

and especially that Ethan Allen had nothing whatever to do with it. In the actual capture of the fortress, the writer claims that Arnold held a joint and equal command with Allen, and is, in fact, entitled to the largest share of the honor.

Mr. DeCosta, who professes to belong to a "new school of history," commences his views of the capture of Ticonderoga with high claims to historical research and accuracy, as follows:

*"The study of American history,"* he says, *"has now entered upon a new era. An intelligent patriotism no longer demands the unquestioned belief of every vainglorious tradition. Historical students have discovered that in order to enforce conviction they must produce authorities."*

We are not disposed to controvert the rule which the writer thus lays down for historical research. Whether it belongs to an old or "a new era," it is peculiarly obligatory upon one, who like the *Galaxy* writer, propounds a new historical theory for the overthrow of a belief which has prevailed for nearly a century, and has hitherto been unquestioned.

Now for the application of this rule to the article of Mr. DeCosta, that we may ascertain to what extent he "enforces conviction" of its truth "by the production of authorities."

And first, in regard to his assumption that John Brown was the originator of the expedition by which Ticonderoga was taken. The first piece of evidence upon which the writer relies, is a letter written from Montreal by Brown to General Joseph Warren and Samuel Adams, in the month of March, 1775, from which he makes a quotation as follows:

"One thing I must mention, to be kept a profound secret. The fort of Ticonderoga must be seized as soon as possible, should hostilities be committed by the king's troops. The people on the New Hampshire Grants *have engaged to do the business*, and, in my opinion, are the proper persons for the job."