

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 08236800 6

CHILD, R
Kittredge
A

DEC 17 1915

DOCTOR ROBERT CHILD
THE REMONSTRANT



BY
GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE

(1888)

Ch. H. Bentley, U.S. Mass

and ~~the~~ U.S. Mass.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

DOCTOR ROBERT CHILD
THE REMONSTRANT

BY
GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE

REPRINTED FROM
THE PUBLICATIONS
OF
The Colonial Society of Massachusetts
VOL. XXI

CAMBRIDGE
JOHN WILSON AND SON
The University Press
1919

DOCTOR ROBERT CHILD THE REMONSTRANT

My original purpose in this paper was to throw together a few facts about Dr. Robert Child that seem to have escaped the notice of New England historians, such, for instance, as the date of his M.D. at Padua, his friendly relations with Boyle and Hartlib, certain details of his travels on the Continent, his acquaintance with the celebrated Harvard alchemist George Stirk, his authorship of two important treatises on agriculture (which include a number of observations on America), his interest in the development of Ireland under the Commonwealth, and the date of his death. As to

his historic clash with the governing forces of the Bay Colony, I supposed, in my guileless ignorance, that the ins and outs of the controversy had been long ago traced by the students of our early annals, and that I could pass over that portion of his life that makes him so conspicuous a figure in our constitutional development with a brief reference to standard authorities. But it soon appeared that I had reckoned without my host. Nowhere was there discoverable an account of the famous Remonstrance of 1646, and of the two resultant prosecutions, that assembled all the *res gestae* or established the chronology of the affair. It became necessary, therefore, to study this episode afresh, with an open mind, and to weigh the evidence as judicially as might be practicable; and thus, in an unguarded moment, I found myself taking up arms against a sea of troubles.

These troubles, in the main, are of rather recent origin. In an earlier generation, when Palfrey composed his masterly sketch of the Remonstrant imbroglio, it was assumed that two men, or two parties, could disagree and come to grips without imposing upon us the duty of inferring that either of them was altogether in the wrong. But of late — at least in the case of our Remonstrant — *animum non caelum mutamus*. Generalities have elbowed concrete particulars into the limbo of the discredited. Scholars no longer regard Robert Child as what he was, — an ardent Presbyterian, a disciple of Robert Baylie, eager to extend to all his countrymen the blessings of a rigid conformity, — but as an advocate of general religious toleration and freedom of conscience, principles which he and his party abhorred with all the strength of their earnest souls as the devil's latest device for the ruin of society and the damnation of mankind. And, on the other hand, I find the fathers of our Commonwealth no longer looked at, in this instance, as the shrewd and valorous (if severe) upholders of a well-conceived plan of civic development, but as a little oligarchy of bigots, conscientiously repressive of everything that we, their descendants, hold to be the inalienable heritage of a freeborn man. The contest between the Remonstrants and the government of the Bay cannot be understood if we approach the subject with any such prejudices. Free speech, the right of petition and appeal, resistance to arbitrary rule, equality before the law, the separateness of church and state, "I am the cap-

tain of my soul" — these are principles that may or may not be involved in the controversy of 1646 and 1647; but that controversy was not conducted upon those principles, either by Child and his associates on the one side or by the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay on the other.

Two parties were struggling for the control of England — the Presbyterians and the Independents. Both were right and both were wrong, as is always the case with partisans; but, in the long run, it has appeared — and is admitted — that the triumph of Independency made for the progress of freedom. It was a closely fought match, and never more hotly contested than at precisely that time when Child and the Remonstrants struck their blow for the Presbyterian party. Of course, the Independents, who bore sway in Massachusetts, countered with all their strength. They could not abandon their friends who were fighting for their very existence in the mother country. *Principiis obsta* was of necessity their motto. The question was not — Shall liberty or bigotry prevail in Massachusetts? It was — Shall Presbyterianism (as it was then, with all its faults) or Independency (as it was then, with all its faults) prevail as a political system among English-speaking men on both sides of the sea? Robert Child is a singularly attractive — even a charming — figure in the life of his time; he fought valorously for his own side when neutrality was a crime; he deserves all honor. But he cannot be judged, in this matter of the Remonstrance, as an individual: he must stand or fall with his party; and what that party was, the bare facts, when we reach them, should determine without argument. It was a party that did not wish either to tolerate or to be tolerated. Its one great principle was domination, for it knew that it was of God and that all other parties were of the devil. Let us admit, if one insists, that the Independents were as bigoted as the Presbyterians. So be it, they were not *more* bigoted, and there could be no advantage to the Colony in undergoing a revolution that should merely substitute one bigotry for another.

That the state of things was as I have described it, *as to parties*, needs no argument, for such is the consensus of historians. It remains to show that the Remonstrance was in truth a party affair. For this we may leave the case to the facts of record, to which we will now turn.

Robert Child was born in 1613 in Kent, probably at Northfleet, where his father, John Child, appears to have had a comfortable estate.¹ At all events, the Child family was of long standing in the county² and both Robert Child and his brother, Major John, were well-to-do. Robert was regarded by our ancestors as a "gentleman" and a "person of quality."³ Robert Child was matriculated at Bene't College (Corpus Christi), Cambridge, at Easter Term, 1628, as a Pensioner, took his A.B. in 1631-2, and proceeded A.M. in 1635.⁴ He went immediately to the University of Leyden, where he entered as a Student of Medicine on May 23, 1635, at the age of twenty-two.⁵ How long he remained at Leyden we do not know, but it is certain that he finished his medical studies at Padua.

Child claimed to have the degree of M.D. from Padua,⁶ and,

¹ The date of Child's birth is inferred from his age (22) when he entered the University of Leyden on May 23, 1635 (see note 5, below). His county (Kent) is mentioned in the record of his admission to Corpus Christi (List appended to Part i of Robert Masters's History of the College of Corpus Christi, 1753, p. 12), and he describes himself in an agreement of August 23, 1650, as "Robert Child of Northfleet in the County of Kent Doctor in Physicke" (Suffolk Deeds, i. 216). His (presumably elder) brother, Major John Child, was also of Northfleet (see p. 94, below). His father's name is given in the Padua record (see p. 5 note 4, below).

² The name of Child (Peter de la Child) occurs in Kent as early as 1262 (Archæologia Cantiana, iii. 252; cf. x. 40; xiii. 209, 305, 308, 426; xviii. 355, 364; xxvii. 45-47, 221). I suspect that Robert Child belonged to that branch of the family that in the sixteenth century held the manor of Parrocks (Porrocks, Paddocks) in the parish of Milton-juxta-Gravesend (John Harris, History of Kent, 1719, pp. 136-137; Hasted's Kent, 2d ed., iii. 339-341 [1797]; Cruden, History of the Town of Gravesend, 1843, pp. 284, 387). The John Child who, on April 27, 1637, was appointed administrator of the estate of Thomas Child, his brother, of "Milton next Gravesend" (Archæologia Cantiana, xx. 26) may have been Robert Child's brother the Major. The John Childe of Kent who, about 1626, was reported by the Commissioners for the Loan as conformable and as having given assurance to pay (Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1625-1626, p. 521), may have been the father. The persons mentioned by Waters, Gleanings, i. 762, seem to belong to quite a different family, but, as Kentishmen, may have been related.

³ Winthrop, ii. 358 (294).

⁴ Savage, 3 Massachusetts Historical Collections, viii. 247; Venn, Book of Matriculations and Degrees, i. 147 (in the record of matriculation the name is spelled *Chiles*). The county (Kent), which identifies this student as our man, is given in the List printed by Masters (see note 1, above).

⁵ Album Studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batavae, Hague, 1875, col. 271 ("Robertus Child Anglus").

⁶ Cf. note 1, above. Major John Child calls him "my Brother *Robert Child* Doctor of Physick" (New-Englands Jonas, p. 1).

though modern writers have usually taken his word, a slight shadow still rests upon his title. For this, the language of the Declaration of the General Court (November, 1646) in answer to the Remonstrance seems to be primarily responsible: "The first . . . is a Paduan Doctor (as he is reputed)."¹ The words seem deliberately chosen to cast a doubt on Child's pretensions. Their tone, at all events, had that effect upon Hutchinson, who remarks that "Child was a young gentleman, just before come from Padua, where he studied physic, and as was reputed, had taken the degree of doctor."² Winslow, in adverting to the subject, uses a tantalizing "however," which, while appearing to admit the fact, has really the effect of leaving one's judgment in suspense: "However he tooke the degree of Doctor in Physick at *Padua*, yet doth not at all practise, though hee hath beene twice in the Countrey where many times is need enough."³ I am glad to be able to set the matter at rest. The archives of the University of Padua testify that "Robertus Child, anglus filius Johannis," passed his examinations for the degree of M.D. on Friday, August 13, 1638.⁴

Child probably went home soon after getting his medical degree, for what seems to have been his first absence from England lasted "two or three years," as appears from a curious passage in his treatise entitled "A large Letter concerning the Defects and Remedies of English Husbandry," written in 1651 and forming the bulk of "Samuel Hartlib his Legacie" published in that year.⁵ This same

¹ Hutchinson Papers (Prince Society), i. 239.

² History of Massachusetts, 2d ed., 1765, i. 145.

³ New-Englands Salamander, p. 7.

⁴ University Archives, vol. cclxxv, p. 179. Some years ago, I asked Mr. William C. Lane, who was writing to Padua, to ask the University Librarian if he could find any entries relating to Robert Child, George Stirk, or Nathaniel Eaton. In his reply (January 12, 1914), the Head of the University Library, Dr. Gaetano Buryada, wrote: "Ho fatto le ricerche da Lei desiderate, ma posso dirLe che solo di Robertus *Child*, anglus filius Johannis, qui si trova notizia. Nel nostro archivio universitario, nel volume 275 che si riferisce ai Dottori e licenziati in chirurgia dal 1629 al 1640, a p. 179 e proprio nell' anno 1638, mese di agosto, giorno di Venerdì, 13, dava gli esami il Child per addottorarsi in medicina. Di Nat. Eaton e dello Stirk non trovo ricordo alcuno, ma debbo pure aggiungere che i nostri atti di archivio hanno molte lacune."

⁵ "There are two wayes of making *Cider* and *Perry*: one, by bruising and beating them, and then presently to put them into a vessel to *ferment* or work (as it is usually called) of themselves: The other way is to boil the juice with

treatise gives much incidental information about his travels; but some of the notes may refer to other visits to the Continent, for after his return he probably visited France again some years later, perhaps in 1642.¹ "I have travelled twice through *France*," he says in the Large Letter,² and his agricultural observations show acquaintance with almost every part of the country from Normandy to the Spanish border.³ Probably he visited Spain,⁴ and perhaps Flanders⁵ and Germany.⁶ Italy he of course knew well.⁷ Winslow in a somewhat insinuating passage, to which we shall return, declares that "as for Doctor *Childe*, hee is a Gentleman that hath travelled other parts before hee came to us, namely *Italy*; confesseth hee was twice at *Rome*, speaketh sometimes highly as I have heard reported in favour of the Jesuites."⁸ It was fortunate for Child's reputation that he did not confide to the fathers of the Bay Colony an incident of his Italian experiences that he mentions in another treatise: "As concerning the extraordinary bignesse of Goose livers, it is in *Italy* amongst the *Jews*, where I have eaten of them, highly esteemed, but at present not much in credit amongst the *Italians*, and to my Palate it is not so excellent a dainty."⁹ Jews and Jesuits would have made a fine alliteration for the author of New-Englands Salamander to play with.¹⁰ Wherever Child went, he kept his eyes open, and he returned to England not only with a medical degree

some good *spices*, by which the rawnesse is taken away, and then to ferment it with some yest, if it work not of it self, this is the best way: and I have tasted *Cider* thus made of an excellent delicate taste. Neither let any complaine of the windinesse; for it is onely want of use: When I had for 2 or 3 years continually drunk *wine* beyond Sea, the strongest beer for 2 or 3 weeks was as windy to me, as *Cider* will be to any; and afterwards when I went to *Paris*, the *wine* of that place was as troublesome as *English beer* for a little time" (2d ed., 1652, p. 20; 3d ed., 1655, p. 20). As to Child's authorship of this Large Letter, see p. 107, below.

¹ See the passage quoted in p. 5 note 5, and cf. p. 9, below.

² Legacie, 2d ed., 1652, p. 23; 3d ed., 1655, p. 23.

³ Legacie, 2d ed., pp. 1-3, 5, 14, 26, 28, 47; 3d ed., pp. 1-3, 5, 14, 26, 28, 48.

⁴ Legacie, 2d ed., p. 44; 3d ed., p. 45.

⁵ Legacie, 2d ed., p. 45, 47; 3d ed., p. 46, 48.

⁶ Legacie, 2d ed., pp. 29, 51; 3d ed., pp. 29, 52. Cf. p. 102 note 1, below.

⁷ Legacie, 2d ed., pp. 5, 27, 28, 51, 52; 3d ed., pp. 5, 27, 28, 52, 53.

⁸ New-Englands Salamander, p. 7. Cf. p. 102 note 1, below.

⁹ An Answer to the Animadversor on the Letter to Mr. Samuel Hartlib of Husbandry (in Samuel Hartlib his Legacy of Husbandry, 3d ed., 1655, p. 168).

¹⁰ See p. 61, below.

but with a vast store of exact knowledge on agriculture and kindred matters. Something led him to think of visiting New England, and thither he went sometime between 1638 and 1641.

Nothing exists in the way of evidence as to the moment when Child made the acquaintance of the younger John Winthrop. Their friendship may have begun in England when Winthrop was there in 1634 and 1635, or even as early as 1631, the year of his first embarkation for America; but Winslow's language suggests that Child was a stranger to the New Englanders until he presented letters of introduction.¹ After all, it is a question of idle curiosity; for, if they had not met before, they certainly became intimate when Child visited the Bay the first time.

Most authorities have overlooked Child's first visit to this country,² but the evidence is decisive. Winslow, writing in 1647, is perfectly clear:

Hee hath beene twice in the Countrey. . . . At his first coming to *New-England* he brought letters commendatory, found good acceptance by reason thereof with the best; fals upon a dilligent survey of the whole Countrey, and painefully travells on foot from Plantation to Plantation; takes notice of the Havens, situation, strength, Churches, Townes, number of Inhabitants, and when he had finished this toylesome taske, returnes againe for *England*, being able to give a better account then any of the Countrey in that respect. Hee comes a second time, and not onely bestoweth some Bookes on the Colledge, as Sir *Kenelme Digby*³ and many others commendably did, but brings second Letters commendatory, having put in some stock among some Merchants of *London*, and for the advancement of Iron workes in the Countrey, which through Gods goodnesse are like to become very profitable to them; but hath no more to doe in the managing of them then any here who have other their Agents being expert in the worke. This Gentlemans carriage is now changed, and is not onely ready to close with such as are discontented, but to bee a leader of such against the government, affront the Authoritie God hath hitherto honored with his blessing, appeale from their justice, and thereby seeke to evade any censure.⁴

¹ Cf. p. 30, below.

² It is noted by Felt (*Ecclesiastical History of New England*, i. 583) and by W. T. R. Marvin, *New-England's Jonas*, 1869 (Introduction, p. xxiv note 41).

³ A list of the books given to Harvard College by Digby is on record in *College Book* i. 259, but this remark appears to be the only allusion to Child's benefaction.

⁴ *New-Englands Salamander*, pp. 7-8.

And Child himself, in his first extant letter to John Winthrop, Jr., written in May, 1641,¹ speaks of his intention to "returne" to New England.² This fixes the date of his first visit within the limits just defined. At the end, Child sends his regards to several eminent persons in the Colony, both lay and clerical: "Remēber my service to yo^r father[,] M^r Dudley, M^r Bellingham, M^r Hūphreys — M^r Cotton, M^r Wilson, M^r Peters — ūto whome I am much beholdē." In a later letter, also written before his second visit, he sends his best respects to Mr. Maverick,³ with whom he was afterwards associated in the Remonstrance. Manifestly, as Winslow has already told us, the letters commendatory had been effective on Child's first visit, and he had indeed "found good acceptation with the best." Child's perambulation of the settlements, undertaken in the same spirit that had guided his European travels, had satisfied him that the new country had resources worth developing, and he was ready to invest something in the plantation.

It is astonishing, in view of this letter of 1641, — even if there were no other testimony available, — that Child should more than once be styled an Episcopalian by recent writers on New England.⁴ He calls it good news that Laud is in the Tower and sure to be punished severely, rejoices that "Lord p^rlates — deanes, prebends, are fallen," and looks forward hopefully to a like fate for the bishops.⁵

¹ Winthrop Papers, iii. 148–151. This letter must have been written between May 8 and 12, for, in a brief budget of "good newes," Child informs Winthrop that "y^e deputy [Strafford] in cōdemēd by both houses," but does not mention his execution. What he says of a fine of £100,000 on canons to help toward the payment to the Scots sounds like an incorrect rumor based on the debate of May 11 in the House of Commons (W. A. Shaw, *History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth*, i. 59).

² "I intend when I returne to you (god willing) to prosecute y^e planting of vines throwly" (Winthrop Papers, iii. 150).

³ March 1, 1644[–5] (iii. 155). In quoting the Winthrop Papers, I have in almost every instance gone back to the manuscripts. This will explain a number of divergences from the printed text.

⁴ Drake, *History and Antiquities of Boston*, 1856, pp. 292, 299; Marvin, with a "probably," in his edition of *New-Englands Jonas*, 1869, p. xxii note 40; Whittier, *1 Massachusetts Historical Proceedings*, xviii. 390, 392; C. E. Banks in his edition of *Henry Gardener's New-Englands Vindication*, p. 32 note 34 (Gorges Society, No. 1, 1884); Augustine Jones, *Life and Work of Thomas Dudley*, 1899, p. 337.

⁵ Winthrop Papers, iii. 150, 151.

In fact, he was a high Presbyterian, as appears abundantly in his later history.

Child's letter of 1641 offers several other points of interest. It has much to say of books, especially of those relating to chemistry, encloses a catalogue (now, alas! no more) of his "chymicall bookes," asks Winthrop to send a list of such works on the subject as *he* possesses, reports on certain volumes which Winthrop had asked him to procure, and announces the sending of several works "from myne own library . . . to pyse till I come to New England." Alchemy was a subject to which both Child and Winthrop devoted much study, and it is continually mentioned in their correspondence. In due season we shall revert to this topic. The following passage is too important to be abridged: "I Intend, if I haue leysure, to goe to Burdeau, from thence to Tholouse to salute Faber¹ — to procure vines and a vigneron,² who can likewise manage silkwormes if it be possible — if I can doe you any pleasure there, pray let me heare from you speedily. I intend when I returne to you (god willing) to prosecute y^e planting of vines throwly, to try somewhat cōcerning silkwormes, and would to my power helpe forward y^e digging of some good mine, if you haue found any in y^e cōutrey."³ Of Child's interest in American mines, which cost him dear, we shall hear more as we proceed. Whether he went to France again before returning to New England we cannot tell, but a sentence in his Answer to the Animadversor⁴ may refer to such a visit: "I lived in *Charanton* two leagus from *Paris*, a whole Vintage, purposely to see how wine was made in France."⁵

Undoubtedly Winthrop received the letter of 1641 before he sailed for England by way of Newfoundland on August 3 in the same

¹ Pierre Jean Fabre, the celebrated French physician and chemist, who died in 1650 (see Ferguson, *Bibliotheca Chemica*, i. 259–260). He was a correspondent of the younger Winthrop (Cromwell Mortimer, dedication of vol. xl of the *Philosophical Transactions*, 1741).

² Cf. Child's essay on the Defects of English Husbandry: "Yet I counsell to get a *Vigneron* from *France*, where there are plenty, and at cheaper rates than ordinary servants here, and who will be serviceable also for *Gardening*" (Samuel Hartlib his *Legacie*, 2d ed., 1652, p. 28; 3d ed., 1655, p. 28).

³ Winthrop Papers, iii. 150.

⁴ See p. 109, below.

⁵ Samuel Hartlib his *Legacy*, 3d ed., 1655, p. 148.

year.¹ He arrived at Bristol on September 28² and remained in Europe more than a year and a half, in the course of which he visited the Continent and may have attended a few medical lectures or anatomical demonstrations at a Dutch or German university.³ One of the main objects of his sojourn in the mother country was to promote the establishment of iron works in Massachusetts. He raised a thousand pounds for this project,⁴ Child being one of the investors,⁵ and the congenial pair must have had many a confabulation. One of these has left a record, for we know that Winthrop told Child of his discovery of black lead at Tantousq,⁶ and that Child promised to stand a quarter part of the expense in developing the mine.⁷ We shall hear more of this speculation presently.

In May, 1643, Winthrop set sail for Boston in the ship "An Cleeve" of London, with "many workmen servants & materialls" for iron works. He had lain "many daies at Gravesend," waiting to be cleared, and, when this formality was over, had been further detained by a scrupulous or interfering port-officer named Robinson, so that he missed a favorable wind and was kept beating about on the English coast above six weeks. After a voyage of more than fourteen weeks he arrived at Boston "neere winter." It was too late to begin operations, and Winthrop had to maintain the imported workmen in idleness until spring.⁸ On the way, he had touched at the Isle of Wight, where some of them seem to have de-

¹ Winthrop, ii. 38 (31).

² John Winthrop, Jr., to his wife, October 8, 1641 (Winthrop Papers, iv. 35).

³ Sir William Boswell to De Vic, November 1, 1642 (Winthrop Papers, iii. 323). We learn from this letter that Winthrop was travelling under the style of "Student in Physic."

⁴ Under 1645 Winthrop notes that "Mr. John Winthrop, the younger, coming from England two years since, brought with him 1000 pounds stock and divers workmen to begin an iron work" (ii. 261 [212]). One concrete trace of the collection of English capital for this project remains in the form of a receipt given by Winthrop, Emanuel Downing, and Hugh Peter to Nicholas Bond for £100 "for the Iron worke," March 23, 1642[-3] (Winthrop Papers, i. 516).

⁵ See pp. 11, 60-61, 65, below.

⁶ See pp. 11, 14-15, 92, 99, 112-115, below.

⁷ Child to Winthrop, March 1, 1644[-5] (Winthrop Papers, iii. 153-155).

⁸ Winthrop's draught of a petition to Parliament, perhaps never presented (Winthrop Papers, iv. 36-37; cf. 2 Massachusetts Historical Proceedings, viii. 13, 14 note). He alleged that he was damnified above £1000 for delay and for wear and tear of workmen. Emanuel Downing, who was also interested in the iron works, seems to have been on the same ship (iii. 152).

serted. On this and other matters he wrote from the Isle to Child, whose reply, dated Gravesend, June 27, 1643, has been preserved. He hopes the rest of the voyage to New England "hath bin both spedy and pspous" but fears Winthrop will not have time to get the works started so late in the season. "These times put me to my wits ends well if o^r Iron busines goe on, all is well." "Pray remember to send me word cōcerning y^e black lead mines." When he wrote this letter, Child meant to sail for Massachusetts in the next spring.¹

On February 25, 1644[-5], Emanuel Downing wrote to the younger Winthrop from London: "Dr. Child purposeth to come over with me, and writes by this shipp of all his owne affaires vnto you."² This letter of Child's is extant and is dated March 1 of the same year. He means to sail for New England soon, perhaps by the following ship. He sends five or six sorts of vines, some prune grafts, and various plants and seeds. When he comes over, he will "vndertake a vineyard wth all care and industry," for he is "confident in 3 yeares wine may be made as good as any in France." (These remarks are worth noting in connection with Child's distinguished essay on the Defects of English Husbandry, to which we shall come in due season.) He is glad to hear that "y^e Iron workes doe goe on, and y^t o^r hopes encrease," and reports some changes in the *personnel* of the English adventurers in the project. Money is scarce, but "we are taking care to provide moneys according to yo^r bills." Mr. Leader, whom Winthrop knows well, has been invited to go over as manager.³ In fact, though Child did not know it, owing to absence from London, the bargain with Richard Leader had been struck. He was to serve the company for seven years from March 25 at an annual salary of £100.⁴

Meanwhile the iron works were in progress, though not yet a going concern. Braintree had been selected by the younger Win-

¹ Winthrop Papers, iii. 151-152.

² Winthrop Papers, i. 60. Downing had left Massachusetts again late in 1644 or early in 1645 (id., i. 89), bringing a letter from Winthrop to Child, to which Child's letter of March 1, 1644[-5], is a reply.

³ Winthrop Papers, iii. 153.

⁴ Emanuel Downing (from London) to John Winthrop, Jr., February 25, 1644[-5] (Winthrop Papers, i. 61; cf. i. 62-64, and 2 Massachusetts Historical Proceedings, iii. 190-197).

throp as the most suitable situation,¹ and here, on January 19, 1644, the town of Boston had granted to him and his "partners" three thousand acres of common land "for the encouragement of an iron worke, to be set up about Monotocot River." These were to be laid out "in the Land next adjoining and most convenient for their said Iron works."² This looks as if the site of the works had already been acquired. Another site was procured at Lynn, at a place called Hammersmith, on the Abousett or Saugus River. At which of the two foundries iron was first manufactured is a vexed question, which we may leave to the local antiquaries.³ Both belonged to the same company, however, which received a monopoly from the General Court in March, 1644.⁴ Somewhere and somehow £1000 had been spent by the following November; a furnace had been set up, but the forge and "finery" were not ready.⁵ The management passed from Winthrop to Richard Leader, an expert, in 1645⁶ and from Leader to John Gifford in 1650.⁷

¹ 2 Massachusetts Historical Proceedings, viii. 13-14.

² Town Records (Boston Record Commissioners' Reports, ii. 77; cf. pp. 91-92, 127); Suffolk Deeds, i. 73.

³ Lewis and Newhall, History of Lynn, index, s. v. *iron works*; Pattee, History of Old Braintree and Quincy, pp. 450-472; E. P. Robinson, Essex Institute Historical Collections, xviii. 241-254; N. M. Hawkes, Register of the Lynn Historical Society for 1902, pp. 46-60.

⁴ Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 61-62; Winthrop, ii. 261 (212-213). The Company's privileges were afterwards extended or otherwise modified in their favor (Records, ii. 81-82, 125-128, 185-186).

⁵ Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 81-82.

⁶ On June 4, 1645, nine persons (including Robert Child), adventurers for the iron works, wrote to Winthrop introducing "our agent," Mr. Richard Leader, now sent over (2 Massachusetts Historical Proceedings, viii. 15-16). Emanuel Downing, writing to Winthrop from England on February 25, March 3, and May 5, 1645, has many suggestions as to what compensation Winthrop should receive for his past services (Winthrop Papers, i. 61-64).

⁷ Records and Files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Essex Institute, i. 294. Emanuel Downing wrote from Salem to John Winthrop, Jr., February 24, 1650[-1]: "I suppose you haue heard how Mr. Leddar hath left the Iron works . . . Here is one Jeffries come in Mr. Leddars place" (Winthrop Papers, i. 76). In 1651 Leader was in trouble for "threatening and slandering the courts, magistrates, and government" of Massachusetts, and for "affronting" the constable in the execution of his duty. He made his peace by means of an apology in writing (Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 227-228). There is a good brief sketch of him by Dr. Charles E. Banks in Tuttle and Dean, Captain John Mason (Prince Society, 1887), p. 92 note 180; but it is comical to read that his severing his connection with the iron works before the expiration of his

We need not pursue the annals of this ill-starred speculation, but a few names and dates must be mentioned to make future references intelligible. At first everybody had high hopes, and in May, 1645, the General Court issued a call for Massachusetts subscriptions which reads like a promoter's prospectus.¹ But the concern was under-capitalized and never made any money. Serious trouble began in 1652. Three of the New England owners — Captain Robert Bridges, Henry Webb, and Joshua Foot — were acting as commissioners for the undertakers, and John Beex or Becx was the leading proprietor in London. Neither the Londoners nor the local executive committee were pleased with Gifford's management, and Gifford was dissatisfied with the state of his accounts.² To secure Gifford and two large creditors (Webb himself and Jeremy Howchin), the committee, on May 24, 1653, gave them a mortgage of the whole property, real and personal — houses, lands, wharves, forges, furnaces, tools, fuel, iron, cattle, boats, bills receivable, and "all the seruants Scotts or English."³ A whirlwind of litigation followed, which lasted for several years. Gifford sued the company and the company sued Gifford; countless suits were brought against the company, or Gifford as its agent, by creditors, and some judgments were obtained.⁴ Gifford was for a time in prison for his debt to the

contract was "a change which had its beginning, doubtless, in a lack of sympathy with the religious views of his employers." William Awbrey of London, merchant, was engaged by the adventurers as their agent on August 23, 1650, and soon came to Massachusetts (Suffolk Deeds, i. 216-218). He was acting in this capacity in January, 1651[-2], and for some time thereafter (Suffolk Deeds, i. 178-180, 227, 232). Apparently he coöperated with Gifford. One Mr. Dawes, "a grave man of good fashion," had come over in 1648 "to oversee Mr. Leader," but "they could not agree" and he returned before September 30 (John Winthrop to his son John, August 14 and September 30, 1648, in Savage's Winthrop, 1853, ii. 434-435).

¹ Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 103-104; cf. iii. 31.

² See Beex's letter to the committee, September 28, 1652, and Webb's letters to Beex, November 6 and December 14, 1653; letter from John Beex and Thomas Foley to Josias Winslow and Captain Keayne, December 26, 1654 (Records and Files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, i. 400-401, ii. 75-91).

³ Suffolk Deeds, i. 306.

⁴ Records and Files, i. 284, 286, 289-295, 300, 309-310, 319, 332, 335, 336, 347-348, 372-374, 378, 385-386, 393-394, 398-402, 417, 425-426; ii. 130, 193; Suffolk Deeds, ii. 266, 271-272; iii. 3, 30, 137; Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 351, 369-372, 379, 381, 406; iv. i. 155-156, 188, 194-195, 216-220, 237, 241-244, 251-254, 268, 330-331.

company, but in May, 1656, he was released by the General Court at the request of the Londoners, who had changed their minds about him,¹ and he went home to tell his story, whereupon, on July 16, 1657, eight of the English partners, for themselves and the others, attorneyed to their associate John Beex, and Beex in turn entrusted the whole business to Gifford (August 25), who came back to Massachusetts,² full of fight. In October, 1657, though the works were still in operation both at Braintree and at Hammersmith, the Court declared that they were "not like long to continew," not being properly supported by the London undertakers, and gave privileges to other parties.³ They went on, nevertheless. In 1658 Gifford got a verdict against Webb for defaming him to the London partners and for unjust imprisonment,⁴ and as late as 1662 he was attempting to recover damages from the estate of Keayne (deceased) on a similar complaint.⁵ Soon after the Restoration, the English adventurers were on hand with a petition to the King to right their wrongs, but nothing came of it.⁶ The best summary of the whole matter is Captain Edward Johnson's choice piece of unconscious humor: "Divers persons of good rank and quality in England, were stirred up by the provident hand of the Lord to venture their estates upon an iron work, which they began at *Braintree*, and profited the owners little, but rather wasted their stock."⁷ Child was one of those who wasted their stock: he lost £450, as we shall see presently.

Meantime we may return to Child's letter of March 1, 1644[-5]. A considerable portion is taken up with a learned excursus on black lead, in criticism of an essay that Winthrop had sent him. He advises Winthrop to "dig lustily," and is still quite ready to "bear the fourth part" of the expense, but "Pray let not out too much cost, till you haue more certainty then as yet you haue." Child had been talking the matter over with Emanuel Downing and Winthrop's brother Stephen, both then in England, and he even thinks of "set-

¹ Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 406, iv. i. 268.

² Suffolk Deeds, iii. 155-161.

³ Massachusetts Colony Records, iv. i. 311.

⁴ Records and Files, ii. 71-72, 74-97, 116. Cf. Lords' Journals, xi. 38, 41; Historical Manuscripts Commission, Seventh Report, Appendix, p. 87.

⁵ Records and Files, ii. 389.

⁶ Calendar of State Papers, America and West Indies, 1661-1668, p. 17.

⁷ Wonder-working Providence, 1654, bk. iii. chap. 6, p. 207.

ting himself" where the mine is, if he finds the place agreeable.¹ This might lead one to infer that the mine he had his eye on was that at Nashawake (Lancaster), for in June, 1644, the General Court had granted permission for a plantation there to Robert Child and others.²

"I thanke you," Child continues, "for engaging me in the Lake discovery, and Misticks mines, though as yet we receive no pfit." The mines in question, I suppose, were at Mistick in Connecticut, where Winthrop had discovered iron ore; he had received authority in 1644 "to make a plantation in the . . . Pequott country . . . & also to lay out a convenient place for iron works."³

By the Lake discovery Child means the project formed in 1644 by certain Boston merchants to find the great lake supposed to lie in the northwest region of the Massachusetts patent and to engage in the beaver trade, thought to originate there, "which came to all the eastern and southern parts." At the March court in 1644 this company obtained a monopoly for that purpose for twenty-one years and in May "they set out in a pinnace, . . . which was to sail up Delaware river" as far as possible, whence the expedition was to be continued in skiffs or canoes under the guidance of William Aspinwall; they were stopped by the Dutch and reached Boston, on their return, on July 20.⁴ Darby Field thought he saw this great lake from the White Hills in 1642,⁵ and years before, in 1632, Edward Howes had written with enthusiasm of this body of water, expressing the fear that the Dutch would anticipate the English in exploring it.⁶ Another company for the

¹ Winthrop Papers, iii. 153-155.

² Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 75 (after May 29). Child mentions the Nashaway mine in his Answer to Boot (see p. 112, below).

³ Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 71; Winthrop Papers, i. 517-518. Cf. Winthrop's 1661 will (Waters, Sketch of the Life of John Winthrop the Younger, p. 70).

⁴ Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 60; Winthrop, ii. 193-194 (160-161), 218 219 (178-179), 229 (187). The adventurers were Valentine Hill, Robert Sedgwick, William Tinge, Francis Norton, Thomas Clarke, Joshua Hewes, and William Aspinwall.

⁵ Winthrop, ii. 82 (68).

⁶ See his letter of November 23, 1632 (Winthrop Papers, i. 480-481), and a note in Howes's hand in a copy of Sir Dudley Digges's essay *Of the Circumference of the Earth, or A Treatise of the North-east-passage* (1612) which

Lake discovery received similar privileges at the October Court in 1645.¹

Summer came, and still Child had not sailed for New England, but his departure was imminent, for on June 23, 1645, Hugh Peter wrote from Deal to the elder Winthrop: "D^r Child is come y^t honest man who will bee of exceeding great vse if the Country know how to improue² him, indeed he is very very vsefull, I pray let vs not play tricks with such men by our ielousyes."³ This is a tantalizing passage. By "jealousies" Peter means, of course, *suspicious*. I cannot avoid the inference that Child's high Presbyterianism had attracted the attention of the leading men in the Colony with whom he associated on his former visit, and that some report had reached Peter which made him fear that the Doctor might be looked at askance. His warning words, it seems likely, were penned just before Child embarked and perhaps came over by the same ship. At all events, Child was in New England in the following September, and had been here long enough to strike a bargain with Richard Vines, for, on the 30th of that month, Vines conveyed to Child all his rights under the Saco patent, and in October he gave him livery and seisin.⁴ Whether Child viewed his new possessions at this

Howes sent to Winthrop in 1632 and which is in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society (Winthrop Papers, i. 480 note): see Ford, Massachusetts Historical Proceedings, lii. 278. In a letter of September 3, 1636, Howes asks "What newes of the Lake?" (Winthrop Papers, i. 503).

¹ Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 53-54. The original petition of the adventurers (Richard Saltonstall, Simon Bradstreet, Samuel Symonds, Richard Dummer, William Hubbard, William Hathorne, and William Payne) is in the Massachusetts Archives, cxix. 5.

² I. e., utilize.

³ Winthrop Papers, i. 108.

⁴ James Graham in his report of title, 1688, declares: "I do Also find that . . . Richard Vines by his Certaine Writing under his hand and Seale Bearing Date y^e Last Day of September one thousand Six hundred fourty five did convey and Sell unto Robert Child Phisicion his heires and Assignes all that Parcell of Land on y^e South Side of y^e River Swackadock Alias Saco in the Province of Maine as is Said in the Above Graunt but find No Conveyance from said Child or from any Vnder him" (Documentary History of the State of Maine, iv. 443). For the Vines patent see Documentary History of the State of Maine, vii. 121-125. "I Richard Vines of Saco gen^t haue barganed and Sould the patent aboue Specified vnto Robert Childe Esq^r Doct^o: of phisick and given him livery and seasin. Vpon the [] day of 8^{ber} 1645 in the presence of M^r Addam Winthorpe and Mr Benjamin Gillam" (York Deeds, i. ii. 9; Folsom, History of Saco and Biddeford, 1830, pp. 74, 319). On October 22, 1645, William Aspinwall "attested a Copie" of Vines's deed to Child (Boston Record Commissioners' Reports, xxxii. 10).

time, or whether he had surveyed them on his previous visit, we cannot tell. At any rate, he did visit Saco at least once in his life, now or formerly, as we shall see when we examine his agricultural writings.

From October, 1645, to May, 1646, we hear nothing of Child. Then, however, he emerges — Remonstrance in hand. At the risk of repeating many familiar things, I shall run through the history of the Remonstrance, for all the facts have never been brought together in one place, though the story has been told again and again, sometimes with scant regard to accuracy in detail.¹

The "Remonstrance and humble Petition" of Robert Child, Thomas Burton, John Smith, Thomas Fowle, David Yale, Samuel Maverick, and John Dand was submitted to the General Court, with a request for an immediate answer, on May 19, 1646,² which was near the close of that session, but its consideration was postponed until the autumn.³ Major John Child, the Remonstrant's brother, asserts

¹ The fullest account of the whole affair is that by W. T. R. Marvin in his reprint of *New-Englands Jonas* (Boston, 1869). This is so detailed, and — in the main — so clear and accurate, that my review of the facts may seem a work of supererogation. Still, there are a good many points in which Marvin's narrative needs correction or supplement, and some of them are of much significance. It was impossible to indicate these points and to enforce their bearing on the subject without telling the whole story. Palfrey's treatment of the episode (*History of New England*, book ii, chapter 4) is admirable, especially for the lucidity with which the relations of the Remonstrance to English politics are brought out; but it is not quite full enough for my purpose. Besides, his arguments have been treated so cavalierly by some recent writers that a reopening of the case is at least excusable. Bancroft (*History of the United States*, 19th ed., 1862, chap. x., i. 437-444) is also excellent, but his plan does not call for details. Most or all of the other important accounts are cited in the course of this paper. Winthrop is naturally our chief authority; he is supplemented by John Child's *New-Englands Jonas*, Winslow's *New-Englands Salamander*, and Johnson's *Wonder-working Providence*. Hubbard depends entirely upon Winthrop, but does not always follow him with due care (chap. 55, ed. 1848, pp. 500, 512-518). Hutchinson is of some use, since he apparently had access to documents now lost (see p. 41 note 1, [below]), but he unfortunately confused the Remonstrants with the Hingham petitioners (see p. 25, below) — an error found also in Oldmixon's *British Empire in America* (2d ed., 1741, i. 88-90), in Neal's *History of New-England, 1720*, i. 213-218, and in Chalmers's *Political Annals of the Present United Colonies, 1780*, i. 179-181. From one of these sources it has made its way into Grahame's *History of the Rise and Progress of the United States, 1827*, i. 320-325.

² *New-Englands Jonas*, p. 13.

³ Winthrop, ii. 320-321 (261-262). The Court convened on May 6 (Massa-

(no doubt truthfully) that it was "in a peaceable way presented, only by two of the Subscribers,"¹ implying, it seems, a contrast to the riotous goings-on that had accompanied the presentation of certain petitions to the Long Parliament in recent years. We shall have occasion to examine the contents of this Remonstrance presently.² Meantime, suffice it to say that it painted a dismal picture of the civil and religious condition of Massachusetts, described the inhabitants as poverty-stricken and discontented, accused the magistrates of arbitrary and tyrannical conduct, and foretold the utter ruin of the Colony unless certain thoroughgoing reforms were put into operation immediately. The reforms contemplated may be summed up under three heads: (1) that the fundamental laws of England and "such others as are no wayes repugnant to them" should be forthwith established in Massachusetts; (2) that the rights of freemen should be extended to "all truly English" (whether church-members or not); and (3) that all well-conducted members of the Church of England should be received without further tests or covenants into the New England churches, or else be allowed "to settle [themselves] here in a church way, according to the best reformatations of England and Scotland," that is, of course, on the Presbyterian model. If their prayers were not granted, the Remonstrants declared that they should feel constrained to appeal to Parliament for redress.

This document naturally disturbed the magistrates, coming as it did immediately after the efforts of William Vassall to get up petitions to Parliament against the New England government,³ and

chusetts Colony Records, iii. 61; Winthrop, ii. 316 [258]) and "lasted near three weeks" (Winthrop, *ibid.*).

¹ *New-Englands Jonas*, p. 14.

² The text of the Remonstrance may be found in *New-Englands Jonas*, pp. 6-13, and in the *Hutchinson Papers*, i. 214-223. There is a very brief abstract, summing up the main complaints and demands, in the *Massachusetts Archives*, cvi. 6 (printed by Sumner, *History of East Boston*, pp. 101-102).

³ See Winthrop, ii. 319, 340, 391 (260-261, 278, 321); Winslow, *New-Englands Salamander*, pp. i. 16-18, 23. The history of Vassall's activity is obscure. It is certain, however, that he carried to England certain petitions against the colonial government (one apparently from the Bay and another from Plymouth) by the *Supply*, which sailed from Boston November 9, 1646 (see p. 33, below), and that he had been occupied with these before Child's Remonstrance was pre-

at a time when Gorton and some of his associates had been in England for at least half a year,¹ extending their alliance among the most turbulent sectaries there and pressing their case before the Commissioners for Plantations. Nor was the discomposure lessened by the conduct of the Remonstrants, who, in the interval between the May and the October Court, in 1646, had so industriously circulated their manifesto in the neighboring colonies that, by the end of the year, it had reached "the Dutch Plantation, Virginia, and Bermudas."² Soon after the petition was presented, Winthrop received a letter from Winslow (dated June 30, 1646)³ which shows how serious the Remonstrance looked to the Plymouth Colony. "A 2d thing," writes Winslow, "w^{ch} moved me to put pen to pap is to entreate you to be better preped (at lest to stauē off prejudice against yo^r Govern^t in the Co^mittee of Parliam^t) in regard of the peticoners & many others who are very busie, who not onely threaten us as well as you, but grossly abuse us & insult & boast as if the victory were attayned before the enterprise is begun if I may so say: ffor I confesse I r[ecieve]d a very proud l^r lately w^{ch} makes me feere things are not to begin."⁴ By "better prepared" I suppose Winslow means better prepared than the Bay had shown itself in Gorton's case, in which the malcontents had the advantage in their first application to the English Commissioners.⁵ Before the October meeting of the General Court, the administration had received from the Commissioners for Plantations an order (dated May 15, 1646) which favored the Gortonians and appeared to assert such jurisdiction over the Colony as the magistrates regarded as a violation of their chartered rights, as well as an encouragement of appeals to the home authorities.⁶

On May 15, 1646, the General Court passed a vote recommending a synod of the New England churches,⁷ and it has been thought sented. On Vassall's character, see the defence of him in 1 Massachusetts Historical Proceedings, vi. 471-479.

¹ See p. 44, below.

² Winslow, *New-Englands Salamander*, p. 6.

³ Winthrop Papers, i. 182.

⁴ I. e., "are well advanced."

⁵ See Winthrop, ii. 332 (272).

⁶ Winthrop, ii. 342-344 (280-282).

⁷ Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 154-156; iii. 70-73; Winthrop, ii. 323-324 (264-265).

that their action was influenced by the Remonstrance,¹ but this was not presented until the 19th,² as it happens, and, anyhow, the elders had brought in a bill proposing the synod at the previous session, in October, 1645, several months before the Remonstrance was drawn up.³ However, at the November session in 1646 the Court did adopt two measures which bear some relation to that document. The first of these was the appointment of a committee to "examine" and "compose in good order" the laws already in force and to suggest others — since we wish to "manifest our vtter disaffec̃ōn to arbitrary goūment." True this committee was but to finish a piece of work begun in 1645, but the mention of arbitrary government undoubtedly glances at the Remonstrance. The second measure was a plan to avoid "all complaints by reason of vnæquall rates,"⁴ and this, too, was a point that Child and his associates had made. *Per contra*, a bill enlarging the privileges of non-freemen, which was ready to pass at the May session in 1646, was postponed on account, it seems, of the presentation of the Remonstrance at that time,⁵ but it became a law at the May session in 1647.⁶

The persons whom Child induced to join him as signatories were of various opinions in religion, and doubtless had — most of them — no clear idea of his main design, the chief bond of union among them being dissatisfaction with the dominant party. The colonial authorities made much of this divergence of sentiment. Johnson, who, in his *Wonder-working Providence*, 1654, sides with the magistrates, remarks with some humor, that "the persons were of a Linsiwolsie disposition, some for Prelacy, some for Presbytery, and some for Plebsbytery, but all joynd together in the thing they would, which was to stir up the people to dislike of the present Government."⁷

The colonial authorities were not spoiling for a fight, and "an

¹ Palfrey, *History of New England*, 1860, ii. 170; Marvin, *New-Englands Jonas*, pp. xxvii-xxviii.

² John Child, *New-Englands Jonas*, p. 13.

³ Winthrop, ii. 323 (264).

⁴ Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 109, 128, 157, 196; iii. 26-27, 46-47, 74-75, 84-85, 87-88.

⁵ Winthrop, ii. 321 (262).

⁶ Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 197; iii. 109-110.

⁷ Bk. iii. chap. 3, p. 202.

eminent person"¹ made some attempt to satisfy the Remonstrants in "a private conference," which seems to have taken place in 1646, before the October court came in. We owe our account of the incident to Winslow. The eminent person asked the petitioners "what Church government it was they would have? One of them answered, he desired that particular government which Mr. *John Goodwin* in Colemanstreet² was exercised in. Another of them said, hee knew not what that was: but hee for his part desired the Presbyterian government. A third of them said hee desired the Episcopall government if it might bee, if not, the Presbyterian: And a fourth told mee himselfe that hee disclaimed anything in the Petition that was against the government of the Churches in *New-England*, &c. resting and liking what was there done in that kind."³

No. 1 in this list sounds as if it were John Dand, whom the General Court describes as an "ould grocer of London" with a failing intellect.⁴ Whoever desired the particular government that Mr. Goodwin was exercised in, ought in all conscience to have been content with New England Congregationalism, for Goodwin was one of the leading lights of Independency. He had been sequestered from St.

¹ Perhaps the Governor (Winthrop) or the Deputy Governor (Thomas Dudley).

² This was the famous preacher whose book justifying the trial of Charles I (*Ἵβριστοδίκαι*. The Obstructours of Justice. Or A Defence of the Honourable Sentence passed upon the late King, by the High Court of Justice. London, 1649) had the honor to be burned by the common hangman in 1660 along with Milton's *Defensio pro Populo Anglicano* and *Εἰκονοκλάστης* (Chalmers, Supplemental Apology, 1799, pp. 7-9; Masson, *Life of Milton*, vi. 181-182, 193). He became Vicar of St. Stephen's, Coleman Street, London, December 18, 1633, succeeding John Davenport, who had resigned (*Newcourt, Repertorium*, i. 537; *Hennessy, Novum Repertorium*, p. 385), and he was sequestered May 22, 1645 (*Hennessy*, p. cliv note *u* 1; cf. p. 470), by the Committee for Plundered Ministers (*Freshfield, Some Remarks upon the Book of Records, etc.*, from *Archæologia*, vol. 1. p. 8) but was reinstated by Parliament in 1649 (*Freshfield*, pp. 10-11). Meantime he had been minister of a private congregation, which was now received very hospitably by the vestry: the details of the arrangement are extremely curious (*Freshfield*, pp. 11-12; *W. A. Shaw, History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth*, 1900, ii. 134-136). Neal describes him succinctly as "a learned Divine, and a quick Disputant, but of a peculiar Mould, being a Republican, an Independant, and a thorough Arminian" (*History of the Puritans*, iii. 391, ed. 1736); cf. *Burnet, Own Time*, ed. Airy, 1897, i. 283-284. See also *Baylie, Dissuasive*, 1645, p. 56; *Cotton, The Way of Congregational Churches Cleared*, 1648, pt. i. pp. 23-28.

³ *New-Englands Salamander*, p. 3.

⁴ Declaration, November, 1646 (*Hutchinson Papers*, i. 240).

Stephen's, Coleman Street, in 1645, by the (Presbyterian) Parliamentary Committee "because he refused to baptize the Children of his Parishioners promiscuously, and to administer the Sacrament to his whole Parish,"¹ and was at this moment the minister of an Independent church in London. It was a similar refusal on the part of the Massachusetts churches that the Remonstrants alleged as their great ecclesiastical grievance. Dand, then, was badly mixed in his mind, and a mere statement of his position by Winslow was enough to label him (for every intelligent contemporary) as an almost imbecile Mr. Facing-both-ways.

No. 2 must have been Child himself. No. 3 was assuredly Maverick.² What Maverick wanted it is easy to discover. Having been admitted as a freeman before church-membership was made a prerequisite, he was under no political disabilities, but he did not like the administration, and — not having been in England since the Presbyterian party had borne sway — he may have fondly imagined

¹ Neal, *History of the Puritans*, iii. 391-392 (1736). The New England Independents, the Remonstrants complained, would not admit sober and godly members of the [Presbyterated] Church of England to the Lord's table (or their children to baptism) without their previous assent to the covenant of some local church (Hutchinson Papers, pp. 193-194, Prince Society, i. 220-221). As to baptizing the children of non-church-members (in the New England sense), there was, as a matter of fact, great diversity of practice. This is clearly set forth in the resolutions of the General Court in May, 1646, recommending the Cambridge assembly or synod of 1646 (Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 70-73; cf. Winthrop, ii. 323-324 [264-265], 329-332 [269-271]). As to communion, it seems clear (from a kind of agreement discernible in the gingerly-conducted debate on this point in *Hypocrisie Unmasked*, *New-Englands Jonas*, and *New-Englands Salamander*) that Presbyterians were sometimes allowed to communicate without actually joining a New England church. We should note, further, that to extend the right of communion to all parishioners indiscriminately was no more a principle of Presbyterian than of Congregational discipline. On the contrary, the Presbyterian system required that only such parishioners should communicate as had passed a catechetical test and were also certified by the elders as of moral and godly conduct. This principle, indeed, was regarded as so vital by the Presbyterian clergy in England that, when a parish declined to assent to it, they in many instances refused to administer the sacrament at all. On the whole subject see the excellent discussion in Dr. William A. Shaw's *History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth*, London, 1900, ii. 142-164.

² "A freeman, but no member of any church, and the reason hath beene his professed affection to the hierarchie" (Declaration of the General Court, November, 1646, Hutchinson Papers, i. 239).

that direct Parliamentary control under a General Governor or a board of Commissioners would be less oppressive than the rule of the little commonwealth. He was frankly an Episcopalian, but church matters were not his chief concern: what he desired was to abolish the quasi-independence of the Bay Colony, and with this end in view he was quite ready to join hands with a high Presbyterian like Child, the deadly enemy of prelacy. Neither he nor Child, of course, had the slightest sympathy with general toleration or with liberty of conscience, the two *bêtes noires* alike of Episcopalians and of Presbyterians and of New England Congregationalists.

No. 4 must have been Fowle, whom Brewster doubtless talked with in London. He is described by the General Court as a church-member who "will be no freeman" since "he likes better to be eased of that trouble and charge."¹ Politics, then, were not his object; and, since he liked the Congregational system, he can have had no wish to introduce Presbyterianism for its own sake. In 1645 he had been a petitioner "for y^e abrogacōn or alte^ra^cōn of y^e lawes-ag^{nt} y^e Anabap^{ts}, and y^t lawe y^t requires speciall allowance for new come^rs residing here."² This shows where he stood: he was really and truly an advocate for liberty of conscience or at least for a large toleration. As such, he is the first of his kind that we have so far discovered in the little band, and we may well ask what on earth he was doing *dans cette galère*. John Smith, whom Brewster does not characterize, was doubtless of similar sentiments, for he was a Providence man. At all events, his objects can hardly have been political, since he was not an inhabitant of the Bay.

Thomas Burton and David Yale are likewise omitted in Brewster's catalogue of opinions. They are both compared, in the Declaration of the General Court, to "those who were called by Absalom to

¹ Declaration of November, 1646 (Hutchinson Papers, i. 239). It is he, undoubtedly to whom the same document refers in the following sentence: "These remonstrants are now come to the church doore, when one of theire companie gives them the slipp, not dareing (it seemes) to enter for feare of an admonition" (i. 241). This accords with what Winslow says of his approving the New England church system.

² Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 51; cf. iii. 64. Emanuel Downing was one of the petitioners. Cf. p. 29 note 1, below. The counter-petition of 1646—"that such Lawes or orders as are in force amongst vs against Anabaptists or other erroneous persones . . . may not be abrogated . . . nor any waies weakened"—is in the Massachusetts Archives, x. 210-211.

accompany him to Hebron"¹— an allusion that escaped nobody in those Scripture-reading days: "And with Absalom went two hundred men out of Jerusalem, that were called; and they went in their simplicity, and they knew not anything."²

Of Thomas Burton little is known. He is described by the Court as "a clarke of the prothonotaries office, a sojournour . . . , and of no visible estate in the country, one who hath never appeared formerly in such designe, however he hath been drawne into this."³ The prothonotary was the Chief Clerk of the King's Bench or the Common Pleas in England. Burton had been in the country for not less than six years and his connections were certainly respectable, for he had married Margaret, daughter of John Otis, great-grandfather of the Patriot.⁴ Apparently he was not a church-member, or he would doubtless by this time have been admitted a freeman; besides, his membership would surely have been mentioned in the passage that describes him in the Declaration of the Court. He lived at Hingham, and the baptism of his five daughters is on record there (1641-1649).⁵ Such a record would usually suffice to show that he belonged to the Hingham church, but the pastor of that town, the Rev. Peter Hobart, did not believe in restricting baptism to the children of church-members.⁶ Since Burton had been prothonotary's clerk, he was doubtless a member of the Church of England, and probably, like Mr. Hobart,⁷ he had Presbyterian sentiments. His legal train-

¹ Hutchinson Papers, i. 239-240.

² 2 Samuel, xv. 11.

³ Declaration of the General Court, November session, 1646, Hutchinson Papers, i. 239.

⁴ History of Hingham, ii. 112, iii. 101-102.

⁵ ii. 112.

⁶ "Hee refuseth to baptize no children that are tendred to him (although this liberty stands not upon a Presbyterian bottom)" writes Winslow, *Hypocrisie Unmasked*, p. 100. Major Child thus challenges Winslow: "Dares Mr. *Winslow* say that Mr. *Hubard* was not punished neither directly nor indirectly, for baptizing some children whose parents were not members of their Churches, and that his sharp fines & disgracefull being bound to the good behaviour, had no influence from the baptism of those children?" (*New-Englands Jonas*, p. [22]). Winslow replies: "For answer, I doe and dare affirme in my conscience, that I am firmly perswaded hee was not" (*New-Englands Salamander*, p. 28). If, as it would seem, Burton's children were among those for whose baptism Hobart was blamed, Burton's impulse to join the Remonstrants would have been especially powerful.

⁷ Winthrop, ii. 288 (235); *Hypocrisie Unmasked*, p. 99.

ing, too, must have predisposed him to favor the extension of the laws of England to the Colony. Here, then, for the first time, we have a petitioner whose sentiments accorded almost exactly with those of Robert Child, and, in truth, Burton seems to have acted as the Doctor's right-hand man in the whole case.¹

But Burton probably had another reason for joining in the Remonstrance. The troubles incident to a military election at Hingham were a *cause célèbre* in 1645, and it is quite possible that Burton, like his pastor, was among the eighty-one petitioners who thought themselves harshly treated by the General Court. The Hingham affair was still in hot controversy when Child presented the Remonstrance in May, 1646, for it was on the 18th of March preceding that Mr. Hobart had objected to the validity of the Marshal's warrant, as not being made out in the King's name, had declared that he and the other Hingham petitioners "had sent into *England* unto his Friends the busines, and expected shortly an answer and advice from thence," and had criticized the government for exceeding its powers, alleging that it was "not more then a Corporation in *England*."² These points, or most of them, were also made in Child's Remonstrance, and likewise (it would seem) in Vassall's petition, and the magistrates therefore regarded the Hingham case as closely connected with that of the Child party, and believed that the two groups were not only acting in concert but were also in league with Vassall.³ So convinced were they, indeed, of such an alliance that at the October court in 1646, when they were about to consult the elders about the business of Gorton and Child, Mr. Hobart was accused of having a hand in Vassall's petition, and though he denied all knowledge of it, was required to withdraw from the conference on the ground that he had shown himself opposed to authority and was at that moment under bonds for his good behavior.⁴ In substance, though perhaps not in detail, the magistrates were not far astray in their belief, for among the documents carried by Vassall and Fowle to England in the Supply for use in their campaign in

¹ Winthrop, ii. 367 (302), justifies such an inference.

² From the official Relation (New-Englands Jonas, p. 4); Winthrop, ii. 271-288, 312-313 (221-236, 255-256). Cf. New-Englands Salamander, pp. 4-6, 28.

³ Cf. New-Englands Salamander, p. 5.

⁴ Winthrop, ii. 340 (278-279).

Parliament were copies of the Hingham petition of 1645, of the complaint against Mr. Hobart for his acts and speeches on March 18, 1646, of the verdict against him returned on June 2, 1646, and of his sentence to pay a fine of £20.¹ Nothing was more natural, then, than for Burton's name to appear among the signatures of the Remonstrants. In fact, he showed much energy in their cause, and was particularly zealous in collecting a number of special providences to show that God was against the government, until his efforts were checked by a providence on the other side, as all may read in Winthrop's narrative.² What became of Burton after the final sentence was passed on the Remonstrants in November, 1647, we have no means of knowing, for there is no mention of him between that date and May 13, 1649, when his daughter Sarah was baptized at Hingham, and with that he disappears from the records.³ I suppose he died soon after. His health had suffered a severe shock in 1646.⁴

David Yale, the father of the founder of Yale College, came to this country in Davenport's company with his stepfather, Theophilus Eaton, it appears, in 1637, and was one of the first settlers of New Haven. He was perhaps an inhabitant there in March, 1641, but on June 21 in the same year is described as "now resident in Boston."⁵ Children were born to him and his wife Ursula in Boston, according to the town records, in 1644, 1645, and on January 14, 1651[-2]. Elihu, his second son, was born in New England (probably in Boston) in 1648 or 1649.⁶ On August 23, 1645, David Yale bought of Ed-

¹ New-Englands Jonas, pp. 3-5.

² Winthrop, ii. 367-368 (302).

³ History of Hingham, ii. 112.

⁴ Winthrop, ii. 367 (302). John Otis, Burton's father-in-law, died on May 31, 1657, and in his will, dated May 30, left "to my daughter Margaret Burton and her three children twenty shillings amongst them, a small brasse pot, and a canvass skillet" (History of Hingham, iii. 102).

⁵ New Haven Colony Records, i. 27, 50, 91; F. B. Dexter, Papers of the New Haven Colony Historical Society, iii. 227; Lechford's Note Book, p. 224 (cf. p. 232), in American Antiquarian Society Transactions and Collections, vii. 414 (cf. p. 426); Winthrop, i. 272 (228).

⁶ Boston Record Commissioners' Reports, ix. 17, 20, 33; Du Gard's MS., excerpted in 2 Notes and Queries, ix. 101, and New England Historical and Genealogical Register, xiv. 201; Dexter, as above, iii. 228-232. Cf. Waters, Gleanings, i. 65. On July 17, 1644, Israel Stoughton in his will, drawn up in

ward Bendall a fine estate on Cotton Hill in Boston,¹ but in 1651 he seems to have returned to London,² where he spent the rest of his life, though he visited Boston for a short time in 1659.³ His Boston estate was sold by his attorneys in 1653.⁴ His will is dated July, 1665 (the great Plague Year), but was not proved (by his son Elihu) for thirty-four years.⁵

Nothing in this biography suggests Presbyterianism, and the only visible reason that emerges for Yale's joining the Remonstrants is the fact that, not being a church-member, he was a non-freeman and could not have his children baptized. Perhaps that was reason enough, but I wonder whether Yale's signing was induced by the trial of his mother, the wife of Governor Theophilus Eaton, by the New Haven Church in 1644 for "divers scandalous offences." By toying with Anabaptist doctrines she had come to entertain scruples which interfered with conformity in church practices. Besides, she had struck her mother-in-law, and slandered her stepdaughter, and declared that "Anthony the neager" had bewitched the beer. In short, she was a little insane⁶ and had made her house an uncomfortable place for the family. She received a public admonition, and in 1645 she was excommunicated for contumacy and falsehood.⁷ Her treatment by the church cannot have been pleasing to her son, and he may well have thought some change in the New England system desirable. True, the Presbyterian model, for which Child was so eager, would have handled the case with quite as much severity, but Yale was young, and — so the fathers thought — was as ignorant of what he was about as Absalom's recruits who went to Hebron "in their simplicity."

England, made David Yale one of his overseers (New England Historical and Genealogical Register, iv. 52).

¹ Suffolk Deeds, ii. 47. Cf. our Publications, xx. 264.

² Suffolk Deeds, i. 192.

³ Winthrop Papers, ii. 501.

⁴ Suffolk Deeds, ii. 48.

⁵ Dexter, as above, iii. 231-232.

⁶ Her daughter, the wife of Governor Edward Hopkins, was insane for many years (Waters, Gleanings, p. 64; Winthrop, ii. 265-266 [216-217]).

⁷ The report of the trial, from the Church Records, is in the Papers of the New Haven Colony Historical Society, v. 133-148; cf. Leonard Bacon, Thirteen Historical Discourses, 1839, pp. 296-306; F. B. Dexter, Historical Catalogue of the Members of the First Church in New Haven, 1914, pp. 2-3.

I have dwelt at some length on the extreme diversity of views among the seven Remonstrants, because this has been thought to explode the theory that we are dealing with a Presbyterian movement. The diversity is, at first sight, a little disconcerting to that theory; but a moment's reflection shows that it is equally disconcerting to *any* theory that would strive to explain the united action of this ill-assorted group. Two separate questions are really involved: (1) What did the Remonstrants try to do? and (2) Why did they try to do it?

The first question admits of an immediate and strictly definite reply:—They tried to subvert the Massachusetts government, to bring the Colony under the thumb of a Presbyterian Parliament, to impose the Solemn League and Covenant upon all the inhabitants, and to procure the establishment of the (Presbyterian) Church of England as a state church.

Why did they try to do this? That is not so easily answered. There were seven Remonstrants, and only two of them were Presbyterians, Child and Burton. These two we can understand without difficulty, for they strove to accomplish exactly what they believed in—the extension to Massachusetts of all the blessings of a Presbyterian national church established in a Presbyterian state. They signed the Remonstrance with full comprehension of what it meant and in hearty agreement with all its principles. The other five were united only in desiring to see the autonomy of the Bay overthrown; and to bring this about they consented to sacrifice—Maverick his Episcopal tenets, Dand and Fowle and Smith their Congregationalism, Fowle and Smith their principle of toleration or of liberty of conscience. Maverick, perhaps, knew what he was about, for he was certainly a thorough Royalist at heart, and he may have realized that the King's sole hope lay in the triumph of the Presbyterian party over the Independents. If so, his action is quite intelligible. He was willing to embark with the Presbyterians in order to save the Church and the King, for he could not doubt that the King would throw them overboard, if God gave him strength, as soon as they had served his turn.¹ Thus Maverick, a Presbyterian

¹ Maverick, whatever his wrongs and his virtues, was not always law-abiding. Witness his punishment for "confederacy" with Thomas Owen in the latter's escape from prison in 1641 (Massachusetts Colony Records, i. 335; Winthrop,

for the nonce, ranges with Child and Burton, and three out of our seven are accounted for. The others, Dand and Fowle and Yale and Smith, belonged in the group only by virtue of their discontent with the administration, which was the sole binding element common to all the Remonstrants.¹ The guiding spirit was undoubtedly

ii. 61-62 [51-52]). In that same year he was also thought to be "privey to the flight of one Bell," who had jumped his bail (Maverick to Winthrop, March 1, 1640[-1], Winthrop Papers, ii. 308-309); nor was this the first time that he had been suspected of harboring shady characters (Massachusetts Colony Records, i. 140, cf. i. 159). The administration had another ground of offence against him of very recent date. In 1644 Madame la Tour had got judgment in £2000 damages in a Massachusetts court against Alderman Barclay of London; and in the next year Barclay had attached Thomas Fowle's ship and had brought suit against Stephen Winthrop, Recorder of the court that found for Madame la Tour, and Captain John Weld, one of the jurymen (Winthrop, ii. 244-248 [198-202]; letters of Stephen Winthrop, March 1, 1644[-5], and March 27, 1646, Winthrop Papers, iv. 200, 205). A mainstay of his case was "a certificate of the proceedings of the [Massachusetts] court under the hands of divers persons of good credit here, who although they reported truth for the most part, yet not the whole truth, being somewhat prejudiced in the case." "These persons," adds Winthrop, "were called in question about it after, for the offence was great, and they had been censured for it, if proof could have been had for a legal conviction." Who they were, he does not inform us, but we learn from another source that one of them was Maverick, for Stephen Winthrop writes to his brother John from London, March 1, 1644[-5]: "Major Sedgwick, M^r Rusell, M^r Maverick & Trerise were they y^t did informe ag^t y^e country vnder their hands" (Winthrop Papers, iv. 200). Barclay's efforts were in vain, but he put Fowle, Weld, and Stephen Winthrop to considerable expense, and their petitions to the General Court in 1645 for reimbursement were unavailing (Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 135, iii. 49-50). The original petitions are in the Massachusetts Archives, ii. 489 (Winthrop and Weld), lx. 142 (Fowle). See also Lords' Journals, vii. 352, 366, 400; Historical Manuscripts Commission, Sixth Report, Appendix, pp. 58, 59, 61, 63; 3 Massachusetts Historical Collections, vii. 98-99, 105-106.

¹ Fowle and Yale (and apparently Dand) were merchants and as such were doubtless influenced by the feeling that the severity of the colonial government discouraged immigration and was damaging to trade. Thus their wish for greater freedom in religious matters may have rested in part (by no means discreditably) on a sound commercial basis. If so, they were under a singular misapprehension in supposing that the establishment of a Presbyterian régime would foster liberty. There is plenty of evidence that friends of New England felt that the harshness toward the Anabaptists and other sectaries was bad for the Colony. On March 1, 1644[-5], Stephen Winthrop wrote from London to his brother John: "Heere is great complaint ag^t vs for o^r severetye ag^t Anabaptist. It doth discourag any people from coming to vs for fear they should be banished if they dissent from vs in opinion" (Winthrop Papers, iv. 200). On September 4, [1646,] Hugh Peter wrote to the younger Winthrop: "None will come to you because you persecute" (Winthrop Papers, i. 109), and Coddington

Child, who was the only man of first-rate intellectual qualities in the coterie. The diversity of views, then, by no means disproves the Presbyterian character of the movement.¹ It proves only that, as in all such movements, some are leaders and some are led.

Anyhow, the private reasonings of the "eminent person" with the Remonstrants were of no effect, and the business was taken up again when the General Court assembled on October 7, 1646. A committee was appointed to draw up an answer to Child and his associates, and Edward Winslow was selected to go to England as the agent of the Colony in the Gorton business, as well as in any troubles that might grow out of the Remonstrance. The committee consisted of Winthrop, Thomas Dudley, Richard Bellingham, and Nathaniel Duncan,² the first three of whom had become personal friends of Child when he visited the Colony for the first time.³

In November, 1646, at an adjourned session, which began on the 4th, at 1 P. M.,⁴ the Court tackled *l'affaire Child* in earnest. The Elders were consulted, and gave their opinion of the Remonstrance,

refers to this remark in a letter of November 11, 1646, to the elder Winthrop: "M^r Petters writes in y^t yo^w, sent to yo^r sonn, y^t yo^w p^{ro}secute" (Charles Deane, *Some Notices of Samuel Gorton*, Boston, 1850, p. 41). Again, on May 5, 1647, Peter writes to John Winthrop, Senior: "Ah sweet New England! & yet sweeter if diuisions bee not among you, if you will giue any incouragement to those that are godly and shall differ etc. I pray doe what you can herin, & know that your example swayse here" (Winthrop Papers, i. 111; cf. 1 Massachusetts Historical Proceedings, x. 19). Giles Firmin writes to the elder Winthrop on July 1, 1646, with regard to Hugh Peter: "I could wish hee did not too much countenance the Opinionists, which wee did so cast out in N. England. I know he abhors them in his heart, but hee hath many hang vpon him, being a man of such vse. I hope God will preserue him spottlesse, notwithstanding vile aspersions cast vpon him, but I perceiue it is by the Presbyterians, against whom sometime hee lets dropp a sharp word" (Winthrop Papers, ii. 277). Cotton, in *The Way of Congregational Churches Cleared* (London, 1648), pt. i. p. 22, remarks: "Surely the way which is practised in *New-England* cannot justly be taxed for too much conniuece to all kinde of Sects: wee here doe rather heare ill for too much rigour."

¹ Dr. H. M. Dexter describes the Remonstrants accurately enough as "a little cabal of Presbyterians and others in Massachusetts — undertaking to work with the aid of the very large number who by this time were in the country resident, who were not members of the churches, and so were debarred from the privileges of freemen" (*Congregationalism*, New York, 1880, p. 435).

² Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 162; Winthrop, ii. 346 (283).

³ See p. 8, above.

⁴ Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 79.

but offered no advice as to what judgment should be passed on the petitioners, leaving that question to the Court.¹ Yet it is still the vogue to call the Colony a theocracy! The Answer had been prepared in the interim.² It is an elaborate document, and skilfully drawn, but is too well known to invite comment.³ This was adopted by the Court, not, as Winthrop explains, "by way of answer" to the Remonstrance, because that "was adjudged a contempt," but "in way of declaration of the Court's apprehension thereof," and was afterwards made public⁴ and somewhat widely circulated.

A ship, the Supply,⁵ was about to sail for England, on which Fowle had engaged passage, and Smith, who lived in Providence, was likely soon to return to his home. They were therefore — so the Records inform us — summoned to Court and asked if they "sawe any evill" in the Remonstrance "which they would retract." When they replied that, on the contrary, "they stood to justify y^e same," they were required to give securities in £100 each "to be responsall to y^e judgm^t of y^e Courte," since they might be out of the jurisdiction when the matter came up. Both of them refused and appealed to the Commissioners for Plantations, declaring that they would "engage" themselves to prosecute the appeal. They were taken out of the courtroom, but were called in again after a brief interval and were once more required to give security "to answer y^t matter of y^e petiçõn," but they "refused to answer," and Fowle argued that the Court was not competent to judge them for any alleged offence against itself, as being a party interested;⁶ "therefore they stood to their appeale for competent justice." Accordingly they were committed to the Marshal until they should furnish the security required.⁷ Winthrop affords further details, from which we

¹ Winthrop, ii. 347 (284).

² Winthrop, ii. 346 (284).

³ Hutchinson Papers, i. 223-247. The manuscript is in the Massachusetts Archives, x. 321-337.

⁴ Winthrop, ii. 346 (284).

⁵ New-Englands Jonas, p. 2; Winslow, New-Englands Salamander, p. 3.

⁶ Cf. the language of Henry Gardener, New-Englands Vindication, 1660: "What Law can we have or expect that be of the Church of England, they Independents, so our Antagonists, incompetent Judges, being parties in action, and opposite in Religion [?]" (pp. 6-7; p. 36, ed. Banks, Gorges Society).

⁷ Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 88-89 (session of November 4, 1646).

learn that Fowle and Smith complained that the other Remonstrants had not also been sent for. Thereupon these were summoned, and all, except Maverick, appeared. Probably the Marshal had failed to find him, since there is no evidence that he attempted to escape, and since his absence was not counted against him later.¹ Child, "being the chief speaker," demanded to know what they were accused of, and was informed that "their charge" was not yet ready, but should be forthcoming in due season, and that the present business had to do only with the question of securities for Fowle and Smith. The Doctor again asked "what offence they had committed, for which they should find sureties," and he was accommodated by the reading of one particularly offensive clause in the Remonstrance. He took a high tone — being young and ardent, and manifestly feeling some scorn for this picayune Parliament — and replied that he and his associates had acted beneath their dignity in petitioning the Court in the first place, whereupon he appealed to the Commissioners. The Governor refused to admit any appeal, as being contrary to the Charter, and "the Court let them know that they did take notice of their contemptuous speeches and behavior, as should further appear in due time." All were then dismissed, with an injunction to appear when summoned, except Smith and Fowle, who had been "committed to the Marshal," as we have already seen, but they soon found sureties, and were released before nightfall.² Though Child's appearance on this occasion is not mentioned in the record, we may be confident that Winthrop is accurate,³ for the *appeal before sentence* was later in this same session made an especial ground of accusation against him and all the other Remonstrants except Maverick.

There is an important remark of Winthrop in a letter to his eldest son (November 16, 1646), which seems to have been overlooked by investigators of these events. He writes: "I had thought we should

The exact date cannot be determined, but it was between November 4, when the Court came in, and November 9, when the Supply sailed.

¹ See p. 38, below.

² Winthrop, ii. 347-348 (284-285); cf. *New-Englands Salamander*, p. 12.

³ It will be noted that the Record testifies that there was an intermission in the hearing or examination of Smith and Fowle. Doubtless it was caused by the time it took to summon Child and the others.

onely haue declared o^r apprehensions concerning the Petition,¹ wthout questioning the Petitioners but, the Dep^ty^es called vpon it, whereupon m^r Fowle was forced to putt in bond to ans^r, &c, & the rest being called, did p^resently appeale to the Parl^t, etc.: so as we are like to proceed to some Censure for their appeal, if not for the Petition."² This shows that the magistrates had not planned to bring the Remonstrants to the bar, but that the Deputies were determined to have them appear. Their bearing when summoned, and the momentous questions raised by their appeal, made "censure" (that is, the passing of some judgment) inevitable.

Soon after this hearing, Fowle went to England in the Supply, as he had intended, and he seems never to have returned to America. The ship sailed on November 9, 1646.³ The passenger list⁴ included Richard Sadler, Captain Thomas Harding, John Leverett, Herbert Pelham,—who, at his own request, was relieved of the duty of serving as agent of the Colony in association with Winslow,⁵—William Vassall,—whom Winslow regards as the chief fomenter of the whole trouble and the constant adviser of the Remonstrants,—Captain William Sayles (late Governor of Bermuda) and William Golding (a minister in that colony), who were charged with the mission of pleading the cause of the Independent churches of the islands with the Bermuda Company, and, if necessary, with Parliament.⁶ The voyage was tempestuous and full of peril; but, after an almost

¹ The allusion is to the Declaration of the General Court, session of November 4, 1646 (see p. 31, above).

² John Winthrop to John Winthrop, Jr., November 16, 1646, printed in the Appendix to Savage's Winthrop, ii. 430.

³ John Winthrop to John Winthrop, Jr., May 14, 1647: "Captain Harding arrived at Bristol 19 (10). They went from here 9 (9), and had a very tempestuous voyage, and were carried among the rocks at Seilly, where never ship came" (Savage's Winthrop, ii. 432). Cf. Winslow, *New-Englands Salamander*, pp. 4, 19.

⁴ Winslow is our authority for the names that follow (*New-Englands Salamander*, pp. 17, 18, 20).

⁵ Winthrop Papers, ii. 138-139. The petition of Herbert Pelham and Richard Saltonstall (who also wished to be relieved of this duty) is dated November 17, 1646, and must have been presented to the court by the latter, since Pelham sailed on the 9th. Yet it is all in Pelham's hand (date included) except Saltonstall's signature. For Saltonstall's appointment (1645), see Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 48.

⁶ See the Rev. Patrick Copland's letter to John Winthrop, September 30, 1647 (Winthrop Papers, iii. 351).

miraculous escape from shipwreck on the Scilly rocks, the Supply reached Bristol on December 19, 1646.¹

A number of documents that concern us went over on the Supply, and their presence occasioned a characteristic incident on the voyage. A few days before the ship set sail, Mr. Cotton of Boston, in his Thursday lecture (November 5, 1646) had mentioned the imminent departure of the Supply and of another vessel that was soon to follow. "If there bee any amongst you my brethren," he had said, "as 't is reported there are, that have a Petition to prefer to the High Court of Parliament . . . that may conduce to the distraction, annoyance and disturbance of the peace of our Churches and weakning the Government of the land where wee live, let such know, the Lord will never suffer them to prosper in their subtill, malicious and desperate undertakings against his people." He declined to advise the passengers, "when the terrors of the Almighty shall beset the Vessell wherein they are, the Heavens shall frowne upon them, the billowes of the Sea shall swell above them, and dangers shall threaten them, (as I perswade my selfe they will)," to "take such a person," as the sailors in the Bible took Jonah, "and cast him into the Sea; God forbid: but," he continued, "I would advise such to come to a resolution in themselves to desist from such enterprises, never further to ingage in them, and to cast such a Petition into the Sea that may occasion so much trouble and disturbance."² The Rev. Thomas Peters (Hugh's brother) was so much stirred by this appeal, that, "having shipped his goods and bedding to have gone in the Ship with them, amongst other arguments this was the maine, that he feared to goe in their company that had such designes, and therefore tooke passage to goe rather by way of *Spaine*."³

¹ Winthrop's letter (p. 33 note 3 above); *New Englands Salamander*, pp. 4, 18-20 (cf. *New-Englands Jonas*, pp. [18-19]). Cf. Copland to Winthrop, September 30, 1647: "Our friends [Sayles and Golding] write they had a miserable voyage from you to old England, but at last they safely arrived at their native Country;" he is giving news contained in their letters of March 15, 1647 (*Winthrop Papers*, iii. 351-352).

² *New-Englands Salamander*, pp. 14-17. The petition was Vassall's.

³ So he told Winslow in London, with permission to print the fact in his *New-Englands Salamander* (p. 18). John Winthrop, in a letter to John Winthrop, Jr., November 16, 1646, says that "M^r Peters is resolved to goe by Malago, wth Cap^t Hawkins" (*Savage's Winthrop*, 2d ed., Appendix, ii. 430). This ship "loosed frō Nantasket" on December 19, 1646, and arrived at Malaga on January 19,

Storms did, indeed, descend upon the ship; the passengers remembered Mr. Cotton's warning, and Fowle, in the midst of the tempest, when two hundred leagues short of Land's End, in compliance with the request of "a godly & discreet woman," took a copy of the Remonstrance out of his trunk and gave it to her, and "referred it to the discretion of others to doe withall as they should see good." This was after midnight, when all were "wearied out and tired in their spirits." The woman showed the paper to Richard Sadler and others. They saw at once that "it was not the right Petition," that is, not Vassall's petition to Parliament, but "because they judged it also to bee very bad, having often seene it in New England, but never liked the same, cut it in peeces as they thought it deserved, and gave the said peeces to a seaman who cast them into the sea." Next day the wind abated, but they had divers storms afterward. In short, Winslow tells us, it was "the terriblest passage that ever I heard on for extremitie of weather, the mariners not able to take an observation of sunne or star in seven hundred leagues sailing or thereabouts."¹ This incident suggested the title for Major John Child's *New-Englands Jonas Cast up at London*, to which we shall recur. Though one copy of the Remonstrance had thus gone overboard, there was another in the ship, and Vassall had with him his own petitions to Parliament.² These, however, must be sharply distinguished from Child's appeal. It does not appear that this appeal was carried to England on the *Supply*, though that is possible. It was Child's intention, as we shall see in a moment, to go to England in a few days, and to bring the matter to the attention of Parliament himself. Fowle's copy of the Remonstrance, as well as certain other pertinent documents, — such as transcripts of the Hingham petition and the proceedings against the Rev. Peter Hobart, the Capital Laws of Massachusetts, and the Freeman's Oath, all of

1647 (Thomas Peters to Governor Winthrop, from Malaga Road, February 17, 1646[-7], Winthrop Papers, ii. 428). Peters was in London as early as April 27, 1647 (ii. 431).

¹ I have followed Winslow's account of this Jonah incident, which is based on inquiries made among the passengers — particularly on information¹ furnished by Captains Sayles, Leverett, and Harding, and Mr. Richard Sadler. The account in *New-Englands Jonas* does not differ in any essential respect, but is less careful and less circumstantial.

² See Winthrop, ii. 340, 391 (279, 321).

which (and other papers unspecified) were taken over in the Supply,¹ — was obviously intended to be used either in support of Vassall's petitions, or in influencing public opinion in preparation for Child's arrival, or in both ways. Nothing of any consequence, however, was done by Fowle or Vassall in England until after the arrival of Winslow, which took place in January, 1647.

But we must return to the proceedings of the November Court of 1646. At that session, the 24th of December was set apart for a day of humiliation "wth respect to y^e hazordous estate of our native country, y^e trowbles thereof, y^e sad condiçõn of y^e church at Barmuda,² & y^e weighty cases in respect of our churches & cõmonwealth, wth reference to any that seeke to vnde^rmyne ye libe^tyes of Gods people here in either or both."³ This was particularly directed against the Remonstrants, and was so understood; and therefore Mr. Peter Hobart, "the pastor at Hingham, and others of his church (being of their party) made light of it, and some said they would not fast against Dr. Child and against themselves."⁴ Hobart, Winthrop asserts, was "of a Presbyterial spirit," that is, he was disposed to "manage all affairs without the church's advice," contrary to the Congregational principle.⁵

¹ New-Englands Jonas, p. [19].

² See Lefroy, Bermudas, i. 569-587, 594-595, 600-633, 711-713; Winthrop, ii. 408-409 (334-336); Sibley, Harvard Graduates, i. 137-140; Winthrop Papers, iii. 340-342, 350-354; unpublished letter of the Rev. Patrick Copland to Winthrop, August 25, 1646, Davis Papers, fol. 7 (Massachusetts Historical Society, O. 12, 3); Colonial Society Publications, xiii. 53-55; A declaration of the Right Honourable Robert, Earle of Warwick, . . . Governour of the Company of London for the Plantation of the Summer Islands; And of the said Company: To the Colony and Plantation there. October 23, 1644 (Harvard College Library). What might have happened in Massachusetts, had Child's conspiracy not been frustrated, Winthrop was able to read in the Bermuda case in a letter from William Rener (March 31, 1647) which he may have received before Child was sentenced: "The Hon^rl^l Companye in London for o^r Ilands, hath sent a newe Gouvernor. At his Arriuall called an Assemblye, and by multiplicitey of vote chose suche Burgesses as serued for the ende p^tended, the greatest p^te of the Councell were independants (as they call them) but by this Assemblye to be caste of, *ipso facto*; haueinge not else against them; Our Elders not suffered to teache the worde, nor anye of that (soc called) independant waye to beare anye office in Cõmonwealthe" (Winthrop Papers, iii. 340).

³ Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 86.

⁴ Winthrop, ii. 372 (305).

⁵ Winthrop, ii. 288 (235). Cf. Hypocrisie Unmasked, p. 99.

About the middle of November, or a little later — near the end of the session, at all events, — all the Remonstrants (except Fowle¹) were summoned and “in the open court, before a great assembly” they heard their petition read and listened to the charge against them, which a committee had prepared in the interval. They were accused, (1) on the basis of various expressions in the Remonstrance, of defaming the government and slandering the churches, with attempting to weaken the authority of the laws and fomenting sedition, and (2) on the basis of their behavior when previously summoned, with “publicly declaring their disaffection” to the government in that they refused to answer, and “disclaiming its jurisdiction” by appealing “before they knew whether the Court would give any sentence against them or not.” The charges were distributed under twelve heads.² The defendants asked time to compose an answer, which they presented in writing later in the same day, probably in the afternoon, the Court reassembling and the attendance of the people still being large. This, as was to be expected, was part defence, part excuse, and part denial, and “the court replied” to it clause by clause “extempore,” as it was read.³ The appeal, which, as we have seen, was brought to their charge as an offence quite distinct from their contempt and the seditious character of the Remonstrance, they justified⁴ as their right; but they did not answer the important point raised in the Charge — namely, that they had appealed before sentence, and in such terms as to deny the jurisdiction of the Court. This point the presiding officer did not neglect to emphasize in replying to the defendants’ answer.⁵ Whatever may be thought of the case of the Remonstrants, nobody who has read the documents can hold that they improved it materially by their rejoinder. They were found guilty and sentenced — Child to a fine of £50, Smith to £40, Maverick to £10, and the rest to £30 each; but were informed that “an ingenuous & publicke

¹ The Record says expressly that Fowle was “at sea” when judgment was passed (iii. 94).

² Winthrop, ii. 348-350 (285-287); Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 90-91.

³ Winthrop, ii. 350-355 (287-291).

⁴ Winthrop’s words (ii. 354 [290]), “they make an apology for their appeal,” must not be misconstrued: *apology* is used in its original meaning, “defence.”

⁵ Winthrop, ii. 354 (290).

acknowledgmen^t of their misdemean^{ors}" would be "accepted as satisfacti^on for their offences, & their fines not taken." They rejected this offer, and the Court declared their sentence.¹ "Three of the magistrates, viz., Mr. Bellingham, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Bradstreet, dissented, and desired to be entered contradicentes in all the proceedings (only Mr. Bradstreet went home before the sentence),"² and five of the Deputies were also recorded as *contradictentes*, two of whom had been leaders in the Hingham disturbances.³ The smallness of Maverick's fine was due to his not having appealed in November.⁴ Child's sentence runs as follows: "Docto^r Childe, as being guilty not only of his offence in the matter of appeale & remonstrance, but also in chardging y^e Cou^rte wth breaches of p^riviledges of Parliament, & contemptuous speeches & behaviou^r towards them, is fined ffifty pounds."⁵ This refers to his demeanor at the November hearing, for there is no indication that he misbehaved at the actual trial. After sentence they all appealed again.²

The trial seems to have occupied one day, and the sentence was almost the closing act of the session.⁶ The exact date cannot be determined, since all the proceedings of the session that began on November 4, 1656, are recorded under that single date, but it was certainly later than the 16th,⁷ and probably several days later.

The sentence, we observe, says nothing about imprisonment or about security for payment.⁸ This silence is significant. The culprits were set at liberty, as the course of events proves, but they were liable to arrest at any time for their unpaid fines.⁹ The object

¹ Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 94; Winthrop, ii. 355-356 (291-292).

² Winthrop, ii. 356 (292).

³ Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 94 (Richard Russell, Henry Bartholmew, Bozon Allen, Joshua Hubbard, Edward Carleton). Allen and Hubbard (Hobart) were the Hingham men, and the latter was the minister's brother.

⁴ *Ibid.*; Winthrop, ii. 355 (291).

⁵ Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 94.

⁶ This may be inferred not only from its place in the record, but also from the words of Winthrop, ii. 356 (292): "So the court was dissolved."

⁷ On November 16, 1646, John Winthrop wrote to his son John, respecting the Remonstrants: "We are like to proceed to some Censure [i. e., judgment] for their appeal, if not for the Petition" (letter in Savage's Winthrop, ii. 430).

⁸ Contrast the language of the sentence imposed in May, 1647, when it was expressly provided that the defendants should be imprisoned until their fines were paid or security given (Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 113).

⁹ Winslow says: "Though they were fined, yet the fines were not levied"

of this apparent leniency seems obvious, — to give the offenders plenty of rope. The magistrates suspected a Presbyterian conspiracy against the Charter and the Independent churches, and they kept a sharp eye on Child and his associates.

Child, even before the trial, seems to have had the intention of paying a visit to England in the autumn,¹ and this purpose must have been well-known to the leading men in the Colony, with whom he had until recently been on friendly terms. After the trial, he made haste to get ready to go in a ship which was to sail in about a week,² and he seems to have talked incautiously about what he expected to accomplish by prosecuting his appeal. The evening before his departure, the Council (Bellingham dissenting) decided "to stay the Doctor for his fine, and to search his trunk and Mr. Dand's study," whereupon, as Winthrop tells us, "we sent the officers presently to fetch the Doctor, and to search his study and Dand's both at one instant." The officers brought Child, and his trunk, which contained nothing contraband, "but at Dand's they found Mr. Smith" and also certain papers — some of them in Child's handwriting³ — which deserved all the attention that the fathers of the Colony gave them.

The fact is, Winthrop and his associates had been too clever for Dr. Child. They had given him every opportunity, since his trial, to prepare such documents as he thought would be most effective in England, knowing full well that he would (if liberty of action were allowed him) get these ready before he sailed, in order to fortify them

(*New-Englands Salamander*, p. 2). Child's letter to John Winthrop, Jr., May 14, 1647, shows that none of the fines had been paid at that date: "I am in some measure straightened for things necessary, esp. if o^r fines be demaunded" (Winthrop Papers, iii. 158).

¹ He writes to John Winthrop, Jr., May 14, 1647: "I neglected to write to my freinds for a supply [of money] this yeare, because my Intentions were for England" (Winthrop Papers, iii. 157-158).

² Winthrop, ii. 356 (292). I suppose this was Major Nehemiah Bourne's ship, which, on November 16, 1646, was expected to be ready to sail within "this 14 dayes" (John Winthrop to John Winthrop, Jr., in the Appendix to Savage's Winthrop, 2d ed., ii. 430). Marvin says inadvertently that Child "was hastily preparing to return to England with Vassal and Fowle" (*New-Englands Jonas*, Introduction, p. xxxix).

³ Winthrop, ii. 356-357 (292-293). Winthrop, ii. 358 (294), says that "the writings" were in Child's hand. Winslow says that one of the "Coppies" was in Child's hand, another in Dand's (*New-Englands Salamander*, p. 13). A

with signatures. This was manifestly their object in postponing his arrest to the eve of sailing. Indeed, their original purpose had been to wait until he had actually embarked: why, Winthrop does not tell us, because he supposes we shall be shrewd enough to infer that any documents seized on shipboard would be not only the last results of the Doctor's activities but would also, from the circumstances of their seizure, require no proof that they were intended for use in the mother country. I should be ashamed to make so obvious a suggestion, were it not that an eminent New Englander has interpreted the action of the vigilant guardians of our independence in quite another fashion. "One striking characteristic of the theocracy," writes Mr. Brooks Adams, "was its love for inflicting mental suffering upon its victims. The same malicious vindictiveness which sent Morton to sea in sight of his blazing home, and which imprisoned Anne Hutchinson in the house of her bitterest enemy, now suggested a scheme for making Childe endure the pangs of disappointment, by allowing him to embark, and then seizing him as the ship was setting sail."¹

The papers thus impounded were three in number. There was a petition to the Commissioners for Plantations from some twenty-five "non-freemen" calling for liberty of conscience and for a general governor. This was of no great consequence. Far more significant was another petition, signed by the original Remonstrants, in which, after reciting the harsh treatment they had received, they ask not only for "settled churches according to the reformation of England," — that is, the Presbyterian reformation, — and for the appointment of a "general governor" or commissioners to regulate the Colony, but for the imposition of "the oath of allegiance and such other covenants" as the Parliament may decide on to test the sentiments of the colonists "to the state of England and true restored Protestant religion," i. e., of course, the Presbyterian system. This clause, we note, calls for the imposition of the Covenant on the whole Colony! The petition also asked for judgment on the Remonstrance and for answers to certain queries. These, which made up the third document, were openly revolutionary. They concerned,

document in the Massachusetts Archives, evi. 6 a (printed below, p. 55), says that "the foule draughts both of Petition & Queris are like his [Child's] hand."

¹ *Emancipation of Massachusetts*, Boston, 1887 [really 1886], p. 92.

amongst other things, the validity of the charter, inquiring "how it might be forfeited, and whether such and such acts or speeches in the pulpits or in the courts were not high treason."¹ The revolutionary nature of the seized documents admits of no question. William Pynchon, on March 9, 1646[-7], wrote from Springfield to Winthrop, on the receipt of certain "extracts," which he sent on (as requested) to Edward Hopkins: "I cannot but be much affected with that malignant spirit that breathes out in their endeours, be[cause] by their manner of proceedinge (though they pretend honest reformation, yet) it seemes to me they would destroy both Church & Co[m]monwealth: in laboring for a generall Governor, & in charging treason by Conniue[n]ce vpon y^e Court."²

Child, on being brought before the Governor and Council, "fell into a great passion, and gave big words, but being told, that they considered he was a person of quality, and therefore he should be used with such respect as was meet to be showed to a gentleman and a scholar, but if he would behave himself no better, he should be committed to the common prison and clapped in irons, — upon this he grew more calm; so he was committed to the marshal, with Smith and Dand, for two or three days, till the ships were gone." He was "very much troubled to be hindered from his voyage, and offered to pay his fine," but the authorities refused to accept this as sufficient to discharge him, since they "now had new matter and worse against him."³ He was bound over to the next Court of Assistants. He was not imprisoned, however, but was allowed to lodge at the house of his friend Richard Leader, manager of the iron works, on giving bond in £800 (with three sureties) not to leave the town limits.⁴

¹ Winthrop, ii. 357-358 (293). Hutchinson (2d ed., 1765, i. 147-149), gives the fullest account of the contents of the seized documents, but he speaks of only one petition, a portion of which was the request for the answers to certain queries. Winthrop, ii. 359 (295), says that the "petitions and queries intended for England" are in the records of "that court," but they are not now to be found there nor have the originals been discovered.

² Winthrop Papers, i. 381. Pynchon goes on to suggest certain measures which the Colony may well take to obviate criticisms made by the Remonstrants.

³ Winthrop, ii. 358 (294).

⁴ So I understand the combined testimony of Child's letter to the younger Winthrop, March 15, 1646[-7] (Winthrop Papers, iii. 156), and of New-Englands Jonas, p. [22]. Winthrop, ii. 358 (294), says merely: "Yet, upon tender of sufficient bail, he was set at liberty, but confined to his house, and to appear at the next court of assistants."

Smith and Dand, refusing to be examined, were not bailed, but committed to prison, "yet lodged in the keeper's house," with liberty to receive visits from their friends.¹

At the Court of Assistants, in March, 1647, the whole matter was referred to the next General Court, partly because that Court had dealt with the former case (that of the Remonstrance itself), and partly because the new grounds of complaint against the defendants were so momentous, concerning "the very life and foundation of our government." Smith and Dand were released on bail, after giving security to pay within two months the fine imposed on each of them in the preceding November. Maverick, who had been fined only £10 on that occasion, had exerted himself in the interim to get signatures to the petition to the Commissioners — the same of which a copy was found in Dand's study. He was therefore summoned to the Court of Assistants, charged with this offence (which, in the view of the Court, involved a breach of his Freeman's Oath), and likewise bound over to the General Court. "Mr. Clerk," of Salem, a freeman and a church member, was also summoned and bound over for the same reason: — he had not signed the original Remonstrance, but "had been very active about the petition to the commissioners in procuring hands to it." Dr. Child, regarded as the chief offender, "was offered his liberty, upon bail to the general court, and to be confined to Boston; but he chose rather to go to prison, and so he was committed."²

We are now in a position to understand Child's letter of March 15, 1646[-7], written from Boston to John Winthrop, Jr., "at Pequat River," immediately after this action of the Assistants:

I should willingly haue come along wth yo^r man, but yo^r father (I thanke him) hath bin y^e especiall occasion of my stoppage here and imprisonm^t, for now I am at Mallins house, chusing rather to abide there, than to Accept of his p^tended Courtesy of Confinem^t to Boston necke, vnder 3 suretys & 800^t bond, w^{ch} Confinem^t I haue patiently endured this 3 months. Imprisonm^t I must expect as long³ viz to y^e General Court, or till y^e Parliam^t relieue me: y^e busines you know, namely y^e petition & remonstrance, for y^e w^{ch} I was fined 50^t, Mr. Smith, 40^t, Mr. Yale 30^t.

¹ Winthrop, ii. 358-359 (294-295); cf. *New Englands Salamander*, p. 13.

² Winthrop, ii. 367 (301).

³ I. e., three months more (in reality, about two months).

He asks payment of £40 which he had lent Winthrop, for "this fine & other businesses may cause me to want moneys."¹ "Mallins," I suppose, was George Munnings, keeper of the Boston prison.² Child, like Smith and Dand, was obviously lodged in the keeper's house,³ not in the prison itself.

Here we must pause to draw an obvious distinction, which has sometimes been overlooked or ignored. The authorities had two separate cases against Child: (1) that which grew directly out of the Remonstrance itself and his conduct when summoned to answer to it, and (2) that concerning the papers found in Dand's study. The first was finished at the November Court in 1646 by the imposition of a fine of £50, which still hung over his head, being unpaid; the second, which involved a conspiracy to subvert the government, was now pending and was to be tried at the spring session of the General Court in 1647. It was the fact that the fine of £50 had not been paid which gave the Council a valid ground for arresting Child in November, 1646, when he was about to sail for England, and doubtless (as already suggested) the neglect to exact payment and the liberty of a week or more accorded to the Doctor before the date of his intended sailing (in November, 1646) had been a piece of policy on the part of the magistrates, who, suspecting a conspiracy against the government, wished to give the plotters every opportunity to take such measures and prepare such documents as should make their ultimate purposes clear.

The Court of Elections was held on May 26, 1647. Winthrop was chosen Governor by a plurality of two or three hundred, and the only new magistrate elected was Captain Robert Bridges. Yet there had been "great laboring" by "the friends of the petitioners to have one chosen governor who favored their cause, and some new magistrates to have been chosen of their side."⁴ Only a few days before, Child was still looking for good news from England. "I hope," he

¹ Winthrop Papers, iii. 156. I infer from this letter that Child had for three months been under bonds not to leave the town limits, and that he refused to renew his bond and went to prison.

² See Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 148.

³ Our associate Mr. Samuel C. Clough states that this house was on the westerly side of the prison land, fronting Court Street, now covered in part by the annex to the City Hall.

⁴ Winthrop, ii. 374-375 (307).

wrote to John Winthrop, Jr., on May 14, "when we heare from England to be comāunded from hence, to prosecute o^r Appeale before y^e Parliam^t & y^t o^r Cause may be heard before indifferent Arbiters, till w^{ch} time I suppose I shall remayne in my ould Lodging in y^e prison."¹ But no such summons arrived, for Winslow had been busy in the interim.

Before Winslow sailed for England, Gorton with his two associates, John Greene and Randall Holden, had accomplished much. They had left Rhode Island about the middle of August, 1645, had arrived in England (it seems) toward the end of the year,² had presented their case to the Commissioners for Plantations, and on May 15, 1646, had procured two orders for reinstatement in their Narragansett lands.³ Holden, arriving at Boston on September 13, had presented the first of these orders, which served him as a passport through the Massachusetts jurisdiction, and the other had been sent over by the Commissioners and had reached the hands of the magistrates.⁴ Winslow's mission in England was to reopen the Gorton case, as the agent of the Bay, and incidentally to bring the Child affair to the attention of the Commissioners, or to oppose the efforts of the Remonstrants if they had got the start of him. Gorton had not returned to America with Holden. He doubtless expected some further move on the part of the Massachusetts Court, and he remained in England to fortify his case. His famous book, *Sim-*

¹ Winthrop Papers, iii. 157.

² Gorton and his comrades left Rhode Island for "the Dutch plantation" about the middle of August, 1645; there they "lay long," waiting for a ship, then sailed to Holland, where they "lay long" again before they could get passage for England. These details (but not the date) come from the letter of August 22, 1661, from the inhabitants of Warwick to the General Court of Massachusetts (Rhode Island Historical Society Collections, ii. 228). The best criterion for the date of Gorton's departure from Rhode Island is the letter of J[ohn]. W[arner], November 20, 1645, printed in *Simplicities Defence*, pp. 93-94. In telling Gorton the news from America, Warner begins by informing him that the Bay authorities had provided an army against the Narragansetts, but that, upon Captain Harding's warning them of the difficulty of the enterprise, they had sent Harding and Wylbour to deal with the savages, associating with them Benedict Arnold as interpreter. Now these events took place in August, 1645 (Plymouth Colony Records, ix. 32 ff, ii. 90), and the commission of Harding, "Welborne," and Arnold is dated August 18 (ix. 41-42).

³ Winthrop gives both orders in full, ii. 333, 342-344 (272-273, 280-282); see also Rhode Island Colonial Records, i. 367-369.

⁴ Winthrop, ii. 333-334, 342 (273, 280).

plicities Defence against Seven-headed Policy, addressed to the Commissioners, was licensed on August 3, 1646, and published as early as November 7th.¹

Winslow sailed from Boston about the middle of December,² and "had a comfortable passage and landfall," so that he must have reached London in January, 1647. He did not get a hearing before the Commissioners until sometime between May 5 and July 22.³ Meanwhile, his facile pen was kept busy. Gorton's *Simplicities Defence* was waiting for him on the bookstalls, and he dashed off a reply, *Hypocrisie Unmasked*, also addressed to the Commissioners, which was issued between February 22 and March 25.⁴ This was answered in its turn by Major John Child, in his *New-Englands Jonas*, which was also written (at least in part) before the latter date,⁵ though not published until after the legal new-year, as its

¹ "Imprimatur August 3, 1646." Thomason bought his copy on November 7 (Thomason Catalogue, i. 473).

² *New-Englands Salamander*, p. 20; Winthrop, ii. 387 (317). Secombe (Dictionary of National Biography, lxii. 202) says that "Winslow sailed from Boston in October 1646," apparently following Jacob B. Moore's statement ("about the middle of October") in his *Memoirs of American Governors*, i. 123. Moore was no doubt misled by Winthrop's "10ber", thinking that he should count January as the first month instead of March. The error would not deserve a word if it had not passed from Secombe into a note in the fine edition of Bradford published by the Massachusetts Historical Society, ii. 394 note 1.

³ On May 5, 1647, Herbert Pelham wrote from London to Winthrop: "For the Busines of the Countrie yow will be more fully informed by my Cosen Winslow, who takes great payns, but as yet can not come to a hearing" (Winthrop Papers, ii. 140). On the same day Hugh Peter wrote to Winthrop: "Appeales will hardly bee ouerthrowne nor doe I mynd it much as a thing you should bee troubled about" (Winthrop Papers, i. 111). Cf. p. 64, below.

⁴ The date in the title-page, 1646, proves that the book was printed before March 25, 1647, and it was certainly written after Winthrop's arrival, which must have taken place in January. It was entered in the Stationers' Register on February 22, 1646[-7] (Stationers' Register, 1640-1708, Roxburghe Club, i. 263). Winslow himself dates it (p. 77) "not much above two moneths" after his departure from New England. Thomason dated it October 2 (Thomason Catalogue, i. 467), which is manifestly wrong, for Winslow did not leave New England until about the middle of December, and he states expressly that he first saw Gorton's book in England: "When I came over, I found that Gorton had enlarged his complaint by publishing a booke called *Simplicities defence against Seven-headed Policy*" (*New-Englands Salamander*, p. 22; cf. *Hypocrisie Unmasked*, p. 63).

⁵ Major Child speaks of 1646 as "this year" (p. [18]). This is in the body of his tract. His reply to *Hypocrisie Unmasked* is in the form of a "Post-Script,"

imprint (1647) shows. Thomason bought it on April 15,¹ which was perhaps the very day of publication. Winslow instantly retorted with *New-Englands Salamander*, which was also issued in 1647 — as early as May 29.²

Major Child, being a high Presbyterian,³ had no sympathy for Gorton, whom he describes as “a man notorious for heresie,”⁴ but, in advocating the cause of his brother, he felt bound to oppose Winslow’s doctrine of No Appeal.⁵ Besides, there were some passages in *Hypocrisie Unmasked* that alluded to the Remonstrants. In particular, Winslow had contended that Presbyterians, as such, were under no disabilities in Massachusetts,⁶ and this point the Major thought it desirable to controvert in the interest of his brother and the other petitioners.⁷

which may have been written after the rest of the book was in type. *New-Englands Jonas* is reprinted in part in 2 Massachusetts Historical Collections, iv. 107–120, and in its entirety by W. T. R. Marvin (Boston, 1869) with a good introduction. It may also be found in Force’s *Tracts*, iv, no. 3. I have used a copy of the original in the Boston Athenæum.

¹ Thomason Catalogue, i. 504.

² This is Thomason’s date (Catalogue, i. 513) and must be close to the day of publication. When Winslow wrote, he had not yet been heard by the Commissioners, for he says that he has been sent over by “the government of the *Massachusetts*” to “render a reason” to the Commissioners with reference to the Gorton business, “which I still attend till their more weighty occasions will permit them to heare” (*Salamander*, p. 22). This passage, then, was certainly written before May 25, the date of their preliminary answer, which was so favorable that Winslow could hardly have refrained from alluding to it if it had already been given when he wrote. The tract is reprinted in 3 Massachusetts Historical Collections, ii. 110–145. I have used the copy of the original in the Harvard College Library.

³ See p. 87, below.

⁴ *New-Englands Jonas*, p. 13 [i. e., 21].

⁵ See Winslow’s Epistle Dedicatory to *Hypocrisie Unmasked*.

⁶ *Hypocrisie Unmasked*, pp. 99–100.

⁷ In the title-page of *New-Englands Salamander*, Winslow describes *New-Englands Jonas* as “an irreligious and scornfull Pamphlet, . . . Owned by Major *John Child*, but not probable to be written by him.” He ascribes the book to “*New-Englands Salamander*,” that is, as we learn from Winthrop (ii. 391 [321]), to William Vassall. At all events, he is convinced that Vassall was Major Child’s “chief animator to this undertaking” (p. 1), and the Post-Script he “verily beleeves” the *Salamander* “penned every word” (p. 13). In fact, Child’s tract (except for this Post-Script) is mostly occupied by copies of documents (the Hingham Petition, with the record of subsequent proceedings in that affair; the Remonstrance; the Capital Laws of Massachusetts; the Oath

Just what was being done by Thomas Fowle (the only Remonstrant then in England), by William Vassall (also there), and by English friends of the cause, to get the business before the Parliament or the Commissioners, we cannot make out with certainty.¹ Fowle and Vassall had been in England ever since December 19, 1646, and something had doubtless been attempted in the way of bringing influence to bear on individual Commissioners or Members of Parliament. Vassall, who believed in universal toleration,² probably joined forces with Gorton, but Major Child and his circle would have gone to the stake before they would have coöperated with a Familist. We know that Vassall took over with him in the Supply one or more petitions to Parliament which called for certain reforms that were also demanded by the Remonstrants, but these were drawn up, it seems, before the Remonstrance was prepared, and were certainly neither in the name nor in the behalf of Child and his associates.³ Vassall's petition, a copy of the Remonstrance, and other pertinent documents, as Major Child informs the world in his *New-Englands Jonas*, arrived safely on the Supply, "and are here in London to be seen and made use of in convenient time."⁴ The Major's present tense applies, of course, to the moment of writing, that is, to some time between February 1 and March 25, 1647 — certainly before the latter date. His language indicates, I think, that the friends of the Remonstrance had not yet submitted their case to the Commissioners.

Before this time, however, Winslow, though he had not yet got a

of a Freeman) and by the story of throwing the petition overboard, which he says (p. 2) is given "verbatim, as it was delivered to me in writing by a Gentleman that was then a passenger in the Ship." Vassall was a passenger.

¹ See pp. 42-44, above.

² See Winslow's letter to Winthrop, November 24, 1645 (Hutchinson Papers, i. 172-175). This letter is generally, and doubtless rightly, thought to refer to Vassall (Palfrey, *History of New England*, ii. 167 note 4). The proposition which Winslow says was brought before the Plymouth Court was "to allow and maintaine full and free tollerance of religion to all men that would preserve the civill peace and submit unto government; and there was no limitation or exception against Turke, Jew, Papist, Arian, Socinian, Nicholaytan, Familist, or any other." Cf. 1 Massachusetts Historical Proceedings, vi. 476-479.

³ No copy of Vassall's petition or petitions is known. See Winthrop, ii. 319-320, 340, 391 (260-261, 278-279, 321); *New-Englands Jonas*, p. 12 [error for 18]; *New-Englands Salamander*, pp. 16, 18, 23.

⁴ *New-Englands Jonas*, p. 13 [error for 19].

formal hearing, must have filed his documents. These included copies not only of various Gorton papers, but also of Child's Remonstrance and the General Court's Declaration in reply; and with them went the protest of December, 1646, addressed to the Commissioners by the Governor and Company in answer to their order of May 15, 1646. This protest covered both cases, Gorton's and Child's. It asserted, with a masterly union of deference and frank courage, the doctrine of No Appeal under the Charter, and called upon the Commissioners to recognize that doctrine, not, to be sure, by affirming it in set terms but "by leaving delinquents to our just proceedings, and discountenancing our enemies and disturbers of our peace, or such as molest our people . . . upon pretence of injustice."¹ Vassall's petitions may or may not have been before the Commissioners when Winslow submitted his papers, but, if so, they were a thing apart, and not a branch or member of the Child agitation, nor did they involve the question of appeal. We know nothing of their history before the Parliament or the Commissioners, except that they were rejected.²

Meanwhile, as we have seen, Robert Child was in confinement at Boston, awaiting the May session of the General Court and looking anxiously for a summons from Parliament that should call him to England to "prosecute his appeal."³ By an odd coincidence, on May 25, 1647, the very day before the Court of Elections was held in Massachusetts, the English Commissioners, who must have given Winslow at least a preliminary hearing, indited a letter to the Governor and Company which sounded the death knell to all Child's hopes.

In this letter the Commissioners acknowledge the receipt from Winslow of the Petition and Remonstrance of the Governor and Company in the Gorton case, and continue in these highly significant terms:

Though we have not yet entered into a particular consideration of the matter, yet we do, in the general, take notice of your respect, as well

¹ Winthrop, ii. 360-364 (295-298).

² As Winthrop, ii. 391 (321), puts it, "Mr. Vassall, finding no entertainment for his petitions, went to Barbados." This news seems to have reached Boston in May, 1648.

³ See p. 44, above.

to the parliament's authority, as your own just privileges, and find cause to be further confirmed in our former opinion and knowledge of your prudence and faithfulness to God and his cause. *And perceiving by your petition, that some persons do take advantage, from our said letter,¹ to decline and question your jurisdiction, and to pretend a general liberty to appeal hither, upon their being called in question before you for matters proper to your cognizance, we thought it necessary (for preventing of further inconveniences in this kind) hereby to declare, that we intended not thereby to encourage any appeals from your justice, nor to restrain the bounds of your jurisdiction to a narrower compass than is held forth by your letters patent, but to leave you with all that freedom and latitude that may, in any respect, be duly claimed by you; knowing that the limiting of you in that kind may be very prejudicial (if not destructive) to the government and public peace of the colony.²*

The passage here italicized refers in the plainest way to the appeal of Child and his associates, and is a direct and favorable reply to certain dignified and outspoken sentences in the petition of the Governor and Company which Winslow had delivered to the Commissioners. This declares that if Gorton be upheld by the Commissioners, it will endanger the peace of the Colony.

For some amongst ourselves, men of vnquiēt spiritts, affecting rule & innovacōn, haue taken bouldnes to p̄ferr scandalous & seditious petitiōns for such libertyes as neither our charter, nor reason, nor religion will allowe; & being called before vs in open Courte to give accomp^t of their miscarriage therein, they have threatned vs wth yo^r honno^rs authority, & before they knew whether wee would p̄ceede to any sentence ag^{nt} them or not, have refused to answer, but appealed to yo^r honno^rs. Y^e cōpy of their petition, & our declaration therevpon, our cōmissiōn^r hath ready to p̄sent to yow. . . . Their appeals wee have not admitted, being assured y^t they cannot stand wth y^e liberty & power graunted vs by our charter, nor willbe allowed by yo^r honno^rs, who well know it would be destructive to all goūment, both in y^e honnor & also in y^e power of it, if it should be in y^e liberty of delinquents to evade y^e sentence of justice, & force vs, by appeales, to ffollow them into England, where the evidences & circumstances of facts cannot be so cleerely held

¹ I. e., the Commissioners' order of May 15, 1646, printed in Winthrop, ii. 342-344 (280-282).

² Winthrop, ii. 389-390 (319-320).

forth as in their pper place. Besids the insupportable chardges wee must be at in y^e psecution thereof.¹

The action of the English Commissioners, however, — as it could not be known to the Magistrates and Deputies at the May session of the General Court, so it was not needed to spur them to decisive action in the case of Child and his associates, for they were confident that they were acting legally and they never lacked courage. Undoubtedly they expected a favorable reply from England, but their action on subsequent occasions — for example, in their treatment of the Commissioners of Charles II in 1665 — shows that they were quite ready to defy the Parliamentary Commissioners now, should these claim any power which the Charter, as our forefathers interpreted it, had lodged in the hands of the Massachusetts authorities.

And so the May court of 1647 began its session on the 26th, and the trial of the Remonstrants was reached in due course. It is important, in view of the prevalent confusion on this subject, to define the issue. The first case, that of the Remonstrance itself, was over and done with, and the penalties had been imposed. The present case, though it had grown out of the former, was quite distinct, and depended on acts discovered and in part committed subsequently to the former trial. These acts, in the opinion of the magistrates, amounted to a conspiracy against the government on the part of Robert Child, John Smith, Samuel Maverick, John Dand, and Thomas Burton. Two of the original Remonstrants were not involved in this second proceeding — Thomas Fowle and David Yale. Fowle had gone to England before the former trial, and had consequently had no part in the subsequent activities that led to the present prosecution. His sureties (whoever they were) were, of course, bound to produce him or settle up, if the Court should call him to bar on the former offence, for which he had never been tried; but it seems clear that the matter was never pressed. How, when, and why Yale dropped out of the case is a mystery. I should be inclined to think he had not signed the petition seized in Dand's study but for the fact that Winthrop says expressly that it was "from Dr.

¹ Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 97 (session of November 4, 1646); Winthrop, ii. 362-363 (297).

Child and the other six petitioners.”¹ Perhaps this is a slip of the pen. At all events the list of culprits given in a contemporary memorial omits his name,² and he is not mentioned in the record of the sentence.³

One new culprit was expected to stand trial with the rest, having been bound over at the Court of Assistants in March, 1647. This was “Mr. Clerk of Salem the keeper of the ordinary there and a church member.” His offence is equated with Maverick’s by Winthrop, for both were freemen: “These having taken an oath of fidelity to the government, and enjoying all liberties of freemen, their offence was far the greater.” They “had been very active about the petition to the commissioners” (that revolutionary document found in Dand’s study) “in procuring hands to it.”⁴ In the opinion of the magistrates, then, they had been guilty of perjury as well as of conspiracy. William Clark had been chosen by the inhabitants of Salem to keep the town ordinary on April 7, 1645,⁵ and in the following October the General Court appointed him Lieutenant of the Military Company of Salem and Lynn.⁶ But alas! at the Quarter Court held at Salem on February 18, 1646, he was “advised to forbear being offensive in suffering a shuffling board in his house, occasioning misspending of time.”⁷ We are not obliged to infer that this incident threw him into the arms of the malcontents, but thought is free.⁸ He died before May 26, 1647, thus escaping trial

¹ Winthrop, ii. 357 (293).

² See pp. 53-55, 56, below.

³ Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 113.

⁴ Winthrop, ii. 367 (301).

⁵ Felt, *Annals of Salem*, 1827, p. 166. The General Court of November, 1646, granted him a license at the rate of £15 a year (Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 173).

⁶ Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 133 (cf. ii. 110).

⁷ Records and Files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, i. 91. He was not, as Felt (p. 172) asserts, fined, for the law against playing “shovelboard” in public houses was not passed until the May 26 session of the General Court, 1647 (Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 195).

⁸ He had other troubles, for on August 4, 1646, he was “discharged of his presentment for affronting the constable, having confessed publicly.” It appears that he had twice affronted this officer, once when the latter had visited his house on an errand about a “hew and crye,” and again when he demanded Clark’s “measure” to compare it with the town standard, thinking the landlord’s measure too small (Records and Files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex

for conspiracy, and his widow was allowed to continue the ordinary at Salem.¹

The exact date of the trial of the conspirators is not determinable. The Court assembled on May 26, 1647, but the trial certainly took place in June,² and sentence was not pronounced until after the 9th.³ There was more or less public sentiment in favor of the defendants, and an escape or rescue was feared, as is shown by the following entry in the records of this session:

In regard of y^e weaknes of y^e prison, & y^t to have iustice now deduced by any escape, would reflect much dishon^r upon y^e Co^rte, & minist^r matt^r of insulting to y^e adverse p^ty, it is ord^red, by authority of this Co^rte, y^t y^e keeper shall huire 2 able men, such as may be trusted wth a matter of so great moment, & if he cannot huire any such, then upon sight hereof y^e cunstables of Boston, or any of them, shall from time to time impresse 2 such men, who shall assist y^e keeper in guarding y^e prisoners day & night, & when they go to y^e publike meetings, & they shalbe alowed 3 sh^s p day & night, each of them, out of y^e fines of y^e prisoners.

It is furth^r ordained, y^t if all y^e prison^rs of D^r Childs conspiracy shalbe once discharged out of prison, except one or 2, y^e keeper shall keepe such one of two of them in irons, except they wilbe at charge of such garde as y^e ma^trates of Boston shall appoint ov^r them.⁴

A very interesting memorial, hitherto unprinted, was submitted to the Court shortly (as it would seem) before a decision was reached. It is docketed, in a hand contemporary with the text: "Deputy^s: motions, 1647,"⁵ and is signed by fourteen members of the House

County, i. 101). He had lawsuits in 1640, 1642, and 1643 (i. 20, 22, 49, 55), but anyhow our forefathers were a litigious lot.

¹ Felt, *Annals of Salem*, p. 175; *Massachusetts Colony Records*, ii. 193. The inventory of his estate (sworn to by his widow, Katherine Clark) is dated June 25, 1647 (*Records and Files*, as above, i. 119).

² Winthrop, ii. 359 (295) says that the trial was in June — "(4) 47." See p. 58, below.

³ On June 9, 1647, Mr. Ezekiel Rogers of Rowley preached at the Cambridge Synod, the Magistrates and Deputies being present, and he "took occasion to speak of the petitioners, (then in question before the court,) and exhorted the court to do justice upon them, yet with desire of favor to such as had been drawn in, etc., and should submit" (Winthrop, ii. 376 [308]).

⁴ *Massachusetts Colony Records*, ii. 195-196.

⁵ The second word is very indistinct, but seems to be meant for "motions" or "Notions."

of Deputies. The document proves that there was considerable difference of opinion in the Court itself, and contains so many curious details that I reproduce it in full from the original in the Archives: ¹

Concerninge the matter about the Petitioners, we finde that this may be legally Charged on them.

For M^r Dan

1 That the Petitioners ² & Queres were found in his Custody & soe must be Charged wth them till he p^roduce an other Author

2: y^t: he purposly raised slanders on the Country & this Appears by his owne letters

3. he went about to nurrish & Cherrish: discontented psons, amongst vs to the disturbinge of y^e Libertiies amongst vs. both in Church & Commonwelth, & this appears, in the two Petitions he gauē to Foy & Barlo the Coppis of w^{ch} were found wth him ³

For M^r: Mauerick.

1: He Countenaunced this Petition that was witnessed to in such a dangero^s & disturbinge way & that appears by his owninge of it from

¹ Massachusetts Archives, cvi. 6 a.

² Error for *Petitions*.

³ Foy and Barlow were apparently sea-captains engaged in the carrying trade between England and the Colony, who testified that Dand had given them copies of both of the seized petitions to take to England. When this delivery was made—whether before or after the raid on Dand's study—does not appear, nor is it clear whether the petitions were actually taken to England by Foy and Barlow. The Foy mentioned can hardly have been the Captain John Foy(e) so well-known in Boston from 1672 (Suffolk Deeds, vii. 317) till this death in 1715 (Sewall's Diary, iii. 68), but may have been an older relative. Captain John Foy bought a house here in 1673 (Suffolk Deeds, viii. 133), took the oath of allegiance in 1678 (Boston Record Commissioners' Reports, xxix. 165), and had by his wife Dorothy (died 1724: Sewall's Diary, iii. 328) nine children born in Boston 1672–1689 (Record Commissioners' Reports, ix. 123, 132, 145, 151, 157, 165, 174, 184). He is often mentioned in Sewall's Diary and Letter-Book and elsewhere (Massachusetts Colony Records, v. 267, 382, 391, 497; Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1693, p. 428; Hinckley Papers, p. 206; Lawrence Hammond's Diary, 2 Massachusetts Historical Proceedings, vii. 157, 159, 168; our Publications, x. 112, xiv. 143; indexes to Toppan's Edward Randolph, iii, iv, vi; Suffolk Deeds, x–xiv; Boston Record Commissioners' Reports, i; Mather Papers; Winthrop Papers, iv, vi); but is easily confused with his son, the younger Captain John Foy (1674–1730), who was of Charlestown (Wyman, Genealogies and Estates of Charlestown, i. 372–373; Boston Record Commissioners' Reports, iii. 210, 211, ix. 250; Sewall's Diary, i. 480, 493, ii. 279, 327; Sewall's Letter-Book, i. 193, 203; Winthrop Papers, iv. 527, 545, v. 515; New England Historical and Genealogical Register, xxiv. 7, 131, 132).

Bushnel & sendinge it for England¹ Conterrary to his Ingagen^t to this Commōwealth.²

For M^r Smith

1: He Countenaunced M^r Dan & Resisted Authority & that Appears in his endeuerō^g to keepe these papers: from Authority that had sent for them to M^r Dans studdy. & in sayinge he hoped to haue Commission to Rannsick the Gouverno^rs Studdy care Longe³

For M^r Burtton:

It is Cleare that he knew of the former petition sent for England: first Foy sayes hee was presnt & cons[ent]⁴ed to the deliuey of it to him⁵

2: by M^r Parker & his wiues Testimony which sayes he hope to haue the best at last which must be by this Petition or a worse way Alsoe he spake slightly of Authority & Contemnd it in oppen Courte by his words & Carriages

For the Doctor

It may be feared & is somethinge pro^ble that he was acquainted with both Petitions & Querēs, & therefor Authority did well to sease on him to secure themselues & to keepe him in Costody for future Euidence

¹ This was the petition "from some non-freeman," in getting signatures to which Maverick had been "very active." See Winthrop, ii. 358, 367 (293-294, 301). This memorandum is the only evidence we have that it was actually "sent for England." One copy was seized in Dand's study — perhaps the "foule draught" mentioned below. It appears, however, that the authorities had a copy with twenty-five signatures that was seized in the raid on Dand (Winthrop, as above), and this can hardly have been the foul draught. What "owninge of it from Bushnel" means is a puzzle. The word *owninge* is very clear in the MS. It was first written *owinge* and the *n* is above the line with a caret. Perhaps "from Bushnel" belongs in sense with "appears," — i. e. that Maverick countenanced the petition appears from *Bushnel's testimony* that he acknowledged it (as a document that he approved).

² I. e., contrary to his oath as a freeman.

³ This outburst on Smith's part gave particular offence in those days as being gross disrespect to authority. Times have changed. See Winthrop, ii. 357 (293): "But at Dand's study they [the officers] found Mr. Smith, who catched up some papers, and when the officer took them from him, he brake out into these speeches, viz. we hope shortly we shall have commission to search the governour's closet."

⁴ Hole in the paper.

⁵ This seems to mean the Remonstrance. It cannot refer to Vassall's petition, for Vassall took that over with him on the Supply (see p. 34, above), nor does Burton seem to have had anything to do with it. As to the Remonstrance, it is clear that two copies were on board the Supply. One of them was thrown over-board, the other was used for the text printed in *New-Englands Jonas* (see pp. 35, 45, above).

w^{ch} might appeare in y^e examinatiō of the Cause; & this feare is grounde, first the foule draughts both of Petition & Queris are like his hand

2: he had mentioned his discontente & said some Queris would Quiett.¹

3: He adioynty Joyned in all former greuances & Complaints to this Courte wth the rest

Therefore we humbly Craue that these o^r earnest breathings for peace both in Courte & Conscience may be taken as fauo^rably: as the rule of loue will giue leaue w^{ch} we haue no Cause to doubt of, & therefore we p^ress we doe not this to direct the Courte but throughinge o^r might² to Cleare o^r selues from some Jelosyes that may seeme to arise from o^r Conterary desent pdone o^r boldnes. we hope not tedio^s: for we are yo^{rs}: as God Inable vs.

Ric Du^mer

Edward Gibons
Brian Pendleton

Robert Payne
Edward: Carlton

[On the back
of the sheet]

Robert Clements
William Barthollmew
Jacob Barney
Steuens Kinsley
Obadiah Bruen
William Pelham
Tho: Lowthroppe
William English
William Fiske³

¹ I. e., apparently "would quiet it." The passage seems to mean that Child, in conversation, had been heard to say that certain queries that were to be sent to England would put an end to his grievances. This remark was thought to refer to the queries afterwards seized in Dand's study.

² If the text is right, the phrase must mean "exerting all our abilities." In that case, we have an example of the verb to *through* (to "carry through," "carry out"), hitherto known only as a Scottish word. Perhaps, however, *throughing* is a scribe's error for *through* and the phrase means "to the best of our ability."

³ Dummer was deputy from Salisbury; Gibbons from Boston; Pendleton from Watertown; Payne from Ipswich; Carlton from Rowley; Clements from Haverhill; Bartholomew from Ipswich; Barney from Salem; Kinsley from Braintree; Bruen (or Brewen) from Gloucester; Pelham from Sudbury; Lothrop from Salem; English from Hampton; Fiske from Wenham (see Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 42, 62, 121-122, 147, 202, 297). Their names all appear in the list of Deputies for 1647 (Records, ii. 186, iii. 105). Four of the persons who were contradictories in the previous sentence, 1646 — Richard Russell, now Treasurer, Bozon Allen, Joshua Hobart (Hubbard), and Edward Carlton (see p. 38, above) — were members of the 1647 Court, but only one of them (Carlton) now appeared as an objector.

Of the fourteen signers, one alone — Jacob Barney of Salem — appears as flatly “contradicens” to the final sentence of the Court; Dummer, Pendleton, Payne, Carlton, Clements, Pelham, and Lothrop are recorded as “somewhat differing from y^e sentence of y^e Courte, in degree only,” and as “desiring their contradicentes might stand on record only as they differed.” They were in favor of lighter fines, and their several opinions are entered.¹ Pendleton, Payne, and Carlton thought Child had been already punished enough by his imprisonment.² The sentence (which was probably followed by an appeal³) runs as follows:

The Courte having taken into serious considera^on the crimes charged on Doc^t Rob^t Child, M^r John Smith, M^r Thomas Burton, M^r John Dand, & M^r Samu^ell Mauericke, & whereof they have binn found guilty vpon full evidence by the former judgment of this Courte,⁴ have agreed upon y^e sentence here ensewing respectively decreed to each of them.

Doctor Child, tuo hundred pounds, & imprisonment vntill it be payd or security given for it	200 ^{li}	00 ^s	00 ^d
M ^r John Smith, one hundred pounds, & imprisonment as before	100	00	00
M ^r John Dand, tuo hundred pounds, & imprisonment as before	200	00	00
M ^r Tho: Burton, one hundred pounds, & imprisonment as before	100	00	00
M ^r Sam: Mauericke, ffor his offence in being p ^r ty to y ^e conspiracy, one hundred pounds, & imprisonment as before	100	00	00
M ^r Sam: Mauericke, ffor his offence in breaking his oath, & in appealing ag ⁿ st y ^e intent of his oath of a freeman, ffifty pounds, & imprisonment as before	050	00	00
Jacob Barney contradicens to y ^e sentence of y ^e Courte. ⁵			

John Dand, being unable to pay his fine and unwilling to apologize, was put in prison.⁶ He petitioned the November Court (1647)

¹ Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 114. Lothrop, however, agreed with the Court as to Child and Dand.

² The formula, in each case, is: “Doctor Child he could not pceed to sentence besides his imprisonment.”

³ See pp. 67, 81-82, below.

⁴ That is, earlier in this same session. The judgment is not recorded.

⁵ Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 113. ⁶ Winthrop, ii. 359 (295).

to remit the penalty, and it was voted that if, before or at the next Quarter Court, he shall tender "such acknowledgement" as shall be approved by that court and by all or a majority of a committee of seven Deputies [named], and shall also give security to the Auditor General for £50 "to be paid into y^e Treasurer wthin 6 months now next coming, he shall yⁿ be discharged."¹ Dand, however, still refused to offer a satisfactory apology and remained in jail until May, 1648, when, having made the requisite *amende*, he was "ffreed from his imprisonm^t, & his fine readyly remitted him."²

Maverick was allowed his liberty for about a month after sentence, but then, not having paid his £150, he was imprisoned.³ From a curious petition presented by his daughter to Andros in 1688, it appears that he was resolved not to pay at all, and that, fearing that the authorities would seize his estate of Noddle's Island, "he made a deede of Gift of the s^d Island to his Eldest sonne," Nathaniel, "not wth any designe to deliver the s^d Deede to him but only to p^rvent the seizure of itt."⁴ After twelve days' confinement, however, he paid his fine and was discharged.³

At the November session of the General Court in this same year (1647) Maverick petitioned for "a review of his Tryall, the reparacõn of his Creditt, and remittm^t of fines⁵ imposed on him," but got no answer.⁶ He repeated his application in October, 1648, whereupon

¹ Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 205.

² Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 241, iii. 125-126; cf. Winthrop, ii. 359 (295).

³ Samuel Maverick's petition, May 8, 1649 (Massachusetts Archives, B xxxviii. 228, printed by Sumner, History of East Boston, p. 110).

⁴ Petition of Mary, the wife of Francis Hooke, of Kittery, Maine, "Daughter and Heiresse of Samuel Mavericke, deceased" (Massachusetts Archives, cxviii. 45; New England Historical and Genealogical Register, viii. 334; Sumner, History of East Boston, p. 107). Mary Maverick married (1) John Palsgrave, February 8, 1655-6, and (2) Francis Hooke, September 20, 1660 (Boston Record Commissioners' Reports, ix. 53, 76). There are several errors in the petition, but there seems to be no reason to doubt the execution of the deed of gift, which is consistent with the fact that, in 1650, Samuel Maverick and his wife, conjointly with their son Nathaniel, conveyed the island to Captain George Briggs of Barbados for 40,000 lbs. of good white sugar (Suffolk Deeds, i. 122-123; Sumner, History of East Boston, p. 178).

⁵ The plural is used because two fines were imposed in June, 1647, £100 for conspiracy and £50 for perjury (see p. 56, above).

⁶ So Maverick recites in a petition submitted in October, 1648 (Massachusetts Archives, B xxxviii. 227). No copy of the 1647 petition has been found, nor is it mentioned in the Court records.

the Deputies voted that he ought to be heard and the Magistrates (October 25) consented.¹ The result was a vote of the Deputies "that on M^r Samuuell Maurickes acknowledgment of his error his fine shalbe Remitted," but apparently the Magistrates refused to concur.² The matter came up again at the May Court in 1649, and on the 4th, in response to Maverick's "request" for "a review of his cause, whereby he might either cleere himself or be satisfied in the evidence formly pduced against him," the General Court appointed May 9 "for hearing him."³ There is no record concerning the business on the 9th, but Maverick's petition of May 8, 1649, is in the Archives. It alleges that he was charged with "conspiracy and periury" at a court held in May and June, 1647, protests his innocence, and asks that his fine of £150 may be repaid.⁴ In another document of May 8, 1649, Maverick specifies what he conceives to be a number of errors in a record of the trial of 1647 which had been furnished him by the Secretary.⁵ Again there was no result, and ap-

¹ The original of this 1648 petition is in the Massachusetts Archives, B xxxviii. 227; and the approval of a rehearing (signed by William Torrey) and the consent of the Magistrates (in Governor Winthrop's hand, signed) are appended on the same sheet. The only date given is that noted by Winthrop after his signature: "25 (8) 48".

² This note of the Deputies (in William Torrey's hand, signed) is preserved on a scrap of paper in the Archives (B xxxviii. 227 a) which is docketed "M^r S: Mauricks Petition 1648." The same scrap shows a memorandum in Winthrop's hand: "An Answr to this Petⁿ will appear in the Record of the Court holden Nov: 19;" but nothing is to be found in the Court Records.

³ Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 153.

⁴ Massachusetts Archives, B xxxviii. 228 (Sumner, History of East Boston, p. 110).

⁵ Massachusetts Archives, B xxxviii. 228 a. I append this memorial (hitherto unprinted) since it furnishes some curious details of the prosecution:

Errors (as I conceiue, in the Coppie of those reco^rds I receiued from m^r Secretarie)

First yo^r whole pceding agst vs seemes to depend on o^r refusall to answer Intergato^ries vpon oath, whereas the Comittie of mag^{rt}s and deputies, had sate diūse dayes & made returne to the Co^rte before eū wee were called as appears by the reco^rds.

Further whereas it is declared in the recco^rds that at o^r appearance when wee were sentenced wee had nothings further to aleage to hinder the Co^rts pcedings against vs vnder fauo^r wee all then desired to see those testimonies vpon w^{ch} o^r sentence was grounded And I in my pticuler answer to the charge against mee desired to haue libertie to make additionall answers for the further Clearing vp of my innocencie w^{ch} I could not obtaine

Further where as it is affirīed in the recco^rds that wee brought in to the

parently the Court was displeased with the high tone of the petitioner, for a "second petition," much humbler in style, came before it on May 16th. Maverick now throws himself upon the Court's mercy: "Being confident and experimentally assured of yo^r clemency to others in the like kind, I am bold rather to crave yo^r mercy in the favorable remittance of my fines then to stand either to justify myself or p^rcedings, w^{ch}, as they have (contrary to my intenc^õns) prouved p^rjudicyall and very offensive, so it hath binn, is, & willbe, my greife and trouble." The Deputies voted to abate £100, but the Magistrates did not concur, for they "cannot finde that the petitioner hath so farr acknowledged himself guilty of his offence . . . as doth give them such satisfac^õn as might moove them to take of any parte of his fine."¹ In the June court of 1650 Maverick petitioned again "for the remittinge or mitigation" of his fine of £150, and this time the Court voted to abate it £75.²

As to Smith and Burton, we have no record that proves the payment of their fines, but Maverick asserts, in his Briefe Description of New England,³ that the Remonstrants "were fined 1000^{li}, a[nd] Notw^tstanding they Appealed to England, they were forced to pay the same."⁴ One notes, by the way, that, in his venomous arraignment of the Colony in this paper, he suppresses the fact that Dand's £100 was remitted and that £75 of his own £150 was finally returned

Co^te o^r seⁿuall answers to o^r seuerall Charges (vnder fauo^r) It was not soe neither was it in the publike meeting howse, but o^r ans^w's were sent for to vs by the marshall, by whom after oure deniall the second time wee sent them

Further the last clawse now on recco^d of o^r sentence Concerning the keeping of one o^r twoe in Irons was noe pte of o^r publike sentence as will appeare by a Coppie of the sentence vnder the Secretaries hand w^{ch} I had six dayes after the Co^te was ended and affirmed vnder his hand to bee a true Coppie fwee weekes after

Di^fuse other both materiall & Circumstantiall erro^rs I conceiue there are w^{ch} for want of time I omitt

Samuell Mauerick

The 8. of the 3d m^o 1649

The "last clawse" to which Maverick refers seems to have embodied the substance of the order printed on p. 52, above.

¹ Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 166-167.

² iii. 200; iv. i. 18.

³ Egerton MS. 2395, fols. 397-411 (British Museum).

⁴ 2 Massachusetts Historical Proceedings, i. 240; New England Historical and Genealogical Register, xxxix. 41.

to him. Still, his statement that the fines were exacted is certainly true (though not the whole truth) in his own case, and probably also with respect to Child's £200. This inference is confirmed by Child's expressed wish, soon after his return to England, that his *fines* might be "restored" or "returned."¹ He even commissioned Richard Leader, agent and manager of the Lynn and Braintree iron works — a venture in which Child was one of the original partners² — to approach the authorities on the subject.³ And he returns to the matter in his last extant letter to the younger Winthrop, August 26, 1650.⁴ We may be sure, then, that Child was not allowed to leave Massachusetts until he had paid his £200. His former fine of £50, however, was still unpaid when he departed. It has been thought that John Winthrop, Jr., stood security for this sum. The facts, however, are rather more complicated, and illustrate, in an amusing fashion, how scarce cash was in old New England. Winthrop had borrowed forty pounds of Child in London. On March 15, 1647, Child asked for the money, explaining why he needed it; he repeated his request on May 14, offering to accept whatever Winthrop could send in lieu of coin, "as peage, if it be good, & other kinds of provisions at price currant." Finally, writing from Gravesend, on May 13, 1648, he approves of Winthrop's act in having "paid in ye 40^l to M^r Leader" and adds, "We are now totally euen."⁵

Meanwhile, in October or November, 1647, the Court had passed the following vote:

Whereas Docto^r Rob^t Child oweth for a fine due to the country the sume of 50^l of lawfull mony charged upon him by the Gen^l Co^rte in the 9th m^o, 1646, w^{ch} is unpaid, & himselfe gone out of this iurisdiction into Europe, & whereas he hath a stock going in the iron workes, under the management of M^r Leader, to the value of 450^l, it is therefore ordered by this Co^rte, that the audito^r gen^l hath hereby pow^r & authority given unto him to make sale of so much of the said stock of 450^l as will p^{se}ntly yeild y^e 50^l due to y^e country.⁶

¹ Child to John Winthrop, Jr., from Gravesend, May 13, 1648 (Winthrop Papers, iii. 159).

² See pp. 10-14, above.

³ See p. 92 note 2, below.

⁴ Winthrop Papers, iii. 162.

⁵ iii. 156, 157, 159.

⁶ Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 199.

The iron works were far from profitable, and such a sale would undoubtedly have been at a great loss. To prevent this, I conjecture, and to square his debt to Child, Winthrop guaranteed to the Colony £40 of Child's first fine, and had Leader, as Child's agent, credit him with that amount.¹ The Bay was an indulgent creditor — and very properly so — to the younger Winthrop, who also claimed a set-off on account of a payment he had made in England for the Colony;² and it appears by the records that he was still indebted for that portion of Child's fine in October, 1650,³ and also in October, 1651, when the debt was forgiven him as a recompense for his services in England.⁴ Whether the odd £10 was ever collected from Child we have no means of knowing.

Mr. Brooks Adams remarks with a certain vagueness, that "though the elders accused Childe of being a Jesuit, there is some ground to suppose that he inclined toward Geneva."⁵ I have too much respect for our forefathers' common sense and knowledge of the world to believe that they seriously took Child — who they knew was a high Presbyterian — for an emissary from the Jesuits. But they may have been willing to dally with this surmise, and perhaps even to repeat it as a ground for odium. That there was suspicion in some minds is indubitable from what Winslow told Major Child *viva voce* and afterwards printed in New-Englands Salamander,⁶ and from the

¹ Leader's receipt is preserved among the Winthrop MSS., xiv. 104:

Rec of John Winthrop Jn^r Esq^r the sume of forty pounds by the order & for the vse of doc Robt Childs witnes my hand the 12th day of September 1647
P Richard Leader.

An order to Winthrop from Leader in favor of Goodman Arnold for any sum not exceeding £6, dated Boston, July 16, 1646, is also preserved among these manuscripts (xiv. 124). On the back Winthrop has written: "M^r leaders note for G Arnold 6^{li}—w^{ch} accordingly M^r Leader paid D^r Child in full of all y^e mony I ref[e]ived of him in England &c."

² Petition printed by Waters, *A Sketch of the Life of John Winthrop the Younger*, pp. 31-32.

³ Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 219.

⁴ iii. 256, iv. i. 65.

⁵ *Emancipation of Massachusetts*, p. 95.

⁶ "I freely imparted to you the Countries colorable grounds of suspecting his agency for the great Incendiaries of Europe, . . . yea that the very yeare hee came over, a gentleman in the country (Mr. *Peters* by name) was advised by letters from a forraign part that the Jesuits had an agent that Sommer in *New-England*. And that the Countrey comparing his practise with the intelligence

Apostle Eliot's entry (1646) in the records of the First Church in Roxbury: "This yeare arose a great disturbance in the country by such as are called the Petitioners a trouble raised by Jesuited agents to molest the peace of the churches & Com.w."¹ To be sure, the same session of the General Court that sentenced Child in June, 1647, passed a law excluding Jesuits from the Colony;² but this action may well have been due to general fears of the Pope and of "Papists," sharpened by reports which had often come from Portugal and the Azores. Cotton, writing in 1647, informs his English readers that "some of the Jesuites at *Lisborn*, and others in the Western Islands have professed to some of our Merchants and Mariners, they look at our Plantations, (and at some of us by name) as dangerous supplanters of the Catholick cause."³ One of the merchants in question, as we learn from Winthrop, was a Mr. Parish, who arrived at Boston from the Madeiras in 1642. He had lived in those islands "many years among the priests and Jesuits, who told him, when he was to come hither, that those of New England were the worst of all heretics, and that they were the cause of the troubles in England."⁴ Into the criss-cross intrigues in which the King and his supporters entangled themselves in 1645 and 1646 — with the Presbyterians of Scotland, with the English Presbyterians (both orthodox and Erastian), with the Roman Catholics of Ireland and

were more jealous of him then any; (though to mee he was a meere stranger)" (New-Englands Salamander, p. 2). Cf. p. 7: "Hee is a Gentleman that hath travelled other parts before hee came to us, namely *Italy*; confesseth hee was twice at *Rome*, speaketh sometimes highly as I have heard reported in favour of the Jesuites." In his first extant letter to the younger Winthrop, 1641, Child reveals his reading of the Jesuit Relations, but he certainly does not express approval: "From myne owne library I likewise send you to pvse till I come to New England, D^r Dauisons workes; y^e French Jesuits voyages in Canada in 3 Volües, that you may see how they proceede in the c̄version of those Heathen, and how little the Lord hath blessed them in there proceeding" (Winthrop Papers, iii. 150). Cf. p. 102 note 1, below.

¹ New England Historical and Genealogical Register, xxxiii. 65.

² Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 193, iii. 112. Felt thinks that "one inducement for the passage of such an act was probably the strong suspicion that Dr. Child . . . was on his second tour in this country as a spy from the Jesuits of Europe" (Ecclesiastical History of New England, i. 597).

³ The Way of Congregational Churches Cleared, London, 1648 (imprimatur, January 1, 1647-[S]), part i. pp. 21-22.

⁴ Winthrop, ii. 111 (92).

France, and even with the Pope, — we need not enter;¹ but the effect of those intrigues on the public mind was unsettling. So ramified and intertwined were they that, as some of them came to light from time to time and others were imagined or guessed at, either of the two great Protestant parties, the Presbyterians and the Independents, might naturally suspect the other of negotiating with Rome. It is just possible, then, that our fathers imagined Child an intermediary between the Presbyterians and the Jesuits, but they can hardly have fancied in their wildest moments that he was actually a member of that society.

Exactly when Child left New England we do not know. On July 14, 1647, he was still in this country, for on that date he gave to Richard Bonighton a deed for one hundred acres of his Saco purchase from Vines in exchange for a like quantity in another patent,² but by *ca.* October 27 he had departed "into Europe," as the Court order proves.³ I think he sailed before September 12th.⁴ An odd detail of his passage to England may be mentioned, because it has escaped the curiosity of previous students. In his Large Letter on Husbandry, 1651, Child remarked: "I should thank any Merchant that could inform me in some trivial and ordinary things done beyond Sea, (*viz.*) how they make *Caviare* out of Sturgeons Rowes? *in Muscovia*, how they boil and pickle their Sturgeon, (which we English in *New-England* cannot as yet do handsomely?)." ⁵ In his comments on this Letter, Dr. Arnold Boot declared that the receipt for caviare may be found in Purchas his Pilgrims, "*second Tome, page 1420.*" ⁶ Replying, Child says:

¹ See, for example, Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*, ed. 1893, ii. 170-176, 258-260, 285-286; iii. 1-57, 62-63, 70-76.

² York Deeds, i. i. 40; Folsom, *History of Saco and Biddeford*, p. 74. Folsom quotes an undated letter from Vines to Child concerning a hundred-acre lot purchased by Joseph Bowles.

³ P. 60, above. William White, an expert miner, seems to have been left stranded by Child's withdrawal: see White's confused letter to Governor Winthrop, July 24, 1648 (2 Massachusetts Historical Collections, iv. 199): "I was promised 5s a day by Doctor Child for my selfe and my sonn."

⁴ See Leader's receipt of that date (p. 61 note 1, above). John Winthrop, Jr., wrote to Child, apparently to England, on October 25, 1647 (Winthrop Papers, iii. 158).

⁵ Samuel Hartlib his *Legacie of Husbandry*, 2d ed., 1652, p. 62 (3d ed., 1655, p. 71). On Child's authorship of a large portion of this volume, see p. 107, below.

⁶ *Legacie*, p. 112 (3d ed., 1655, p. 127). See p. 108, below.

I am certain that *Purchase* himself, never saw the making of *Cavare*, nor the Merchant perhaps that wrote it, and therefore I must question the Process, and know that in *New-England* where there are abundance of Sturgeon, whose rows are ordinarily accounted the Material of it, yet never any ever so much as attempted to make it, though divers Fishmongers were there, and attempted to pickle Sturgeon, though with ill success; for in the ship in which I returned from *New-England*, many Scores of Cags of Sturgeon were sent to *London*, which were all naught, and cried about the Stree[t]s, under the notion of Holy Sturgeon.¹

When Child reached home, if not before, he must have learned of the action of the Commissioners in the Gorton case. Their two letters to the Colony, dated May 25 and July 22, 1647, had virtually settled the fate of the Remonstrance. In the first, they advert plainly enough to Child and his associates, declaring that they have no wish to encourage appeals or to limit the jurisdiction of Massachusetts, and admitting that the contentions of the Bay have been in defence of legal privileges under the Charter. The second and final letter reaffirms these expressions: "We did by our said letter declare our tenderness of your just privileges, and of preserving entire the authority and jurisdiction of the several governments in New England, whereof we shall still express our continued care."²

After this, it might well have seemed hopeless for Child to prosecute his appeal. But he was an ardent soul, and no doubt received help from his family and friends, especially his brother the Major. At all events, by March or April, 1648, Child had given up the fight, for in May three ships arrived from England in one day, bringing word by the passengers, and also by letters from Winslow, that the struggle was over. Child had "preferred a petition to the committee [i. e., the Commissioners for Plantations] against us, and put in Mr. Thomas Fowle his name among others; but he, hearing of it, protested against it, (for God had brought him very low, both in his estate and his reputation, since he joined in the first petition)." This application to the Commissioners had come to nothing. News also came of an encounter on the Exchange, in which Child had told Francis Willoughby that the people of New England "were a company of rogues and knaves."

¹ Legacie, 3d ed., 1655, p. 168. See p. 109, below.

² Winthrop, ii. 387-390 (318-320).

Mr. Willoughby answered, that he who spake so, etc., was a knave, whereupon the Doctor gave him a box on the ear. Mr. Willoughby was ready to have closed with him, etc., but being upon the exchange, he was stayed, but presently arrested him. And when the Doctor saw the danger he was in, he employed some friends to make his peace, who ordered him to give five pounds to the poor of New England, (for Mr. Willoughby would have nothing of him,) and to give Mr. Willoughby open satisfaction in the full exchange, and to give it under his hand, never to speak evil of New England men after, nor to occasion any trouble to the country, or to any of the people, all which he gladly performed; and besides God had so blasted his estate, as he was quite broken.¹

In consequence, perhaps, of his reverses of fortune, Child seems to have sold Vines's Saco patent, about this time, to John Beex and associates, the proprietors of the iron works,² in which he still retained an interest.³

It was, of course, largely the efforts of Winslow in gaining the support of men of influence, as well as in presenting the Gorton case, along with Child's, to the Commissioners before the Doctor's arrival, that had doomed Child's final attempt. Four pieces of contemporary testimony may close this episode in our hero's career. The Apostle Eliot wrote in the Records of his church at Roxbury under 1647: "God so graciously prospered m^r Winslows indeavours in England, against Gorton & his complices, y^t all their great hopes were dashed; and they among vs, a little pulled in their heads, and held their peace."⁴ Bradford, under 1647, thus records the facts as he saw them:

This year Mr. Edward Winslow went into England, upon this occasion: some discontented persons under the govermente of the Massachusetts sought to trouble their peace, and disturbe, if not innovate,

¹ Winthrop, ii. 391-392 (321-322).

² In 1659 the lands included in this patent were conveyed to Lt. William Phillips of Boston, vintner, by William Hathorne of Salem as attorney for John Jeffard (Gifford) in behalf of Mr. Beex and Company (York Deeds, i. i. 82; Folsom, History of Saco and Biddeford, p. 103). Child had purchased the patent in 1645 (see p. 16, above). James Graham, who reported on the title in 1688, could find no record of any conveyance from Child or "from any under him" (p. 16 note 4, above).

³ Child as one of the proprietors of the iron works joins with Beex and others in an agreement with John Gifford, August 23, 1650 (Suffolk Deeds, i. 216).

⁴ New England Historical and Genealogical Register, xxxiii. 238.

their govermente, by laying many scandals upon them; and intended to prosecute against them in England, by petitioning and complaining to the Parlemeute. Allso Samuell Gorton and his company made complaints against them; so as they made choyse of Mr. Winslow to be their agente, to make their defence, and gave him comission and instructions for that end; in which he so carried him selfe as did well answer their ends, and cleared them from any blame or dishonour, to the shame of their adversaries.¹

On July 14, 1648, Herbert Pelham wrote from England to Winthrop:

I doubt but you are fully informed, by my Cosen Winslow in those things that concerne the affayrs of the Collonies, the care of w^{ch} busines you have comitted to him; who as he was fitly chosen by your selfe & the rest, soe he hath as faythfully discharged that trust you have reposed in him. I could from my owne observation say much concerning his care & dilligence in improving every opportunitie and his many wearisome journeys and attendancys for the dispatch of the Busines he came about . . . but I shall leave it to the relation of some now returning to you.²

Maverick, about 1661, in a paper drawn up to serve as ammunition in his campaign against the liberties of New England, shall be the last witness, for the proverb says that losers must have leave to talk:³

7 persons of Quality about 12 years since for petitioning for themselves & Neighbo^{rs} that they might have votes in Elections as ffreeholders or be ffreed from publick Charge, and be admitted to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper and their Children to Baptisme as Members of the Church of England, and have liberty to have Ministers among themselves learned pious and Orthodox, no way dissonant from ye best Reformation in England, and desireing alsoe to have a body of Lawes to be Established and published to prevent Arbitrary Tiranny, For thus desireing these three reasonable requests besids imprissonement and other indignitys, they were fined 1000^{li}, a[nd] Notw^tstanding they

¹ History of Plimmoth Plantation, 1912, ii. 391-393.

² Winthrop Papers, ii. 144-145.

³ The proverb was familiar to our forefathers. It is used with dignified indulgence in the Court's letter to the adventurers for the iron works, 1646: "Wee find yo^r stile more sharpe & your conclucōns more peremptory then ratiōnall, (as wee conceive,) but wee consider yow have binn hitherto losers, & therefore may take leave to speake" (Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 91).

Appealed to England,¹ they were forced to pay the same, *and now also at great Charges to send one home to prosecute their appeal* which proved to no Effect, That dismall Change falling out, Just at that time And they sending home hither one Edward Winslow a Smooth toungeed Cunning fellow, who soon gott himselve into Favo^r of those then in Supreame power, against whom it was in vaine to strive, and soe they remained sufferers to this day.²

"Now," in the passage that I have italicized, must refer to the time of writing. If so, we have merely an assertion that Maverick himself has come to England as the representative of the petitioners, whose cause has languished for all these years; but he can hardly have meant to pose as agent for the seven Remonstrants, for Child and Burton were dead, Fowle and Yale had dropped the business years before, and Maverick and John Dand seem to have been the only members of the group who were pursuing the affair. At about this same time, thirteen persons who found themselves aggrieved by the New England authorities petitioned the Council for Foreign Plantations for redress. Among them were Edward Godfrey (formerly Governor of Maine), John Gifford (agent for the iron works),³ John Baxe (one of the chief adventurers in the same speculation), and our old friend John Dand the Remonstrant.⁴ On March 4, 1661, the Council directed the attendance (on the 11th) of Godfrey and Gifford, as well as Maverick and Captain Breedon, "with such papers and writings as together with their own particular knowledge may give information of the present condition and government . . . of New England."⁵ We are at liberty to conjecture that Maverick's Briefe Description was one of the papers submitted on the 11th, when the hearing was duly held and the same four persons, with Captain [John] Leverett, Thomas Bell, and Mr. [Joshua] Wollnough were ordered to attend on the 14th.⁶ After this there

¹ This indicates that there was an appeal after the second trial.

² Egerton MS. 2395, British Museum (2 Massachusetts Historical Proceedings, i. 240; New England Historical and Genealogical Register, xxxix. 41).

³ Gifford at this same time was full of projects. He was trying to convince the English authorities that copper and precious stones might be found in New England (Calendar of State Papers, America and West Indies, 1661-1668, pp. 25-26).

⁴ Pp. 16-17.

⁵ P. 15.

⁶ P. 16. On the 14th this order is repeated for the 18th as to Godfrey, Gifford, Maverick, Breedon, and Leverett, and Leverett is to bring a copy of the "patent for New England" (p. 16).

seems to have been a lull for a couple of years, but Maverick did not despair. On August 1, 1663, he petitions the King, alleging that he has lived many years in New England, "and with many others suffered great wrongs from those who have the rule," and on the 30th he renews his application, in behalf of himself and "many thousand loyal subjects there."¹ He has "for near three years been a constant solicitor for relief from his Majesty," and now "prays that some persons may be speedily sent over to regulate all things there now out of order, being assured that if relief appear not they will either rise in arms one part against the other or remove to the Dutch or other places."² We may have all the sympathy we choose for Maverick's grudge without crediting him with cautious veracity in this prognostication. Commissioners were in fact appointed in 1664, with Maverick as one of them, and they did their best to regulate New England — with what success in Boston everybody knows. Soon after his appointment, Maverick petitioned again, thanking the King for the honor, and acknowledging the receipt of £250 "towards his setting forth." He asked for somewhat more of the royal bounty, however, since he had expended at least £500.³ I mention this because it throws some light on the passage just quoted from the Briefe Description, in which Maverick appears to represent himself as one "now sent home [to England] at great Charges" by the Remonstrants to prosecute their old appeal.⁴ Clarendon's letter of March 5, 1665, warning him not to indulge his personal enmities in his official acts would be good reading at this point, but is too long to quote.⁵ On May 31, of that same year, Governor Bellingham, in the name and by the order of the General Court, wrote to Sir William Morrice complaining against Maverick "for calling them traitors again and again, and [for] threats destructive to them."⁶ I have always been unable to understand why our ancestors should be so much glorified for resisting and thwarting Maverick and his fellow-conspirators in 1664 and 1665, when they are so much blamed for resisting and thwarting Maverick and his fellow-conspirators in

¹ Calendar, as above, p. 151.

² P. 157.

³ P. 204.

⁴ P. 67, above.

⁵ New York Colonial Documents, iii. 92.

⁶ Calendar, as above, p. 302.

1646 and 1647. On both occasions they proved their quality as clever and courageous administrators at a moment of crisis. The political points at issue were precisely the same, and we ought not to judge the earlier case like sentimentalists and reserve our common sense for the later.

In estimating rights and wrongs in the controversy between the Bay and the Remonstrants, it is inevitable that historians should take sides. Maybe it is likewise inevitable that, in so doing, many of them should instinctively espouse that cause which appears, at first face, to embody resistance to a narrow and provincial tyranny and to represent civic freedom and liberty of conscience; but I am inclined to think more caution might have been used in accepting the Remonstrants as authentic champions of these noble principles. Certain it is, at all events, that we cannot pass judgment as if the antithesis were between liberality on the one hand and bigotry on the other. Our ancestors of the Bay believed — on good grounds — that they were grappling with a conspiracy to overthrow the government, both civil and ecclesiastical, under which they desired to live. This they suspected from the outset, and their initial suspicions were completely justified by the documents which, in the second stage of the affair, they seized at Dand's lodgings, for these proved beyond a peradventure that Child hoped to procure from Parliament the abrogation of the Charter (as forfeited for non-fulfilment of its conditions), the trial of the magistrates for high treason, the supersession of the Governor and Company by a General Governor under the immediate control of Parliament in all things (without chartered privileges) or by a Board of Parliamentary Commissioners, and the establishment of Presbyterianism as the state church. These objects, all of them plainly avowed in the seized documents, were for the most part expressed or implied in the original Remonstrance,¹ as the magistrates were not slow to discern, though their modern critics have been less keen of sight. In short,

¹ The Remonstrance practically accuses the colonial authorities of having violated the Charter (whence it was an unavoidable inference that they had forfeited it), and with having broken their oath of allegiance (Hutchinson Papers, i. 217, lines 27-28). The signers express in set terms their objection to that measure of independence which the Colony arrogates, maintaining that it should reduce itself to its proper position, which is not that of a "free state," but that of "a colonie or corporation of England" (i. 219, lines 13-14). They hope for

the object of the Remonstrants, from the beginning, was to abolish the independence of the Bay Colony, and the object of the General Court, from the beginning, was, in opposing them, to maintain that independence, which they regarded as vital to their happiness and prosperity.

We, their descendants, who enjoy the fruits of that independence, need not be too harsh in criticizing those who founded and transmitted it. But let us not get ahead of our reasoning. I am not maintaining that the Colony was the abode of liberty for the individual, as we understand it. That is another question, which does not logically arise at any stage of the present discussion. The issue was quite different. Child desired to bring the Colony under the Parliamentary thumb; he desired to reduce it to the position of a civic corporation in the mother country — to that of London, for example, though without the chartered privileges and immunities which that city enjoyed. To the colonists, on the other hand, it was a prime object, though remaining a part of the Empire, to achieve the position of an independent state, something like Canada now-a-days, for example, or New Zealand. On this issue there was, of course, no possibility of compromise, nor can there be any doubt which of the two objects was the more desirable in the long run. The logic of events has settled that problem, and theoretical con-

such changes as may bring the Colony under the immediate and minutely exercised control of the Parliament (i. 222, lines 19–20). And, if the colonial authorities do not voluntarily undertake such measures as shall bring about these ends, they threaten to endeavor to force the changes by an appeal to Parliament itself (i. 221, lines 28–30).

It may be held, perhaps, that the danger from Child was not so great as the colonists imagined, but that consideration, even if it is sound — as by no means appears — neither alters the fact of his revolutionary purposes nor renders the magistrates blameworthy for resisting them with all their strength. If they were nervous, they had every reason to be nervous. The autonomy of the Colony had been continually attacked, and they knew that their enemies were numerous in England and elsewhere. When we read Maverick's *Briefe Description*, drawn up *ca.* 1661, and note his bitter assault upon the Bay (2 Massachusetts Historical Proceedings, i. 239–242), we are apt to think that his enmity resulted from the treatment he had experienced in the matter of the Remonstrance. This may be true in part, but what seems to have eluded the observation of some scholars is the fact that what Maverick was alleging and what he was attempting in 1661–1665 accord perfectly with what we know of the allegations and attempts of the Remonstrants in 1646 and 1647.

siderations have no standing. We may admit that the little commonwealth that our ancestors were establishing was narrow and bigoted at the moment; and that some of the changes that Child believed in would have been salutary may also — for argument's sake — be conceded. Still, it remains true that it was better, in the long run, to keep that commonwealth independent and to let it work toward the light in its own way, however slowly, than to destroy its autonomy at one blow, even if such destruction brought about the reform of certain abuses. We honor our ancestors, I repeat, for successfully resisting the royal Commissioners of 1664, who came hither with just such powers as Child's proposed Commissioners of Parliament would have wielded if they had been appointed, and again in 1689 for ousting Andros, who realized at length the alternative desire of Child for a General Governor. How then can we condemn them for thwarting a similar attempt at subjugation in 1646 and 1647? We shall not, I trust, be deluded by the mere name of a Parliament, for the Long Parliament in 1646 was far more arbitrary in its temper than Charles II in 1664, and every bit as arbitrary as James II, who appointed Andros.

Winslow four times asserts in plain terms that permission to form Presbyterian churches was offered to the Remonstrants in open court. In *Hypocrisy Unmasked* he writes: "Not long before I came away certaine discontented persons in open Court of the *Massachusetts*, demanding that liberty,¹ it was freely and as openly tendred to them; shewing their former practices by mee mentioned; but willed not to expect that wee should provide them Ministers &c. for the same, but getting such themselves they might exercise the Presbyterian Government at their libertie, walking peaceably towards us as wee trusted we should doe towards them."² Major Child did not venture to deny this allegation, but he tried to throw doubt upon it. "This," he retorted, "is strange news to us here, for we hear not one word of that offer from those Petitioners, although here are letters from some of them dated since Mr. *Winslows* coming from thence, that relates that Dr. *Child* & others of them remained still in prison, save that D. *Child* hath the liberty to be confined to M. *Leders* house upon security of 800.l. bond given for his

¹ That is, to "be suffered to exercise their Presbyteriall government amongst us."

² *Hypocrisy Unmasked*, p. 100.

abiding there.”¹ And so, in *New-Englands Salamander*, Winslow reiterated his assertion: “I heard them demand in Court the Presbyterian government, and it was granted them.”² And again: “Let the Reader know that the Presbyterian Government was as freely tendered them by the Governour in the open Court without any contradiction of any the Assistants or other, as ever I heard any thing in my life.”³ And finally, — “For . . . the late tender of the Court of the *Massachusetts* to their Petitioners for the enjoyment of it⁴ at present, themselves providing for it, ’t is not so strange as true: But whereas they say, they hear not of the latter (being since they came away:) ’T is false; I have told them, and they may heare it by many others.”⁵

Let it not be forgotten that at this very moment the utmost that the moderate Presbyterians in England were willing to grant was that, when the Presbyterian system had been established by law, such Independents as wished might be allowed to form and support their own separate churches, whereas the thoroughgoing Presbyterians (like the Scottish Baylie, whom Major Child quotes with approval⁶) wished to withhold even that degree of toleration and, reviving the Laudian practice under another name, to force the Independents to conform or take the consequences. All this was better known to the rulers of the Bay than it seems to be to many of their critics now. They knew also (and so did Child when he presented his Remonstrance on May 19, 1646) that on the 5th of March the House of Commons had passed an ordinance establishing Presbyterianism in England,⁷ and they may well have known also that the Lords had assented on the 14th.⁸ They were well aware that bare toleration was all that Congregationalism could expect of a

¹ *New-Englands Jonas*, p. [22].

² *New-Englands Salamander*, p. 3.

³ *New-Englands Salamander*, pp. 12-13.

⁴ I. e., “their liberty in the exercise of the Presbyterian government.”

⁵ *New-Englands Salamander*, p. 28.

⁶ See p. 87, below.

⁷ *Commons’ Journals*, iv. 463-465.

⁸ *Lords’ Journals*, viii. 209. As Gardiner points out (*Great Civil War*, ed. 1893, iii. 77), the Lords had amended the ordinance, and it therefore had to go back to the Commons; but that was a mere detail: nobody doubted any longer that the Church of England was to be Presbyterian.

Presbyterian Church of England, and that it would have to fight hard to achieve even that measure of freedom. They would have been weak indeed if they had not stood to their guns in America. And why should we be offended at them for thinking that they were doing Presbyterians full justice if they allowed them precisely the same privileges in Massachusetts that the Congregationalists in England, in the most favorable prospect, might hope to receive from the Presbyterians there? It's a poor rule that won't work both ways!

Winslow did not miss this point: there is very little in this whole affair that he *did* miss. In *Hypocrisie Unmasked*, addressing an English (not a colonial) audience, after explaining how, some years before, certain Scottish Presbyterians had received permission to settle in Massachusetts and to organize their own churches in their own way, he remarks that by this it "will easily appeare how wee are here wronged by many; and the harder measure as wee heare imposed upon our brethren for our sakes, nay pretending our example for their president [precedent]." Then, when he has told of the offer to Child and the Remonstrants, he concludes with a trenchant suggestion, though moderately and even ironically put: "So that if our brethren here [i. e., in England] shall bee restrained they walking peaceably, the example must not be taken from us, but arise from some other principle."¹ From *what* other principle, he tellingly refrains from specifying.

Of course, the magistrates, with a passionate interest quite justified by the crisis, were watching the life-and-death struggle in England, both in Parliament and out, between the Presbyterians and the Independents; and they were well aware that Massachusetts was deeply and even essentially involved in the contest. New England was regarded by the Presbyterian party in the mother country as the true nidus of the Independent germ, and to New England the English Independents looked for coöperation and effective aid. Only four years before, in 1642, an appeal had come from "divers Lords of the upper house, and some thirty of the house of commons and others from the ministers there, who stood for the independency of churches," begging for the presence of Cotton, Hooker, and Davenport to advance the cause in England. And in the very year

¹ *Hypocrisie Unmasked*, p. 100.

(1645, July 1) that preceded Child's Remonstrance, the elders of the churches throughout the United Colonies met at Cambridge to "examine the writings which some of them had prepared" in answer to many books from England, a part of which were "in maintenance of the Presbyterial government (agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines in England) against the Congregational way, which was practised here."¹ Child himself arrived in that same summer or in the autumn, and lost no time in identifying himself with the Presbyterian opposition, for his Remonstrance was presented to the General Court in the following May. At home the parties seemed almost to counterbalance, but in the Colony the Independents were at present in control. The issue was well defined in England, and our Massachusetts forefathers were better informed than some of their descendants as to what it was.² They would have been not only cowards, but traitors to their friends in England as well as to themselves, if they had not opposed all such movements as that of Child and his associates; and they would have been blind leaders indeed if they had failed to see the purpose and significance of the particular agitation in which Child was taking the lead.

So much for generalities — now for one or two concrete matters involved in the case of the Remonstrants — or rather, in their two cases, for we must never forget that there were two distinct trials for different (though connected) acts, and two distinct sentences.

It is continually asserted, or implied, that Child and his friends were punished for petitioning the General Court,³ and much rhetoric

¹ Winthrop, ii. 91-92 (76), 304 (248). Cf. Cotton, *The Way of Congregational Churches Cleared*, 1648, pt. i. p. 68: "If none of us have been willing to reply to the Books written against us, how come it to passe that Mr. Hooker hath written a large answer to Mr. Rutherford, Mr. Davenport to Mr. Paget, Mr. Mader to Mr. Rathbone, Mr. Shepard and Mr. Allen to Mr. Ball, Mr. Norton in Latine to Mr. Appollonii; my self to Mr. Williams, both to his examination of my Letter, and to his bloody Tenent?"

² In 1645 Stephen Winthrop wrote to his brother John: "Only the presbyterian Govern^t is resolved on & y^e other are at a Losse: & cannot tell where they shall find rest" (Winthrop Papers, iv. 202).

³ Dr. C. E. Banks, in his edition of Henry Gardener's *New Englands Vindication*, avers that the Remonstrants, whom he calls Episcopalians, "were heavily fined for presuming to petition for freedom of worship" (Gorges Society, 1884, p. 32, n. 34). Whittier remarks that the colonial authorities "imprisoned Dr. Child, an Episcopalian, for petitioning the General Court for toleration" (*Massachusetts Historical Proceedings*, xviii. 390).

has been expended (not to say wasted) in denouncing our fathers for such a violation of one of the most precious of all civic rights. Many scholars seem to forget that the right of petition, as we understand it, has got itself defined and established by dint of a long course of development. Let us give all credit to Child and the Remonstrants for doing their part — though with motives quite different from those of constitutional reformers — to advance the ideas of the world on this vital question of republicanism; but let us not be too hasty in condemning our forefathers for observing the only rules they knew or could know. Their Court was a little Parliament, and they followed Parliamentary precedents in this regard. Again and again, in the critical years between 1640 and 1646, the House of Commons had rebuked or punished petitioners for breach of privilege in cases in which to-day, with our present principles, such action would seem monstrous. To petition at all, on some subjects, was thought offensive, and no matter how proper the subject of any given petition, Parliament always showed extreme sensitiveness to anything in the manner of expression, or in the bearing of the petitioners, that might be actually or technically a contempt. It was even a contempt, and therefore punishable, to criticize the character or conduct of a member of the House. There can be no question what would have happened to any group of petitioners who had dared to present to the Commons a document embodying the assertions and conceived in the style that Child ventured upon in his Remonstrance. They would have been sent to the Tower incontinently and would hardly have got off without heavy fines. And, apart from language and matter, there was, in this case, such conduct on the part of the Remonstrants when called before the magistrates, though not when brought into Court for their judgment, as the most lenient of modern judges could hardly have refrained from treating as contempt of court. In this regard, we must not forget that the General Court was not merely a legislative body, but actually a court of judicature, civil and criminal, and that — whatever liberties are accorded to petitioners before a legislative assembly to-day — our judges are still sensitive, and have a power to punish for contempt which is quite as arbitrary as that which Parliament exercised in the seventeenth century — be it the English Parliament or our little parliament of the Massachusetts Bay.

Child's party, of course, complained that they were punished for petitioning, but our forefathers knew better. Child was himself informed by the Court, at a preliminary examination, when he contended that "it was no offence to prefer a petition," that the Remonstrants "were not questioned for petitioning, but for such miscarriages, etc., as appeared in their petition and Remonstrance."¹ Winslow, in defending the Colony, points out with perfect clearness the necessary distinction: "There were none committed for petitioning, but for their Remonstrance and the many false charges and seditious insinuations tending to faction and insurrections sleighting the government &c."² And he then particularizes, so that there can be no doubt what expressions were contemptuous and seditious. Winslow was addressing not a colonial but an English circle, and he knew well that every intelligent reader would see at a glance how such a series of expressions as he quotes or cites would have been regarded by Parliament. So much for the right of petition and the question of contempt.³

The second point is that of the appeal to Parliament, or to the Commissioners for Plantations — which amounts to the same thing. Here Child and his friends made a bad mistake in tactics, of which the magistrates took instant advantage. They put in their first appeal at the wrong moment and in a wrong way, and thus got into an altogether false position. Without waiting for the decision of the Court on the charges of contempt and sedition, or even for a formal arraignment, they "refused to answer" and appealed to the Commissioners in England, and this was of course construed as a denial of jurisdiction, as in fact it was and was meant to be. In the language of the charge brought against them in the first case, they "publicly declared their disaffection [to our government], in that, being called by the Court to render an accompt of their misapprehensions and evil expressions in the premises, they refused to answer; but, by appealing from this government, they disclaimed the juris-

¹ Winthrop, ii. 347 (284).

² New-Englands Salamander, p. 9.

³ Chief Justice Marshall, in his brief account of the affair, brings out this point, as might be expected, with proper emphasis: "Their plea that the right to petition government was sacred, was answered by saying that they were not accused for petitioning, but for using contemptuous and seditious expressions" (*History of the Colonies, Philadelphia, 1824, pp. 119-120*).

diction thereof, *before they knew whether [the court] would give any sentence against them, or no.*"¹ This point was also made with perfect distinctness in the official letter of the Governor and Company to the Commissioners.²

Whether or not an appeal would lie from the General Court to Parliament was a question on which the magistrates had made up their minds.³ They held that under the Charter the judgment of the General Court was final, and they regarded the establishment and maintenance of this principle as necessary to the safety of their plantation. Of course they knew that it was a ticklish point, but they were quite right in supposing that it was vital, and they were bold accordingly in its assertion, though they had until very recently avoided raising it directly. Almost at the beginning they had been accused of setting up a separate state and renouncing the laws of England as well as its Church,⁴ and throughout the pre-Parliamentary period they had lived in constant danger of having their power superseded or nullified by Commissioners or a commissioned Governor.

With the coming-in of Parliament the situation became peculiarly embarrassing, both with regard to sovereignty in general and with regard to the right of appeal. Fears were past from King and Council, and the Parliament was friendly. It was requisite, therefore, to keep its favor and at the same time to maintain the position that appeals could not be made.⁵ Nervousness on this point showed itself in 1640 (or 1641) when the authorities declined to accept the well-meant advice of friends in England that they should petition for

¹ The Charge, in Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 91; Winthrop, ii. 350 (287).

² In Massachusetts Colony Records, iii. 97; Winthrop, ii. 362 (297).

³ There was, of course, some difference of opinion, and therefore a certain sentiment favoring a petition to Parliament for a new charter with enlarged powers; but wiser counsels prevailed, for it was feared that Parliament might reduce rather than increase the local authority (Winthrop, ii. 341-342 [280]). The elders gave their opinion that there was no appeal (ii. 345 [282-283]).

⁴ Winthrop, i. 119, 122 (100, 102-103).

⁵ One notes that Winthrop, while recording with obvious relief the action of the House of Lords in 1641 in reviving the Charter, takes care to add that the petition which resulted in this action, though presented by "some of our people being then in London," was "preferred without warrant from our court" (ii. 50 [42]).

additional privileges. "We declined the motion, for this consideration, that if we should put ourselves under the protection of the parliament, we must then be subject to all such laws as they should make, or at least such as they might impose upon us."¹ This passage in Winthrop led Governor Trumbull, "one of the most deliberate assertors of the American revolution," to remark, most pertinently, as it happens, to our present purpose: "Here observe, that as at this time, so it hath been ever since, that the colonies, so far from acknowledging the parliament to have a right to make laws binding on them in all cases whatsoever, they have ever denied it in any case."² Through the help, at first, of friends in England, and later by a Fabian policy of no less courage than shrewdness, they had managed to retain their Charter, in spite of attempts to procure its recall by Order in Council in 1632³ and 1634,⁴ of its abrogation by *quo warranto* in 1635,⁵ and of continual demands to surrender it (in 1634,⁶ 1638,⁷ 1639⁸), until Parliament took up the reins of government and in effect reaffirmed it in 1641.⁹ And during all this period they had, when occasion rose, shown themselves ready to resist a Commission or a commissioned Governor by force of arms if need were.¹⁰ Thus by tract of time, improved with rare political skill at every turn, the colonists had succeeded in establishing a *de facto*

¹ Winthrop, ii. 29-30 (25).

² Savage's note, *ibid.* The passage is in Trumbull's letter to Van der Capellan, August 31, 1779 (1 Massachusetts Historical Collections, vi. 156).

³ Winthrop, i. 119, 122-123 (100, 102-103); Hutchinson Papers, i. 57-59; Bradford, ii. 141-145; Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial Series, i. 183; C. F. Adams, 1 Massachusetts Historical Proceedings, xx. 81-85.

⁴ Winthrop, i. 161, 163 (135, 137); ii. 233-234 (190-191).

⁵ Brought in Trinity Term, 11 Charles I (Hutchinson Papers, i. 114-116); decree, Michaelmas Term (i. 116-118).

⁶ Winthrop, i. 163 (137).

⁷ Hutchinson Papers, i. 118-119; Winthrop, i. 323-324 (269), 329-330 (274); Hubbard, ch. 36, ed. 1848, pp. 268-271.

⁸ Winthrop, i. 359-360 (298-299), 367 (305).

⁹ Winthrop, i. 50 (42).

¹⁰ Winthrop, i. 171, 183, 280-281 (143-144, 154, 234-235). As to the first of these occasions, see Laud's commission of 1634 in American Antiquarian Society Proceedings, xiii. 213-220. These signs of promptitude in resistance were, soon after the Restoration, made a ground of attack on the Colony by Samuel Maverick in his Briefe Description of New England preserved in Egerton MS. 2395 (2 Massachusetts Historical Proceedings, i. 240-241; New England Historical and Genealogical Register, xxxix. 41-42).

rule (which they were prepared to defend *de jure*) that there was no appeal to England against sentences or judgments passed in Massachusetts; but they had so far contrived (except in the Gorton case) to prevent this question from coming to a direct issue in the mother country. That they had such points in mind at the outset is shown by Winthrop's remark that Winslow, in 1635, was ill-advised in petitioning the Council "for a commission to withstand the intrusions of the French and Dutch," since "such precedents might endanger our liberty, that we should do nothing hereafter but by commission out of England."¹

As the Civil War progressed, however, and as Parliament became more and more nearly absolute, — while, in the strife of parties on both sides of the water, disaffection or dissatisfaction with the colonial government increased with the growth of a mixed population, — the moment was inevitably approaching when this doctrine of No Appeal must be decided. It came up in the case of Captain Stagg when he made prize of a Bristol ship in Boston harbor, and was asserted as undoubtedly sound "in causes of judicature," but here a conflict of authority was avoided by some very close reasoning, into which we need not enter.² And then, in Child's Remonstrance, presented in May, 1646, the Court found itself confronted with a distinct threat to appeal to "the honourable houses of Parliament" if the petitioners should not receive a satisfactory response; and, before the matter had been taken up by the Court, the disquieting news came that Samuel Gorton and two of his fellows who had gone to England and appealed to the Commissioners for Plantations against their treatment by the Bay authorities, had met with a large measure of success. For there arrived by Captain Wall's ship on September 13, 1646, shortly after the presentation of the Remonstrance to the May Court, a letter from the Commissioners (dated May 15 in that year), which was instantly sent to the Governor by Randall Holden, its bearer. It was an order to allow the Gortonians to land and to proceed unmolested to their settlement on Narragansett Bay. By the same ship, or immediately after, came another order from the Commissioners, dated ten days later (May 25, 1646), to reinstate the Gortonians in their settlement.

¹ Winthrop, i. 205 (172).

² Winthrop, ii. 222-225 (180-183).

The first of these orders, after some hesitation, was quietly obeyed in so far that Holden, who seems to have come alone, was allowed to go in peace, but the second — Gorton himself being still in England — was made the special subject of Winslow's commission, as we have already seen.¹

The Gortonian petition, which the Commissioners had received and on which they had taken provisional action, was to all intents and purposes an appeal from the Bay to Parliament; and the fathers of the Colony were shrewd enough, in forwarding their own protest to the Commissioners by the hands of Winslow, in December, 1646, to bring this Gorton appeal into connection with the case of Child. For, since Child had not appealed (in November, 1646) until the Commissioners' action in the Gorton matter had become known in Boston, it was reasonable to assert that his boldness in *appealing before judgment* had been encouraged, if not suggested, by that action. And the two cases were particularly advantageous ones, from the Massachusetts point of view, on which to raise the general question. For the Gortonians were sectaries of a sort that Parliament would be unlikely to encourage when all the documents were laid before it, particularly that extraordinary manifesto of Randall Holden addressed "To the great and honoured Idol Generall, now set up in the Massachusetts."² This was a paper which the Commissioners must at once recognize as the kind of thing no legislative or judicial body could be expected to accept with patience. And as to Child, the fact that in his Remonstrance he had also used offensive language (though of a different kind) and had included the threat of an appeal, as well as the error in tactics he had committed in appealing before judgment and in expressing his contempt for the jurisdiction, would go far to put him out of court with Parliament and the Commissioners. Thus this crisis, as it demanded that the Massachusetts authorities should at last make a firm stand

¹ Winthrop, ii. 332-334, 340-346, 359-367 (272-273, 278-284, 295-301).

² Hypocrisy Unmasked, pp. 28-36. Two specimens of the diction of this document will suffice: "Out of the abovesaid principles, which is the kingdome of darknesse and of the devill; you have writ another Note unto us, to adde to your former pride and folly." "But we know our course, professing the kingdome of God and his righteousnesse, renouncing that of darknesse and the devill, wherein you delight to trust . . . O yee generation of vipers, who hath fore-warned you, or fore-stalled your mindes with this, but Satan himselfe."

on the invalidity of appeals, and should state their doctrine with perfect clearness, so it afforded them an uncommonly favorable opportunity to do both. As we have noted, their representations, under the skilful handling of the astute Winslow, elicited a reply from the Commissioners which practically, though not in express terms, conceded the point and established the doctrine of No Appeal, which the Colony had long cherished as one of the most valuable of its chartered rights. And this reply coincided almost to a day with Child's appeal after conviction on the second case against him, at the May Court in 1647. That appeal, therefore, was a practical nullity at the moment when it was made.

As it has sometimes been asserted — how erroneously we have seen — that the Remonstrants were fined and imprisoned for petitioning the General Court, so we hear now and again that they were punished for appealing. The late Mr. Charles Francis Adams, as I understand him, avers that an appeal to Parliament, in this and other cases, "was looked upon and treated in Massachusetts as a crime, and as such was punished." And, though he acknowledges that "the stubborn spirit of independence behind" this denial of right was "what made New England," he cannot refrain from the query: "Yet would Verres have dared to make a crime of the complaint a Roman citizen had proffered to the Senate and People of Rome?"¹ The implied comparison does not please me, nor am I altogether satisfied with the classical allusion. For I cannot forget the climax of Cicero's terrific denunciation of the wicked proconsul — the case of that Gavius of Consa who, because he threatened to take his wrongs to Rome, was scourged and tortured, though he protested his Roman citizenship, and finally was crucified. "Nullus gemitus, nulla vox alia illius miseri inter dolorem crepitumque plagarum audiebatur, nisi haec, 'Civis Romanus sum!'" And Verres set up the cross on the Strait of Messina, that, since Gavius said he was a Roman citizen, he might see Italy and his home as he hung there dying. "Monumentum sceleris audaciaeque suae voluit esse in conspectu Italiae, vestibulo Siciliae, praetervectione omnium qui ultro citroque navigarent."²

¹ Three Episodes of Massachusetts History, pp. 349-350.

² In Verrem, Actio ii. lib. v, 61-66.

Thus I vindicate Verres from the charge that he would have respected the right of appeal to Rome. Our ancestors, in the cases of Child and Maverick, the record will also vindicate from the charge of treating an appeal to Parliament as a crime. Child appealed twice once, in his first case, *before sentence*, with contemptuous denial of the Court's jurisdiction. In this appeal Maverick was not concerned, and Child, as we have seen, was not punished for appealing, but for appealing at such a moment and in such a way as to make himself guilty of high contempt. The second appeal, in which both shared, was at the end of the first case. It was treated as an offence in Maverick's case only, because it violated his oath as a freeman.¹

Note that Samuel Maverick, who knew at least as much about these transactions as our local iconoclasts, was under no misapprehension about the charges against him. Referring, in a formal document, to the second trial (on the *first*, he had escaped with a mulct of only £10), he avers that he was convicted of "conspiracy and perjury." And he was quite correct. Child's actions — after the first case, that of the Remonstrance itself, had been disposed of — amounted to a plot against the government, and therefore the records speak, with stern but exact judgment, of "Dr. Child's conspiracy," and in this conspiracy Maverick was unquestionably implicated. As to perjury, all one has to do is to read the Freeman's Oath, which Maverick had taken, to determine that question.²

The prevalent opinion seems to be that Child presented his Remonstrance of 1646 in good faith and with a sincere desire to procure from the colonial authorities the blessings of civil liberty and freedom of worship. One plain fact has often been strangely overlooked: namely, that Robert Child, who was no fool, did not intend that his Petition and Remonstrance should be favorably considered by the General Court. Merely to read the document — a temptation which some scholars appear to have resisted — will convince anybody that he could have had no such hope or purpose.

¹ There was probably an appeal after the second trial also (see pp. 67, 81, 84). If so, Maverick's sentence (p. 54, above) may apply to this occasion; but, in any event, Child was punished for no appeal except that at the November hearing in 1646.

² It is printed in *New-Englands Jonas*, p. [17], to show that the Colony was setting up a commonwealth independent of the mother country.

For the Court to give the petition a favorable hearing would have been to admit that the colonists had violated their Charter and neglected their oath of allegiance, inasmuch as they had not yet established "a settled forme of government according to the lawes of England;" that the inhabitants, under the system that prevailed, could not have "a sure and comfortable enjoyment of [their] lives, liberties, and estates, according to [their] due and naturall rights as freeborne subjects of the English nation;" that the magistrates appeared to cherish "an overgreedy spirit of arbitrary power," such as was "detestable to our English nation and to all good men" and was "at present a chief cause of the intestine warre" in the mother country, — in short, a disposition like that of Charles I himself; that the people lived in constant fear of "illegal commitments, unjust imprisonments, taxes, rates, customes, levyes of ungrounded and undoing assessments, unjustifiable presses, undue fynes, unmeasurable expenses and charges;" that the limitations on the franchise and on eligibility to office were causing "many great inconveniences, secret discontents, murmurings, rents in the plantations," and even "fears of perpetual slavery and bondage;" that the church polity of Massachusetts occasioned "an ocean of inconveniences, dishonor to God and to his ordinances, . . . encrease of anabaptisme and of those that totally contemn all ordinances as vaine, fading of christian graces, decrease of brotherly love, heresies, [and] schismes;"¹ that "all things in the Colony" were "growing worse and worse, even to the threatning . . . of no less than final ruin" — "the Gospel much darkened," "Christian charity and brotherly love almost frozen," "secret discontents fretting like cankers," "merchandizing and shipping by speciall providence wasted," "husbandry now withering," "villages and plantations much deserted," credit "almost lost," "strife and contention now rife," and our brethren in England in "just indignation" and "flying from us as a pest."² Furthermore, for the Court to grant the specific requests

¹ It passes my comprehension how anybody who had read this passage could straightway characterize Child as a champion of religious liberty or freedom of conscience. Perhaps nobody who has read the passage has ever so characterized him.

² This particular passage was read to the Remonstrants by the Court at the first hearing as a specimen of the offensiveness of the document (Winthrop, ii. 347 [284]).

or demands embodied in the Remonstrance would have meant that the whole body of English laws should be substituted for the colonial code; that the Colony should cease to regard itself as a free state, and should reduce itself to the condition of "other corporations of England;" that all English denizens not now admitted to full rights should be forthwith accorded them, or released from the liability to taxation; that members of the Church of England should enjoy all the privileges of church-members in the Colony without being required to take the covenants of the colonial churches, or else should be allowed to "settle themselves" in accordance with the Presbyterian system.¹

We need not here inquire whether the allegations were true or false, and the requests reasonable or unreasonable, for that is not the point. The point is rather that Child, who was on his second visit to the Colony and was intimately acquainted with its leading men,² must have known perfectly well that his petition would be refused — that the administration could not grant it without giving up principles and purposes which they held most tenaciously, and for whose sake they had emigrated in the first place. His intention clearly was, not to persuade the government to adopt certain reforms which would be equivalent to a revolution, but to furnish himself with a grievance which should enable him to appeal to Parliament with telling emphasis. This appeal he meant to urge in person, backed by the whole Presbyterian party, then in the majority in the House of Commons — a party of which his brother Major John Child was an important member.

When, at the end of the Remonstrance, he declared that, in case the petition were rejected, he and his associates should "be necessitated to apply [their] humble desires to the honourable Houses of Parliament," he was not indulging in a mere threat: he was expressing, none too guardedly, the real purpose that he had in mind in presenting his Remonstrance. And the threat itself would be a powerful argument when he went to the Commons. "You see, gentlemen," so he could argue, "how slightly these rebellious colonists hold your authority. I assured them that I should appeal to you if they were not just to me, and they threw out my petition all

¹ Hutchinson Papers, i. 214-223.

² See pp. 7-8, above.

the same!" Indeed, the whole Remonstrance, if read with all the circumstances in mind, reveals itself at once as a paper intended, from the first, for the eyes of the Presbyterian party in England, both in the Parliament and out, who had long looked askance at New England as a stronghold of Independency. Only in form was it addressed to our General Court.¹

And the nature of the petition that was to come before Parliament, on the basis of the clearly foreseen rejection of this extraordinary Remonstrance, is not a matter of conjecture, for we know the contents of the papers seized in Dand's study on the eve of Child's intended sailing. After a recital of their bitter experiences, the Remonstrants petition the Commissioners not only for the extension to Massachusetts of the laws of England and for liberties like those of English freeholders, but "for settled churches according to the reformation of England," — that is, for the introduction of the Presbyterian system, — for the appointment of "a General Governor or some honorable Commissioners" to take charge of the Colony, and for the imposition upon all of the oath of allegiance "and other covenants which the Parliament shall think most convenient, to be as a touchstone to try our affections to the state of England and true restored Protestant religion." This last request is particularly notable. What Child had in mind was *that the colonists should be forced to take the Covenant!* After this, one thinks, we should hear no more of Child as one of the noble army of martyrs to liberty of conscience and freedom of speech.² Along with this

¹ Captain Edward Johnson, who is a good witness as to contemporary opinion in the Bay, was in no doubt on this point (Wonder-working Providence, 1654, bk. iii. chap. 3, p. 202). Bancroft states the facts in brief and trenchant terms: "An entire revolution was demanded." "The document was written in a spirit of wanton insult" and "was evidently designed for English ears." Child "desired only an excuse for appealing to England" (History of the United States, chap. x, 19th ed., 1862, i. 438, 439). Chalmers writes amusingly: "A petition, which would now appear so humble and so reasonable, we ought naturally to infer, met with the most gracious attention. But no conclusion however would be more erroneous" (Political Annals, 1780, i. 179).

² Grahame makes a pretty keen observation: "The discovery of the intolerance meditated by these persons served to exasperate the intolerance which they themselves were experiencing from the society of which they formed but an insignificant fraction" (History of the Rise and Progress of the United States, London, 1827, i. 324).

petition was to go a copy of the original Remonstrance, which was a sweeping denunciation of the Colony and its whole government, both civil and ecclesiastical. There was also a paper of queries, intended for the Commissioners, asking, among other things, "about the validity" of the Massachusetts patent, "and how it might be forfeited," and whether certain specified "acts or speeches in the pulpits or in the Court were not high treason."¹

These papers, it may be, were drawn up after the Remonstrance had been rejected and its subscribers fined, and may have been more drastic on that account, but there is every reason to suppose that, so far as the petition to the Commissioners is concerned, it represents substantially what Child had originally intended to bring before Parliament, though he had since decided to bring the matter before the Commissioners.² It is impossible not to infer that, from the beginning, Child's design was, if he could, to impose Presbyterianism on the Colony as the legally established system as well as to effect such a radical change in the colonial government as should abolish the Charter and put an end to the large degree of independence which the Bay had thus far enjoyed. The Remonstrance itself was simply a means to this end.

Nor were the fathers of our commonwealth in doubt, even before they seized Child's and Dand's papers, that the Remonstrants (or their ringleaders) intended to nullify the Charter and to reduce the Colony to a condition of absolute dependence on the will of a Presbyterian majority in Parliament. When Child told the Court, in November, 1646, "that they [the Remonstrants] did beneath themselves in petitioning to us, etc., and in conclusion appealed to the Commissioners in England," the Governor replied that "he would admit no appeal, nor was it allowed by our charter, *but by this it appeared what their aim was in their petition*; they complained of fear of perpetual slavery,³ etc., *but their intent was, to make us slaves*

¹ Winthrop, ii. 357 (293).

² Whether one petitioned the Parliament or the Commissioners was a mere detail of procedure, for any petition to the Parliament from the colonies was sure to be referred to the Commissioners for advice, if not for final action.

³ Cf. the Remonstrance: "Whence issue forth . . . also jealousies of too much unwarranted power and dominion on the one side, and of perpetual slavery and bondage on the other" (Hutchinson Papers, i. 218).

to them and such as themselves were, and that by the parliament and commissioners." ¹ There could be no clearer pronouncement. The Court understood that the Remonstrance was a move in the Presbyterian campaign, and that it was intended from the outset for presentation to the Parliamentary authorities in England. Its rejection was a foregone conclusion: it was drawn up to be rejected and thus to serve as the basis of an appeal.

That Robert Child's sentiments were violently anti-Independent comes out clearly in the papers already examined. Their testimony is corroborated by the pamphlet issued by his brother the Major. Note, for instance, the closing words: "I shall desire the Reader by all that hath been said, to observe how Independents are all of a peece, for subtilitie, designs, fallacies, both in *New-England* and in *Old*." ² Or take the following dictum, which discloses the actual personage whose tenets ruled the Major's life and opinions: "We have cause heartily to pray, That (as Mr. *Baily* sets forth in his book of *Disswasive from the Errors of the times*) as from *New-England* came Independencie of Churches hither, which hath spread over all parts here; that from thence also (in time) Arbitrary Government in the Commonwealth may not come hither." ³

Major Child's citation of Mr. Baily seems to have made slight impression upon the minds of the more recent investigators of New England history, but it deserves a moment's pause, for it shows us where he stood and thus gives the plainest indication of the real purpose of the whole agitation. A quotation or two from Baylie's famous *Dissuasive* will be more than enough:

The fruits of *Independency* may be seen in the profession and practices of the most who have been admitted, as very fit, if not the fittest members of their Churches. These have much exceeded any of the *Brownists* that yet we have heard of: first, in the vilenesse of their Errours; secondly, in the multitude of the erring persons; thirdly, in the hypocrisie joyned with their errours; fourthly, in malice against their neighbours, and contempt of their Superiours, Magistrates and Ministers for their opposition to them in their evil ways; and lastly, in their singular obstinacie, stiffly sticking unto their errours, in defiance

¹ Winthrop, ii. 347 (285).

² *New-Englands Jonas*, p. [22].

³ P. 12 [error for 20].

of all that any upon earth could do for their reclaiming, or that God from heaven, almost miraculously, had declared against them.¹

These Five last yeers, the chief of that party, both from *Arnhem*, *Roterdam* and *New-England*, have kept their residence at *London*, to advance, by common counsels and industry, their Way, in these days of their hopes . . . But three things seem to be clear, which make their way at *London* no more lovely then in the places mentioned. First, they have been here exceeding unhappie in retarding, and to their power crossing the blessed Reformation in hand.² Secondly, they have pregnantly occasioned the multiplication of Heresies and Schisms, above all that ever was heard of in any one place in any former Age. Thirdly, they have occasioned such Divisions in the State, that, had it not been for the extraordinary mercies of God, the Parliament and all that follow them, had long ago been laid under the feet of their enraged enemies, and the whole Isle, long before this, totally ruined.³

After this we are not surprised to find the excellent Baylie (whom I greatly admire for his clearness and force of style, and for the frankness with which he joins issue with everything that makes for liberty of conscience and freedom of speech) spending a whole chapter to prove that "Independencie is contrary to the Word of God."⁴ "Liberty of Conscience," he declares, "and Toleration of all or any Religion is so prodigious an impiety, that this religious Parliament cannot but abhorre the very naming of it."⁵ After digesting these tough morsels of Presbyterian doctrine, one can hardly read with a straight face the strictures passed upon our fathers by those scholars who maintain that Child and his fellows were contending for free speech and religious liberty.⁶ But, lest

¹ Robert Baylie, *A Dissuasive from the Errours of the Time*, London, 1645, pp. 60-61.

² I. e., the establishment of the complete Presbyterian system, including the inquisitorial power over manners and morals in private life.

³ P. 90.

⁴ Chap. x. pp. 196-223.

⁵ Epistle Dedicatory, p. [iv].

⁶ Among writers who think or seem to think that Robert Child was an advocate of toleration or of liberty of conscience may be mentioned Whittier (Preface to *Snow-Bound*; 1 *Massachusetts Historical Proceedings*, xviii. 390); C. F. Adams, *Massachusetts its Historians and its History*, p. 60, and *Three Episodes of Massachusetts History*, i. 333; Brooks Adams, *Emancipation of Massachusetts*, p. 95; W. T. R. Marvin, *New-Englands Jonas*, p. 1; Peter Oliver, *Puritan*

some one may think that Baylie's arguments were academic — that he was upholding a theoretical system, not aiming to establish a social and political tyranny — let me quote from a sermon which he delivered in this same year (1645) before the House of Lords, and which he published at their request.¹ First, note his opinion as to the propriety of tolerating "errors," that is, divergencies from the Presbyterian doctrine and discipline:

It is more, at least no lesse unlawfull for a Christian State to give any libertie or toleration to Errours, then to set up in every Citie and Parish of their Dominions, Bordels for Uncleanesse, Stages for Playes, and Lists for Duels. That a libertie for Errours is no lesse hatefull to God no lesse hurtfull to men, then a freedome without any punishment, without any discouragement, for all men, when and wheresoever they pleased, to kill, to steal, to rob, to commit adultery, or to do any of these mischiefs, which are most repugnant to the Civill law, and destructive of humane societie.²

But what are "Errours"? Baylie leaves us in no doubt on this point, for he enumerates several aberrant sects that appear to him equally dangerous: — the Canterburians (i. e., High Churchmen of Laud's temper), the Antinomians, the Anabaptists, the Libertines, and *the Independents*. And, as he puts the Independents at the top of the climax, so he does not hesitate to explain their bad eminence:

Commonwealth, p. 420; C. E. Banks, reprint of Henry Gardener's *New-Englands Vindication*, p. 32, n. 34; Sumner, *History of East Boston*, p. 99; Barry, *History of Massachusetts*, 1855, i. 339.

It must be admitted that one of the petitions to the Commissioners seized in Dand's study (signed by a number of non-freemen) did ask for "liberty of conscience" as well as for a General Governor (p. 40, above). How Child meant to utilize such a paper, which was glaringly inconsistent with his own request for the imposition of the Covenant and the establishment of Presbyterianism, does not appear: probably, however, merely as evidence of general discontent, for only so could it serve his turn and back up the requests that he had draughted to submit to the Commissioners. Such discontent, if proved, might encourage the Presbyterian party in England to attempt the overthrow of the Massachusetts régime, and, if that were once abolished, the Presbyterian régime would of course be decreed as its successor, no matter what wishes these non-freemen might cherish for universal toleration.

¹ Errors and Induration, are the Great Sins and the Great Judgements of the Time. Preached in a Sermon Before the . . . House of Peers, . . . July 30. 1645 (London, 1645).

² Preface.

“That so much-extolled Independency,” he calls it, “wherein many Religious souls for the time do wander, which is the chief hand that opened at first, and keepeth open to this day the door to all the other Errours that plague us.” Still, he has hope: Independency is likely to be suppressed by the strong hand of the law, and Presbyterianism, which alone is of God, will soon be established by God’s mighty arm throughout the land. “Yet here is our Comfort, That, in answer to our Supplications, the Lord hath stirred up the hearts of those who have power effectually to minde that which we are confident will prove the Remedy of these and many more of our present Evils: I mean, The setting up, without further Delay, of the Lords Government in his own House, over all the Land.”

All this, to be sure, is in the Preface to the printed sermon, but the actual discourse addressed to the Lords breathes the same sentiments:

Understand the Language of them who plead for liberty of errors; If you beleeve Christ, or the Doctrine of *Paul* attested by *Peter*, and the rest both Prophets and Apostles . . .; they invite you to permit ravening Woolfs freely to enter your streets, and tear in peeces all they meet with; to come into your Houses and Chambers, to devour the souls of your best beloved Wives, Sons, Daughters, Servants, and Friends; to lead them all out to a ditch, and drown them; yea, which is infinitely worse, to cast them all in the pit of damnation. . . .

Would you count him a gracious parent, who should wink at any who brought into his house Vipers and Serpents, Woolfs and Tigers, to destroy his Children? who brought in Boxes of Pestiferous Cloaths, and boldly spread them on the Beds, and about the Table where he himself and family were to sit and lie? This is the office and onely exercise of all our Hereticks and Patrons of error.¹

Among these heretics and patrons of error, be it understood, the Independents have a chief place in Baylie’s mind — “the Independents,” he says, “the Brownists, or the Anabaptists, or any of the Heterodox Societies.”² One more quotation may suffice; it gives the practical application of all that precedes: “All Christians are obliged to the uttermost of their power to quench the fire of Heresie and Schism; but above all other, we have a speciall obliga-

¹ P. 26.

² Pp. 22-23.

tion for this duty." ¹ What he particularly wishes to quench — if we had any doubt about it — we could learn from a clause in the Dissuasive: "that lamentable *Independency* which in *Old and New-England* hath been the fountain of many evils already, though no more should ensue." ² Away with Independency, and the other heresies and schisms will be easily crushed!

Baylie's Dissuasive appeared the year before the Remonstrance was presented. All such books came to New England without delay and the task of answering them devolved in large measure upon the Massachusetts divines. Indeed, John Cotton was penning his reply to Baylie and Rutherford ³ at the very time that the troubles with the Remonstrants were in full swing. ⁴ Our ancestors knew what high Presbyterianism meant and they recognized it when they saw it. Some of their descendants and critics are not so well-informed or not so vigilant. Otherwise, Child would never have been glorified as a champion of religious liberty. Why, Major Child rejects this imputation as a "false report" invented by Winslow and the New Englanders to injure the repute of the Remonstrants in the mother country! "They give out of my Brother and others," he exclaims with indignation, "that they desire a Toleration of all Religioun." ⁵ Nothing could have seemed a worse slander to a conscientious Presbyterian of Baylie's school. ⁶

The friendship between Child and the younger John Winthrop was not disturbed even by the outcome of the trial of June, 1647. ⁷

¹ P. 26.

² P. 17.

³ *The Way of Congregational Churches Cleared*. London, 1648 (Imprimatur, January 1, 1647[-8]).

⁴ Winthrop, ii. 304-305 (248-249); Palfrey, *History of New England*, 1860, ii. 84-92, 173, n. 1.

⁵ *New-Englands Jonas*, p. 1.

⁶ The Remonstrance itself ascribes to New England Congregationalism "an ocean of inconveniences, dishonor to God and to his ordinances, little profit by the ministry, *encrease of anabaptisme*, and of those that totally contemn all ordinances as vaine, fading of christian graces, decrease of brotherly love, *heresies, schismes, &c.*" (Hutchinson Papers, i. 221).

⁷ Winthrop is mentioned in the list of those present at the opening of the spring session of the General Court on May 6, 1646 (Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 146). It was at this session (on May 19) that the Remonstrance was presented, but it was not taken up until November (see p. 30, above), when he was in Connecticut (John Winthrop to John Winthrop, Jr., October 26,

Soon after Child left America, Winthrop sent him a letter (dated October 25, 1647) informing him that he had paid Leader the borrowed £40. Child replied, but, fearing his letter might miscarry, he wrote again on May 13, 1648, lest "intelligence betwixt us" might be broken. "If I had not quarrelld in y^e country," he writes, "I should have bin willing to haue ventured an 100^l or two vpon yo^r mine of ½,¹ but shall not haue any thing to doe with y^t country hereafter in this kind, vnles my fines be restored, w^{ch} I had destinated to this end, & yet will adventure them wth you, if they be returned. I am not so offended wth y^e country but I may be reconciled, & passe by such iniuryes as I haue there received, knowing to doe good for evil is Xian-like." The tone of the letter is affectionate and he sends his "best respects to yo^r wife, brother, father, & all o^r freinds."² Winthrop's reply (March 23, 1648[-9]) mentions the black lead but avoids the subject of the fines: "I have not beene at Boston since last Spring:³ have done nothing yet about the ½ mine; because of y^e difficulty in y^e beginning exopt a plantation were neere, or a good stocke. It can be well forborne a yeare or 2, w^{ch} because of your departure I have not minded to raise by other adventure."⁴

Child's letter of 1648 is dated at Gravesend, but he was then

November 16 and 19, 1646, in Savage's Winthrop, 2d ed., Appendix, ii. 429-431). He was also in Connecticut in May, 1647 (Winthrop Papers, iii. 157-158, iv. 222-223), and probably also in June, when the second trial of the Remonstrants took place. However, he attended meetings of the Commissioners of the United Colonies, at Boston, perhaps in July and certainly in August, 1647 (Acts of the Commissioners, i. 96-97, 101), and may therefore have seen Child before the latter sailed for England (see p. 63, above). Winthrop was an uncommonly charming person and never quarrelled with anybody, even with Samuel Gorton (Winthrop Papers, ii. 627); his success in dealing with the English government after the Restoration has astonished all students of our early history.

¹ I. e., [black] lead.

² Winthrop Papers, iii. 158-161. On August 21, 1648, Richard Leader writes to Winthrop on the same subject: "I have lately received from the Doc, whoe remembers his love to you and hath ordered me to see if his fine can be remitted; which he will venture in your black lead myne, in case you approve of it" (2 Massachusetts Historical Proceedings, iii. 192).

³ This may be a kind of excuse for having nothing to say about the fines.

⁴ Winthrop Papers, iv. 41. The sheet is endorsed "Letter intended to D^r Child." We cannot be sure, therefore, whether this letter was ever sent, but Child's letter of August 26, 1650, shows that Winthrop had written.

lodging at the house of one Dr. Garbet at Hogsdon, which was close by and was also in the neighborhood of Northfleet, where he was born and where his elder brother the Major still lived, doubtless on the hereditary estate. Manifestly Garbet was an alchemist, and he was an old friend of Winthrop's.¹ Child was tranquilly working at a "few experiments," probably chemical, and when they were finished he thought he should "settle in Kent, and follow [his] calling, being almost weary of rambling." In his budget of news we find one significant item: "The army is much divided, y^e people much displeas'd wth y^e Parliam^{ts} proceedings. Essex hath lately declared so much, & other Countyes begin to speake higher language." One of these counties, though Child does not say so, was Kent itself, and his brother the Major was in the thick of the troubles. At the end of this very month the Kentishmen rose in arms against the Parliament and so bestirred themselves that their defeat was celebrated by their opponents as a great victory; as indeed it was, for they threatened London, and if London had fallen into Royalist hands, what would have become of English history?² Only one incident in the short campaign concerns us here, but that is lively enough and made some noise at the time. We have several reports about it from the field — for there were war correspondents even in those days, and news-pamphlets took the place of the modern *extra*.

The following account is from a tract printed June 2, 1648:

His Excellency³ had Intelligence, That a party of the Kentish Rebels (not *Browns* Rebels) had fortified and barricadoed a Bridge which led

¹ "He remembers his love to you, he hath not bin Idle, these many yeares, yet I cañot see he had done much in this great busines" (Winthrop Papers, iii. 160).

² On the whole matter see A Perfect Diurnall, no. 253 (May 29–June 5, 1648), pp. 2034–2040; Rushworth, Historical Collections, vii. 1133–1137, 1130 *bis*–1131 *bis*; Clarendon, bk. xi (ed. 1826, vi. 25–31, 38–41, 56–62); Heath, Brief Chronicle, 2d impression, 1663, pp. 314–317; C. R. Markham, Life of Fairfax, pp. 305–309; Archæologia Cantiana, ix. 31–49; Gardiner, History of the Great Civil War, chap. lxii (ed. 1893, iv. 132–142). The Rev. Thomas Peters (Hugh's younger brother), writing from Falmouth, England, on June 26, 1648, gives his friend John Winthrop, Jr., a brief account of the revolt (Winthrop Papers, ii. 432). Nehemiah Bourne mentions "the rebellion of Kent, Essex, and other parts" in a letter to Governor Winthrop, August 12, 1648 (Winthrop Papers, ii. 303). Winthrop mentions the affair in a letter to his son John, September 30, 1648 (Savage's Winthrop, 2d ed., Appendix, ii. 434).

³ Fairfax.

towards Gravesend; a commanded party was sent forth under the conduct of Major *Husbands*,¹ and Capt. *Evansons* Troop, in all about 300 horse, who mounted about an hundred foot behinde them: when they drew towards the Bridge, the enemy fired thick upon them; our men notwithstanding fell on, and the horse swam through the water, and so got over; by this time the enemy perceiving in what danger they were, fled: Major *Childe* who commanded them and was very active, hardly escaped, having his Horse shot, whereupon he forsook it; his Son was shot in the back, and taken. There were about twenty slain in the place, divers wounded, and thirty Prisoners taken, many escaped, by hiding themselves in the Corn fields and houses. The enemies party consisted of the Countrey-men thereabouts, the Seamen, and some London Apprentices.²

A letter of June 2, 1648, runs as follows: "On Thursday the first of June, our Army marched towards Rochester, whereby the way we found a passage over a Bridge neare Norfleel maintained by about 600. foot, whereof Major Child had command, his Excellency commanded out a party of 200 horse, 100. foot mounted behind them; Major Husbands having the command of them, and after some dispute, we gained the passe, and the enemy fled, about 20. killed, and 30. prisoners taken."³ A report dated Rochester, June 5, 1648, states succinctly: "On June 1 Major *Husbands* with 300 tooke *Norfleete* bridge, from Major *Child*, killed 20 and took 30 prisoners."⁴

What became of Major Child after this defeat we do not know, but he escaped on foot, unwounded — as we have seen — and probably managed to make his peace with the authorities. Anyhow, we hear no more of him for a couple of years.⁵ Meanwhile we must

¹ Azariah Husbands, a well-known officer in the Parliamentary army (see Clarke Papers, ed. by C. H. Firth, Camden Society, i. 57, ii. 274).

² The Lord Generals Letter In Answer to the Message of the Kentish-men, May 31, 1648. Imprimatur June 1, 1648. London, Printed June 2, 1648 (Harvard College Library), pp. 6-7. The extract is not from Fairfax's letter, but from another letter dated Mapham, 1 June, 1648, and printed in the tract. The same letter, with slight variations, is included in A Perfect Diurnall for May 29-June 5, 1648, no. 253, pp. 2037-2038 (Harvard College Library).

³ Letter dated Maidstone, June 2, 1648, in A Perfect Diurnall, as above, p. 2039; also in Rushworth, vii. 1137.

⁴ A Narrative of the Great Victory obtained by the Lord Generall in Kent (London, 1648), p. 6 (Harvard College Library).

⁵ The Christian name of Major Child is not mentioned in any of the contem-

turn a leaf backward. In 1645 one "Major Childe," obviously the same man that we have just seen fighting hard amongst the Royalists, had been a trusted officer on the Parliamentary side, and his soldiering had not been confined to his own county. On April 14 of that year the Committee of Both Kingdoms sent him orders: "Upon information just received of commotions in Kent, . . . to march back with the trained bands of Kent under your command, and there obey such further directions as you shall receive from this Committee or that of Kent."¹ We ought never to wonder that anybody — *anybody!* — should have changed sides in England between 1645 and 1648. But Major Child had not changed sides. He was a high Presbyterian in 1645, when he fought under Parliamentary orders; he was a high Presbyterian in 1647, when, in New-Englands Jonas, he quoted Robert Baylie, the most thoroughgoing of Scottish doctrinaires, against the Independents, and wound up his tract with the pregnant sentence, "I shall desire the Reader . . . to observe how Independents are all of a peece, for subtilitie, designs, fallacies, both in New-England and in Old;" and he was a high Presbyterian when, in 1648, he led his troop against the Parliamentary forces in the Royalist uprising. Times had changed, but the Major was still the same. His party, in its hatred of Independency and its fear of the growing power of the army, which was Independency's stronghold, was ready to throw itself into the arms of the King, but its representatives in Parliament still hesitated, and the Major, like many other gentlemen in his county and elsewhere, thought that the time for debate was past and the moment for action had come. Technically, then, he was fighting against the Parliament; in reality, however, he was supporting, wisely or unwisely, the reaction which his own party in Parliament longed for, but which it was too weak, too timid, or too politic to bring to the arbitrament of the sword. A

porary accounts of the skirmish, but it is given, with his place of residence, in the "information" brought by John Bulfinch against "Major John Childe, or Chiles, Northfleet, Kent," on November 2, 1650, which declares that "he was a commissioned officer in arms against Parliament in the Kentish insurrection of 1648" (Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Advance of Money, iii. 1274). The Doctor's brother, the Major John Child of New-Englands Jonas, was (as Winthrop tells us) "a Major of a regiment in Kent" (ii. 391 [321]), and Northfleet was undoubtedly his home.

¹ Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1644-1645, p. 407 (cf. p. 406).

contemporary tract entitled *A Letter from a Gentlemen in Kent*,¹ written to exculpate the insurgents and to claim indulgence for them on the part of the authorities, describes the revolt as directed not against Parliament but against the Independent faction.² Major Child's share in the Kentish insurrection, then, is most instructive. It dispels any doubts that may linger in our minds as to the real politics of his brother Robert's conspiracy against the civil and ecclesiastical government of Massachusetts. We do not need this evidence, but it comes to hand unsought, in welcome confirmation of the inferences that the documents in the case have already forced us to draw.

Before we return to the Doctor, we may as well follow his brother's fortunes so far as they appear in the records. If the Major's offence was overlooked for a time, he was at all events not relieved from suspicion. On November 20, 1650, a certain John Bulfinch laid an information against him, alleging that he had been "a commissioned officer" in the Kentish revolt and had aided the Royalists on other occasions. Accordingly an order was issued (January 1, 1651) that his estate should be "seized and secured" and that the rents should remain in the tenants' hands. But the Major clearly had powerful friends and, though his activity in the uprising was notorious, he was able to put up a good fight *pro domo*. On the 7th of January he got permission to "hold his estate on security," to have a copy of the charge, and to examine witnesses before the County Committee.³ The law, we should remember, obliged the informer to

¹ London, 1648 (Harvard College Library).

² According to this writer the county was loyal to Parliament but had been driven to revolt by the oppressive acts of the Committee for Kent. It was, he alleges, "a plaine *Committee-war*, without the least premeditate designe or plot against the *Parliament*, or their present peace and security" (p. 8). "On the one side you have a whole County, represented by all the *Knights, Gentlemen, and Yeomen* thereof, by many of the *Deputy Lieutenants* themselves, the *Capitaines* and other *Officers of Horse and Foot* ever wel-affected to the *Parliament* . . . On the other side, you have about six or seven, or few more busie *pragmaticall Committee-men*, having neither *honour* nor *honesty*, patronizing the *Separatists* and *Sectaries of the Country*, by them alone had in veneration, as favourers of conscientious Professours; and elsewhere by persons of greater power and place held to be zealous members of the *Independant Churches* . . . six or seven *Committee-men* with so many hundred perhaps of their schismaticall Adherents" (pp. 12-13).

³ Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Advance of Money, iii. 1274.

prosecute the case himself. Soon after, it seems, fresh charges of "delinquency" were "instigated" by a neighbor, one Henry Payne of Milton-juxta-Gravesend,¹ and the Major was imprisoned. We have the order for his release passed by the Council of State on May 20, 1651. Colonel Twisleton and Mr. Parker of Gravesend are instructed as follows: "Upon some information received, we thought fit to restrain the liberty of Major John Child of Northfleet, but upon considering his petition, we are inclined to discharge him on security; you are to take his recognizance in 1,000*l.*, with two sureties in 500*l.* each, to appear before the Council when commanded, and to be of good behaviour."² On the 28th Child petitioned that two witnesses might be summoned to invalidate Payne's testimony: his own "fidelity," he declares, "is known by his constant employment for the State, as commander of towns, etc." On June 11th he once more asked "to be made responsible on good security for his estate, it being seized, and his rents in the tenants' hands, whereby he and his family are in some want." The request was granted. On October 8, Bulfinch the informer, begged for a hearing in the case, and this was ordered.³ Here the record ends, but it is clear that Child managed to keep his estate until the Act of Oblivion came to his relief in 1652. This appears from the lament of Colonel Nicholas Devereux of Westminster, March 24, 1652. This gallant warrior "complains that though he has entered 27 cases in the book of information, yet the Act of Oblivion has cut him off from the benefit of his discoveries, though many cases had been entered two years, and were ready for judgment; *that of Major John Child, of Kent, was 1,000*l.* to his prejudice.*"⁴ In 1654 Child was again in confinement, for in that year the petition of "Mary, wife of Major John Child, prisoner in Upnor Castle, Kent, for her husband's release," was referred to the appropriate committee⁵ — result unknown. Five years later, on the eve of the Restoration, he appears in the Government service. On August 2, 1659, the Council of State issued a warrant for the payment of £20 to "Major Child" (doubtless the same man) "for

¹ Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Advance of Money, iii. 1274. Perhaps these charges were part of the same Bulfinch case.

² Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1651, p. 211 (cf. p. 208).

³ Calendar, Committee for Advance of Money, iii. 1274.

⁴ *Id.*, ii. 870.

⁵ Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1655-1656, p. 94.

intelligence" and the Committee for Examinations was to confer with him;¹ on August 5th the Council voted that he should "secure suspected persons."² This is the last we hear of our Major, but we may hope that King Charles forgave these lapses, in view of what had gone before.

We must now return to Dr. Robert Child, whom we left in May, 1648, at Dr. Garbet's house in Hogsdon, Kent, busy with chemical experiments and contemplating the life of a general practitioner in his native county. He was on friendly terms with the scientific circle to which Boyle and Hartlib belonged, and was deeply engaged, as we shall see presently, in alchemical speculations, as well as in the more practical study of agriculture, then attracting much attention in England. In this same letter to Winthrop he mentions "an Ingenuous young man of my acquaintance" who "hath newly invented double writing, so y^t a man can write 2 or 3 Copyes or more as soone & as fairely as one, he hath a pattent graunted in y^e Parliam^t for 14 yeares, by y^e next y^e invention will be com̃on."³ This was Dr. (later Sir) William Petty, destined to be one of the founders of the science of political economy, whose "pentograph" was then a new thing. Petty speaks of the contrivance in a little tract entitled *The Advice of W. P. to Mr. Samuel Hartlib, for The Advancement of some particular Parts of Learning*, published early in 1648.⁴ Child's letter also contains some thrilling alchemical news, to which we shall later return.⁵

¹ Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1659-1660, pp. 67, 580.

² Id., 1659-1660, p. 75.

³ Winthrop Papers, iii. 159.

⁴ The Epistle Dedicatory, signed "W. P.," is dated "London the 8. January. 164⁷." The title-page bears the date 1647, obviously Old Style. There is a copy in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society which may have been a present from Hartlib to the younger Winthrop. Some copies appear to be dated 1648 (see Dircks, Biographical Memoir of Samuel Hartlib, p. 60). The tract is reprinted in Oldys, *Harleian Miscellany*, vi. 1-13 (1745), ed. Park, 4to, vi. 1-14 (1810), with the later date. On the pentograph, which proved a disappointment, see Hartlib to Boyle, May 8, 1654 (Boyle's Works, v. 264); Fitzmaurice, *Life of Sir William Petty*, 1895, pp. 10-11, 13. Hartlib, writing to Boyle, November 16, 1647, speaks of "one *Petty*, of twenty four years of age, not altogether a very dear *Worsley*, but a perfect *Frenchman*," etc. (Boyle's Works, ed. Birch, 1744, v. 256). Benjamin Worsley and Robert Boyle were doubtless friends of Child's at this time, as we know they were a little later.

⁵ P. 129, below.

On August 26, 1650, Child wrote again from Gravesend. The letter is long and interesting. It expresses an eager hope that their correspondence may continue and deploras the fact that they can "sildome write." Heretofore Child's extant letters have begun with the formal "Sir" or "Worthy Sir," but this time he addresses Winthrop as "Loving freind." He has not yet quite abandoned his wish to return to New England:

I am sorry you haue not as yet attempted your blacke ½ mine, y^t we might know certaynely what it conteyneth; I, for my part, am more than halfe weaned from New-England, by their discourtesye, yet if they would returne me my fine, I would adventure it with you & phaps might see you. Otherwise either I shalbe for Ireland where at Kilkenny a new Acadamy is to be erected or I shall retreate to a more solitary life, as I can cōmaund myselfe, with 6 or 7 gentlemen & scollars, who haue resolved to live retyredly & follow their studyes & experiences, if these troublesome times molest not, these gentlemen for Curiositye & Learning scarcely haue their equals in England, next weeke we are to meete & conclude by my next you may heare more: I suppose you are to yo^r Plantacōn, out of the way, yet I hope some times to heare from you, & if you haue any thing that is rare, pray let vs receive part. Commaund me S^r, if I can serve you, for truly I am Your loving frend

Robt Child

A postscript gives a large budget of European news and closes with a notable passage:

S^r I desire to heare from you sometimes, & if you meete with any rare thing, vegetable minerall &c. or any strange newes communicate it to your freind: & further if you see a booke called Anthroposophia, tell me, if you can, what the metaphysicall subiect is, which is the great question now amongst vs which is the perfection of all things. — S^r, I send not further at p^rsent but to commit you to the Almighty Resting Yours, R C¹

No further letters on either side are known to be in existence, but I am glad to be able to prove (as I shall do shortly) that these two choice and congenial spirits were never estranged.

The scheme for a society of scholars came to nothing, nor, so far as I can discover, did the Kilkenny project ever take shape. At all events, Child did not go to Ireland immediately. William Coddington

¹ Winthrop Papers, iii. 161-164.

ton, after his return from England with his commission as "Governor of Acquedneck, alias Rhode Island, and Quinnungate Island," wrote to John Winthrop, Jr., on February 19, 1651[-2], that he had met Child several times in England, doubtless in London and probably in 1650 or 1651:¹ "I sawe Do^r Child who did inquire diuers tymes very affecshonately how the Pequite Sachem did, & would haue had me for to haue taken yo^r plantation in to my Co^mistion w^{ch} I would not doe wthout order."² Coddington had a short and inglorious career in his ill-gotten governorship, and I should be sorry to think that Child seriously advised him to take Winthrop's Connecticut colony under his ægis. The Doctor was certainly in a jesting vein when he dubbed Winthrop "the Pequit sachem,"³ and the advice he gave to Coddington must have been part of the jest. Whether the budding Governor was humorist enough to understand, is a problem that I must leave to the Rhode Island pundits, for his words may be taken either way.

We have still further traces of Child in 1651. On March 7, Elias Ashmole makes the following entry in his Diary: "I went to Maidstone with Dr. Child the physician. And 3 *Hor. post merid.* I first became acquainted with Dr. Flood."⁴ Ashmole was one of the most enthusiastic students of alchemy in that age, and a general virtuoso, so that he and Child had much in common. Another alchemist in Child's circle was young George Stirk (or Starkey) of the Harvard Class of 1646. Stirk was the son of the Rev. George Stirk of Bermuda,⁵ who died in 1637, and he had been especially recommended

¹ Coddington went to England in January, 1648-9 (Roger Williams to John Winthrop, Jr., January 29, 1648[-9], in 3 Massachusetts Historical Collections, ix. 280, and Letters of Roger Williams, ed. by J. R. Bartlett, p. 169, 1 Narragansett Club Publications, vi). His commission was on the stocks from March 6, 1650, — when the Council of State referred his petition to the Committee of the Admiralty for report, — until April 3, 1651, when it was granted (Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, 1574-1660, pp. 335-338, 354; Edward Winslow's letter of April 17, 1651, in Plymouth Colony Records, ix. 197, and Hutchinson Papers, i. 258). Coddington seems to have reached his home at Newport in August, 1651 (see William Arnold's letter of September 1, 1651, in Hutchinson Papers, i. 267; cf. Roger Williams to John Winthrop, Jr., October 6, 1651, in 3 Massachusetts Historical Collections, ix. 294, and Letters of Roger Williams, p. 228).

² Winthrop Papers, ii. 282. ³ Cf. p. 166 note 5, below.

⁴ Lives of Ashmole and Lilly, ed. by Charles Burman, 1774, p. 313.

⁵ See our Publications, xiii. 16-59.

to the care of the elder Winthrop by the Rev. Patrick Copland, at whose instance, it seems, he had come to Harvard for his education instead of going to England.¹ He began to study chemistry, in his spare hours, in 1644, while still an undergraduate,² and was encouraged by the younger Winthrop, who lent him books from his well-furnished library.³ In 1647, the year of Child's second trial, we find Stirk practising medicine,⁴ presumably in Cambridge or Boston, and he was certainly established in Boston in 1648-1650.⁵ Child probably knew him in this country, and when (in 1650 or 1651) Stirk went to England to follow his profession there, it was Child who introduced him to Robert Boyle. This appears from Stirk's own words in dedicating his *Pyrotechny Asserted and Illustrated* (London, 1658) "To the Honourable, Virtuous, and most accomplished Gentleman, Robert Boyl, Esq; My very good Friend." The address begins: "Since it was my good fortune first by the occasion of our mutual Friend, Dr. *Robert Child*, (whose memory being a man most learned and ingenuous, I honour,) to kiss your Honours hand, your love to me hath ever continued so real and constant, that if I should not take such notice of it, as to my power to acknowledge it, I should worthily deserve the black note of infamy." The introduction apparently took place in 1651.⁶ In this

¹ Copland to Winthrop, December 4, 1639 (Winthrop Papers, iii. 279).

² "In the Year of Our Lord 1644. I first began the studie of *Chemical Philosophie*" (Stirk, *Pyrotechny Asserted*, London, 1658, p. 76).

³ Stirk to John Winthrop, Jr., [from Boston], August 2, 1648 (Winthrop Papers, iii. 359-360).

⁴ Copland to Winthrop, September 30, 1647 (Winthrop Papers, iii. 353).

⁵ These dates appear from an entry in William Aspinwall's Notarial Records (Boston Record Commissioners' Reports, xxxii. 304).

⁶ The exact dates are not determinable, but we know that Stirk was in this country as late as May 31, 1650 (Massachusetts Colony Records, iv. i. 15), and there is every reason to believe that he went to England with his maternal grandfather, Stephen Painter, who arrived in Boston, *en route* for London, on August 6, 1650 (Increase Mather, in the Dunster MS., M. H. S.; our Publications, xiii. 53-55). Painter was in London before July 19, 1651 (Lefroy, Bermudas, ii. 24), and that Stirk was there in 1652 is proved by an entry in his own hand in Sloane MS. 370S, fol. 78 a. Boyle went to Ireland in 1652 (Life, by Birch, in Boyle's Works, i. 30), and in January, 1653, his letter to John Mallet shows that he had already been there for some time (Works, i. 31). In either 1651 or 1652 Stirk collaborated with Boyle in an experiment in medical chemistry: by a misprint the date is given both ways in his tract entitled *George Starkey's Pill Vindicated*, and Boyle does not give it at all (Works, i. 510-511, 563-565). Child may have

same year (or more probably in 1650) Dr. John French dedicated to Child his English translation of Agrippa's Occult Philosophy,¹ one of the most famous of all works on natural magic.

gone to Ireland in the latter part of 1651, and he certainly was there in 1652 (see p. 119 note 5, below). On the whole, it is safe to infer that Stirk went to England in the latter part of 1650, and that in 1651 he was introduced to Boyle.

¹ Three Books of Occult Philosophy, written by Henry Cornelius Agrippa . . . Translated out of the Latin into the English Tongue, By J. F. London, 1651. As to the identity of the translator, see Ferguson (Bibliotheca Chemica i. 293); the question is settled definitely by two entries (unknown to Ferguson) in the Stationers' Register (Roxburghe Club, i. 341, 342). The same J. F. translated Sendivogius (London, 1650). Child speaks of both translations in a letter to Winthrop (p. 125, below), but says nothing about J. F. and does not mention the dedication. Some account of Dr. French (1616?-1657) may be found in the Dictionary of National Biography, xx. 251-252.

Dr. French's dedication of his translation of Agrippa's Occult Philosophy has just been transcribed for me from a copy in the British Museum. It is so interesting that I append it entire. The volume is dated 1651 in the imprint, but Thomason bought it on November 24, 1650 (Thomason's Catalogue, i. 818). The book was entered in the Stationers' Register on April 23, 1650 (Roxburghe Club, i. 342), and Child mentions it in a letter of August 26, 1650, as "coming out" (Winthrop Papers, iii. 162).

To my most honorable, and no less learned Friend, *Robert Childe*, Doctor of Physick.

Sir! Great men decline, mighty men may fall, but an honest Philosopher keeps his Station for ever. To your self therefore I crave leave to present, what I know you are able to protect; not with sword, but by reason; & not that only, but that by your acceptance you are able to give a lustre to. I see it is not in vain that you have compassed Sea and Land, for thereby you have made a Proselyte, not of another, but of your self, by being converted from vulgar, and irrational incredulities to the rational embracing of the Sublime, Hermetically, and Theomagical truths. You are skilled in the one as if *Hermes* had been your Tutor; have insight in the other, as if *Agrippa* your Master. Many transmarine Philosophers, which we only read, you have conversed with: many Countries, rarities, and antiquities, which we have only heard of, and admire, you have seen. Nay you have not only heard of, but seen, not in Maps, but in *Rome* it self the manners of *Rome*. There you have seen much Ceremony, and little Religion; and in the wilderness of *New England*, you have seen amongst some, much Religion, and little Ceremony; and amongst others, I mean the Natives thereof, neither Ceremony, nor Religion, but what nature dictates to them. In this there is no small variety, and your observation not little. In your passage thither by Sea, you have seen the wonders of God in the Deep; and by Land, you have seen the astonishing works of God in the unaccessible Mountains. You have left no stone unturned, that the turning thereof might conduce to the discovery of what was Occult, and worthy to be known. It is part of my ambition to let the world know that I honor such as your self, & my learned friend, & your experienced fellow-traveller, Doctor *Charlet*, who have, like true Philosophers neglected your worldly

In 1651, at the request of Milton's friend Samuel Hartlib, who had a passion for issuing little books and was particularly interested in projects for the improvement of English agriculture and industry, Robert Child composed an essay entitled "A Large Letter concerning the Defects and Remedies of English Husbandry written to Mr. Samuel Hartlib," which forms the bulk of a volume published in that same year under the title, *Samuel Hartlib his Legacie*.¹

advantages to become masters of that which hath now rendered you both truly honorable. If I had as many languages as your selves, the rhetoricall and pathetical expressions thereof would fail to signifie my estimation of, and affections towards you both. Now *Sir!* as in reference to this my translation, if your judgement shall finde a deficiency therein, let your candor make a supply thereof. Let this Treatise of Occult Philosophy, coming as a stranger amongst the English, be patronized by you, remembering that your self was once a stranger in the Country of its Nativity. This stranger I have dressed in an English garb; but if it be not according to the fashion, and therefore ungrateful to any, let your approbation make it the mode; you know strangers most commonly induce a fashion, especially if any once begin to approve of their habit. Your approbation is that which it will stand in need of, and which will render me,

S I R,

Most obligedly yours,

J. F.

¹ *Samuel Hartlib his Legacie: or An Enlargement of the Discourse of Husbandry used in Brabant & Flaunders*, London, 1651. In my references I have used the second and third editions, 1652, 1655 (which are in the Harvard College Library), but I have examined the New York Public Library's copy of the first edition (1651). Except for the Appendix (added in the second edition), the contents of the first and the second edition are identical, and there is only one trifling difference in arrangement: the errata and the brief advertisement about clover, which in the first edition come at the end of the front matter, are in the second edition transferred to the penultimate page of the volume. As to the Appendix in the second edition, see p. 108, below. The Large Letter is on pp. 1-108 in the first edition, pp. 1-81 in the second, pp. 1-96 in the third. The subtitle (*An Enlargement, etc.*), dropped in the third edition, is a little misleading. It means that this book was issued as *an addition to* the material on this practical art contained in a tract already published by Hartlib in 1650 — *A Discours of Husbandrie used in Brabant and Flanders* (of which a second edition appeared in 1652 and a third in 1654). Of this earlier tract the author was Sir Richard Weston, as Hartlib informs us in the preface to the *Legacie*, as well as in the second and third editions of the *Discours* itself. When he first published the *Discours*, he was ignorant of the author's name.

The Large Letter in the third edition of the *Legacy* shows a few additions. I have noted the following: P. 38 of ed. 3 (a philosophical discussion of "the true causes of Fertility") is not in ed. 2; "Instructions for the increase and planting of Mulberry-trees," pp. 63-68, ed. 3, is not in ed. 2 (this is reprinted from a tract "printed by *Eliaz. Edgar*, in the year 1609:" see p. 55); there is a slight addition

This essay gives one a highly favorable impression of Child's powers as an observer and a practical man of science. Interpreting the word "husbandry" in a large sense, he treats not only of every department of farming and gardening — implements, fertilizers, the chemistry of soils, rotation of crops, methods of sowing and planting, diseases of wheat with their cause and cure — but of stock-raising, vine-growing, wine-making, orchards, forestry, fishponds, mines, clay for pottery, building stone, mineral springs, bee-keeping, and silkworms. He deplores the neglect of meadows, the existence of so much waste land which might be brought under cultivation, the remissness of farmers in acquainting themselves with foreign methods, their ignorance of many useful plants that are native to the country, their reluctance to try experiments and compare notes. Many plants and some animals might be introduced into England with profit. Black foxes, musk-cats, sables, minks, martens, and the "musk-squash" might be raised for their fur. Even elephants might be useful as traction-engines. He dilates particularly on the silkworm, which, as he thinks, experience has shown will thrive in England. "Divers Ladies, Gentlewomen, Scholars, Citizens, &c. have nursed up divers wormes to perfection, though they have had little skil in the managing of them; and likewise not such accommodations as are necessary for them; and more would they have done, if they could have had *Mulberry-leaves*. I am informed that one near *Charing-Crosse* maketh a good living by them: as also another by *Ratliffe-Crosse*; and therefore if we can bring up an 100, why not a 1000, yea 100000, if we had food for them?"¹ The silkworm, by the way, was a timely topic. It was in the very next year that Hartlib put forth that fascinating little volume in which, on the strength of Virginia Ferrar's experiment, an attempt was made to convince the planters of Virginia that silkworms would pay better than tobacco.² Elephants and silkworms may not be suited to the

in ed. 3, p. 82, as against ed. 2, p. 72; most of pp. 91–92 in ed. 3 is new; the passage beginning "Lastly, for a Corollary," on p. 93 of ed. 3, and ending "I leave to them at the Helme of the State," p. 95, is not in ed. 2. The total increase amounts to about eleven pages, six of which (63–68) are reprinted from the Edgar tract.

¹ Samuel Hartlib his *Legacie*, 2d ed., 1652, p. 54. The 3d ed. (1655) adds (after "Ratliffe-Crosse") "yea, even in *Cheshire* at *Duckenfield* they thrive & prosper" (p. 55).

² A Rare and New Discovery of A speedy way, and easie means, found out

British climate, but very few of Child's suggestions are vagaries. His essay is full of good things, and was highly commended by no less an authority than the Rev. Walter Harte, the author of the celebrated *Essays on Husbandry* (1764)¹ which Thomas Hollis characterizes in a manuscript note² as "Written like a Good man, a Scholar, and a Gentleman."

Child's treatise is a kind of index to his European travels, and we have already resorted to it for information on that score.³ He often refers to New England. "*Bees* thrive very much" there, he tells us.⁴ There is a kind of oats "which in *New England* serveth well for Oatmeal without grinding, being beaten as they come out of the barn."⁵ Summer wheat "is sown abundantly" there "in *April* and *May*, and reaped ordinarily in 3 moneths."⁶ He had observed the "*Palmer-worms*, which is a kind of great black *Cater-piller*, (which I have seen destroying much in *New-England*);"⁷ this was in July, 1646.⁸ "In *New-England*, where there is no Chalk nor Limestone, they are compelled to burn *Oyster-shells*, *Cockles*, to make *Lime*; or else they could hardly build any houses."⁹ This reminds us of the ordinance passed in 1705 by Dangerfield, now Truro, that "inasmuch as great damage is done by persons digging shells out of the proprietors' lands, to sell and transport, which shells might

by a young Lady in England, she having made full proof thereof in May, Anno 1652. For the feeding of Silk-Worms in the woods, on the Mulberry-Tree-leaves in Virginia (London, 1652: Boston Public Library). Child refers to this tract in his answer to Boot (Samuel Hartlib his Legacy, 3d ed., 1655, pp. 151-152): "Moreover, a Lady (*Virginia F.*) as I have lately seen in print, hath hatched worms in *England*, and then turned them forth to the *Mulberry-trees*, exposed to the cold and moisture of the Air, and yet they have done well, yea better then those within doors."

¹ Essay i, p. 129 (also in the ed. of 1770).

² In the copy of the 1764 edition which he gave to the library of Harvard College.

³ P. 5, above.

⁴ 2d ed., p. 49; 3d ed., p. 50.

⁵ 2d ed., pp. 68-69; 3d ed., p. 78.

⁶ 2d ed., p. 68; 3d ed., pp. 77-78.

⁷ 2d ed., p. 10; 3d ed., p. 10. The parenthetical clause about New England is added in the third edition.

⁸ Winthrop, ii. 327 (267-268); William Pynchon to Winthrop, July 7, 1646 (Winthrop Papers, i. 378); John Eliot, Records of First Church in Roxbury (New England Historical and Genealogical Register, xxxiii. 65).

⁹ 2d ed., p. 67; 3d ed., p. 76.

otherwise be of use to the inhabitants to make lime, a fine be imposed of 6d. pr. bushel.”¹ Among the animals that Child wishes to have introduced for their fur, we recognize the American muskrat, under its Indian name — so he spells it — of *Musk-Squash*,² and may recall, if we like, the strange story of the musquash and the cat which Cotton Mather sent to the Royal Society in 1716.³ Two longer extracts may serve as their own apology:

In *New-England* they *fish* their ground, which is done thus: In the *spring* about *April*, there cometh up a *fish* to the fresh *Rivers*, called an *Alewife*; because of it's great belly: and is a kind of *shade*, full of bones; these are caught in wiers, and sold very cheap to the planters, who usually put one or two cut in pieces into the hill where their *Corne* is planted, called *Virginia-Wheate*, for they plant it in hills, 5 grains in an hill, almost as we plant *Hops* (in *May*, or *June*; for it will not endure frosts) and at that distance; it causeth fertility extraordinary for two years, especially the first: for they have had 50 or 60 bushels on an Acre, and yet plough not their land, and in the same hills do plant the same *Corne* for many years together, and have good crops: besides abundance of *Pompions*, and *French* or *Kidney beanes*. In the *North* parts of *New England*, where the fisher-men live, they usually *fish* their ground with *Cods-heads*; which if they were in *England* would be better employed. I suppose that when *sprats* be cheap, men might mend their *Hop-grounds* with them, and it would quit cost: but the *dogs* will be apt to *scrape* them up, as they do in *New-England*, unlesse one of their legs be tyed up.⁴

We will onely fall⁵ upon our Northern Plantations,⁶ *Verginia*, *New-England*, and instance in a few things. Why may not the *Silk-grasse* of *Verginia*, the *Salsaperilla*, *Sassarfas*, *Rattlesnake-weed* (which is an excellent cordial)⁷ be beneficial to us, as also their *Cedars*, *Pines*, *Plum-trees*, *Cherries* great *Strawberries* and their *Locusts* (which is a prickly plant, a swift grower, and therefore excellent for hedges) be usefull to us? So for *New England*, why should we think that the *Indian corn*, the

¹ Freeman, History of Cape Cod, ii. 545.

² 2d ed., p. 72; 3d ed., p. 82.

³ American Antiquarian Society Proceedings, xxvi. 37.

⁴ 2d ed., pp. 35-36; 3d ed., pp. 35-36.

⁵ Misprinted "sail" in ed. 2.

⁶ In distinction from "the Southern Plantations, as *Barbadoes*, *Antego*, *Saint Croix*[,] *Christopher*, *Mevis*, *Monferate*" (ed. 2, p. 60; ed. 3, p. 69).

⁷ See our Publications, xiv. 151, 183-184; American Antiquarian Society Proceedings, xxv. 359, xxvi. 23-24, 42.

*Marsh*¹ *wheat*, that excellent *Rie*, the *Pease* (which never are eaten with magots,) the *French*, or *Kidney Beans*, the *Pumpions*, *Squashes*, *Water mellons*, *Musk-mellons*, *Hurtleberries*, *wild Hemp*, *Fir*, &c. of those parts are altogether uselesse for us? as also the *Cramberries*, (which are so called by the *Indians*, but by the *English*, *Bear-berries*, because it is thought the Bears eat them in Winter; or *Barberries*, by reason of their fine acid tast like *Barberries*,) which is a fruit as big and as red as a Cherry, ripe onely in the winter, and growing close to the ground in bogs, where nothing else will grow? They are accounted very good against the Scurvie, and very pleasant in Tarts. I know not a more excellent and healthfuller fruit.²

This essay of Child's — the Large Letter — is dated at the end "Anno 1651" in the first edition³ and signed in blank:

Your,

Nor is the author's name mentioned anywhere in the volume. The same is true of the second edition (1652),⁴ but in the third (1655) the signature is —

Your faithful Friend,
and Servant
 ROB. CHILD.⁵

Even without this, however, we should be able to identify the author, for Hartlib himself ascribes the essay to Dr. Child in a letter to Boyle, May 8, 1654.⁶ The connection of this interesting treatise

¹ The 3d ed. reads (correctly) *March*.

² 2d ed., pp. 60–61; 3d ed., pp. 69–70.

³ P. 108.

⁴ P. 81.

⁵ P. 96.

⁶ Boyle's Works, v. 262. Harte, *Essays on Husbandry*, 1764 (also in the edition of 1770), speaks of "*Robert Child*, the true author of the *famous Treatise on Husbandry*, commonly called HARTLIB'S LEGACY" (Essay, i. p. 129; cf. Essay i., p. 23; Essay ii., p. 54), and Sir Egerton Brydges (*Censura Literaria*, 2d ed., v. 117) quotes Harte. Dircks (*Biographical Memoir of Samuel Hartlib*, p. 69) is disposed to credit the Large Letter to Cressy Dymock, though he was aware of its ascription to Child by Harte and in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, lxxii. 12; but Dircks had overlooked both Hartlib's letter to Boyle and the plain signature in the third edition of the *Legacy*. The paper in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (signed "Ferd. Stanley") is by Brydges (see *Censura Literaria*, ed. 2, vii. 201).

with Robert Child the Remonstrant seems to have escaped the notice of most New England historians and antiquaries; but I am sure it was known to our lamented associate Frederick Lewis Gay, for the Harvard College copy of the third edition of the *Legacy*, which prints the signature, came from his library.

Child wrote the Large Letter before he went to Ireland.¹ The volume that contains it (Samuel Hartlib his *Legacie*) was published in 1651, and came out before July 1, for on that date Dr. Arnold Boot, a distinguished Dutch physician and Hebraist, then living in Paris, wrote to Hartlib, thanking him for a copy and highly commending the tract, which he had "perused instantly *à capite ad calcem*." Boot followed up this letter with nine others, dated from July $\frac{1}{2}$ ², 1651, to January $\frac{3}{8}$, 1652, and the series formed a running commentary on Child's essay. His notes, in the main, touched points in which he disagreed with some matter of detail, but he praised the whole book as "a most excellent piece; and from the beginning to the end fraught with most excellent observations and experiments."

Hartlib instantly published a second edition (1652), in which he reprinted Child's Large Letter and the other contents of the first edition, with an Appendix containing (1) Boot's ten letters (or extracts from them) under the title of Annotations upon the *Legacie* of Husbandry and (2) An Interrogatory Relating more particularly to the Husbandry and Naturall History of Ireland.² To the Annotations he prefixed a signed epistle "To his worthy and very much Honoured Friend, the Author of the large letter of Husbandry," from which it appears plainly that Child was now in Ireland. He calls Boot's letters (which follow) to Child's notice, and continues:

And least you should imagine, that you are at this distance forgotten by us, give me leave to present you with another taske proper for your

¹ This is proved by what Hartlib says in a letter "To his worthy and very much Honoured Friend, the Author of the large Letter of Husbandry," prefixed to the Appendix that appears in the second edition of the *Legacie*, 1652.

² Besides the general title-page (Samuel Hartlib his *Legacie* . . . The second Edition augmented with an Appendix) there is a title-page for the Appendix (An Appendix To The *Legacie* of Husbandry: or, A Seed-plot of Annotations upon the *Legacie* aforesaid. With an Interrogatorie, Relating more particularly to the Husbandry, and Naturall History of Ireland) and another for the Interrogatory. Each of the three title-pages bears the date 1652.

thoughts in the place where now you are, that the advantages of Nature, which God hath bestowed upon *Ireland*, may not lie undiscovered, and without improvement, at this season wherein the Replanting of the wast and desolate places of that Countrey, is seriously laid to heart by many: I shall therefore desire you to look upon this Alphabet of Interrogatories, and consider what Answers your Observatious [*sic*] will afford unto them; or what you can learne from the Observations of others to clear them.¹

Child responded by composing a series of observations on Boot's critique, which were printed by Hartlib in the third edition of the *Legacy* (1655) under the title "An Answer to the Animadversor on the Letter to Mr. Samuel Hartlib of Husbandry."² This Answer comes immediately after Boot's letters, which are headed "Dr. *Arnold Beati's*, Annotations upon the *Legacy of Husbandry*."³ *Beati* is a mere misprint for *Boate*, the English method of spelling the Doctor's surname.⁴ There is no possible doubt about the writer. In the Table of Contents he is called Dr. Arnold Boat, and in a letter to Boyle (May 8, 1654), Hartlib thus announces this third edition:

I could give you likewise several accounts concerning la Lucerne, and St. Foynne;⁵ but my legacy of husbandry being to be printed the third time, you shall find them all in that edition with the Answer of the late Dr. *Child* to the animadverter, Dr. *Boate*, upon his large letter of husbandry, wherein there are divers excellent observations and experiments, which, by God's blessing, are like to enrich these nations, if their industry be not wanting.⁶

¹ P. [102].

² *Legacy*, 3d ed., pp. 132-172. This Answer is neither signed nor dated, but no signature is needed to assure us that it is the work of the writer of the Large Letter. The author uses the first personal pronoun continually in referring to statements made in that essay.

³ They are on pp. 118-132. In the second edition (1652), when Boot's annotations first saw the light (pp. 103-118), their author's name is not given.

⁴ Both Dr. Arnold Boot and his brother Dr. Gerard (see p. 116, below) used this spelling of their name (Boate) when writing English, to preclude the otherwise inevitable mispronunciation. See, for example, Arnold Boot's letters to Ussher in Ussher's *Whole Works*, ed. Elrington and Todd, vol. xvi.

⁵ These two kinds of forage, then much in favor in France, were just beginning to interest agriculturalists in England and Ireland. See Samuel Hartlib his *Legacie*, 2d ed., 1652, pp. 1-4, 84-89; 3d ed., 1655, pp. 1-4, 98-104, 250-255.

⁶ Boyle's *Works*, v. 262.

In this Answer to Boot Child has a good deal to say about New England products. A few extracts are worth making.¹ We may begin with a curious medical note:

As for the Pox, . . . I will not long discourse, whether it proceeded from eating mans flesh at *Naples*, (as Lord *Bacon*² and others seem to affirm) or from the *Indyces*, which is most likely; but how it first came amongst them, is very difficult to know, its most probable from their base corrupt dyet, eating mans flesh, not using salt, or any thing of high tast, as I have observed amōgst the *Indiās* of *New England*, where i[t] abounds,³ or perhaps from *Bestialitys*.⁴

There was an outbreak of this disease in Boston in 1646⁵ while Child was here, and he alludes to the cases in the Remonstrance as a sign that God is displeased with the administration.⁶

Here is a remark which points a moral for the dry days that are coming. Child is speaking of making beer without malt:

Yea I know that Potatoes maketh excellent drink in *Barbadoes*; also in *New-England* the stalks of *Virginian* wheat, as it is usually called. Squashes or Gourds, Pumpions boyled make considerable drink; Parsnips make that which is accounted rare; therefore much more the Grains above mentioned [namely, wheat, barley, peas, etc.].⁷

Henry Stubbe, however, the Warwick physician, gives a rather alarming account of this potato tipple:

When I was at *Barbadoes* we carried off several poor *English* thence to *Jamaica*, where many of them falling *sick*, and some being *well*, were let *blood*: I observed that in those *poor people*, which live upon nothing almost but *Roots*, and drink *Mobby* (a liquor made of *Potatoes* boyl'd and steep'd in water, and so fermented) that *their blood* did stream out *yellow*, and in the *Porringer* did scarce retain any show of *red* in the *coagulated*

¹ See also *Legacy*, 3d ed. (1655), pp. 140, 154, 157, 163, 168. Child also mentions things he has seen in Ireland (pp. 163, 164, 166, 169; cf. p. 152). In the Large Letter in this 3d ed. are two mentions of Ireland (pp. 82, 91) not found in the 2d ed.

² I have not found this in Bacon.

³ Cf. our Publications, xiv. 151, 185-186; American Antiquarian Society Proceedings, xxvi, 42,

⁴ P. 138.

⁵ Winthrop, ii. 315-316 (258).

⁶ Hutchinson Papers, i. 215.

⁷ P. 142.

mass: yet are they *well* and *strong*, but look *pale* and *freckled*: such persons (which are frequent in *Barbadoes*) are called *Mobby-faces*.¹

The following notes confirm what Winslow says about Child's peregrination of New England, though we cannot be sure to which of his two visits they apply. They derive additional interest from the fact that in 1645 Child purchased Vines's Saco patent.²

I am sure that *Sassafras* groweth in the Northern Plantations of *New-England*, even as far North as *Sacho*, where the Snow usually lyeth five moneths, and the Winter extream bitter in respect of *England*: and further this *Sassafras* is not a small plant or shrub easily nipt with the frost, but a great Tree, so that boards of ten inches Diameter have been made thereof; and further, where it once groweth, hardly to be destroyed: so that it much annoyeth the Corn by its young shoots, and the Mower in Harvest more then any other Tree that I heard of in that Country. I was informed that the Native *Indians* of the place, when they lose themselves in the Woods, presently run to these small shoots, and thereby know which is North and South. Indeed I have observed that one side is more speckled then another, and perhaps other small shoots of plants are so, but not as yet observed (for ought I know) of any.

And he goes on to show how *sassafras* is not sufficiently described by any botanist, so far as he knows.³

I know that in *New-England* the wild-Bays (which is like our common bays in smell and leaves) casteth its leaf in Winter, as also a kind of Fir about *Casho-bay*, (out of which is extracted a very odoriferous gum) and others in like manner, &c. In *New-England* divers in the beginning of their plantations, used this Plant⁴ in their Beer, hoping that it would have served both for mault and spice, but it deceived their expectations. For in my apprehension it giveth a taste not pleasant, and also they that accustomed themselves to this drink, especially in the Summer found themselves faint and weak, not able to endure labour.⁵

¹ The Lord Bacons Relation of the Sweating-Sickness Examined, in a Reply to George Thomson, Pretender to Physicke and Chymistry (London, 1671), p. 117 (Harvard College Library).

² P. 16, above.

³ *Legacy*, 3d ed., 1655, p. 153.

⁴ *Sassafras*.

⁵ Pp. 153-154.

In *New-England* I have seen Pines above four foot Diameter, and the length accordingly, even in the most Northern places . . . : so concerning Cedars, they grow of a very great height and bignesse in the Northern parts of *New-England*, where snow lyeth five or six months.¹

Snakeweed, supposed to be a cure for the venom of the rattlesnake, attracted much attention from naturalists and physicians in the seventeenth and eighteenth century, as one may see, for instance, in the Philosophical Transactions and in the writings of Cotton Mather.² Child regarded this plant as likely to flourish in England:

When I was in *New-England* I was acquainted with an ancient Gentleman, who also was a Scholer, and had lived ten years in *Virginia*, who certified me that there were two sorts of *Rattle-snake-weeds*, the greater, and the less. That which he called the greater I casually had in my hand, . . . I . . . have far greater hopes of the flourishing of this wild plant, that [read *than*] of Tobacco, (either of that which in *New-England* is called *Poak*, much differing from the *Virginian*, or of that other commonly used and sown in *Virginia*).³

The following extract concerning black lead is of quite peculiar interest — personal as well as historical:

I think it likewise not amiss to certify that in *New-England* this Material is found in divers places; as at *Nashaway* about forty miles from *Boston*, as also on *Pequat* River about eighty miles from *Boston*: this last was given from the Court of *Boston* to a friend of yours and mine, viz. Mr. *John Winthrop*, this Gentleman sent divers pieces thereof to me, that I might enquire of some *Dutch* Merchants what price it bare in *Holland*, and how much might be vendible, which accordingly I did, and also shewed it to the two Gentlemen above named,⁴ who were very inquisitive where I had it, and how much might be procured thereof, and desired that I would leave one of the greater pieces with them, that they might try it which I did; and the next morning enquiring again what they said to my black lead; they told me it was nothing worth, because it would not endure the Saw, they hoping, as I after found to

¹ P. 156.

² See p. 106, above.

³ P. 155.

⁴ Namely, "Master *Bolton* and Master *Bret*, who live in *Cornhill* nigh the Exchange, and sell Colours" (p. 132).

have had enough for to have furnished *Europe* with black Combs, which are very rare and dear, a small one usually sold at twenty or thirty shillings: My friend Mr. *W.* hoped that this material had been *Plumbago Cisalpini*, which he also calleth *Mater Argenti*.¹ But I suppose in this particular he was mistaken, yet upon Examination we found pure silver amongst it, which by calculation might amount to 15*l.* per tun, though the black lead sent me, was found onely on the surface of the earth: I am the longer on this discourse, because this material hath been little considered as yet by learned men that I can find, and also because my friend would be glad to have some ingenious men to joyn with him in a Work, which hath very great probabilities of very great profit to the undertakers.

The common uses of black-lead, are first to make black-lead pens for *Mathematicians*, &c. 2. For Painters and Limners. 3. For those that work in Copper to make their hammer go glib. And lastly, if any great pieces be found, which is rare in *Cumberland Mine*, to make Combes of them, because they discolour gray hairs, and make black hair of a Raven-like, or glittering blacknesse, much desired in *Italy, Spain, &c.*²

In tracing Child's career we have several times encountered references to the younger Winthrop's black lead.³ Winthrop, when in England in 1641-1643, had roused his interest in the mine.⁴ It was at Tantousq or Tantiusques, in the southern part of the present town of Sturbridge in Worcester County, and, as Child remarks in the passage just quoted, was given to Winthrop by the General Court of Massachusetts. There is a record of this action at the session of November 13, 1644: "Mr Iohn Winthrope, Iunior, is granted y^e hill at Tantousq, about 60 miles westward, in which the black leade is, and liberty to purchase some land there of the Indians."⁵ In the next year, just before he visited the Bay for the

¹ Child is referring to the treatise *De Metallicis* by Andreas Cæsalpinus (Cesalpino). *Plumbago* is treated in book iii, chap. 22 (Nürnberg edition, 1602 pp. 211-212), where much is said about silver, though I do not find the phrase "*mater argenti*." In his letter of March 1, 1644[-5], in a little excursus on this same subject (see p. 14, above), Child also refers to Cæsalpinus, having his eye apparently on book i, chap. 9, pp. 28-29, and book iii, chap. 8, pp. 186-187, as well as on the passage just cited.

² Samuel Hartlib his *Legacy*, 3d ed., 1655, pp. 133-134.

³ See pp. 10, 11, 14-15, 92, 99, above.

⁴ See Child's letter of June 27, 1643 (Winthrop Papers, iii. 152).

⁵ Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 82. This action was in general though not exact accord with a policy adopted at the session of June 2, 1641: "For in-

second time, Child was eager to invest money in the project. He wrote to Winthrop on March 1, 1645, after talking with Emanuel Downing and Stephen Winthrop, and warned him not to expect too much from the enterprise, but he expressed his readiness to stand a quarter of the expenses. He adds a learned discourse on the subject, quoting "Cesalpine," as in the extract just given from the reply to Boot.¹ Downing and Winthrop's brother Stephen were at this time acting as promoters in the mother country.² On June 16 of the same year, Richard Hill writes to Winthrop from London on the subject. He has heard from Winthrop by letter, and has also been talking with Downing and Stephen Winthrop: "I . . . am glad to heare you haue soe well spent your time as I vnderstand you haue, in ffinding out that mine of black Lead." Specimens had been sent to England and Hill had tested them. The substance yielded about a shilling a ton in silver. "If itt yealded any Lead mettle itt would bee somthing like, but as itt is, it is only to bee gathered by Quicksiluer as I conceaue." A larger quantity, some four or five hundredweight, is needed for a definitive test.³ Later, during his troubles in New England and thereafter, Child returns more than once to the subject of the Tantousq mine. He was still eager to invest in it in 1650, if the authorities of the Bay would apply his fines to that object, and his letter of August 26, 1650, proves that Winthrop had so far done nothing to develop the property.⁴ Winthrop's letter of 1649 shows no great alacrity in proceeding,⁵ but later, in 1658 and 1659, there was a vigorous though troubled attempt to get to work.⁶ The subsequent history of the mine down to the begin-

curagment of such as will adventure for the discovery of mines, it is ordered, that whosoever shalbee at the charge for discovery of any mine wthin this jurisdiction shall enjoy the same, wth a fit portion of land to the same, for 21 years to their pp. use" (i. 327).

¹ Winthrop Papers, iii. 153-155.

² Stephen Winthrop writes to his brother John from London on March 1, 1644[-5]: "We are inquiring a chapm̄ for yo^r black lead. There is some of it sent into France for triall. We hope we shall setle al yo^r busines & o^r returne in ye Cambrid shipp a month after this" (Winthrop Papers, iv. 200-201).

³ Winthrop Papers, iii. 336.

⁴ Winthrop Papers, iii. 162 (cf. pp. 156-157, 159).

⁵ See p. 92, above.

⁶ William Paine's letters to John Winthrop, Jr. (Winthrop Papers, ii. 404-410). In 1662 at a meeting of the Royal Society (December 31) "Mr. Winthrop

ning of the present century, when (in 1902) a fresh attempt was made to operate it, has been told in a very interesting paper by Professor George H. Haynes.¹ I am informed that the mine has now lain idle for several years.

We should have more of Child's observations on American natural history but for an accident in transportation: "In *New-England* I have seen a Plant with good success used for *Sarsaperilla*, . . . but concerning this plant and divers others, which grow in *New-England*, I cannot give you that account I desire, because my seeds and papers unhappily miscarried."²

The Interrogatory which Hartlib prepared for Child's use in gathering materials for a natural history of Ireland covers most things in nature and includes some matters of curious interest. Under *Maccamboy* is the inquiry "Whether there be such a thing at all, that this herb should purge the body meerly by external touch, or whether it be a fable, what particular observations have been taken for or against it, . . . and in what place it groweth?" Under *Poisons*, Hartlib asks, of course, for "particular observations of the Antipathy of the Irish earth and Aire, against all poisonous creatures." Under *Patricks-Purgatory*, he requests a "perfect description of the Logh, Island, Caves, and the whole proceedings there, during the Justiceship of the Earle of *Corke*, and the Lord Chancellour *Loftus*." Under *Barnacles* are several questions, all directed toward an elucidation of the venerable legend of the geese that develop out of these marine crustaceans. Sir Kenelm Digby, who was probably a friend of Child, as he was of Hartlib and Boyle and the younger Winthrop, could have answered the questions authoritatively. So at least Lady Fanshawe thought in January, 1649:

When we came to Calais we met the Earl of Strafford and Sir Kenelm Digby, with some of our countrymen. We were all feasted at the Governor's of the Castle, and much excellent discourse passed; but, as was reason, most share was Sir Kenelm Digby's, who had enlarged somewhat more in extraordinary stories than might be averred, and all of

remarked that there was no right black-lead any where except in England and New England" (Birch, *History of the Royal Society*, i. 167).

¹ "The Tale of Tantiusques," *American Antiquarian Society Proceedings* xiv. 471-497.

² Samuel Hartlib his *Legacy*, 3d ed., 1655, p. 154.

them passed with great applause and wonder of the French then at table. But the concluding was that barnacles, a bird in Jersey, was first a shell-fish to appearance, and from that, sticking upon old wood, became in time a bird. After some consideration, they all unanimously burst out into laughter, believing it altogether false; and, to say the truth, it was the only thing true he had discoursed with them. This was his infirmity, though otherwise a person of most excellent parts and a very fine-bred gentleman.¹

The learned world was particularly interested in these bernicle geese. The very learned Father Athanasius Kircher — *pace tanti viri dixerim* — communicated a high-fantastical theory on the subject to Robert Southwell in 1661.² But later in that same year Dr. Worthington was able to tell Hartlib that the great naturalist Ray and his company had recently visited “the Bass Island, and both saw and fed on the Soland geese, but they found all was not true which is usually reported of them.”³ The modern inquirer may slake his thirst with Mr. Henry Lee’s exposition in *Sea Fables Explained*.⁴ As for St. Patrick’s Purgatory, Hartlib’s appetite for facts had been whetted by Gerard Boot’s brief account of this celebrated place of pilgrimage and of its destruction in 1632 by Loftus and Cork. The documents that he desired may now be found in Canon O’Connor’s book.⁵

Gerard Boot, the elder brother of that Dr. Arnold Boot who wrote *Animadversions on Child’s Large Letter*, was a native of Gorinchem in Holland⁶ and an M.D. of Leyden.⁷ He removed to England

¹ *Memoirs of Ann Lady Fanshawe*, London, 1907, p. 50.

² Southwell to Boyle, Rome, March 30, 1661 (*Boyle’s Works*, v. 405). In the same year (April 3) Dr. William Petty was desired by the Royal Society “to inquire in Ireland concerning the petrification of wood, the bernacles,” etc. (*Birch, History of the Royal Society*, i. 20).

³ Worthington to Hartlib, October 7, 1661 (*Diary and Correspondence of Dr. John Worthington*, ed. Crossley, Chetham Society, ii. 51).

⁴ Pp. 98–122, *International Fisheries Exhibition*, London, 1883, Literature, vol. iii.

⁵ Rev. Daniel O’Connor, *St. Patrick’s Purgatory*, Lough Derg (Dublin, 1895), pp. 132–140. Cf. the Earl of Cork’s *Diary*, September 8, 1632 (*Lismore Papers*, ed. by A. B. Grosart, 1st Series, iii. 159); Dorothea Townshend, *Life and Letters of the Great Earl of Cork*, 1904, pp. 192–193.

⁶ Van der Aa, *Biographisch Woordenboek der Nederlanden*, ii. (iii.) 892.

⁷ The *Leyden Album Studiosorum* registers his admission as a student of

ca. 1630¹ and for nearly twenty years was established as a general practitioner in London, where in 1648 he had a house in "Crooked Friars."² In 1646 he was admitted a licentiate of the College of Physicians.³ His interest in Ireland arose partly from his having invested a large share of his estate in the Irish forfeited lands⁴—the so-called Irish adventure in which so much money was made and lost in the latter part of the seventeenth century.⁵ Arnold Boot, who was two years his junior,⁶ practised in Dublin with much success from 1636 to 1644,⁷ having Strafford and Archbishop Ussher among his patients,⁸ when he went to Paris and settled there.⁹ In 1644, on his way to France, the Dover boat in which he had embarked

medicine (aged 25) on June 21, 1628 (col. 211), describing him as "Gorekomiensis." See also note 6, below.

¹ Van der Aa, ii. (iii.) 892.

² Letter from Arnold Boot (Boate) to Ussher, March 5, 1648 (Ussher's Whole Works, ed. by Elrington and Todd, xvi. 554).

³ November 6, 1646 (Munk, Roll of the Royal College of Physicians of London, i. 243-244). Munk says he was "entered in the physic line at Leyden, 21st June, 1628, being then twenty-five years of age, and graduated a doctor of medicine there, the 3rd July, 1628."

⁴ Arnold Boot's prefatory letter. Cf. Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, Adventurers for Land, 1642-1659, p. 129; Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1647-1660, pp. 410, 416, 535.

⁵ "And the Adventurers after 10 years being out of their Principal Mony, which now ought to be double by its Interest, they sold their Adventures for under 10 *s. per l. anno* 1652, in open and free Market" (Sir William Petty, Political Survey of Ireland, 2d ed., 1719, p. 23).

⁶ Gerard was born in 1604, Arnold in 1606 (van der Aa, ii. [iii.] 892, 893). The Leyden Album Studiosorum registers the admission of "Arnoldus Boot Gorichomiensis," aged 22, as a student of medicine on April 23, 1629 (col. 217).

⁷ Gerard Boot, Irelands Naturall History, chap. xxiii, section 4 (Collection of Tracts and Treatises, i. 143); Arnold Boot's prefatory letter. His earliest extant letter to Ussher is dated Dublin, October 30, 1638 (Ussher's Whole Works, xvi. 39-40).

⁸ The Rev. Alexander Clogie, writing of Ussher, says: "The speech of his own physitian, D. Bootius, a learned Dutchman (who was also physitian to the e. of Strafford), is very remarkable; *Si Armachanus noster esset*," etc. (Speculum Episcoporum, § 49, printed in Two Biographies of William Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore, ed. by E. E. Shuckburgh, 1902, p. 118).

⁹ Van der Aa, ii. (iii.) 893. We can locate him in Paris, on the evidence of his correspondence with Ussher and Hartlib, from April 1 $\frac{1}{2}$, 1648, to October 18, 1653 (Ussher's Whole Works, xvi. 126-130, 581-582, and *passim*; Samuel Hartlib his Legacie, 2d ed., 1652, pp. 103-118, 3d ed., 1655, pp. 118-132; Boyle's Works, v. 258). On December 22, 1650, Evelyn, then in Paris, notes in his Diary: "Came the learned Dr. Boet to visite me" (ed. Wheatley, 1906, ii. 20).

was captured by a privateer in the Parliamentary service,¹ and he was detained in London from early in May to late in October.² Probably he lodged with Dr. Gerard. At all events, they had many talks about Ireland, and Dr. Gerard, who had never visited that country, wrote the First Book of his *Naturall History* in 1645 on the basis of their conversations and of subsequent intercourse with several gentlemen who had been driven out by the "bloody combustions" there. He meant to add three more books, but he never carried out his plan. He sent the manuscript to Dr. Arnold, who returned it with editorial improvements.³ In 1647 (July 16) the House of Commons ordered that Dr. Gerard be appointed "Physician of the Army in Ireland" and be sent to Dublin;⁴ but there was some delay. Finally, in 1649, he was appointed State Physician for Ireland and "Doctor to the hospital at Dublin," and he went over late in the year.⁵ He died at Dublin on January $\frac{9}{19}$, 1649-50.²

Hartlib was eager to have Gerard Boot's fragmentary work completed, for he thought such a treatise would be of great benefit to the "improvers" of Ireland under the Commonwealth. His Interrogatory was meant to encourage the gathering of material for this purpose. He looked to Arnold Boot as the natural continuator, and in 1653 his hopes were high, for towards the end of that year the Doctor started from Paris for England.⁶ His final destination, apparently, was Dublin, where he may have expected to succeed his brother as State Physician. He reached Dieppe — but I must let

¹ In the House of Commons, April 25, 1644, "the humble Petition of Dr. *Arnold Boate* and Mr. *Ben. Worsley*, in the Behalf of themselves, and other poor Protestant Passengers, taken by some Ships in the Parliament's Service, in their Passage upon a Vessel of *Dover*, was this Day read; and referred, and in an especial Manner recommended unto the Consideration of the Adventurers, that set forth the Ships that took the said Passengers; to inquire into the Condition and Affection of the said Passengers; and to do therein as they shall think fit; and to report their Doings therein to the House" (Commons' Journals, iii. 469).

² Arnold Boot's prefatory letter in *Irelands Naturall History*.

³ Arnold Boot's prefatory letter.

⁴ Commons' Journals, v. 247. Benjamin Worsley was named as General Surgeon to the Army in Ireland in the same order.

⁵ Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1649-1650, pp. 66, 588; Arnold Boot's prefatory letter.

⁶ His last letter to Hartlib from Paris (October 18, 1653) expressed his intention of bringing a book to Boyle, who was then in Ireland (Hartlib to Boyle, February 28, 1653-4, Boyle's Works, v. 258).

Hartlib tell the story — he is writing to Boyle, February 28, 1653–4: “I need not tell you again (for I hear, that you know it already) that Dr. *Boat*, when he was come as far as *Diepe* towards *England*, being let blood by those common butchers of human kind, departed this world: which really is a very great loss to the commonwealth of learning.”¹ The butchers thus pilloried are merely those physicians or surgeons who followed the old drastic method of treatment. Hartlib favored the new school, which walked in the footsteps of Paracelsus and van Helmont, eschewing huge doses, violent purges, and phlebotomy, and relying on so-called chemical remedies.² Dr. *Boot*’s death may safely be referred to the latter part of 1653.³ It left Hartlib in doubt how to procure the completion of Gerard *Boot*’s work, and his thoughts turned instinctively to Child. He writes to Boyle (February 28, 1653–4) that he is “utterly at a loss” how to go on “except Dr. *Child* from *Ireland* succeed him [Arnold *Boot*] in the pursuit of that weighty subject,” and again, in the same letter, he protests: “I must now most solemnly call upon you, on the behalf of the *Natural History of Ireland*, which, if yourself and Dr. *Child* do not take professedly to task, I fear will never be perfected to any purpose; at least, if so much could be done in it, as to have all the interrogatories judiciously answered . . . it would be a considerable addition to a second edition of this imperfect work.”⁴

Child certainly went to Ireland either in 1651 or more probably in 1652.⁵ What was his particular inducement we do not know, though it is a good guess that he was invited by a certain large landowner with whom, as we shall see presently, he was afterwards associated there. Perhaps, however, the design of the Commonwealth for “planting” that country with English settlers is reason

¹ Hartlib to Boyle, February 28, 1653–4 (Boyle’s Works, v. 258).

² His son-in-law Clod (Clodius, Claudius) was a fashionable London practitioner of the chemical persuasion (see Hartlib to John Pell, April 1, 1658, in Robert Vaughan, Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell, ii. 454).

³ Van der Aa says 1653 (p. 893). The author of *Boot*’s life in the Dictionary of National Biography (J. T. Gilbert) says the date of his death has not been ascertained (v. 284), but gives it as 1653 with a query. Neither of them knows of the passage in Hartlib’s letter.

⁴ Boyle’s Works, v. 259.

⁵ We know that he was still in England during a good part of 1651 (see pp. 100–103, 107–108, above), and that he was in Ireland when, in 1652, the second edition of Samuel Hartlib his *Legacie* was published (see p. 108, above).

enough, for Ireland was at this time a land of promise for all the investors, speculators, and projectors in England. Child's friend, Robert Boyle, who had large Irish estates, went over in 1652.¹ Two other friends of his, Dr. (afterwards Sir) William Petty and Benjamin Worsley went over to take government positions in 1652 — Petty to be physician to the army and Worsley to act as Secretary to the Commissioners.² Worsley was already well acquainted with Ireland, where he had been Surgeon-General to the Army from 1641 to 1645.³ Child's friend Richard Leader, with whom he seems to have lodged in Boston and at whose house there he was certainly at one time confined,⁴ had been in Ireland before his appointment as manager of the iron works, and must have spoken favorably of that kingdom. Leader, at all events was an enthusiast on the subject. In 1650 he wrote to John Winthrop, Jr., from Barbadoes: "For

¹ Birch's *Life of Boyle* in *Boyle's Works*, i. 30; cf. Boyle's letter to John Mallet, January, 1652-3 (*Works*, i. 31).

² Child was certainly acquainted with Petty (p. 98, above), and it may be assumed that he also knew Worsley, who was an intimate friend of both Boyle and Hartlib. Petty and Worsley went over on the same ship, arriving at Waterford on September 10, 1652 (Petty, *History of the Down Survey*, ed. Larcom, Dublin, 1851, p. 2; Petty's will, *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, vol. xxiv, *Antiquities*, p. 110). Worsley was Secretary to the Commissioners for the Affairs of Ireland as early as February 4, 1653 (*Calendar of State Papers, Ireland*, 1647-1660, p. 391), and I assume that he had this appointment before he left England.

³ Worsley was "Chirurgion-General of the whole Army" in Ireland from 1641 to 1645 (*Calendar of State Papers, Ireland*, 1633-1647, pp. 776, 780, 787; *Manuscripts of the Marquess of Ormonde*, *Historical Manuscripts Commission*, *New Series*, ii. 256-257, 284; *Lords' Journals*, vii. 401, 424; *Historical Manuscripts Commission*, 6th Report, Appendix, pp. 61, 63).

⁴ See pp. 41, 71, above. On August 26, 1650, Child wrote to the younger Winthrop: "M^r Leader hath more curious booke[s] than I; especially about Divinity businesses; where you may see them" (*Winthrop Papers*, iii. 162). I am indebted to Mr. Clough for the following note:

Although Richard Leader's place of residence was chiefly at Lynn, he was the owner of at least two parcels of real estate in Boston. One of these, the one referred to in the text, he sold, October 10, 1655, for £200, to Mr. William Paine: "all that my Mansion house (now in possession of Mr. Robert Patershall, merchant) at Boston, together with ye Orchard, gardens, tymber yeards, wharfes wayes, water courses, Grounds," etc. (*Suffolk Deeds*, ii. 210.) The site of this property is in part now numbered 350-360 on the west side of North Street, between Harris Street and Hanover Avenue. In Leader's time, this estate, included also the corresponding frontage on the easterly side of North Street to the water's edge. Cf. *Savage*, *Genealogical Dictionary*, iii. 67, 68; *Aspinwall*, *Notarial Records*, p. 367.

my owne part I see no place so good as Ireland, either for p'fitt or pleasure; Where I intend to steere my course so sone as I can withdraw what I have oute of this westerne parte of the world."¹ The agricultural and industrial possibilities of the new plantations would have been a strong attraction to a man of Child's tastes, and his fortunes needed repairing.

Soon after Child's death, Hartlib wrote to Boyle: "By that, which I read concerning Dr. *Child's* husbandries in the work of *Ireland*, I see what a good foundation of life he hath laid for that honest country calling. But I doubt the colonel cannot shew us any more observations or directions of his in writing, besides what is extant already from his own hand; though this would have improved clover, flax and woad, upon many more lands than his own."² These sayings are uncommonly Orphic, even for Hartlib, but luckily his remark in a letter to Winthrop — that Child at the time of his death was "living with Esquire Hill"³ — gives us the answer to the riddle and thus enables us to understand what Child's occupation was in Ireland. Esquire Hill and the Colonel are manifestly one and the same person — to wit, Colonel Arthur Hill, son and successor of Sir Moyses Hill of County Down. Colonel Hill had been appointed one of the Commissioners of Revenue for Ulster in 1651,⁴ and his duties were much concerned with the sequestration of forfeited estates and the re-peopling of the county with new planters. In this capacity he had a strong interest in husbandry. He had also every motive to study the subject on his own account, for he had succeeded to the family estates and was a great landholder. The Marquesses of Downshire are his descendants,⁵ and their holdings in Ireland and England were worth nearly £100,000 a year in 1883.⁶

¹ Letter to John Winthrop, Jr., January 16, 1659-60 (2 Massachusetts Historical Proceedings, iii. 196).

² Hartlib to Boyle, May 8, 1654 (Boyle's Works, v. 262).

³ See p. 123, below.

⁴ Letter from Major George Rawdon to Lord Conway, November 20, 1651 (Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1647-1660, p. 383); R. Dunlop, *Ireland under the Commonwealth*, vol. i. pp. cxxvii. 40 note (cf. i. 71-73, 127, 131; ii. 329, 339, 655, 658, 670).

⁵ Burke's Peerage, under *Downshire*. The head of the family was created Viscount Hillsborough in 1717, Earl of Hillsborough in 1751, and Marquess of Downshire in 1789.

⁶ Complete Peerage, by G. E. C., iv. 461 (1916).

Even in the lifetime of his father, Arthur Hill had distinguished himself as a progressive landlord, for Sir William Brereton, in 1635, records a visit to "a brave plantation" which he held on a long lease from Lord Chichester: "This plantation is said doth yield him a £1000 per annum. Many Lanekashire and Cheshire men are here planted; with some of them I conversed. They sit upon a rack rent, and pay 5s. or 6s. an acre for good ploughing land, which now is clothed with excellent good corn."¹

Child, as we may now infer, was serving Colonel Arthur Hill as agricultural expert, with his headquarters perhaps at what is now Hillsborough Castle, near Belfast.² Boyle had doubtless been writing to Hartlib about the value of Child's services to Hill in the great enterprise of planting Ulster. Probably Child had himself invested something in Irish lands. A Robert Child subscribed £50 for the Irish adventure on July 19, 1642, and there is a reference to this same transaction in a record of March 10, 1651-2,³ which must be close to the time when our Robert Child went to Ireland. The name occurs again in a list of adventurers dated July 20, 1653, shortly before his death.⁴

Child died, it seems, between February and May, 1654. In a letter to Boyle, dated February 28, 1653-4, Hartlib expresses the hope that Child will finish Gerard Boot's Natural History of Ireland,⁵ but in writing to Boyle on May 8 he speaks of him as "the

¹ Sir William Brereton's Travels, Chetham Society, 1844, pp. 128-129.

² There is a possible trace of Child in this part of Ireland in a passage in his Answer to Boot (Samuel Hartlib his Legacy, 3d ed., 1655, p. 164): "I have seen long pices of yellow transparent Stone, or Amber found in a Fountain nigh Lake Neagh, about six miles from Antrim which the Irish say (though vainly) that it is found only there on *May-day*, and doe use it superstitiously about divers things." Cf. Birch, History of the Royal Society, ii. 60.

³ Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, Adventurers for Land, 1642-1659, p. 92; cf. pp. 91, 352.

⁴ Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1647-1660, p. 405.

⁵ Boyle's Works, v. 259. In the same letter Hartlib remarks: "Sir, you complain of that barbarous (for the present) country, wherein you live; but if you would but make a right use of yourself, from the place where you live, towards Dr. Child, Mr. Worsley, Dr. Petty, major Morgan (not to mention others) they would abundantly cherish in you many philosophical thoughts, and encourage you, perhaps more vigorously than I can do at this distance and uncertainties, to venture even upon divers choice chemical experiments, for the advancement both of health and wealth." The letter was written in reply to a letter from Boyle dated Youghal, January 10, 1653-4.

late Dr. Child.”¹ His friend the younger Winthrop did not hear of his death till some years later, for in 1661 Hartlib wrote to him, apparently in response to something in a letter of Winthrop’s, perhaps an inquiry: “I wonder that you have not heard of D^r Rob. Child who dyed in Ireland about 3. yeares agoe living with Esquire Hill. He was a singular lover of your Person and a most vseful honest Man in his kind.”² Child seems never to have married. He was certainly a bachelor when he was in New England,³ and we hear nothing that would lead us to infer that he ever took a wife.

I have passed lightly over Child’s alchemical pursuits in order not to complicate too much our study of this remarkable man. They did not interfere with his practical, every-day interests — medicine, mining, agriculture, speculation in colonial iron works; nor were they inconsistent with mundane engrossment, for a time, in English-American politics. This observation is not without significance. Why somebody has not paid serious attention to the alchemical studies of the early New Englanders⁴ — Winthrop and Child and Stirk and Brewster and Avery, not to mention later investigators, like President Stiles and Judge Danforth and Dr. Æneas Munson⁵ — I do not know; but I suspect it is because alchemy ranges with witchcraft in the thoughts of most of us and we feel that this is a case in which “least said, soonest mended” is a sane maxim. In fact, however, there is no connection between the two subjects. Witchcraft looks backward: it reverts to the abysm of time; it reminds us (not much to our self-satisfaction) of the pit of primeval savagery

¹ Boyle’s Works, v. 262. In this same letter (v. 264) Hartlib writes: “I am intending . . . to write to the possessors of the late Dr. *Boate*’s papers, to publish those in print beyond the seas, which contain the Natural History of *Ireland*, written in Low-Dutch originally, as he told me in his life-time.” This must refer to Dr. Arnold Boot, but no such publication is known.

² Hartlib to Winthrop, September 3, 1661 (1 Massachusetts Historical Proceedings, xvi. 213). It will be noted that Hartlib underestimates the lapse of time.

³ Declaration of the General Court, November, 1646 (Hutchinson Papers, i. 239).

⁴ Lowell devotes a few pages to the subject in his essay on *New England Two Centuries Ago*, 1865 (Works, Standard Library edition, ii. 46-56).

⁵ For Munson (1734-1826) see Stiles, *Literary Diary*, ed. F. B. Dexter, iii. 345, 471, 472; Henry Bronson, *Papers of the New Haven Colony Historical Society*, ii. 263-274.

out of which we are digged, of the miry clay that still adheres to the hem of our rationalistic garments; it is our vital link with Ashantee and the juju-men of the West Coast. But alchemy looks forward: it is experimental science in the making — science that does not yet acknowledge its finite bounds, but aspires star-eyed to the illimitable possibilities. Child's lifetime coincided with the eager stirrings of the scientific instinct in England. Had he lived a few more years, he might well have been one of the founders of the Royal Society, like his friends Boyle and the younger Winthrop. For a physician not to study alchemy in those days was a sign that he was either a reactionary or a fossil.

We have slight occasion, then, to take the defensive, and none at all to apologize for our great-grandfathers as if their zeal in alchemy were merely a picturesque and amiable weakness. It is much to the credit of New England intellectual life in the seventeenth century that the younger Winthrop could meet Robert Child and Sir Kenelm Digby on their own ground in these speculations; that George Stirk could go to London in 1650 with so thorough a knowledge of alchemical principles and processes that he was able to impose on the world his splendid fiction of the adept Eirenæus Philalethes, who still rules royally in the counsels of occultists; that Jonathan Brewster, our Plymouth elder's son, was in 1657 in hot and sanguine pursuit of the grand elixir in his cabin on the Connecticut frontier with the Indians howling at his kitchen door;¹ that William Avery at Boston in 1684 was patiently searching for the alkahest or universal solvent and had taught his son Jonathan to be "an assiduous labourer at the chemical fire."²

¹ Brewster was at a trading post at Manheken (Monhegen), afterwards a part of Norwich, Connecticut. See his letters to the younger Winthrop, January, 1656[-7] (Winthrop Papers, ii. 72-75, 77-81). He writes: "It is 5. yeares wanting two monthes before the red Elixer be pfected, and 4. yeares before the white, soe that my worke will be yet till December next, before the coullers bee & 5 monthes after before the white apeare, and after the white standes a working till pfected by the hott fyerey imbibitiones, one whole year after till September. I feare I shall not live to see it finished, in regard ptly of the Indianes who I feare will raise warres: as also I haue a conceite y^t God sees me not worthy of such a blessing, by reason of my manifold miscariadges" (ii. 79).

² See William Avery's two letters to Boyle (November 9, 1682, and May 1, 1684), printed in Boyle's Works, v. 614-617; cf. our Publications, xiv. 147, 162-165.

Child's interest in alchemy and in the occult appears in the earliest letter of his that we possess — that addressed to his friend Winthrop in 1641¹ — and it emerges unabated in his latest extant letter to the same correspondent, that of August 26, 1650:² "Cornel. Agrippa de Occult phio [Philosophia] is coming forth in English,³ & Sendivogius,"⁴ so he notes as an item of scientific intelligence, along with an announcement of the great Harvey's book *de Generatione*⁵ and Dr. Bate's treatise on the rickets.⁶ And he mentions Thomas Vaughan twice: — first, by way of literary news, "One Vaughan an Ingenious young man hath written Anthroposophia, & is printing phio Adamitica,"⁷ and again, near the end, in a kind of intellectual S.O.S.: "If you see a Booke called Anthroposophia, tell me, if you can, what the metaphysicall subiect is, which is the great question now amongst vs which is the perfection of all things." Thomas Vaughan, brother of the mystical poet, killed himself accidentally by exploding a mercurial compound.⁸ Experimentation and occultism, since (as we fondly think) divorced, were then joined in loving union. John Heydon (the friend of George Stirk, who was the friend of Robert Child) was an attorney who cast figures by geomancy and astromancy for the benefit of his clients, and found they served to increase his practice.⁹ Much later, Presi-

¹ Winthrop Papers, iii. 148-151.

² iii. 161-164.

³ See p. 102, above.

⁴ A New Light of Alchymie . . . Written by Micheel Sendivogius . . . Translated . . . by J. F. M.D. London, 1650. On Sendivogius see Ferguson, *Bibliotheca Chemica*, ii. 364-370. As to the translator, see p. 102, above.

⁵ *Exercitationes de Generatione Animalium*, London, 1651.

⁶ Francis Glisson, George Bate, and Ahasuerus Regemorter, *De Rachitide* . . . *Tractatus*, London, 1651.

⁷ *Anthroposophia Theomagica: Or A Discourse of the Nature of Man and his state after death; Grounded on his Creator's Proto-Chimistry, and verifi'd by a practicall Examination of Principles in the Great World.* By Eugenius Philalethes. London, 1650. *Magia Adamica: or The Antiquitie of Magic, and The Descent thereof from Adam downwards, proved. Whereunto is added a perfect, and full Discoverie of the true Cælum Terræ, or the Magician's Heavenly Chaos, and first Matter of all Things.* By Eugenius Philalethes. London, 1650.

⁸ See p. 142, below.

⁹ "Although our self is not of the Theomagical Order of the *Holy Rosie Cross*; yet we have been very studious and curious in searching out their secret Mysterious Learning near twenty years: besides, we have served as a Clerk five years

dent Stiles of Yale was reputed to know the great secret, but felt constrained to protest (with *coram Deo veritas*) that he was ignorant whether such a thing was even possible.¹

As to the younger John Winthrop, he began these studies early in life, for they loom large in the letters he received from the friend of his youth, Edward Howes, from 1628 to 1644.² When he met Child, then, Winthrop was doubtless already well versed in the science, and we have no reason to suppose that his faith was ever shaken. When he died, in 1676, he had long enjoyed the reputation of having discovered the mighty secret of the Hermetic sages. This comes out plainly in the Funeral Tribute published in that year by

in *Cliffords-Inne*, and now in Terme-time we follow the practice of an Attorney in the *Kings-bench* at *Westminster*. But this is our Vacation-Recreation, and it is profitable to our Practice in the Law; and by these Arts we gain credit: for we will undertake no cause that shall go against us; let the Plaintiff or Defendant pretend what they will, we know before-hand what good or evil will end the business; and so we (contrary to others) endeavour peace, save money and trouble; yet we do not profess our self a Scholar, but a Gentleman, and that very few Artists can do" (John Heydon, *Theomagia: or, The Temple of Wisdome, Spiritual, Cœlestial, and Elemental*, bk. iii. chap. 19, p. 125, London, 1663, 1664).

¹ "Interspersed among my miscellaneous Writings may perhaps be found Things respecting the Rosacrucean Philosophy, which may induce some to imagine that I have more Knowledge of that matter than I really have. I have no Knowledge of it at all; I never saw Transmutation, the aurific Powder, nor the Philosophers Stone; nor did I ever converse with an Adept knowing him to be such. The only Man that I ever suspected as a real & true Adept was Rabbi Tobias of Poland, but he evaded my Interrogatories & communicated to me nothing — I believe he was only a conjectural speculative Philosopher. I have known 2 or 3 Persons (as Judge Danforth & Rev. Mr. West) who believed the reality of the Philosophers Stone, but neither of them ever obtained it. They are only conjectural & speculative Philosophers — and of such, D^r Franklin told me there were several at Philad^a &c. who were loosing their Time in chemical Experiments to no Effect. I never had, or made an Exp^t with, a Furnace or Alembic in all my Life. I am not versed in the Books of the Adepts; I have seen but few of those authors, & read less — perhaps all the little I have read collectively would not equal a common Octavo Volume. I am infinitely less acquainted with that than any other of the Sciences in the whole Encyclopædia of Literature. I never absorbed the extracted Sulpher of Gold in Terra: I have no practical Knowl. of the Matter: the few Ideas I have about it are only imaginary, conjectural & speculative. *Coram Deo Veritas*" (Stiles, *Literary Diary*, July 1, 1777, ii. 173–174; cf. ii. 183, 216; iii. 345, 348, 471–472).

² 3 Massachusetts Historical Collections, ix. 240–245, 252–258; Winthrop Papers, i. 467–513.

Benjamin Tompson, "Learned Schoolmaster & Physician & y^e Renowned Poet of N. Engl.:"¹

Projections various by fire he made
Where Nature had her common Treasure laid.
Some thought the tincture Philosophick lay
Hatcht by the Mineral Sun in Winthrops way,
And clear it shines to me he had a Stone
Grav'd with his Name which he could read alone.²

The epitaph in Mather's *Magnalia* also testifies to Winthrop's reputation as a successful alchemist:

*Non Periit, sed ad Cœlestem Societatem
Regia Magis Regiam,
Vere Adeptus,
Abiit:*

WINTHROPUS, *Non minor magnis Majoribus.*³

This signifies that, whether or not Winthrop was really an adept in alchemy (that is, whether or not he had found the philosopher's stone), he was "an adept in the true sense" because he had now learned the secrets of the heavenly kingdom. The same belief is hinted at in Mather's interminable epitaph on Four Winthrops, in his "Hades Look'd into," 1717, a funeral sermon on Wait Winthrop:

Cinis tegitur hoc Marmore,
Dignus Lapide Philosophorum tegi.
Quatuor conduntur in hoc Tumulo
WINTHROPI.⁴

But the most striking of all tributes is a vivid passage in President Stiles's Diary, June 1, 1787. Stiles is speaking of "the *Governors Ring*, as it is called, or a Mountain in the N. W. corner of East Haddam:"

Gov^r Trumbull has often told me that this was the Place to which Gov. Winthrop of N. Lond. used to resort with his Servant; and after

¹ So runs the inscription on his tombstone in Roxbury (Hazard, 5 Massachusetts Historical Collections, ii. 19).

² A black-letter broadside, reprinted by Waters, *Sketch of the Life of John Winthrop the Younger*, p. 75; cf. S. A. Green, *John Foster*, p. 127; 2 Massachusetts Historical Proceedings, x. 270-271.

³ *Magnalia*, 1702, bk. ii. chap. 11, p. 33.

⁴ P. 43.

spend^s three Weeks in the Woods of this Mountain in roast^s Ores & assaying Metals & casting gold Rings, he used to return home to N. Lond. with plenty of Gold. Hence this is called the Gov. Winthrop's Ring to this day. Gov. Winthrop was an Adept, in intimate Correspond. with Sir Knelm Digby and first chemical & Philosophical Characters of the last Century — as may be seen in the Dedic^a of 40th Vol. Phil. Transactions 1740.¹

The younger Winthrop had more than a thousand books "in a chamber" in Boston in 1640. We owe our knowledge of the extent of his library to the fact that there was "corn of divers sorts" in the same chamber and that the mice were busy. One of the volumes consisted of "the Greek testament, the psalms, and the common prayer . . . bound together. He found the common prayer eaten with mice, every leaf of it, and not any of the two other touched, nor any of his other books, though there were above a thousand."² Many volumes that belonged to him I have examined in the New York Society Library³ and in the libraries of Yale University and the Massachusetts Historical Society. His collection was rich in alchemical and occult books, which he lent freely to other investigators. One volume, a German translation of the *Antimonii Mysteria Gemina* of the famous Alexander von Suchten,⁴ bears Child's autograph on the title-page: "Rob Child his booke 1636." John Winthrop (H. C. 1700) has also written his own name with Dee's famous monadic symbol (likewise used by John the Connecticut governor) on the same page. Child and his friend Winthrop ex-

¹ Literary Diary, iii. 266.

² Winthrop, ii. 24 (20).

³ There is an imperfect list of that portion of them that went to this corporation in the Alphabetical and Analytical Catalogue of the New York Society Library, 1850, pp. 491-505.

⁴ *Antimonii Mysteria Gemina*. Alexandri von Suchten. Das ist: Von den grossen Geheimnissen des Antimonij . . . Durch Johann Thölden, Leipzig, 1604 (Society Library, No. 240). On von Suchten, see Ferguson, *Bibliotheca Chemica*, ii. 415-417. Antimony in Winthrop's time was an equally entralling subject to the would-be adept and to the physician. Dr. William Douglass, in recording the death of the younger Winthrop, April 5, 1676, remarks: "He was much given to experimental Philosophy and Medicine; several of his *Recipe's* are still used by that Family in Charity to the Poor; some of his Pieces are to be found amongst the first *Philosophical Transactions* of the London Royal Society; he was a great Admirer of *Van Helmont*, and dealt much in *Antimonials*" (Summary, Boston, 1751, ii. 159 note †).

changed their treasures from time to time, by way of loan or gift, and it is pleasant to be able to read von Suchten's treatise in a copy that has been reverently handled by these two eager students of Hermetic philosophy.

The most exciting of Child's utterances on occult subjects occurs in a letter to Winthrop, written on May 13, 1648, soon after his return to England:

I had letters from a freind in Scotland, who hath pfected Helmonts menstruū, & made many excellent expim^{ts} by it for transmutacōn he did send a sheet written to me of all of thē & some things else but y^e ship was cast away & his freind who brought these things, hardly eschaped wth life. I dayly expect to heare from him, or else I resolve to see him if peace continue betwixt y^e 2 Kingdomes, w^{ch} is much to be feared: S^r I desire you, if you meet wth any sorts of seeds or stones, w^{ch} are not comōn to make me ptaker of some of them; & I shall willingly doe you service in this or any other way. Its reported by diverse, y^t y^e Empo^r of Germany hath found a secret to turne ☉ into ☽ ¹ by y^e w^{ch} he pays his Army y^e Duke of Holstein is turnd a great Chymist. Some say (y^t haue good intelligence) y^t Helia Artista is borne. I saw letters y^t came to a learned D^r from y^e *Fratres R C* to y^t purpose but he is not of O^r nacōn.²

This reveals Child as in close contact with the latest scientific news from the Continent. The "fratres R. C." are, of course, the Rosicrucians, who ever since 1614 had been making a vast stir in Europe. One of the greatest of them was, like Child, a Kentishman — Dr. Robert Fludd, who died in London in 1637. I should like to think that Child knew him and, indeed, nothing is more probable. Both Winthrop and Edward Howes were deeply interested in Fludd's works, of which Howes gives Winthrop a catalogue in 1632: he calls him "the famous and farre renoued English man of our tymes."³ At first sight Fludd seems a likely candidate for identity with the mystical doctor whom Howes mentions so reverently in 1635:

I haue bin 2 or 3 tymes since wth the D^r and can gett but small satisfacōn about yo^r queries, I doubt he hath some p̄iudicate concept of

¹ I. e., "silver into gold."

² Winthrop Papers, iii. 159-160.

³ Howes to Winthrop, November 24, 1632 (Winthrop Papers, i. 483-485; cf. i. 496, 497, and 3 Massachusetts Historical Collections, ix. 255).

one of vs, or both; yet I must confesse he seemed verie free to me, only in the maine he was misticall, this he said that when the will of God is yo^u shall knowe, what yo^u desire, it will come wth such a light, that it will make a harmonie amonge all yo^r authors, causing them sweetly to agree, and putt yo^u for euer after out of doubt & question. To discern the fratres scientiæ I cannot as yet learne of him.¹

But it is pretty certain that the person meant is one "Dr. Euer."²

The report that Child quotes about the Emperor of Germany was founded on a strange occurrence at Prague in January, 1648. A certain Johann Conrad von Richthausen (so runs the tale) displayed to the Emperor Ferdinand III a grain of red powder which he averred was the true philosopher's stone. With this one grain, in the Emperor's presence, three pounds of quicksilver were transmuted into about two pounds and a half of pure gold. From this alchemic gold the Emperor caused a medal to be struck of the value of three hundred ducats, and upon Richthausen he bestowed, somewhat later, the grotesque title of Baron Chaos — Freiherr von Chaos.³

¹ Howes to Winthrop, August 21, 1635 (Winthrop Papers, i. 499). See also Howes's letters of August 4, 1636, and March 21, 1637[-8] (i. 501-502, 504-505), which are in a strain of exalted mysticism. The earliest of all Howes's letters to Winthrop (January 22, 1628) has a distinctly mystical tinge (Winthrop Papers, i. 467-468).

² Cf. Winthrop Papers, i. 500, 502, 507.

³ The medal is figured in J. J. Becher, *Oedipus Chemicus*, Frankfurt, 1664, ad p. 168; J. F. Helvetius, *Vitulus Aureus*, Amsterdam, 1667 (2d ed., Hague, 1702), frontispiece; Johann Zwelfer, *Mantissa Spagyrica*, pt. i. cap. 1 (*Pharmacopœia Augustana Reformata cum eius Mantissa & Appendice*, Dordrecht, 1672, p. 796; cf. Gabriel Clauder, *Dissertatio de Tinctura Universali*, Altenburg, 1678, pp. 84-88); W[illiam]. C[oopers], *A Philosophicall Epitaph*, London, 1673, opposite pp. 34, 41; *Musæum Hermeticum*, Frankfurt, 1677, p. 830 (*The Hermetic Museum*, London, 1893, ii. 281); J. J. Manget, *Bibliotheca Chemica Curiosa*, Geneva, 1702, i. 200; J. F. Buddeus, *Exercitatio Politica An Alchemistæ sint in Republica Tolerandi* (in his *Commentatio Academica de Concordia Religionis Christianæ Statusque Civilis*, etc., Halle, 1712), fig. iv. ad p. 549 (German translation, *Historisch- und Politische Untersuchung von der Alchemie*, in Friedrich Roth-Scholtz, *Deutsches Theatrum Chemicum*, Nürnberg, 1727, i. 78, fig. iv); Lenglet-Dufresnoy, *Histoire de la Philosophie Hermetique*, Paris, 1742, ii. 36-37; Kiesewetter, *Geschichte des Occultismus*, Leipzig, 1895, ii. 135. See also *Journal des Voyages de Monsieur de Monconys*, 2^e Partie, Lyons, 1666, pp. 378-380 (*Voyage d'Allemagne*); D. G. Morhof, *De Metallorum Transmutatione*, Hamburg, 1673, p. 164; Wilhelm Freiherr von Schröder, *Nothwendiger Unterricht vom Goldmachen*, 1684 (Roth-Scholtz, *Deutsches Theatrum Chemi-*

The Duke of Holstein mentioned in Child's budget of alchemical news was Frederick III of Holstein-Gottorp, a rather magnificent personage in his day, who succeeded in 1616 and died in 1659. He appears to have been a correspondent of the younger Winthrop's, doubtless on scientific topics.¹

The rumor which Child mentions, that "Helia Artista is born," signified the appearance of a divinely enlightened adept to whom was revealed the secret of the elixir. There was a saying, derived from Jewish tradition, "When Elias shall come, he shall make all things plain,"² — "That Proverbial Prediction of the *Jews*," as Henry More calls it, "touching their expected *Elias*, *Elias cùm venerit solvet omnia*."³ Elias Artista, therefore, became a term

cum, 1727, i. 232-233); G. W. Wedel, *Introductio in Alchimiam*, Jena, 1705, p. 14; K. C. Schmieder, *Geschichte der Alchemie*, Halle, 1832, pp. 397-401; Louis Figuier, *L'Alchemie et les Alchimistes*, 3d ed., Paris, 1860, pp. 247-248; A. Bauer, *Chemie und Alchymie in Oesterreich*, Vienna, 1883, pp. 35-36; H. Kopp, *Die Alchemie in älterer und neuerer Zeit*, Heidelberg, 1886, i. 89-90, 195 n.; A. E. Waite, *Lives of Alchemistical Philosophers*, London, 1888, pp. 182-183; H. C. Bolton, *Contributions of Alchemy to Numismatics*, New York, 1890, pp. 19-20 (also in *American Journal of Numismatics*, xxiv. 82); Ferguson, *Bibliotheca Chemica*, ii. 572; J. C. Creiling, *Die Edelgeborne Jungfer Alchymia*, Tübingen, 1730, pp. 84-92 (with figure).

¹ Among the letters addressed to John Winthrop, Jr., still remaining in the hands of his grandson, John Winthrop, F. R. S. (H. C. 1700) in 1741, there was at least one from "FRED. Princeps Holsatiæ & D. Slesvic" (Cromwell Mortimer's dedication to vol. xl of the *Philosophical Transactions*). The Harvard College copy of the volume was given to the library by this John Winthrop and contains an inscription in his beautiful handwriting:

Presented,

To the publick Library
of Harvard College, at
Cambridge in New-England;
by their very Affectionate
and most Obedient, humble
Servant

J: Winthrop.

Like his grandfather, many of whose alchemical books he inherited, this John Winthrop was a spagyric philosopher. "The extraordinary Knowledge," writes Mortimer in the dedication, "you have in the deep Mysteries of the most secret *Hermetic Science*, will always make you esteemed and courted by learned and good Men."

² See Malachi, iv. 5-6; Matthew, xi. 14, xvii. 10-12; Mark, ix. 11-13; John, i. 21, 25.

³ *Divine Dialogues*, 1668, ii. 361 (2d ed., 1713, p. 473).

among alchemists for him who should solve their desperate problem. Paracelsus gave wide currency to the phrase.¹ For an English example, take the work called "Cheiragogia Heliana. A Manuduction to the Philosopher's Magical Gold: by Geo. Thor. Astromagus" (London, 1659). "*Theophrastus*," writes Thor, "sayes thus: That, That is not In It, we may attain by the help of the Other: by, It, meaning the magnetick Spirit of the World, which is the Philosophers True Magnesia. And That (sayes he) will follow the Captain of Art (that is, *Helias* the Artist) close."² Works were published under the name of *Elias Artista*.³ In 1666, Johann Friedrich Helvetius, an eminent physician, was visited at the Hague by a nameless wanderer who gave him a little bit of the philosopher's stone, by means of which Helvetius was able (so he thought) to succeed *once* in making gold out of lead. He published his experiences in a tract called *The Golden Calf*,⁴ and throughout he calls his mysterious visitor *Elias Artista*. With reference to this incident, William Cooper, in his *Philosophicall Epitaph* (1673), addresses Child's friend *Elias Ashmole* in a lofty strain:

However Sir, give me leave to tender you these small Reliques of my obsequious obsequy, as Burnt Offerings, Reviving and describing *Aarons Calf* ground to dust by *Moses*, with *Helvetius* his Golden Calf, burnt to a stone or Pouder, by the *Teutonic Elias Artista*, and I wish you might prove another *Elias* (as your name imports) in this Fieri Chariot, or Transfiguration for the benefit of this our English nation, and of the whole world, to glorifie him who is the giver of all good things.

Indeed, this same Cooper, in the same dedication, unconsciously bestows the title *Elias the Artist* upon George Stirk also. For he cites "our late *English Phœnix*, or *Elias Artisto Anonymon*, in his book of *The open entrance to the shut Pallace of the King*." This is the *Introitus Apertus*, the most famous of the treatises of *Philalethes*, — and *Philalethes*, as I am prepared to prove, was George Stirk and none other, though Cooper did not know it.

¹ See the references in Hermann Kopp, *Die Alchemie in älterer und neuerer Zeit*, Heidelberg, 1886, i. 250-251.

² P. 5.

³ See Ferguson, *Bibliotheca Chemica*, i. 236-237.

⁴ *Vitulus Aureus, Quem Mundus adorat & orat*. Amsterdam, 1667 (2d ed., the Hague, 1702).

This little excursus on Elias the Artist will, I trust, be forgiven when I point out its pertinency. We have it on Child's own word, as the letter shows, that he was not Helias Artista himself and that he had never solved, or pretended to solve, the momentous problem of transmutation. This testimony may suffice to quiet forever a strange and romantic rumor which was current in scientific circles on the Continent soon after Child's death and which still echoes dimly among students of the occult and the pseudonymous. This is the report that Child was Eirenæus Philalethes (or Philaletha), that mysterious adept who discovered the secret of transmutation in 1645 at the age of twenty-three, wrote several books on the subject, — including the thrice-famous *Introitus Apertus ad Oclusum Regis Palatium*, — and wandered for years about Europe in disguise, occasionally performing the miracle of transmutation.

About the middle of the sixteenth century there occurred, on the Continent, three supposed cases of the successful transmutation of metals. Each was attested by a perfectly reputable witness who was then (and should be now) above suspicion of fraud or lying. Just what actually happened in a chemical way, or just what tricks were played by the transmuters, we are not called upon to explain. It is enough for us to feel sure that something did occur each time, and that silver or gold was found in the crucible.

The earliest of the three cases is that of Claude Berigard, an eminent French physician, born in 1578, who spent a good part of his life as Professor of the Aristotelian Philosophy in Italy, first at Pisa, afterwards at Padua. Berigard himself gives an account of the affair in his *Circulus Pisanus*, a commentary on Aristotelianism published in 1643. When he was living in Pisa, he received from an acquaintance one dram of a powder resembling wild poppy in color. Berigard worked the experiment in person, and took every precaution against being deluded, for he well knew that in many former instances gold had been secretly introduced into either the materials or the utensils. The result was convincing, for by means of the powder he turned ten drams of mercury into fine gold.¹ The second experiment took place on February 24, 1649, at Chur in Switzerland, in the presence of the apothecary Michael Morgenbesser; it was

¹ *Circulus Pisanus Claudii Berigardi* (Utini, 1643), chap. xxv. p. 154.

worked by a traveller from Genoa and produced silver from lead.¹ The third transmutation was effected in 1650 at Geneva in the presence of Pastor Gross; the adept was an Italian, who turned a mixture of tin and mercury into gold.² On the basis of these and other similar events, many scientific men, it seems, soon came to believe that a mysterious adept was adrift on the Continent, who used various disguises, and from time to time introduced himself (now by one name, now by another) to some student of the art and either effected transmutation or furnished the powder (known as the philosopher's stone) which enabled one to work the chemical miracle.

Now George Stirk, soon after his removal from Boston to London, which took place in 1650 or 1651, had exhibited various alchemical manuscripts in Latin which he said were the work of an adept who chose to call himself Eirenæus Philalethes. Stirk's story was that these had been given to him in New England by a friend of his who knew the adept well. This story he printed in 1654 in the preface to Part I of a versified treatise, *The Marrow of Alchemy*,³ a work which he then pretended was written by the friend in question, but which he afterwards acknowledged as his own composition.⁴ Stirk allowed copies of the manuscripts to circulate among students of alchemy, and they excited a lively interest, both in England and on the Continent. He died in 1665, and two years later Johann Lange published at Amsterdam the most important document of the group, the *Introitus Apertus ad Oclusum Regis Palatium*, ascrib-

¹ Morgenbesser's letter dated Wahlau, October 14, 1672, as quoted from the original by Samuel Reyher, *Dissertatio de Nummis quibusdam ex Chymico Metallo factis* (Kiel, 1692), pp. 138-140.

² Gross's own account, as communicated by him to J. J. Manget and reported by the latter in his *Bibliotheca Chemica Curiosa*, Geneva, 1702, Preface, pp. [iv-v].

³ *The Marrow of Alchemy, Being an Experimental Treatise, Discovering the secret and most hidden Mystery of the Philosophers Elixer. . . .* By Eirænæus Philoponos Philalethes. London, Printed by A. M. for Edw. Brewster . . . 1654. The Second Part appeared in 1655.

⁴ The complete evidence for this acknowledgment is too long and complicated to be given here. One decisive fact, however, may be cited. Stirk prefixed a Latin poem, with an English translation, to John Heydon's *Idea of the Law*, 1660, and another Latin poem (dated May 4, 1663) to the same author's *Theomagia*, 1664, and on both occasions he added his pseudonym "Eirenæus Philoponos Philalethes" to his own signature — *George* (in the second case *Georgius*) *Starkey*.

ing it on the title-page to "an anonymous philosopher Philaletha." In this work the concealed author describes himself as a true adept who had discovered the art of gold-making in 1645 at the age of twenty-three. Other editions and other tracts followed, appearing at different places, and under various editorship, and conjectures were freely emitted as to the identity of Philalethes, who was generally regarded as an authority of the first rank. Inquiries directed by Continental scholars to learned friends in England elicited much information about George Stirk, who had been a familiar figure in London scientific circles, as well as divers guesses as to Philalethes and Stirk's relations with him. It was the current opinion that Eirenæus Philalethes was an Englishman, now wandering incognito in foreign parts.

In the course of this lively interchange of learned chitchat, Stirk's known friendship with the much-travelled Dr. Robert Child, coupled with the fact that they had met in America,¹ was likely at any moment to suggest the attachment of Child's name to these tracts in some fashion; but the first extant testimony to any such connection dates from 1677. In that year (or perhaps in 1676) a distinguished Moravian physician, Johann Ferdinand Hertodt von Todtenfeld — an ominous name for a doctor! — sent to the Breslau Ephemerides a Latin epistle on Philalethes, including an extract from a letter received from an English colleague. The extract may be closely translated as follows:

Philaletha Anonymus was really named George Starkey. He was an Englishman by nation. Having made the acquaintance of a certain adept called Dr. Childe in America or the West Indies (called New England) he received from him an ounce of the White Elixir, one part of which transmuted a thousand times a thousand parts of lead, tin, or common mercury into the best silver. And without doubt, if George Starkey had not so quickly shown his hypocrisy, he would have obtained complete knowledge of the art. Wherefore, he then returned to England with his tincture, and carried with him the names or titles of twelve small tracts on chemistry composed by the learned Childe, the names of which I do not remember well but they will be found in the preface of the Marrow of Alchemy written in English, and I do remember the following, which are *Introitus Apertus ad Oclclusum Regis Palatium*,

¹ See p. 101, above.

Brevis manuductio ad Rubinum caelestem, Fons Chymicæ Philosophiæ, Brevis via ad vitam longam, Elenchus errorum in arte chymica deviantium, Brevis manuductio ad campum Sophiæ. These six tracts were first written in English. Of all of them I have had a copy in my hands, copied from Starkey's autograph, before they were published in Latin, and so Starkey was the real author of those twelve tracts, and he carried with him only those twelve titles [of tracts] which Dr. Childe had promised that he would later send to him. But when Starkey saw that Dr. Childe would not write to him further, then he composed twelve tracts under those titles which Dr. Childe had given. And so he has been the cause of many evils by means of his deceptions. He died of the plague in 1665 while confined in the prison of London for his debts. At the time when he received the tincture from Dr. Childe he was twenty-three years old, and in the following year I made his acquaintance. But I did not come to know him well until he had used up all he had. Then, at my expense and that of certain friends of mine, we discovered the emptiness of his words. Now let it suffice to say concerning him in death, "May he rest in peace!"¹

Thus wrote Hertodt's English correspondent. Hertodt himself had nothing to add as to the identity of Philalethes, but he did assert that he had found his works a deceptive guide, and this utterance soon elicited an anonymous reply, also published in the *Ephemerides*: "I will not quarrel with anybody," says the apologist, "as to whether Starkey or Childe was the author of the tracts which circulate under the name of Philaletha, . . . but I do maintain that nobody can have written them *qui non habuerit penitissimam Chemiæ arcanorum notitiam.*"² Hertodt's paper and the reply, appearing as they did in the transactions of an important academy, attracted instant attention. There are three contemporary (or almost contemporary) copies of both communications, in three different hands, in Sloane MS. 646 in the British Museum,³ and Manget reprinted them both in 1702.⁴ In 1683 Johann Otto von Helbig defended the

¹ *Miscellanea Curiosa, sive Ephemerides Medico-Physicæ Germanicæ Academicæ Naturæ Curiosorum*, for 1677, Breslau, 1678, viii. 384-386. This was the official journal of the Breslau Academia Naturæ Curiosorum (later the Leopoldina), of which Hertodt was a Fellow.

² *Miscellanea Curiosa*, as above, viii. 389.

³ Fols. 2-6, 11b-13b, 23-24.

⁴ Johann Jakob Manget, *Bibliotheca Chemica Curiosa*, Geneva, 1702, ii. 697-700.

works of Philalethes against Hertodt, but admitted that he knew nothing of the author except that a London friend had lately informed him that he believed the adept to be still living in one of the islands under English rule.¹ In 1684 Wilhelm Freiherr von Schröder mentioned Hertodt's attack on Philalethes without approval.²

From the publication of Hertodt's letter until the present time, the name of Child has continued to be associated, off and on, with the works of Philalethes. In Sloane MS. 2558 there is a copy of Stirk's Marrow of Alchemy (made from the printed book) which has "Dr. Child" written in an eighteenth-century hand³ at the foot of the title-page under the imprint, and (in the same hand) there is a note on the blank page opposite the title-page: "it is supposed Eireneus Philalethes name was Bartlet who was acquainted with Dr. Child."⁴ Fuchs in his Repertorium, 1806-8, identifies Philalethes with "Childe."⁵ The same notion is mentioned, though the writer does not commit himself, in the ludicrously incorrect account of George Starkey (Stirk) in the Dictionary of National Biography.⁶

There is a curious piece of evidence which shows that the erroneous identification of Eireneus Philalethes with Child made its way to America and that scientific men in Boston about the beginning of the nineteenth century had recognized this Child as the Remonstrant. I find the evidence in certain alchemical books that once belonged to Judge Samuel Danforth.

¹ Dni. de Helbig *judicium de Philalethæ introitu ad apertum Regis palatium, & Pantaleone* (appendix to Johann. Ottonis de Helbig, *Magnæ Britannæ Equitis*, . . . *Judicium de Duumviris Hermeticis Fœderatis*, Jena, 1683, pp. 42-45):—"Licet amicus quidam Londini, cum nuper in Anglia essem, suam de Philalethâ suspicionem, & qvod sub Imperio Britannico, in Insula quadam Anglicana adhuc viveret, mihi dixerit" (p. 42). There is an English translation (in the hand of Samuel Bellingham, M.D.) of the passage about Philalethes in Sloane MS. 633 (fol. 234a). It begins: "As Concerning Philalethes Introitus I know not the Author Although a friend at London wth I was Lately in England told mee hee beleued hee yet Lived in Some of y^e English Islands or Plantations."

² Nothwendiger Unterricht vom Goldmâchen, 1684 (in Friedrich Roth-Scholtz, *Deutsches Theatrum Chemicum*, Theil i., Nürnberg, 1727, p. 273).

³ Not Sloane's.

⁴ Both these notes are in the same hand as the text. The discrepancy is accounted for if we conjecture that the copyist transcribed scribbles (in different hands) found in the printed volume from which he copied.

⁵ Georg F. C. Fuchs, *Repertorium der chemischen Litteratur*, p. 199 (*Ferguson*, *Bibliotheca Chemica*, ii. 194).

⁶ liv. 108.

Judge Danforth's career as a public man is well-known. He was the son of the Rev. John Danforth of Dorchester, and was born in that town in 1696. He graduated at Harvard College in 1715, was Selectman of Cambridge 1733-1734, 1737-1739, Representative to the General Court 1734-1738, Member of the Council 1739-1774, Register of Probate for Middlesex County 1731-1745, Judge of Probate 1745-1775, Judge of the Inferior Court of Common Pleas for Middlesex 1741-1774. He was also a Special Justice of the Court of Common Pleas in 1735 and of the Superior Court in 1753.¹ For a long time (at least from 1743 to 1768) he was one of the Commissioners of the Land Bank.² It is interesting to remember that he was on the committee appointed by the General Court for the rebuilding of Harvard Hall after the fire of 1764.³ He died at Cambridge on October 2, 1777. The Judge was a Tory, and as such he received the appointment of Mandamus Councillor on August 9, 1774, which he was forced to resign on September 2. This he did in Harvard Square, Cambridge, in the presence of a crowd of some four thousand people, who listened quietly to the old man's feeble voice. The scene is described in a letter from Dr. Thomas Young to Samuel Adams written two days later.⁴ Danforth's alchemical studies have attracted less attention. Dr. John Eliot remarks with dry brevity: "He was said to be a great natural philosopher and chymist."⁵ More to the point is the testimony of President Stiles, who thus records his death under date of October 3, 1777:⁶ "Last week the Hon. Samuel Danforth Esq. of Cambridge died in Boston,

¹ Paige, *History of Cambridge*, pp. 461, 465; Whitmore, *Civil List*, pp. 56-63, 73, 79, 88, 90; Emory Washburn, *Sketches of the Judicial History of Massachusetts*, 1840, p. 342; W. T. Davis, *History of the Judiciary of Massachusetts*, 1900, pp. 137, 140; *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, vii. 319.

² *Our Publications*, iv (index).

³ *Id.*, xiv. 13, 16, 17.

⁴ Wells, *Life and Public Services of Samuel Adams*, ii. 237-238; *our Publications*, xi. 36 and n. 3. Cf. Thomas Newell's *Diary*, September 2, 1774 (1 *Massachusetts Historical Proceedings*, iv. 222, xv. 357); *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, xxviii. 61-62, xxix. 63-64, xliii. 146-147. In 1775 Danforth's house in Cambridge was protected by a guard: see Col. William Henshaw's *Orderly Book*, April 22, 1775 (1 *Massachusetts Historical Proceedings*, xv. 90).

⁵ *Biographical Dictionary*, 1809, p. 148 note.

⁶ *Literary Diary*, ii. 216.

æt. 81 & supra. He was deeply studied in the Writings of the Adepts, believed the Philosophers Stone a Reality and perhaps for Chemical knowledge might have passed among the Chemists for a **בעל שם**.”¹

Convincing testimony to Danforth's alchemical ardor exists (though heretofore overlooked) in a fragment of his library still preserved in the Boston Athenæum.² He was in the habit of annotating his books. His marginalia exhibit his hand as it was at different periods of his life, and sometimes the same volume shows considerable differences in both ink and penmanship, so that these comments represent a long course of study, begun when he was a young man. Some of the books were obviously used as laboratory manuals. In Stirk's *Pyrotechny*,³ in particular, the stains, and the brittle leaves at the end, show plain traces of the action of the Judge's chemicals. The *Opus Tripartitum*⁴ also exhibits signs of constant thumbing, and all three of its tracts are plentifully underlined and annotated in the Judge's hand. Several other volumes have Danforth's manuscript notes, some of which are highly interesting: I hope to return to them some day. Meantime our immediate concern is with the next possessor of these volumes, the Judge's eldest son, Samuel Danforth, M.D., who, like his father, was a Royalist.⁵ He was born at Cambridge in 1740, graduated at Harvard College in 1758, and practised medicine for many years in Boston, where he died in 1827.⁶ His eminence as a chemist was locally celebrated. He received the degree of M.D. from Harvard in 1790.

Dr. Danforth inherited his father's alchemical library,⁷ and I think that he too once believed in the philosopher's stone.⁸ His

¹ Ba'al Shem, "Master of the Name:" a term applied to an adept in secret learning; properly, one who can work wonders by virtue of knowing the true name of God (see Ginsberg, *Jewish Encyclopædia*, ii. 382-383). Our associate Professor George F. Moore has helped me here.

² These books came to the Athenæum by gift of Judge Danforth's son Dr. Samuel Danforth (H. C. 1758) and grandson Dr. Thomas Danforth (H. C. 1792).

³ *Pyrotechny Asserted and Illustrated*. By George Starkey. London, 1658.

⁴ *Opus Tripartitum de Philosophorum Arcanis*, London, 1678.

⁵ Our Publications, v. 260.

⁶ Thacher, *American Medical Biography*, ii. 233-238; *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, vii. 319-320.

⁷ Judge Danforth's library was valued in the inventory of his estate at £300; he bequeathed one half of it to his son Samuel (Suffolk County Probate Files).

⁸ See his manuscript note in the Judge's copy of *Urim and Thummim*, p. 71: "The Author of the above written *Urim and Thummim* was an adept."

signature — “Sam^l Danforth’s 1799” — occurs in the Judge’s copy of *Opus Tripartitum* (1678), a collection of three tracts. The printed title-page designates the writer, in the ablative, as “Autore, Anonymo sub Nomine Æyrenæi Philalethes, natu Angli, Habitatione Cosmopolitæ.” Under the last two words Dr. Danforth has written “D^r Robert Child.” On the special title-page of the *Experimenta de Præparatione Mercurii Sophici* (in the same volume) we have the following state of things:

[Printed] *Ex Manuscripto Philosophici Americani, alias*
 [Written] D^r Robert Child sub Nomine
 [Printed] ÆYRENÆI PHILALETES, natu An-
 [Printed] gli, habitatione Cosmopolitæ.¹

Again in the same volume, after the printed words “Catalogus Librorum editorum Authore Æyrenæo Philalethe Cosmopolita,”² is written “anglice D^r Robert Child.” At the end of the last tract in the volume (the *Vade-Mecum Philosophicum*) is written “Script in Boston Nov-Angliae.”³ Again, under the words “Authore Anonymo Philaletha Philosopho” printed in the half-title of the *Introitus Apertus in the Musæum Hermeticum*,⁴ occurs the manuscript entry: “or D^r Robert Child sometime a resident in Boston.” Finally, under the name *Eyræneus Philaletha Cosmopolita* on the title-page of *Secrets Reveal’d*,⁵ the Doctor has written “D^r Robert Child” and in the margin: “he fled to New England where he was persecuted as a Church of England man — see Hutchinsons History.”

All these scribbles appear to be in the same hand that wrote “Sam^l Danforth’s 1799” in the *Opus Tripartitum*, and if so, they show that Dr. Danforth had got hold of the erroneous idea, common in

¹ P. 181.

² P. [223].

³ P. 222.

⁴ *Musæum Hermeticum Reformatum et Amplificatum* (Frankfort, 1677), p. 647. This copy has no indication of having been Judge Danforth’s, but it certainly belonged to his son the Doctor, who gave it to the Athenæum in 1812.

⁵ *Secrets Reveal’d*: or, An Open Entrance to the Shut-Palace of the King . . . Composed by a most famous English-man, Styling himself Anonymus, or Eyræneus Philaletha Cosmopolita: Who, by Inspiration and Reading, attained to the Philosophers Stone at his Age of Twenty three years, Anno Domini, 1645 (London, 1669). This volume has the Doctor’s autograph on the title-page: “Samuel Danforth’s.”

the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, that the right name of Philalethes was Child, and that he identified this Child with the celebrated Remonstrant.

By 1698, however, another identification had come before the public, for in that year Georg Wolfgang Wedel, in the preface to his edition of the *Introitus Apertus*, declared that Philalethes was commonly thought to have been an Englishman named Thomas de Vagan.¹ The error is patent. Thomas Vaughan (1621-1665), twin brother of Henry the poet, wrote under the name of *Eugenius* (not *Eirenæus*) Philalethes, and all his works are well-known. We have already found Child citing two of them in a letter to Winthrop.² But, absurd as it is, the error had considerable currency. It is repeated, for example, in the title-page of a German translation of the *Introitus Apertus* published at Hamburg in 1705;³ and it is mentioned in 1742 by the abbé Lenglet-Dufresnoy, who, however, does not commit himself, remarking of Philalethes that "son nom, sa personne, sa vie, ses ouvrages, tout est chez lui un paradoxe indéchiffable."⁴ The confusion between *Eugenius* and *Eirenæus* Philalethes, though often rectified,⁵ has persisted to very recent times. One finds "Philalèthe Irénée" in Larousse (1874) unhesitatingly equated with "Thomas de Vaughan ou Waghan."⁶ Hermann Kopp, in 1886, remarked that it has not been determined whether Philalethes was really, "as most have supposed," an Englishman named Thomas Vaughan;⁷ and as late as 1896, Mr. E. K. Chambers, though

¹ *Introitus Apertus ad Oculum Regis Palatium*, autore Anonymo Philaletha Philosopho, . . . denuo publicatus, cum Indice & noua præfatione Georgii Wolffgangi Wedelii, Jena, 1699. Ad Lectorem, p.15. This preface is dated September 21, 1698. Wedel does not repeat the statement, however, in his *Introductio in Alchimiam* (Jena, 1705), though he often refers to Philaletha, whom he reckons among authorities who are "classici, veri, principes" (p. 19).

² See p. 125, above.

³ *Abyssus Alchymie Exploratus . . . von Thoma de Vagan, Einem Englischen Adepto . . . gezeiget und beschrieben*, Hamburg, 1705.

⁴ *Histoire de la Philosophie Hermetique*, i. 403. Lenglet-Dufresnoy adds (i. 480): "Eyrenée *Philalèthe* se nommoit à ce qu'on croit, *Thomas de Vagan*."

⁵ Anthony à Wood in his *Athenæ Oxonienses*, first published in 1691 and 1692, distinguishes *Eirenæus* from *Eugenius* (Vaughan) and both from the author of *The Marrow of Alchemy*. See Bliss's edition, iii. 725 (370).

⁶ *Dictionnaire Universel*, xii. 801.

⁷ *Alchemie in älterer und neuerer Zeit* (Heidelberg, 1886), i. 200.

not convinced that Eirenæus (as well as Eugenius) was Thomas Vaughan, was yet by no means sure that he was not.¹

The real Thomas Vaughan, a devout and highly-esteemed occult philosopher, was born in 1622 and killed himself by an alchemical accident in 1665, but neither his record nor the known limits of his career could preserve his name from an astonishing profanation in 1895, when Léo Taxil² made him a choregus of Satanism. According to the spurious *Mémoires d'une ex-Palladiste*, ascribed to "Miss Diana Vaughan," high priestess of the Luciferians, but really concocted by Taxil, and published in monthly numbers by the *Librairie Antimaçonique* at Paris, Vaughan was fourth successor to Faustus Socinus as Grand Master of the Fraternity of the Rose Cross and was the organizer of "la Franc-Maçonnerie, telle qu'elle est aujourd'hui." In 1645 he got himself substituted at the last moment for the regular headsman at the execution of Laud, offered to Lucifer the blood of that "noble martyr" (with which he had soaked a sacred corporal), and secured in return a contract, signed by Lucifer and himself, enabling him to make gold and assuring him of a life of Hermetic knowledge for thirty-three years. After this infernal consecration he wrote the *Introitus Apertus*. On the 25th of March, 1678, his term was up and he was carried off by the devil.³ The extraordinary hoax of which these memoirs formed a part extended over a period of twelve years and affords one of the most amazing instances of human gullibility on record, but does not here concern us. Taxil owned up in a public address of unexampled cynicism delivered on April 19, 1897.⁴ What makes his fiction pertinent to

¹ Poems of Henry Vaughan, ed. by E. K. Chambers, vol. ii. pp. xxxiii-lvi.

² Taxil's real name was Gabriel Jogand-Pagès.

³ *Mémoires d'une ex-Palladiste*, pp. 110, 130-133, 172, 176-178, 240.

⁴ There is a full report of his address (based chiefly on that in *Le Frondeur* of April 25, 1917) in H. Gruber, *Betrug als Ende eines Betrugers*, Berlin, 1897, pp. 9-28, and a briefer report in Braeunlich, *Der neueste Teufelsschwindel*, Leipzig, 1897, pp. 96-101. Cf. *Journal des Débats*, April 24, 1897, cix. 782-784; *L'Univers* (Paris) for April 23, 25, and 27, 1897. Taxil had previously been exposed by A. E. Waite, *Devil-Worship in France* (London, 1896); by F. Legge in *The Contemporary Review* for October, 1896, lxx. 466-483 (cf. lxi. 694-710); by Pournalès in *Études publiées par des Pères de la Compagnie de Jésus*, 34^e année, January-March, 1897, lxx. 162-174 (cf. *L'Univers* for March 12, 1897); and by Gruber, *Leo Taxil's Palladismus-Roman* (Berlin, 1897), but many believed in him until the very moment of his impenitent confession. For copies of several journals

our present study is that it is founded, to a large extent, on the acceptance of Thomas Vaughan as Eirenæus Philalethes. Undoubtedly the blunder has had its effect in developing the notion that our mysterious adept changed his name whenever the fancy took him, and thus has fostered the idea that a number of successful transmutations in the seventeenth century were worked by Eirenæus Philalethes in disguise. Peträus, in 1717, declared that "the late Baron Urbiger" (himself a very shadowy personage, thought by many to have been a Borghese¹) asserted stoutly that King Charles II had told him that Eirenæus Philalethes made projection in his own royal presence;² and Lenglet-Dufresnoy, in 1742, mentioned an opinion that he was the wandering stranger who gave Helvetius the powder of projection in 1666.³ This idea Taxil utilized in his Luciferian romance, including the incident in his account of Thomas Vaughan and adding the statement that Vaughan forthwith initiated Helvetius as a Luciferian.⁴

But we are not at the end of our comedy of errors. In a singular work, with a singular title, *Die Edelgeborne Jungfer Alchymia*, by Johann Conrad Creiling,⁵ which appeared anonymously at Tübingen in 1730, the author avers that the writings of Philaletha have become "as familiar to alchemists as their daily bread, and have met with general applause from the majority. . . . By some (among them Wedel) his name is given as Thomas de Vagan; by others (Hertodt, for instance) as Childe or Dr. Zcheil, residing in America. Certain it is that Georgius Sterkey, an apothecary in London, who

containing important material on Taxil's imposture I am indebted to the staff of St. John's Ecclesiastical Seminary at Brighton and to the Maurist Fathers in Boston.

¹ See Ferguson, *Bibliotheca Chemica*, ii. 487-488.

² "Der Irenæus I. Anonym. Philaletha aber soll Projection ver König Carls II. gethan haben, wie dann der sel. B. Urbiger aus dieses grossen Königs Munde solches selber gehöret zu haben sehr versichert hat" (Fr. Basillii Valentini . . . Chymische Schriften: Samt einer neuen Vorrede . . . begleitet von Bened. Nic. Petraeo, Med. D., 6th ed., Leipzig, 1760, sig. f v^o). The first edition of Peträus's book appeared at Hamburg in 1717 (Roth-Scholtz, *Deutsches Theatrum Chemicum*, Nürnberg, 1727, i. 656). The Urbiger yarn owes what plausibility it has to King Charles's well-known interest in alchemy (Burnet, *Own Time*, ed. 1833, i. 169).

³ *Histoire de la Philosophie Hermetique*, i. 405. See p. 132, above.

⁴ *Mémoires d'une ex-Palladiste*, pp. 215-217.

⁵ On the authorship, see Ferguson, *Bibliotheca Chemica*, i. 182-183.

died . . . of the plague in 1665, published the tracts in question, and perhaps wrote some of them himself. In the tract *Medulla Alchymix* he . . . gives information which shows that he did not obtain these writings (much less any of the tincture) directly from the adept, . . . but that the adept Childe gave some of the incomparable tincture, in English America, to Thomas de Vagan, or Vagan to Childe or to some other person," and so on.¹ Creiling, one sees, had been consulting George Stirk's *Marrow of Alchemy*, and, unaware of the elaborate mystification which that book involves, he has rigged an ingenious combination. Since both Vaughan and Child had been put forward, by different authorities, as the real Philalethes, he inferred that one of the two (probably Child) was the anonymous adept celebrated by Stirk in his preface, and that the other (probably Vaughan) was the friend mentioned *ibidem* as the disciple of this adept and as the author of the *Marrow* itself. The outlandish name *Dr. Zcheil* is merely Creiling's gallant attempt to spell *Child* phonetically in German.

Creiling's combinations have met with all the success that their irresponsible ingenuity deserves. In 1832 Karl Schmieder, Professor at Cassel, published his famous *History of Alchemy*. Schmieder believes that it is possible to transmute base metals into silver and gold, and that the secret was passed down from generation to generation among a select circle of initiates. He is inclined, therefore, to ascribe the three famous cases just mentioned — those of Berigard, Morgenbusser, and Gross — to one and the same philosopher, who may well have been identical with a certain unnamed adept from whom the great chemist van Helmont received the philosopher's stone. And this personage Schmieder would like to think was the mysterious wanderer Eirenæus Philalethes. For him he constructs a wild biography, which is a patchwork made up of all the blunders and credulous guesses that I have briefly registered. It is very likely, Schmieder thinks, that Philalethes passed under five names in his travels — Thomas de Vaughan, Thomas Vagan, Childe, Dr. Zheil, and Carnobie; when he was in America, where he met Starkey, he called himself Childe.²

So splendid a piece of constructive fiction, fortified in its details

¹ Chap. ii. § xxxi, pp. 195-197.

² Schmieder, *Geschichte der Alchemie*, Halle, 1832, pp. 389-392.

by so much citation of learned authors, the world has not willingly let die. Figuiet repeats it, almost word for word, with additions, in his vastly entertaining book *L'Alchimie et les Alchimistes*.¹ Kiesewetter, in 1895, goes over the same ground in his *Geschichte des Occultismus*,² with the same string of names, including Childe and Zheil, and so does Gessmann in 1900.³ Mr. A. E. Waite, in *The Real History of the Rosicrucians* (1887), informs us that Vaughan "adopted various pseudonyms in the different countries through which he passed in his wanderings as an alchemical propagandist. Thus in America he called himself Doctor Zheil, and in Holland Carnobius."⁴ None of these scholars seems to recognize Child and Z(c)heil as the same name differently spelled.⁵ Caillet, who equates our adept with Vaughan, remarks with solemn caution: "On a prétendu que Vaughan s'était fait appeler en Amérique '*le Docteur ZHEIL*' et en Hollande '*CARNOBE*.' Il n'a pas laissé d'écrits sous ces noms, à ma connaissance."⁶ An unverifiable reference in Ferguson's *Bibliotheca Chemica* (1906) introduces another factor into the confused equation: "Bacstrom says distinctly that his [Eirenæus Philalethes'] name was Winthorp and that he was Starkey's patron."⁷ Who Bacstrom was I cannot discover.⁸ He deserves our gratitude, however, for bringing in the name of the younger Winthrop, who, as

¹ 2d ed., Paris, 1856, chap. vi, pp. 276-286. He gives liberal, but not too liberal, acknowledgment to Schmieder in his preface.

² ii. 130-132.

³ G. W. Gessmann, *Die Geheimsymbole der Chemie und Medicin des Mittelalters*, Munich, 1900, p. 11.

⁴ P. 309. In his *Lives of Alchemistical Philosophers*, 1888, pp. 187-189, Waite gives up the identification of Eirenæus with Vaughan, but in his edition of *The Magical Writings of Thomas Vaughan*, 1888, he still contemplates the mysterious adept as wandering "over a large portion of the habitable globe, performing astounding transmutations under various names and disguises" (p. vii).

⁵ Ferguson saw the identity of the names (*Bibliotheca Chemica*, ii. 194).

⁶ Albert L. Caillet, *Manuel Bibliographique des Sciences Psychiques ou Occultes*, Paris, 1912, iii. 669.

⁷ Ferguson, *Bibliotheca Chemica*, ii. 194.

⁸ He may have been that Johann Friedrich Bachstrom, German physician and preacher, of whom Adelung gives an account in his continuation of Jöcher (*Fortsetzung und Ergänzungen zu Jöchers Allgemeinem Gelehrten Lexico*, i [1784]. 1323-1325). This Bachstrom lived in the first half of the eighteenth century and visited England, where he is said to have become an F. R. S., though this claim is not substantiated by the list in *Records of the Royal Society*, 2d ed., 1901.

we know, was a friend of both Stirk and Child, who were also friends of each other. As a matter of fact, as I hope to prove when time serves, Eirenæus Philalethes was the creation of George Stirk's teeming brain and not too scrupulous conscience, and the works ascribed to him, so far as they ever existed, were of Stirk's own composition.

My task is finished. I have followed the career of Robert Child from his birth to his death, and have even ventured to register the posthumous fictions that have associated themselves with his name. Few characters in our colonial annals are so multifariously interesting, and none, I think, appeals more congenially to a modern student.

