimand family, together with the Haldimand Papers, Additional Manuscripts, 21660–21880, have been accessible for more than half a century. Transcripts are available in the Canadian Archives at Ottawa. The Library of Congress has photostatic reproductions of virtually all the documents bearing upon Pennsylvania, and the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania has transcripts of the documents concerning western Pennsylvania found in volumes 21634, 21638, 21640, 21643, 21645–21647, and 21656. These collections will be cited hereafter as “Add.MSS.” with the volume and folio numbers.

5 Add.MSS., 21652:10. Forbes, writing to Bouquet on June 16, 1758, asserted, “I can say nothing, only I was advised by everyone to go By Raes Town.” Add.MSS., 21640:63.
strong, James Burd, George Croghan, and John Harris. Probably most of their propaganda was oral. On June 17, however, John Armstrong wrote to Bouquet and expressed his expectation of giving him “a few thoughts upon the subject of reconstructing the piece of unknown Road,” and eleven days later he said that Pennsylvania troops would be reluctant to go by way of Cumberland. In July Bouquet stated that the altercation about the road was “an affair of party of province against province, with which we have nothing to do.”

During June and July the attention of Forbes and Bouquet was centered on the route over the Allegheny Ridge and Laurel Hill, and exploring parties were sent out to reconnoiter. In the middle of July Forbes sent out Major George Armstrong, brother of Colonel John Armstrong, and an old fur trader, Dunning, to survey a route over the mountains, and on July 26 Armstrong with a party of twenty men crossed Laurel Hill and visited Loyalhanning. Enthusiastic about the region, he wrote Bouquet, “Lawrel Hill is about 2½ Miles over. The Top of it a little stoney and the West side more so, however they are but loos and can be pretty easie removed it is about 18 Miles from this place to Loyalhan8 the latter is a very pretty place; well Wattered and Grass in a bundence. The Situation is undoubtedly Good for nature has supplied it with all conveniences, and what makes it more desirable is the Westeren breeses carrying with them the Smell of the French Brandy.” Two days later he described Loyalhanning as “a very proper and advantagious post for us.”

On the last day of July Forbes sent orders to Bouquet to begin construction of the new road from Raystown to Loyalhanning. Three days later Bouquet replied that Burd had informed him that a new gap was practicable and that five hundred men could cut the road in six days, that Sir John St. Clair, who had gone on to Loyalhan-

6 Add.MSS., 21652: 44, 53; 21643: 125, 130. An unpublished letter from Forbes to Abercromby indicating that as early as June Forbes definitely planned to go from Raystown across the Alleghenies is in the Abercromby Papers in the Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, San Marino, California. Photostatic copies of documents referred to in this collection were made available to the author through the courtesy of Miss Irene Stewart of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh. In writing to Bouquet on July 23 Forbes discussed the pressure upon him and asserted his disinterestedness. Add.MSS., 21640: 104.

7 Add.MSS., 21640: 70, 93, 104, 110; 21652: 49, 51; 21658: 16, 18-20, 22-28; 21642: 160; 21643: 162, 164.
FORT LIGONIER

ning, likewise reported the road practicable, and that Armstrong had his party working on the road, while White was marking a route over Laurel Hill. Armstrong, indeed, on August 7 was anxious "to begin some Works at Loyalhannen or to Reconitre toward F. Duquesne." On August 9 Lieutenant Allen, sent out by Armstrong, "came to an old Incampment at the Loyal hanon old Town," and two days later Colby Chew visited the place. For three weeks road construction went steadily on in the face of many difficulties. St. Clair on August 17 pronounced Loyalhanning "a good place for a fort," and on the following day Bouquet declared that it was time to occupy the site and began preparations.

The plan for a fort at Loyalhanning, formulated on August 20, was to construct magazines for the provisions, to cover them with a fort of stockades or logs, and to reënforce the fort if necessary by an exterior line of defense, the interval of from fifteen to eighteen feet to be filled with dirt from the ditch. Bouquet intended that Major William Grant should take charge of the post at Loyalhanning and form an intrenched camp, but on August 23, when the party marched for the fort, Colonel James Burd accompanied Grant, and instructions for the enterprise were issued to Burd. These instructions are of great interest. Burd was to march from Raystown on August 23, 1758. As soon as he arrived at Loyalhanning an encampment was to be laid out with two small redoubts at two hundred yards distance. "A Storehouse of 120 feet long and at least 25 feet wide" was to be built immediately on the site of the fort, a hospital and ovens were to be constructed, and preparations were to be made to harvest hay. Burd was much delayed by rain and by bad roads over the hills. He was at Fort Dewart on August 26; at Quimahony from August 28 to 30; and at Clear Fields, one mile from the eastern foot of Laurel Hill on August 31. On Sunday, September 3, he reached Loyalhanning and put in a day's work on "the Encampment Mr Rhor had formerly seen." Burd wrote Bouquet on Wednesday

8 Add.MSS., 21640:115, 121. Armstrong had sent White with twenty men "to mark the Road &c over Lowrell hill," on July 30, 1758. Add.MSS., 21643:165.


morning, however, that he “evacuated the old ground, & began our breast work on the New, on Monday morning,” because “upon Reconnoitering we found a very fine piece of Ground naturally strong being high & having the Creek on the one side, and a fine spring on the other, just under our works”; that he would have the troops in the breastworks at ten o'clock that day; and that he would send “a draught of this (I really will say) fine place,” but that he could find no place to make hay and no coal. On the following day Bouquet arrived at Loyalhanning. He had found the road “a most infernal one” and the pack horses and wagons in bad condition. Probably as a result of this state of affairs, provisions were dangerously low at the new post.

Events at Loyalhanning during the remainder of the year 1758 are full of interest. For several days after his arrival Bouquet busied himself getting the road repaired, settling matters of discipline in the forces, and getting up provisions. In the midst of this work came the news of the defeat of Major Grant, who had set out from the fort on September 9 to reconnoiter and had advanced on Fort Duquesne. Since Bouquet was in command at the time, the responsibility for this episode rests somewhat firmly upon his shoulders.

Forbes reached Raystown on September 15, and two days later Bouquet, preparing to return over the road to further its repair and to get forward provisions and forces for a final effort against Fort Duquesne, drew up elaborate instructions to leave with Burd at Loyalhanning. Ac-
According to these instructions, 150 men were to work on "a fort of logs" to be "built around the storehouse," and 250 were to work on the road to an advanced post where three redoubts were to be garrisoned. Forbes strongly disapproved of the waste of "money and Labour" and complained that Captain Gordon was building at Loyalhanning a fort "fit to stand a siege." According to Burd there was a minor Indian attack on October 5, and on October 12, two days after Forbes's complaint was written, a fierce attack was made on this "fort fit to stand a siege."

Concerning the famous battle of Loyalhanning little need be said other than to note that some of the commonly accepted accounts are open to question. Burd reported in his journal that he buried three French soldiers, a report that corresponds exactly to the statement of the French that in the battle of Loyalhanning only three of their soldiers were killed. But Burd's famous letter putting the number of attackers at twelve hundred French and two hundred Indians should be compared with the statement of a French prisoner that the attacking force consisted of one thousand men (between eight and nine hundred French and the rest Indians) and that of François Marchand de Ligneris, commandant at Fort Duquesne, that it consisted of only four hundred and forty French and one hundred and fifty Indians. The French commander was not "M. de Vetri" as stated in a contemporary letter from Loyalhanning and in many secondary accounts, but Charles Philippe Aubry, an officer of troops from the Illinois country.

During the latter part of October the British did not realize the weak and desperate condition of the French at Fort Duquesne. The capture of Fort Frontenac on August 26 had cut off supplies so that Ligneris

15 Add.MSS., 21640:165, 177; 21643:230; orderly book of Bouquet and Mercer (Library of Congress); Burd to Bouquet, October 5, 1758, Burd's letter book. Gordon's work was still incomplete on October 20. Bouquet informed Forbes on that date that, as the enemy had stolen almost all the horses, the wall around the magazines was not finished. Gordon, he said, had made the most exposed side of it with a double row of logs to be filled in with dirt, and the rest had been commenced with stockades. Add.MSS., 21640:184.

was compelled to send some of his men to other posts, and the Indians were deserting in the face of oncoming winter. Ignorance of these facts, however, together with rain, bad roads, scarcity of provisions, and army discontent at Loyalhanning threatened ruin to the British expedition. The troops lacked blankets and clothing for winter campaigning, and Bouquet informed Forbes that the forces at Loyalhanning were uneasy and that ingratitude was rife and cabals were in existence. As early as October 20 he had written about the impossibility of carrying artillery back over Laurel Hill during the winter. Washington thought that the expedition must terminate at Loyalhanning for the year. Forbes, after a let-up in the rain, pushed forward, but he was still in grave doubt about the outcome when he reached the top of the Allegheny Mountain on October 28. He was at Stony Creek the last two days of October and in "Camp at the foot of Laurel Hill" on November 1. He evidently reached Loyalhanning on November 3, for the orders of that day provided for "a gill of Spirits" per day as long as the supply should last "by the order of Forbes" and called for a review of "the Line" by the general "tomorrow forenoon at 12 Oclock." At this time there were 4,614 officers and men in camp.

Forbes intended at first to press on in spite of difficulties, but evidently the next few days brought discouragements. An order for a "General Court Martial" was called on Friday, November 10, "Consisting of Lt Col 8 Majors & 10 Captains," and on November 11 a council of war was held, consisting of Forbes and Colonels Bouquet, Montgomery, Sinclair, Washington, Byrd, Armstrong, Burd, and Mercer. Forbes at this point apparently abandoned the idea of advancing against Fort Duquesne before the following year. At the council three reasons for advancing were brought forward, but seven were set forth against going

18 Add.MSS., 21640: 184. A letter from Forbes to Pitt of October 20 expresses much the same sentiment. Forbes felt that he was shut up in the mountains and unable to extricate himself. Forbes's letter is in William Pitt, Correspondence ... with Colonial Governors, 1: 370-375 (edited by Gertrude S. Kimball—New York, 1906).
further, and Bouquet’s memorandum ended with the logical conclusion that the risks were so evidently greater than the advantages that there could be no doubt as to the only policy dictated by prudence.\textsuperscript{21} That Forbes despaired of expelling the French from the region that year is also evidenced by three additional unpublished documents. The first of these is a request from Bouquet and other colonels to Captain Gordon and Lieutenant Dudgeon, engineers, to give their opinion as to how many men would be necessary to secure Loyalhanning during the winter and on whether or not the fort could stand an artillery attack. The opinions rendered, which compose the second document, were unfavorable. It was stated that a number of men sufficient to protect the place could not be provided there in winter time with the necessary provisions and that, although some defense against an artillery attack might be provided by the construction of a parapet outside the stockade, which would require the labor of five hundred men for nine weeks, “One Coehorn Mortar would be Sufficient to Destroy the Place by Blowing up the Magazine.” The third document is a plan for a winter expedition against Fort Duquesne by way of the Kiskiminetas and Allegheny rivers.\textsuperscript{22}

All this pessimism was soon to disappear. As is well known, rumors of enemies in the neighborhood on November 12 led to the sending out of parties from the fort and to a subsequent misunderstanding in which the British troops fired on each other. But the outcome of the incident was the capture of a prisoner who revealed the French weakness at Fort Duquesne, and, on acquiring this information, the British decided to proceed with the expedition.\textsuperscript{23} With the events of the march from Loyalhanning it is unnecessary to deal at length. Unpublished materials throw slight additional light upon the story. An order of the day at Loyalhanning on November 14 divided the forces into three “Bodys” under Bou-


\textsuperscript{22} Add. MSS., 21643:247, 282. Bouquet endorsed the third document “1759,” but there was no Fort Duquesne in 1759, and it plainly belongs to the period around November 11, 1758.

\textsuperscript{23} There are accounts of this incident in the \textit{Pennsylvania Gazette}, November 30, 1758; in \textit{Niles’ Weekly Register}, 14:179 (May 9, 1818); in \textit{Scribner’s Magazine}, 13:530–537 (May, 1893); and in the \textit{Pennsylvania Archives}, first series, 12:393. As unpublished material on the subject there is Forbes’s account to Abercromby, November 17, 1758, in the Abercromby Papers.
QUET, "Montgomerie," and Washington, "who is to Act as Brigadiers," with Washington in command on the right wing, Montgomery in the center, and Bouquet on the left wing. An unexplained item of November 16 reads: "No women to March with Brigadier Washington's Division." A letter written on November 20 from Burd at Loyalhanning, where he had been left behind, indicates considerable regret on his part that he was no longer in the lead of the expedition. Two other letters of November 20 give interesting information on the redoubts near which Hannastown was built. Halkett, Forbes's secretary, wrote Burd that two hundred men were wanted to take charge of the new post twenty-two miles from Loyalhanning where "Four Redoubts" had been constructed, and Forbes stated in a letter, probably to Washington, that he was writing "From the Camp where they are building the Redouts just arrived 2 a Clock afternoon." Two days later Forbes in his litter was stopped in his advance by darkness and bad roads. The end of the expedition was literally in sight on November 22, when Washington was first at the "Camp Cross Turtle Creek" and later at "Bouquet's Camp."

On the renaming of Fort Loyalhanning as Fort Ligonier there is little to say. It was probably arranged at the time the decision was made to rename Fort Duquesne as Pittsburgh. Forbes, in his famous letter to Pitt started at "Pittsburgh" on November 27 and completed in Philadelphia on January 21, wrote, on the latter date, that he had given Pitt's name to Fort Duquesne and that he had used "the same freedom in the naming of two other forts . . . the one Fort Ligonier & the other Bedford." Christian Frederick Post used the expression "Fort Ligonier" as early as December 4, but it should be noted that Burd still used the term "Loyalhanning" on that date. In connection with the naming of Loyalhanning there is an interesting historical matter that illustrates the romance of research. Two years ago the author of this article examined at the Library of Congress a photostatic copy of an autograph letter from George


25 Pitt, Correspondence, 1: 409; Christian Frederick Post, "Second Journal," in Olden Time, 1: 173 (April, 1846); Burd to his wife, December 4, 1758, Shippen Papers (Historical Society of Pennsylvania).
Washington to Bouquet, written on November 17, 1758, from the “Camp West of Bushy Run,” in which Washington wrote that he had been sadly puzzled for want of a guide and that he had applied for one before he left “Pitsborough.”*6 The first impression received from this letter was that it was wrongly dated, since it was plainly in the writing of Washington who could not, it is said, tell a lie, but who presumably might make an error. On the basis of this letter alone an article was drawn up entitled, “Pitsborough: A Mystery,” wherein it was pointed out that, in spite of the possibility of an error in date, the contents of the letter and the harmony of the facts led to the conclusion that the name “Pitsborough” referred “to some place east of present Pittsburgh” and that it was logical to suppose that this place was Loyalhanning, “where Forbes and his subordinates spent anxious days in the early part of November.” Comments on Washington’s letter are no longer necessary, however, for in the handwriting of Bouquet there is among his papers a document confirming the fact that for a time Loyalhanning was named for the distinguished English minister. Bouquet’s document begins with the statement that when the army was encamped at “Pittsborough” on the eleventh of November, the general called a council of war. Since Forbes himself used the title “Loyalhannon” in his address to Kings Beaver and Shingas on November 9, the name “Pittsborough” must have been assigned to the place on November 10, probably at the “General Court Martiall” already mentioned.27 It is interesting to note that this earliest name is spelled “Pittsburgh,” and not “Pittsborough,” though it cannot be overlooked that the writer is a French-speaking Swiss, and not the Scotchman Forbes. The use of this name is an additional proof of the bad situation at Loyalhanning in the fall of 1758. Plainly Forbes despaired of the immediate capture of Fort Duquesne, and in the bad condition of his health he probably had no hope of ever taking it himself. He evidently desired to honor William Pitt by giving some place his name, and the first English fort in the Ohio Valley, which might have proved his last halt, was the natural selection.

*6 This letter is printed in Washington, Writings, 2: 305.

*7 Add.MSS., 21643: 280; Post, in Olden Time, 1: 163 (April, 1846). The name “Loyalhanning” seems to have been restored after the decision to go forward against Fort Duquesne. Orderly book of Bouquet and Mercer.
Forbes returned to Fort Ligonier on December 7, 1758, and remained there until Christmas; after a typical British celebration he departed the next day for Philadelphia, leaving behind in command of affairs his trusted lieutenant, Bouquet. During the winter of 1758–59 there was constant marching and countermarching of troops to and from Fort Ligonier. From Fort Loudoun on January 4 Forbes notified Bouquet that seven hundred and fifty men were ordered for Fort Ligonier and Fort Pitt, that one hundred provincials were ordered to Ligonier from Bedford, that two hundred Highlanders were on the march back west, and that fifty Royal Americans would be sent back west from Carlisle. At Ligonier the soldiers constructed the outwork in the front and “replaced two Batterys on that Quarter being demolished by the Frost,” built a “palisade joining these to the angles of each Bastion,” and worked on barracks. The explanation of all this military activity is the fact that the French were still at Venango, Fort Le Boeuf, and Presque Isle, with some of their Indian allies. Alarm not only for the safety of Pittsburgh but also for that of Fort Ligonier was the natural result. The importance of Ligonier at this time is evidenced by a letter from Amherst to Bouquet on March 16, 1759, in which he wrote, “I shoul’d think that Fort Ligonier, from the Description I have of the Ground about it, its Distance from Pittsburg, and the facility there will be to take the Provisions there wou’d be the proper place to have a Corps of Troops, for the Security of Pittsburg, the Post itself, and the whole Communication.”

To supply the troops at Bedford, Ligonier, and Pittsburgh with provisions during the winter was no easy task. Pack horses, loaded with flour, and droves of hogs were convoyed west by strong military escorts. Contemporary accounts disagree as to whether or not there was actual hunger at Fort Ligonier. According to one letter there was lack of food but other letters indicate the contrary. Thomas Lloyd, an officer in the Pennsylvania Regiment, writing to Bouquet on February 19, stated that the garrison of 242 men was “stocked with provisions to the 20th

28 Post, in Olden Times, 1:175 (April, 1846); Add.MSS., 21640:207, 213; 21644:56.
29 See the correspondence of Mercer and others at Pittsburgh with the Pennsylvania authorities in the Pennsylvania Colonial Records, vol. 8, and in the Pennsylvania Archives, first series, vol. 3, and Mercer’s correspondence with Bouquet in Add.MSS., 21644.
30 Add.MSS., 21634:9, 20.
March. The state of health of the troops is also a matter about which there are varying reports. A detailed one is that of Lieutenant Archibald Blane, who wrote from Ligonier on March 2 that the detachment of Royal Americans continued very healthy but that there was more sickness among the Pennsylvania troops. Lloyd declared on the same day that the provincials were in bad shape, that they had the scurvy and needed vegetables, that jaundice was epidemic in the garrison, and that rheumatism had followed jaundice in his own case. Probably the "glooms" also got the better of some of the garrison—one officer in the Pennsylvania Regiment wrote the following poem entitled "The Glooms of Ligonier":

From climes deformed with frost severe,  
From mountains wrapt in snow, 
Where surly winter rules the year,  
And howling tempests blow:

To you, whose modest charms improve 
The lightning of your eyes;  
Still conscious of the force of love,  
We soldiers waft our sighs.

Though fortune calls us here, beyond 
Each gay engaging view, 
Yet, pleased, we do our duty, fond 
To serve our prince and you.

Our prince, to merit ever just,  
Rewards the soldier's toil, 
You too will deign, we humbly trust,  
To pay us with a smile.

While happy thus the scene shall shift,  
We've nothing more to ask;  
Honour, the king's peculiar gift, 
And love, your tender task.

Of these possest, at fate we'll smile,  
Defy the surly year,  
Honour and love shall reconcile  
The glooms of Ligonier.

As the winter of 1759 came to an end, efforts were made to push on from the east military reinforcements and fresh food supplies. Bouquet

31 Add.MSS., 21644: 5, 6, 45, 49, 56, 80–84; Ourry to Bouquet, February 17, 1759, Add. MSS., 21642.
32 Pennsylvania Magazine, 24:120 (1900).
announced on March 18 that one hundred men were being sent and that fresh beef was being forwarded for the sick. On March 20 Blane wrote of the men’s need of money and declared that one-sixth of them were sick. Several days later Lloyd reported the condition of the Pennsylvanians as deplorable. He said that the surgeon himself was sick, that the men had not been paid for six months, that the weather continued severe, that provisions were at hand for only two weeks, and that many men were in the hospital. Bouquet replied on April 13 that he had sent a surgeon and that the sick were to be attended “without distinction of corps,” and he wrote Byrd to lose no time in sending reinforcements to Ligonier.33

Brigadier General John Stanwix, who had been appointed to succeed Forbes on the death of the latter in March, faced very unfavorable conditions. As Bouquet informed him on April 26, provisions were lacking, the road was spoiled, the bridges were washed away, and the people were displeased about the failure to settle the accounts of the campaign of the preceding year. Hostile Indians were beginning to attack soldiers and escorts of convoys along the line of communication and had killed eleven convalescents going down from Ligonier to Bedford. Advertisements were put out for wagons to carry provisions to Ligonier; for the country people were unwilling to haul beyond Bedford.34 During May trouble with the Indians increased. They appeared first on May 21, and on the following day, in spite of the fact that the garrison consisted of only 397 men, Captain McKenzie and 145 men were sent out to locate the marauders.35 On the next day two additional parties were sent out from the fort, but the Indians eluded them and attacked a convey of provisions escorted by Captain Bullit of the Virginia troops. Captain Woodward and one hundred Virginians were sent to the rescue but they

---

33 Add.MSS., 21652: 82, 86, 287; 21644: 12, 120.
34 Add.MSS., 21652: 88; 21638: 5; Pennsylvania Archives, first series, 3: 628. It was necessary to use pack horses from Bedford to Ligonier and to use the king’s own horses and wagons beyond Ligonier. See Add.MSS., 21638: 15. It took a month for a loaded wagon to go from the eastern settlements to Fort Pitt. Add.MSS., 21652: 94.
35 Add.MSS., 21644: 181. According to this letter a minor attack had been made on May 3. The garrison was composed of 13 Royal Artillerymen, 77 Highlanders, 155 Virginians, 84 First Battalion Pennsylvanians, and 60 Second Battalion Pennsylvanians. Add.MSS., 21644: 204.
did not arrive before the Indians had killed or captured thirty-six of the hundred men in Bullit's force, wounded several more, carried off the horses, and burned five of the twelve wagons loaded with pork and bacon. Bouquet, then in Philadelphia, was alarmed and sent word that troops were soon coming up and directions that the garrison was never to be drawn away from the fort. After six weeks of comparative quiet in which men and provisions were moved with caution, a final French and Indian attack was made on Fort Ligonier on July 6. Though a party of the garrison, caught away from the fort, got back with difficulty, the enemy was repulsed, and even the cattle and cattle guards were saved. According to a report brought back to Pittsburgh by friendly Indians, the enemy hung around the fort for three days. In fact they hovered along the line of communication for several weeks, and for a time there was high alarm about a possible attack by French and Indians from Venango on both Pittsburgh and Fort Ligonier. But the success of the campaign in western New York settled these fears. The approach of British forces against Niagara caused the withdrawal northward of all French power in the region south of Presque Isle; the defeat of these forces by Sir William Johnson and the capture of Fort Niagara on July 25 were followed by the evacuation of the French posts in western Pennsylvania.

The western campaign of 1759, the purpose of which was to drive the French out of the entire region of the Great Lakes and the Northwest, was to have been conducted jointly from New York, by way of the Mohawk, and from Philadelphia, by way of Pittsburgh and Presque Isle. The construction of an impregnable fortress was begun at Pitts-

---

36 William Trent's journal, 1759 (Historical Society of Pennsylvania); Add.MSS., 21644:172, 180, 187; Mercer to [Stanwix], June 4, 1759, Add.MSS., 21652:117. Mercer states there were only eighty Indians in the attack.

37 Add.MSS., 21652:105; Pennsylvania Archives, first series, 3:668.

38 James Kenny, "Journal to Y^ Westward, 1758–59," in Pennsylvania Magazine, 37:430 (1913); Add.MSS., 21644:228, 270, 284; 21655:34, 47; 21639:80; 21654:43. A vast number of unpublished documents on the French at Venango are in the French archives, and transcripts of most of them are at Ottawa. The Library of Congress has photostatic copies of some of them.


burgh in the autumn of 1759 by Stanwix and Captain Harry Gordon, but General Amherst's plan for an expedition from western Pennsylvania was a failure because of the impossibility of getting adequate men and supplies up to Pittsburgh before winter set in.\textsuperscript{41} These features of the campaign, however, largely determined matters at Fort Ligonier during the latter half of the year. Dozens of unpublished documents in the Bouquet Papers deal with the escorting of convoys carrying from Fort Ligonier provisions and tools and materials for artificers at work on Fort Pitt and with the concentration of soldiers at Pittsburgh in anticipation of the intended expedition to Lake Erie and Niagara. Fort Ligonier was characterized at this time as being "no more than a Post of passage."\textsuperscript{42} In midsummer much work had to be done on the road and some work was done on the fort itself—Colonel Adam Stephen in July constructed an underground magazine, and Captain Gordon, on his way to Pittsburgh to construct Fort Pitt, thought Fort Ligonier was in need of "a good deal of repair" and made some suggestions.\textsuperscript{43}

A council of war at Pittsburgh on October 7 concluded that advance to Lake Erie that year was impossible. News of the capture of Quebec reached Ligonier on October 19, and soon thereafter a reversal of the westward movement set in. So anxious were the soldiers to get back to the settlements before winter that it was necessary to demand passes for all those going by Ligonier, particularly if they were on horses, which were sometimes stolen for transportation purposes. Several other details of life at Fort Ligonier in this year are worth attention. To students of the Forbes Road and its successors it may be interesting to note that in September Captain Shelby located a new road from there to the redoubts


\textsuperscript{42} Add.MSS., 21644:469. Most of the documents are found in Add.MSS., 21638, 21644, 21652, 21654, and 21655. According to an official report, 250 loaded wagons reached Ligonier from Bedford during 1759 and 228 left Ligonier for Pittsburgh. Add. MSS., 21654:57.

\textsuperscript{43} Add.MSS., 21644:268, 272. Interruptions by the enemy had caused the neglect of the roads, and no magazines could be established at Ligonier until wagons could use the road. Bouquet ordered commanders to employ their troops on the road from Bedford to Pittsburgh. See Add.MSS., 21652:125. According to Stanwix, this work was still necessary in the autumn. Add.MSS., 21638:41.
near the site of Hannastown, which Stanwix declared "miss's all the Steep hills & save's eight or ten Miles." In the autumn, also, there was a dispute about the excess number of women in the garrison; a bullock pen was constructed; and the garden at the post was fenced in. George Morton of the quartermaster department had stables prepared for sixty horses and intended to make a great saving of forage by having the horses use nose bags made under his supervision. Captain Woodward with 118 men was ordered to take over the command of Fort Ligonier, together with the posts of Wetherall and Stony Creek, for the winter.44

From 1760 to 1765 activities at Fort Ligonier were dependent for the most part on the general policy of the British government as it affected the Ohio Valley and western Pennsylvania. During the campaign of 1760 the British forces succeeded in advancing from Pittsburgh to Presque Isle, and the capitulation of Montreal put an end to French power in Canada. In 1761 British interest was not concentrated on specific objectives as in previous years, and no events of great historical significance occurred in western Pennsylvania. British policy included the establishment and maintenance of power around the Great Lakes; regulation of Indian trade; and the substitution, when possible, of provincial forces for royal troops.45 In 1762 there were few changes in this general policy, but difficulties in the matter of regulating Indian trade, especially in connection with the sale of rum and with restriction of settlement on lands not yet ceded by the Indians, increased. Late in this same year rumors of a great Indian conspiracy, termed by Bouquet "a pretended new conspiracy of the Senecas, Delawares & Shawanese to strike us," were in circulation.46 The general aspects of events in 1763—the proclamation


45 Much of the material in the Bouquet Papers on the establishment of British power in 1760–61 has been printed in the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections, 19: 27–295 (Lansing, 1911). Some of it is printed in the Massachusetts Historical Collections, fourth series, 9: 238–447 (Boston, 1871), and in Johnson, Papers, 3: 188–598. Material on the same subject in the Amherst Papers, PRO, WO 34, has not yet been published. The major part of the documentary material on Indian trade is in Johnson, Papers, vol. 3. Material on the troops is in the Pennsylvania Colonial Records, 8: 578–590, and in Add.MSS., 21634: 44.

46 Bouquet to Amherst, December 12, 1762, Add.MSS., 21634: 175. Compare Croghan to Johnson, December 10, 1762, in Johnson, Papers, 3: 964–966.
of the cessation of arms early in the year, the pushing of preparations for occupation of the Illinois country, the famous Indian war known as Pontiac's Conspiracy, the march of Bouquet from Carlisle to Pittsburgh during July and August, the British proclamation restricting settlement, the planning of a campaign against the Indians in Ohio, and the change of commanders-in-chief from Amherst to Thomas Gage—are well known, and a great many of the documents relating to them are in print. Continued suppression of hostile Indians on the western Pennsylvania frontier was carried on by the British government in 1764, and late in the autumn of that year Bouquet made his famous expedition into Ohio, for which preparations had continued throughout the spring and summer. During the succeeding year the imperial policy of Great Britain was one of retrenchment.

Life at Fort Ligonier during this period reflected the general trend of events. Unpublished documents throw new light on many of the activities there. In 1760, as in the second half of the preceding year, the fort was little more than a post of passage. The Indians continued to be troublesome. In May a Virginia soldier was killed near Bushy Run, and General Monckton, who had succeeded Stanwix in command in the department, was "very Anxious about Legonier, there being a great many Ordnance Stores there." Bouquet with four companies was rushed forward to Bedford with orders to send a detachment to Fort Ligonier, and Monckton himself came there in the last week in June. Again, on October 28, at the end of the campaign, Monckton stopped there with Gates and Burd. The necessity of apprehending passing deserters, particularly among the provincial soldiers of Pennsylvania, continued during 1760–61, and some of those from western posts without military passes even had the temerity to carry away with them arms belonging to the government. Evidently Fort Ligonier was fortunate in its commanding officer, Lieutenant Blane; Monckton himself declared in

47 Most of the documentary material on Bouquet's march is in Add. MSS., 21634, 21642, 21649, and 21653, and some of the original letters, particularly of Bouquet to Amherst, are in PRO, WO 34, vol. 40.
48 Massachusetts Historical Collections, fourth series, 9: 251–253, 262; Pennsylvania Archives, first series, 3: 719, 726; Add. MSS., 21638: 85, 87, 90, 96, 97; Monckton to Amherst, June 23, 1760, PRO, WO 34, vol. 43; Burd's journal, 1760, in Pennsylvania Archives, second series, 7: 428.
April, 1761, "Legonier can't be better, as I find Lieu't Blaine is there." Early in 1764, however, Blane, who had long wanted to be relieved, secured permission to "go down the country." Bouquet declared him "a worthy good man whom I am very sorry to lose." In February, 1764, Lieutenant Smith was commandant, but by April Captain Robert Stewart, formerly of the First Virginia Regiment but now a commissioned officer in the British army, was in command. He was still there in September but left to accompany Bouquet's expedition into Ohio. He was sent back to Ligonier in late November. Blane and Stewart both experienced trouble with the Indians. In 1761 Indians stole horses and picked up stray animals, although it was claimed that at this time they "have not the Least use" for horses. In 1762 they frequented the road and stole both horses and cattle. During this year the fort was the center of much activity in the way of troop movements, transportation of provisions and other supplies, and the general routine of army and camp life. Bouquet, who was heartily tired of all the routine and the responsibility, finally gained permission from Amherst to be relieved from duty on the frontier and went east to clear up his accounts. He passed through Ligonier late in November and reached Philadelphia in December.

In the early summer of 1763 the garrison at Ligonier consisted of Blane and only seven soldiers, and the preservation of the post during the Indian uprising was a grave responsibility. Indications during June, when the fort was besieged by the Indians, that the place might be lost or abandoned, led to an immediate promise of aid from Bouquet and later to his statement that everything must be risked to secure Ligonier and his command to send a detachment from Fort Bedford. It is well known that skulking parties of Indians continued to hang around Ligo-

50 Add.MSS., 21638:205; 21650:8, 58, 121, 485; 21653:305; 21657:84; Bouquet to Gage, November 30, 1764, Add.MSS., 21637. Stewart's career can be traced in Hamilton, *Letters to Washington*.
51 Add.MSS., 21646:304; 21647:37; 21648:119; Andrew Byerly's complaints, January 3, 1762, in Trent's journal.
52 Add.MSS., 21634:141, 150, 168, 175; 21653:150.
53 Add.MSS., 21653:239-244. An abstract of this letter was printed in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, November 10, 1763.
nier in the autumn of this year—one cattle guard soldier, Hugh Henry, was killed in September, and in November a convoy of provisions was turned back from Allegheny Hill to Bedford. In 1764 Stewart was repeatedly troubled by prowling Indians, for whom the inhabitants of the settlement about the fort seem to have been the particular objective. Bouquet stopped at Ligonier again on his expedition into Ohio about the middle of September of that year. A memorandum of ten items “to be looked after”; two plans, one of ordinary encampment and one of disposition in case of attack; and an elaborate “Disposition for the March from Ligonier” show that he used his short stay in planning more fully his campaign. After this expedition he passed once more through the valley of the Loyalhanna, in midwinter, and left western Pennsylvania, never to return. One of the most interesting documents concerning him is his unpublished “Will or Testament,” which was drawn up and attested at Carlisle on July 5, 1763, on the eve of his departure for Forts Bedford, Ligonier, and Pitt and possibly for the next world. It suggests dramatically the spirit in which he entered upon the journey.

In spite of the Indian menace activities beside the regular military routine were carried on at Fort Ligonier. The road was continually in need of repair, and fallen trees had often to be cleared away. Transportation beyond Ligonier was so difficult in 1761 that impressment of horses and wagons was sometimes necessary, though Bouquet, probably afraid of causing bitterness among the settlers, claimed that he alone could authorize impressments and forbade Blane to do so. Work on the fort was also necessary. Blane wrote Bouquet on July 2, 1761, that the fort “has four good Bastions and an uper Horn Work, which covers the Barraks” and that he had cleared away everything else, “both the lower Horn work and the Retrenchment, Capt Woodward made round the

55 Add.MSS., 21649: 360; Darlington, Bouquet, 206; Darlington, Fort Pitt, 140–142.
56 Add.MSS., 21650: 121, 171, 229, 301, 329.
58 Add.MSS., 21653: 189. Bouquet made his friend Colonel Frederick Haldimand his heir and executor. As already noted, it was through the Haldimand family that the papers of these two men came into the possession of the British Museum. It is worth noting also that the original autograph signed letters of Bouquet to Amherst of August 5 and 6, 1763, copies of which have been used since that date by hundreds of writers, are now available to the public in the Amherst Papers. They are in PRO, WO 34, 40: 644–652.
General's House, as they both obstructed the Deffence of the Bastions.” It was also necessary at this time to repair the houses at the post for the following winter, for none of them was in condition to protect people from the cold. In the latter part of 1763 the barracks, even those of the officers, were not habitable without repairs, for which masons and carpenters were lacking, and stoves were requisitioned because there was not a single chimney in the barracks. By October 25, however, Blane reported that work on barracks within the fort had begun, with so many “good hands” that he expected to finish one on the following day. The artificers were still “working well” on November 11, and late in that month Blane was able to report satisfactory results. In 1764 two bridges, which, it was thought, would resist all floods, were built by the soldiers. Besides building and repair work the garrison was occupied to some extent with gardening—in 1760 it is recorded that Blane had “both Cabbages and Sallade above Ground” by the first of April. Stewart in 1764 furnished not only protection but horses to keep three plows busy for the inhabitants. In July the oats had been sown and people were busily engaged in cutting hay, and by early September the hay and forage were harvested and ready for appraisal. Stewart also reported the discovery in May of a coal pit within forty yards of the fort, and the coal, according to the blacksmith, was “extremely good and in great quantity.”

The life of a soldier at the fort was probably not one of much personal satisfaction. In 1762 the garrison was small in number and poor in quality; soldiers on a march or in escort of a convoy labored under a weight of more than sixty pounds of equipment and those employed as artificers or laborers received only from ninepence to one shilling threepence per day. There was continuous trouble about the quantity and character of provision at the fort. Rats, or “vermin” as they were called, which played havoc with flour, infested the provisions in 1761 and 1762. Much of the flour was stored in bulk and became damaged by damp and so moldy as to be fit only to be fed to the hogs. While Bouquet was at Ligonier on August 3, 1763, he ordered an inspection of the biscuit stored

60 Add.MSS., 21648:135, 281, 341; 21656:2a.
there and reported damaged. The report of Captain Murray and five lieutenants attached to the order read, "One thousand & thirty five pounds of Bisquet not fitt for Men to Eat & all are of opinion that the badness of said Bisquet has been owing to bad Baking & being put up in Baggs when Hott." Late in August it was necessary to send Major Campbell with a detachment from Fort Pitt to help the weak garrison repair fences and get in firewood for the winter, but provisions were so low that they had to go on to Fort Bedford. In the middle of September blankets, salt, and nails were lacking, and the militiamen were in need of shirts, shoes, and other equipment. There was neither doctor nor medicine available. It was requested that a sutler be allowed to come to the post provided with all kinds of wearing apparel, and the hint was given that "no body will bring dry goods without Liquors," or, as one might say, without wet goods.

Before midwinter, however, the miserably small garrison of the time of the Indian uprising was increased to fifty-five, convos of provisions were sent in, and a surgeon, Doctor Spence, was provided for the post. In 1764 Bouquet ordered the contractor's agents to deposit provisions for sixty men at Fort Ligonier.

In spite of unfavorable conditions and the small size of the garrison, things were not wholly dull and there was some chance for fun and feasting. Blane was able in 1761 to entertain guests at dinner, and, on November 9, to spend with his guest, "ye Evening in ye Garden." On September 1 of the following year he informed Bouquet that the hunting season had come and desired him to come up from Fort Pitt to go hunting. He must have been a bit skeptical about the result, however, for he hoped Bouquet would have sent him eight or ten bullocks "to fatten them against you come." It was evidently also possible at that time to get ducks "out of the creek." A certain amount of gossip and scandal also enlivened life at the fort: in 1763 "Doctor Boyd ... brought himself into a fine scrape with McAlister, the Smith—(upon Account of his Daughter) having given from under his hand that he would marry her when he gets down the country."
Probably the most valuable information on the history of Fort Ligonier and its vicinity furnished by unpublished materials is that in regard to early settlers and settlement. Nowhere in the documents is there the slightest reference to any settlers in the neighborhood of the fort as early as 1759. Something more than tradition is necessary to prove their presence. In 1760, likewise, there is no evidence of any farmers in the region. An unpublished document lists among articles necessary for the western department for this year "farmers at Bedford, Ligonier ... Gist's, Burd and Pittsburgh." Official policy was on the whole opposed to farmers settling in the neighborhood—the board of trade and plantations in England notified William Pitt on February 21 that western settlement on the lakes and waters was advisable, provided due regard was had for engagements with the Indians, but that officers, including provincial officers, and soldiers were "the properest persons for such settlements." The proceedings of an Indian conference held from April 6 to 12 at Fort Pitt reveal that while the Indians wanted traders to come among them, particularly if they brought rum, they were very sensitive about the permanent occupation of the land. There seem to have been many traders along the line of a communication and at the posts. On April 1 there appeared at Fort Ligonier a shoe peddler, from whom the "Serjt at Stonnie Creek" took seven pair, although Blane thought the peddler's prices exorbitant and wrote to Bouquet that he considered the fellow an "imposing Scoundrel."

In 1761, although the imperial policy remained that of guaranteeing the Indians possession of unceded lands and of not allowing private holdings of lands even at military posts, and although as late as October 30 Bouquet issued a proclamation forbidding settlement west of the Allegheny Mountains without special permit, actual frontier farmer settlement seems to have begun west of Laurel Hill, and this and the succeeding year were the first years of pioneering in what is now Westmoreland County. In May of 1761 Andrew Byerly was located at Bushy Run, although at that time he appeared in no hurry to build himself a house. Before the end of November, however, he must have been well established for at that season he had turkeys for disposal to others. Captain

William Clapham was also settled at “Sewickley old town” on the Youghiogheny River as early as July, 1761.66

How many of the fourteen families living between Bushy Run and Laurel Hill at the outbreak of the Indian attack in 1763 established their homes in the West in 1762, it is impossible to determine. Byerly and Clapham were already in the region, and remained there. Early in January Byerly complained to the commanding officer that a Munsey Indian had stolen from him “five of the Kings Bullocks and some Cows.” On July 11 Christian Frederick Post, taking some Ohio Indians east for a conference at Lancaster, stopped at Byerly’s place. He writes “when we came to Byerlys they were hungry, I bought a young Steer for them, which they stripp’d, roasted & buyld, & then went 14 miles further well pleased.” A petition of William Ewer to Bouquet on November 14 says that on his way up he left his mare, gun, shot pouch, powder horn, and ammunition in care of Byerly who had “put out of the way or disposed of them.” Clapham, in his second year at “Sewickley old town” seems to have had a trustworthy reputation. Blane sent Bouquet’s horse to him to send on to Fort Pitt, and on September 16 Bouquet instructed David Franks to send twenty-five oxen to be stall fed at Clapham’s at sevenpence per pound. Clapham was killed at the opening of the Indian attack in 1763; and Andrew Byerly’s heroic rôle at the battle of Bushy Run is well known.67 Isaac Stimble was also in the region early in 1762. Some of the horses stolen by the Indians at that time belonged to him, and Blane wrote, “Poor Stimble will be ruined if the horses are not recovered.” Stimble and others set off in pursuit, and four days later Blane was alarmed because nothing had yet been heard from him, but since his name appears again in the records of the next year (in connection with a matter of debt to a man named Duncastle) he must have returned, though whether with his horses one cannot say.68

Byerly, Clapham, and Stimble are the only pioneers mentioned by name in the records consulted for 1762, but there are general references

66 Johnson, Papers, 3: 514-516; Add.MSS., 21636: 72; 21646: 231; 21647: 37, 255.
67 Add.MSS., 21634: 170; 21648: 141, 438; 21658: 80; Trent’s journal, January 10, 1762; Post, “Journal,” in Pennsylvania Archives, first series, 4: 95. The findings of a court of inquiry on Clapham’s property and accounts is in PRO, WO 34, 40: 713-716.
68 Add.MSS., 21648: 119, 125; 21649: 48, 457.
to other settlers in the region. In his letter about Stimble written in April, Blane said that some of the horses stolen belonged to “inhabitants” and some to pack horse men, and on June 14 he wrote Bouquet that he was inclosing a list of people applying for plantations. In September it was assumed that the “inhabitants” around Ligonier could care for twenty oxen and twenty fat hogs until the season for slaughtering arrived, and in November Amherst ordered Bouquet to sell to “Traders and Emigrants” flour that had been condemned at Forts Bedford, Ligonier, and Pitt. Amherst’s orders transmitted by Bouquet to Blane in January, 1763, were that flour should be sold “to the Inhabitants to Traders or Emigrants.” In his reply Blane said that he could not sell flour of such poor quality to the “Inhabitants which from the fewness of their number” could buy only a “trifling” amount, and on February 24 he said that he could sell no flour because “money is very scarce in these parts.”

On August 20 the name of a settler not before mentioned appears in a letter from Blane to Bouquet certifying to property losses at the hands of the Indians on behalf of Robert Lauchlin, who had served as a militiaman during the siege of Fort Ligonier in June and July.

With reference to settlers four documents of 1763 dealing with the loss of lives and property at the hands of the Indians are of particular interest. One of these is the list of the killed, scalped, and captured in the department of Fort Pitt. Of a total of thirty-three only six were in what is now Westmoreland County—five at Clapham’s and one, Michael Shannon, at Ligonier. A document of September 30 lists thirty-one civilians, eighteen traders, and eighty-eight servants lost, with a property loss to the traders of forty-five thousand pounds. The number of people killed by the Indians west of the Susquehanna is given as 170. A third document is a petition of fourteen settlers “Lately Resideing Betwixt Ligonier and Fort Pitt,” their “houses and Furniture Being all Burned; and

69 Add.MSS., 21648:221; 21658: 80; 21656: 38; 21653: 153; 21649: 67. Blane wrote that there were fifty thousand pounds of flour, of which twelve thousand were very bad and the remainder indifferent. See Add.MSS., 21649:48. He did later sell 10,742 pounds of the flour, however, getting rid of that in greatest danger of spoiling and securing from seven shillings sixpence to ten shillings per hundredweight for most of it. Add.MSS., 21649: 124.

70 Add.MSS., 21654: 176.

71 Add.MSS., 21654: 70; PRO, WO 34, 40: 709-712.
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... Crops all Destroy’d,” to the “Gentlemen Commissioners... Sitting at Carlisle,” to take “our Distressed Circumstances under your Consideration.” The names of the petitioners, as spelled in the body of the document, were: “Andrew Byardly, Jacob Myards, Robert Craighton, John Fields, Samuel Shannon, Frederick Seever, Isaac Stimble, Andrew Bonsure, Michael Rutter, Robert Lauglin, Michael Cofman, John Long, Robert Rodgers, & Robert Atkins.” Six persons signed in behalf of themselves “and what is absent of the Above mentioned persons.” Their signatures read: Andrew Byerly, Jacob Mayer, Rob Creighton, Sam Shanenn, Frederick Saeher, and Rob Laughlin. Those of Byerly, Mayer, and Saeher are in German script.

The fourth document is an “Accompt of Losses Sustained By the Inhabitants of Fort Legonier and Communications while Detained by Lieut Blane for the immediate Defence of that Post ’till a Reinforcement could be sent to his garrison, which at the Irruption of the Savages consisted only in one Serjeant and seven Private Men.” The account is endorsed by Blane: “N. B. I have given a Voucher agreeable to the annexed.” The names of Robert Creighton, John Fields, John Long, and Robert Atkins do not appear on this list, but there are two names, those of Daniel Lafaar and Joseph Senovina, that were not on the settlers’ petition. There is as one would expect a great variation in spelling. Of the sixteen names on the two documents about half are German, two are French, one is Italian, and only six can be English, Scotch-Irish, Scotch, or Irish. The losses listed in the “Accompt” amounted to a total of 324 pounds; the total number of horses lost was twenty-four and the total number of cattle twenty-eight. For these losses the commissioners, John Reid and Edward Shippen, would not take upon themselves “to make any allowance.” They merely submitted the document with an unfavorable report “to the Consideration of His Excellency the Commander in Chief.” The colony of Pennsylvania even refused to pay the petitioners for two months’ militia service at Fort Ligonier and suggested that application be made to Bouquet. In view of Bouquet’s promise on July 4 to see that the payment was made, it is to be hoped that they received at least this small compensation.

72 Add.MSS., 21658:97.
73 Add.MSS., 21654:232; 21658:156; 21649:229.
In 1764 private property and plantations evidently existed along the Forbes Road; for Bouquet on his march from Carlisle issued orders for his officers and men to respect all private property in districts through which they passed. At Bedford on September 3 he instructed Captain Ritzhaupt of the Bullock Guard that no damage was to be done "to any of the plantations."  

The correspondence of Bouquet with General Gage in the spring of 1765 indicates what became of Fort Ligonier after Bouquet's final departure from the West. On March 4 he suggested the abandonment of "all the small Posts" and on March 16 he reported that all wooden forts were "falling in decay." If the posts were to be continued all the forts along the Forbes Road must be "new built, as they are mouldering away, like all other Wooden Forts in the Country." Considering Great Britain's policy of retrenchment there was little chance that Fort Ligonier would be "new built" by the Crown, and there was equally small likelihood that Pennsylvania, likewise retrenching and abandoning posts, would keep up the fort and maintain the garrison. The last reference to Fort Ligonier as a British military stronghold that has been found is in a letter written by General Gage to Secretary Conway on May 6, 1766, in which it was proposed that the post should have "a very small Garrison." Perhaps when the Gage Papers are more fully exploited the exact date of its abandonment will be discovered.

74 Add. MSS., 21653: 307, 314. The Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania has photostatic copies of the petition and the "Accompit of Losses."

75 Bouquet to Gage, March 4, 16, April 10, 1765, Add. MSS., 21637; General Thomas Gage, Correspondence ... with the Secretaries of State, 1763-1775, 1:90 (edited by Clarence E. Carter—New Haven, 1931). On the Gage Papers, see ante, 16:132 (May, 1933).