

1689. shore, and from these two points kept up such a terrible musketry fire on the fort, from noon till evening of the 14th, that no one durst appear openly.

The
Indians be-
sieve Fort
Peinkuit.

When night came, they summoned the commandant to surrender the place; and an Englishman having answered in derision that he was tired and was going to sleep, the fire began, as if by concert, on both sides; but the Indians, under cover of the darkness, approached the fort, and invested it, keeping close watch all night to prevent any one leaving it. The next day, at early dawn, the firing was renewed on both sides, and was at first quite hot; but, after some volleys, the English stopped their fire, and asked to capitulate. The Indians at once approached, and swore that they would do violence to no one, provided the garrison evacuated the fort immediately.

They take
it.

The commandant appeared the next moment at the head of fourteen men, all that he had left, and of some women, each one carrying a bundle on the back. The Canibas let them pass, without touching any thing, merely telling them that if they were wise they would never come back again; that the Abénaqui nations had too often experienced their perfidy ever to leave them in quiet, if they showed themselves in their country again; that they were lords of their own territory, and would never permit there such restless and grasping people as they were, who annoyed them, moreover, in the practice of their religion.¹

They then entered the fort,² committing no disorder

¹ Hutchinson (Hist. of Mass., i., p. 352), followed by Williamson (Hist. of Maine, i., p. 613), says the Indians killed some after the surrender and made prisoners of others. La Motte Cadillac, in his Memoir (Canada Doc., II., v.; Maine Hist. Coll., vi., p. 283), says they killed in all 80, but spared the commandant and six of his people at the instance of Matekwando. But John Gyles, the best English account, says that Weems went off in Pateshall's sloop,

and says nothing of any violation of the terms. Drake's Indian Captivities, p. 77; Mather's Magnalia, book vii., p. 65. Andros, in his defence, ascribed its loss to removal of troops; but the Answer to Sir Edmund Andros's Account (Maine Hist. Coll., v., p. 394) attributes it to the careless security of the garrison.

² N. Y. Col. Doc., ix., p. 438. Thury's Account, Boston, French Doc., vii., p. 297.